

# The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

OFFICE : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S HOME, POONA 4.

VOL. XVI, No. 17. }

POONA—THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 1933.

{ INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.  
FOREIGN " 15s.

## CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK. ... ..	193
ARTICLES :—	
Constitutional Amendment. ... ..	195
Indian Federal Finance. By C. V. Hanumantha Rao. ... ..	198
OUR LONDON LETTER. ... ..	200
REVIEWS :—	
Downfall of the Labour Government. By V. V. Giri. ... ..	201
Principles of Civics. By E. Asirvatham. ... ..	203
Indian Journalism. By P. N. Driver. ... ..	203
SHORT NOTICES. ... ..	204
BOOKS RECEIVED. ... ..	204

## Topics of the Week.

### The Indian "Assessors."

THE Indian "assessors" of the Joint Select Committee of Parliament which is to consider the White Paper number 28 (21 from British India and 7 from the States, as many as one-third of the former being drawn from Bombay.) It was at one time feared that Labour and women would go unrepresented; but wiser counsels seem to have prevailed in the end and they have secured representation in the persons of Mr. N. M. Joshi and Begum Shah Nawaz. The central legislature's claims have been recognised by the nomination of Sir H. S. Gour and Sir Abdur Rahim from the Assembly and Sir Phiroze C. Sethna from the Upper House. Mr. A. Rangaswamy Iyengar's inclusion in the list is an agreeable surprise. The Hindus of the Punjab are complaining at the absence of any representation to themselves; but the invitation extended to Mr. N. C. Kelkar, President of the Hindu Sabha, deprives their complaint of much of its force. Muslims get 5 out of the 21 seats assigned to British India, if Mrs. Shah Nawaz is regarded as a representative not of her community but of her sex, as ought to be the case and will be represented by the Aga Khan, Mr. Ghuznavi, Sir Abdur Rahim, Dr. S. A. Khan and Chowdhury Zafrullah Khan. The Indian States' delegation also contains three Mahomedans—Sir Akbar Hydari, Sir Liaqut Hayat Khan and Sir Mirza Ismail. European and Indian Commerce will be represented by Sir Hubert Carr and Sir Purshottamdas Thakurdas, respectively while the redoubtable Dr. Ambedkar will be there to safeguard the interests of the depressed classes. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar could with decency not have been excluded and duly figure in the list which must be said to be on the whole satisfactory. We must however own to a sense

of keen disappointment at the non-inclusion of Mr. Chintamani or some one holding his views.

### Indian Merchants on White Paper.

THE proceedings of the last session of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry which was held during Easter week in Delhi have interest for the general public in so far as they enable it to understand the reactions of the Indian commercial community to the proposed lines of reform of the Indian constitution. The resolution on the subject which was moved by Mr. N. R. Sarkar made it clear that not only do the proposals embodied in the White Paper constitute a breach of solemn promises to elevate India to the status of a Dominion but that they register a definite set-back even on the existing state of things. To judge from the utterances of responsible men in the Federation, the opinion in Indian commercial circles seems to be that the White Paper proposals are littered all over with safeguards and restrictions and confer very little of real responsibility on the Indian people. It is feared that this would in practice lead to constant friction and deadlocks between the legislature and the executive and would, far from allaying the existing political discontent in the country, still further aggravate it. The insistence upon the proposed Reserve Bank being free from "political influence" is looked upon with suspicion by Indian merchants who scent in it a determined attempt to set up a Bank so constituted that it will be incapable of subserving national interests. In fact the mover of the resolution plainly stated that "no scheme will be acceptable to India unless it contemplates the constitution of the Bank in such a manner as to suit the currency requirements of the country."

The question whether the Federation was to co-operate in the further stages of constitution-building gave rise to considerable controversy. Presumably as a result of informal consultations a formula acceptable to the different sections of opinion in the Conference seems to have been hit upon. This was placed before the Conference by the President himself and, after pronouncing the Government's dual policy a failure, urged the immediate release of Mahatma Gandhi and other political prisoners "in the interest of peace, goodwill and prosperity." This was sought to be amended in the direction of ruling out co-operation on the part of the Federation in the coming constitutional discussions in London so long as the Government's repressive policy involving the denial to the people of this country of the right of freedom of speech and writing and the suppression of the Congress was at work. The amendment had what is described as "a fair majority," but was withdrawn on an appeal by the President, who assured its proposer that the Federation's policy in regard to that matter had already been clearly defined. Apparently this had reference to the deci-

sion arrived at by the Federation last year on the subject. This forbade representatives of the Federation from offering their help in hammering out the constitutional details unless and until the present repressive policy had given place to one of reconciliation. Thus so long as this decision remains unaltered the Federation will have to go unrepresented in the deliberations of the Joint Select Committee which will soon start on its labours in right earnest.

\* \* \*

#### The Late Mr. Hasan Imam.

MR. HASAN IMAM who passed away a few days ago enjoyed the reputation of being an exceptionally broad-minded Muslim. At a time when communalism was a sure means of preferment he consistently refused to be contaminated by it and regarded himself as an Indian first and everything else afterwards. When the historic Muslim deputation of 1906 waited upon the then Viceroy, Lord Minto, in order to press upon him their co-religionists' demand for separate electorates, great pressure is stated to have been brought to bear upon Mr. Hasan Imam with a view to inducing him to join it and thus to lend the weight of his influence to the agitation for communal electorates. But he successfully resisted it and continued to be a nationally-minded Muslim till the end. He presided over the special session of the Congress held in Bombay in August 1918 when it met to consider the Montagu-Chelmsford reform proposals. It is worthy of note that unsatisfactory as these were to him, he not only counselled the Congress against their "hasty rejection" but earnestly bespoke its sympathetic consideration of the proposals. When in 1930 Mahatma Gandhi inaugurated his salt satyagraha campaign, Mr. Hassan Imam along with his family did his best to support it, though weak health prevented him from being more active than he was. Mrs. Besant's Home Rule campaign of 1917 also counted Mr. Imam amongst its staunch friends. He possessed forensic ability of a very high order and enjoyed a large and lucrative practice at the bar. During the four years he served on the Bench of the Calcutta High Court he is stated to have distinguished himself by the independence of his character, his sound judgment and unquestioned impartiality. His death leaves the Muslim community distinctly poorer and deprives India of a sturdy patriot.

\* \* \*

#### International Conference on India.

MADAME MORIN deserves the thanks of the Indian public for her indefatigable exertions to educate world opinion in regard to the Indian problem. As is well known, she was one of the principal organisers of the International Conference on India held in Geneva in September last and a large part of the credit for the recent meetings of the International Committee on Indian Affairs must similarly go to her. The principal topic which engaged the attention of the Committee was of course the White Paper. The Committee noted "the overwhelming nature of the safeguards for Imperial rule" provided in the constitutional proposals embodied in that document and expressed the hope that the coming discussions of the proposals in Great Britain would lead to a "real measure of self-government" being conferred on India. The Conference also echoed the Indian demand for the release of political prisoners so as to make it possible for all parties including the Congress to participate in the ensuing discussions. The present state of British opinion however does not seem to warrant the hope that the wishes of the Committee either in respect of the release of political prisoners or in that of a substantial modification of

the White Paper proposals stand much chance of being respected by the authorities.

The Conference had the benefit of Miss Wilkinson's firsthand knowledge about the situation in India gleaned as a result of more than three months' stay in this country last year as a member of the India League Delegation. Her general view of the White Paper proposals was that they were designed considerably to strengthen the powers of the Viceroy. The net result of the Federation being made to depend upon half the States coming in and the establishment of the Reserve Bank was, she feared, to delay its inauguration almost indefinitely. She shared the Indian resentment at the absence of a time-limit for the introduction of the new reforms and expressed strong dissatisfaction at the sweeping nature of the financial safeguards which were indicative of a desire to withhold the control of the purse from Indians. One cannot say that in criticising the White Paper in the manner she did Miss Wilkinson was laying it on too thick. Dr. Privat's lecture arranged in connection with the Conference must have gone a long way in dispelling prejudices and misconceptions about Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress, while Miss Rolland's speech must have considerably helped her hearers to understand the inwardness of the Poona Pact and the agitation for securing to the depressed classes admission to Hindu temples. Such efforts to spread correct information about the existing state of affairs in India are extremely valuable and cannot be too often repeated.

\* \* \*

#### Social Legislation in Baroda.

IN the matter of social legislation Baroda has always been more progressive than British India and even in 1931-32, its administration report for which year has just fallen into our hands, it has fully maintained that position. Being the first State to enact a Hindu Divorce Act, its working of the same is full of interest to us in British India who are anxious to see similar legislation placed on our statute book as early as possible. Out of the 47 suits instituted in Baroda under that law last year, 46 were by persons belonging to castes in which divorce is customary; and the one suit by a Brahman woman who so far did not enjoy facilities for dissolving her marriage was ultimately compromised. 35 of the suits were for divorce, 4 for judicial separation and 8 for restitution of conjugal rights. The Act has been in operation in Baroda for more than a year without its leading to any dismemberment of the Hindu community, on which ground its enactment is being resisted in British India by orthodox opinion.

Another piece of social legislation which was passed last year and to which attention may be drawn here is the amendment of the law designed to prevent early marriages. The amendment raised the marriageable age from 12 to 14 in the case of girls and from 16 to 18 in the case of boys—a step which will be heartily welcomed by all social reformers. It is interesting to observe how the original Act worked during the year under report. The number of applications for exemption under it went up from 5 in 1930-31 to 17 in 1931-32, which is accounted for in the report by the fact that the marriage season was restricted owing to a special conjunction of the stars. There is nothing surprising in people belonging to backward communities applying for exemption, but it is certainly a matter for wonder that even the Brahmans who are educationally the most advanced community should seek to be exempted from the operation of the Act, and, what is more, should have as many as 20 per cent. of their applications granted. We hope it is the State's policy to dis-

courage such applications as far as possible—at any rate from communities known as advanced.

That the beneficent provisions of the Act are being increasingly appreciated by the public is clear from the fact that the number of infant marriages decreased in one year by nearly 300 (2,198 in 1931-32 as against 2,500 during the previous year) and that the percentage of infant marriages to the total number declined from 17.1 in 1930-31 to 15.3 the next year. It is a matter for satisfaction that attempts by the State subjects to get round the provisions of the Act by performing marriages prohibited under the Act in foreign territory do not pass unnoticed by the State authorities. Thus we find that in 1931-32 sanction to prosecute guardians of minors married in contravention of the Act, though outside Baroda, was asked for in 92 cases but granted in 75. It may be mentioned that a part of the fines levied under the Act is spent on educative work among people who owing to their ignorance are slow to appreciate its benefits.

An allied measure which was published during the year for eliciting public opinion was the one to prevent unequal marriages or marriages the ages of the parties to which show a great disparity. It is to be hoped that the measure will in due course be added to the Baroda statute book if it has not already been enacted into law.

#### The Children's Aid Society.

THE Children's Aid Society, the direct offshoot of the Children Act in this presidency, recently held its annual meeting with the Governor in the chair and from the report of its activities during 1932, the sixth year of its existence, which was submitted to

this meeting, there is reason to say that the Society is trying to fill a void in our social organisation. The problem of the child suffering from lack of parental care or from ill-treatment at the hands of its guardians is too important to be ignored and is being tackled by the Society on lines which have stood the test of experience in other countries. As is well known, the Society conducts a Remand Home in Bombay, admissions to which have more than doubled during the Society's brief existence—a sign of its growing usefulness. The number of children admitted to this Home in 1927 was 379 whereas it went up to 798 in 1932, boys numbering five times as many as girls. It is worthy of note that nearly 200 of the inmates of the Home last year found their way into it owing to their being found guilty of political offences in connection with the civil disobedience campaign. For obvious reasons the Home cannot be expected to provide permanent shelter to those who are admitted to it but only serves as a temporary refuge before their final disposal can be decided upon, the length of stay averaging 6-8 weeks per child. Some of the methods of disposal are their committal to the institutions devoting themselves to children's welfare, restoration to parents or relatives, discharge with or without work found for them and release on bail. The number of cases due for disposal with the balance of 95 from the preceding year was 893, of which 790 were disposed of in these ways. The strength of the Junior School maintained by the Society was 70 on the last day of the last year. Among the Society's more pressing needs may be mentioned an isolation hospital for which the Governor appealed for funds. It is to be hoped that his appeal will not go altogether unheeded.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

IT is to be feared that the difficulties confronting us in the matter of altering in future the constitution which is now being framed are not sufficiently realised in the country. Public opinion seems to concentrate on the fact that for all such alterations we have to depend upon the British Parliament. Our subordination in this respect is of course complete. Except in such matters as have been expressly left to the Indian legislatures, we have to wait upon the pleasure of Parliament in Great Britain for any constitutional changes that we may desire, whether they be of small detail or vital principle. The Under Secretary of State made the position clear beyond a shadow of doubt. Answering the objection that the safeguards are not definitely stated to be transitory, he said in the Commons debate on the 29th March: "It is true that it is our intention that any amendment of this Act of Parliament should be by a further act of Parliament except in so far as any amendment to the constitution could be effected by an amendment to the Instrument of Instructions. These Instruments, if amended, I would remind hon. Members, must be submitted to both Houses of Parliament. The fact, therefore, is that Parliament, which has proposed the scheme, must take the responsibility, and will have the responsibility, for any alteration in the scheme, which I think is a fair constitutional procedure." The principle of automatic development of the constitution to which the Simon

Report paid such unctuous homage has thus been deliberately discarded, and we are left wholly at the mercy of the British Parliament. This is of course a very serious defect, which must be remedied if the instrument of government which is now being forged is at all to be acceptable to the country. The public demand in respect to this defect was thus voiced by the Liberal Federation at its Calcutta session. It asked, in clause (e) of its resolution on the White Paper, that "the Constitution Act should vest in the future legislatures of India the right to amend its provisions subject to reasonable and necessary safeguards." Just what safeguards the Federation had in mind is not known. It may be presumed, however, that the Federation would require, in the case of the central government, a vote of a majority of a certain size in both the House of Assembly and the Council of State for a constitutional amendment to take effect. The more important point is whether the Liberal Federation would desire the constitution to be capable of amendment by such a special procedure only in minor matters not involving an extension of its present powers or in the main structure. If, e. g., it is thought that it should be within the competence of the central legislature, by its own action and without reference to the British Parliament, to transfer any subject from the reserved to the non-reserved list, the demand is clearly outside the sphere of practical politics. There is not the slightest chance of

any such demand being seriously considered in the present temper of the imperial Parliament. If, however, any changes are desired in minor details which do not affect the framework of the constitution, it may yet be possible perhaps for our central legislature to obtain the power of amendment, without having to go to the British Parliament every time.

But it would be a mistake of the first order to assume, as apparently it is very widely assumed, that the block to the future amendment of the constitution comes only from the British Parliament. A much more effective block will come from the States. The formation of the federation will be what is well called "a covenanted occasion." The British Parliament will be the plenary authority for British Indian provinces, but it will have no authority whatsoever in respect to the States. The Constitution Act which the British Parliament will pass, establishing a federation, will have no force in the States except in so far as the States which join the federation will have previously agreed to make the Act applicable to themselves. The White Paper says: "By this Instrument (of Accession) the ruler will transfer to the Crown for the purposes of the federation his powers and jurisdiction in respect of those matters which he is willing to recognise as federal matters; and the powers and jurisdiction so transferred will thereafter be exercised on behalf of the federation and in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution Act by the Governor-General, the Federal Legislature, the Federal Court and such other federal organs as the Constitution Act may create. But in the case of every State which accedes, the powers and jurisdiction of the federation in relation to that State and the subjects of its ruler will be strictly co-terminous with the powers and jurisdiction transferred to the Crown by the ruler himself and defined in his Instrument of Accession." If any amendment that may be contemplated in future impinges upon the powers and jurisdiction conferred upon the federation by any of the States, it will not be competent to Parliament by itself to effect such an amendment. The federation will receive the present powers by treaty; any additional powers also it will have to receive by treaty. If a modification or expansion of the constitution is therefore desired to come into effect throughout the federal area, we shall have to depend upon the consent not only of the British Parliament, which is all that most people are probably thinking of, but upon the individual consent of the 300 or 400 States that may join the federation. We may fix upon as stiff an amendment procedure as we may choose. We may adopt the U.S.A. procedure, desired by the Indian States, which requires a two-thirds vote of each house of the federal legislature for merely proposing an amendment and ratification by three-fourths of the component parts of the federation for the amendment to take effect. For the purposes of such ratification the British Indian provinces together will be one of these units and each acceding State, big or small, another unit. We cannot go much farther in making our consti-

tution rigid and cast-iron. But, even if all these requirements are fulfilled—and it will be almost a miracle when they are—even then no amendment will be possible if it seeks to make any alteration in the powers surrendered by the States to the federation. This matter will be wholly outside the scope of the federal government, and will have to be determined by each State for itself alone.

There is no federation in the world which has not found it necessary, not only occasionally, but rather frequently, to reapportion its powers between the local and national governments. Let us take, for instance, the case of Canada, to show that the question we are considering is not merely academic, but highly practical. Reacting from the U. S. A. constitution in many respects, Canada assigned certain enumerated powers to the constituent provinces and left the residue of the legislative powers to the federal Parliament, thus reversing the procedure adopted in U. S. A. Moreover care was taken to give to the federal Parliament a general power "to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the Provinces." It was also understood that even if a subject were local in origin it would be treated as one of federal concern if it grew in importance. A writer recognised as an authority on the constitution of Canada says: "A matter may originate locally, like a hydro-electric scheme, continue for a time of local importance, and gradually assume national interest and import. When such a condition is constitutionally established, the dominion can legislate and can override provincial legislation, if there is a clash." It might appear that with all these safeguards it would be an easy matter in Canada to secure an increase of the federal powers, where experience had shown it to be necessary. In fact, it has proved to be a problem of the utmost difficulty in that country. To give only a few instances, aviation, radio regulations, movement of troops, taxation, the liquor trade, the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, unemployment insurance, the eight-hour day are some of the matters that have caused the utmost trouble. These can only be dealt with federally with any success, but under the existing constitution they have to be dealt with locally. Why not alter the constitution then, the reader may ask. But it cannot be. Curiously enough, the British North America Act gave the provincial Parliaments the right of amending their own constitutions, but denied it to the Dominion Parliament. All that the latter can do is to pass a humble Address through both houses and humbly petition the imperial Parliament to pass an Act amending the dominion constitution. Of course it is now recognised that the imperial Parliament must give effect to the petition. But if the amendment desired seeks to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament at the expense of the provinces, then the imperial Parliament may refuse to pass legislation curtailing provincial rights. It may insist upon the assent of

any one or more provinces that may be directly concerned in the change, or of a bare majority of all the provinces, or of a two-thirds or three-fourths majority of them, or of every single province. Till now, as a matter of fact, imperial legislation has not been refused in any case; 31 amendments were sought during the last 65 years and they have all been adopted without question. But there is a doubt that amending legislation may be refused by the British Parliament in future on the ground that the consent of the provinces is not forthcoming. And even a mere doubt of this kind has put such extraordinary difficulties in the way of Canadian statesmen obtaining for the federal legislature the powers which they have found to be essential that legislation in many important branches of public welfare have been held up for decades. Take the question of unemployment insurance. A Dominion-Provincial Conference was held at Ottawa in January last to tackle this vexed problem by amicable settlement, but the Conference ended in smoke on account of provincial jealousies. There are only nine provinces in Canada, and one or another always holds out against any measure which requires to be handled federally but which under the constitution as it stands has to be handled locally. Unanimous consent of nine provinces (supposing it is required by the British Parliament) to the transfer of any subject from provincial to federal jurisdiction is thought on all hands to be a condition impossible of achievement in Canada, where the whole bias of the constitution is in favour of the federal and against local authorities. How will it be in India, where the bias is in the contrary direction, if for every amendment affecting the States the unanimous consent of the several hundred States joining the federation is required? Do our constitutional architects believe that the federal list will be initially so framed that it will fit our condition, not only at present but in the remote future, and that the forces of social and economic transformation which make a redistribution of powers necessary in every federation will have been fully anticipated and provided for? Even if they be gifted with a prevision which no maker of constitutions has so far possessed, what is the basis upon which the present federal list is drawn? It does not contain subjects which should be ideally there, but only those which the rulers of States, singly and collectively, agree to put upon it. If an avowedly inadequate and imperfect list cannot be filled out and expanded in future except with the consent of all the States, it is easy to imagine how infinitely worse off must we be than Canadians, for instance, in passing social legislation for which adequate machinery is lacking even now, and for which the need will be increasingly felt with the march of human knowledge.

Extension of the federal jurisdiction is only one of the many points in respect to which a modification of the constitution is found necessary. In India necessity will soon be felt for varying the essential form of government. The Liberal Federation has laid down as a necessary condition of federation the introduction of election in the States

as the method of choosing their representatives in the House of Assembly, even though it be indirect election for a brief period to be named in the Constitution Act. This implies that the rulers of the federating States should agree beforehand not only to indirect election in the beginning, but to direct election after a certain specified period. The Liberal Federation thus calls for a contract to be entered into between British India and the Indian States before the federation is formed, and no constitutional amendment will be necessary to secure the desiderated assimilation of the method of choosing representatives of the States to that of choosing the representatives of British India in the lower chamber of the legislature. But there will perhaps be other bodies which, unlike the Liberal Federation, will be prepared to acquiesce in nomination by the Princes for a short time. And perhaps they will not take an undertaking from the rulers, as the Liberal Federation would take, to have nomination or indirect election replaced by direct election after a fixed time. Such bodies will find it of the utmost importance to provide beforehand for a reasonably easy procedure of constitutional amendment whereby they will be enabled to have elective representation in the States irrespectively of the wishes of all the rulers. They may be ready to allow nomination to continue in force for a long time; they may require the consent of a large number of States to a law passed by a big-sized majority in the federal legislature for election to come into force in every State. All these alternatives are possible; but one alternative it is impossible to contemplate, viz. that the law should have to be ratified by every State before it takes effect in all the States. We can think of no British Indian politician or association that will agree to nomination not only now and for an undefined period in future, but for as long as the rulers themselves desire. Some time or other, be it near or distant, they will want to have election, and direct election on the same franchise as in British India, in every State, whether its ruler is agreeable to it or not. Similarly, they will want to have election for the upper chamber. The compulsory element will have to come in, however much it may be minimised and softened by requiring a large proportion of the States (say, three-quarters) to give their consent to election. But there must be power in the federation in certain circumstances to enforce it upon unwilling rulers.

All that this implies is that the rulers, besides surrendering to the federation the powers that will be enumerated in their Instruments of Accession, must also agree to surrender a measure of power, which cannot now be defined, that may be demanded of them on the passing of a constitutional amendment by a procedure to be laid down in the Constitution Act. We shall not be making an excessive demand upon the States if we ask for this. In every federation the independent States which join it give up not only those functions that may be specifically mentioned in the constitution, but undertake in advance to give up any other

if and when so desired by a certain proportion of the States forming the federation. They also agree in advance to make any other changes in the structure of government that may be required of them. But the Princes have put forward a demand that no such call shall ever be made upon them. Any sacrifice which they have to make they must be left to make with their individual free consent. It is no use comforting ourselves with the thought that this demand is but a bargaining point which they will waive eventually but which they are using now in order to extract concession in another direction. Even if they were to make no such demand, their position under the present proposals will be just as they desire it, unless British Indian politicians take care here and now to secure for the federal legislature a power to alter the constitution without the consent of each individual unit of the federation. We must of course try and dispense with the necessity of having recourse to Parliament every time a constitutional change becomes necessary. But it will be infinitely more difficult to get a move on with constitutional growth if the consent of each one of the several hundred States has to be obtained in taking every forward step.

#### INDIAN FEDERAL FINANCE.\*

THIS highly suggestive book is a very useful and welcome addition to the considerable number of publications on Indian federal problems. The claim in the Preface that "an attempt is made in the following pages to present an independent and constructive study of the various points relating to finance and commerce which will soon engage the attention of public men in India and Great Britain" is amply justified. The author has been entirely free from prejudice of any description but has discussed the various questions in a judicial and impartial spirit. The story has of course been subject to the qualification that it has proceeded on the preliminary assumption that India will have a federal constitution with responsible government at the centre subject to such checks and safeguards as are recognised to be in the Indian interests and "which should as far as possible be internal in the country itself and not external or imposed upon the country by outside authority" (p. 5).

This book is divided into three sections dealing with finance, commerce and federal finance respectively. In the first part, safeguards demanded in respect of finance are discussed and suggestions made which, if enforced, would make the safeguards, in the opinion of the author, acceptable without being irksome, and which would reconcile financial responsibility with adequate guarantees to special interests. In chapter 3 of section I dealing with the methods by which financial responsibility could be secured to the Legislature, the author writes that, when such responsibility is transferred (1) the voting of supplies in respect of all departments transferred must rest with the Legislature itself and (2) that in respect of the reserved departments, the legislature should be allowed to vote the supplies, subject to the power of restoration in the Governor-General in case of any rejected demands (p. 15). Discussing a situation in which the Finance Bill is either wholly rejected or so mutilated as to prove inadequate to meet the needs

of all the public departments for any year, "British Indian" suggests as a means of meeting it the continuance of the powers of certification now possessed by the Governor-General. As an alternative, he approves of the Japanese method by which "in the event of the rejection by the Legislature of Government's proposals for raising the revenue in any given year, the provision made for the last financial year should continue automatically to be operative" (p. 24).

With reference to the financial safeguards demanded, the author wants the establishment of a consolidated fund by which certain items of expenditure can be classified as "first charges." The first charge should include (1) statutory charges, (2) the public debt, and (3) salaries and pensions of Government servants. The advantage of this system is that by making certain items first charges on the fund, they are withdrawn from the annual vote of the Legislature (p. 28). The author realises that this is a restriction on the powers of the Legislature and can be defended only in cases of proved necessity. The first charges come up to 80% of the Indian budget; and if they are all totally excluded from the legislature's purview, then financial responsibility will be nil and the Reforms will fail. "It is in this belief," he writes, "that the suggestion to throw open the reserved departments' budget to the vote, subject to the power of restoration by the Governor-General, is made." In the chapter on "Exchange and Currency," the author wants the establishment of a Reserve Bank and to entrust it with the day to day management of the currency (p. 38). This step ought to ensure "that a prudent monetary policy is consistently followed" by the Federal Government, which is all that anybody can desire. He postulates the following essential conditions with regard to the Bank:—(1) It should be free from interference from the executive or the Legislature; (2) It should be established by an Act of the Indian Legislature; (3) It should be under national control; (4) It should not be tied down to work on lines approved by the Bank of England (p. 40).

In section 2 on "Commerce," "British Indian" discusses in the first chapter the demand for commercial safeguards and says that the question divides itself into two categories: (1) as affecting persons ordinarily resident in India and carrying on business in the country; and (2) as affecting persons and bodies in the United Kingdom trading with India, but neither resident nor possessing establishments there. After stating that "Indian opinion of all shades so unanimous that there should be no discrimination merely on the ground of race, colour or creed" (p. 54), "British Indian" refers to certain limitations of the above principle in practice. The first limitation is in respect of key industries (p. 55); the second in respect of the right of the Federal Government to nationalise certain industries, subject to the payment of suitable compensation and subject also to the general principle that property rights should be inviolable (pp. 56-60); and the third in respect of unfair competition, to regulate which the National Government should have the complete right (p. 60). In regard to the grant of subsidies or bounties, "British Indian" wants that the Indian Legislature "must have the right to attach reasonable conditions to any such grant from public funds" and quotes with approval the conditions prescribed by the External Capital Committee as being appropriate to the needs of the situation. About the methods of giving effect to the principle, the author suggests the adoption of the definition of the word "citizen" as given in the Nehru constitution and excluding from the protection or subsidy granted all those not coming within the definition (p. 68). Discussing the suggestion of the

\* *Finance and Commerce in Federal India*. By "British Indian." (Oxford University Press, ) 1933. 20cm. 171p. 5/-.

Federal Structure Committee that the constitution should contain a clause prohibiting legislative or administrative discrimination, he approves of it in respect of legislative discrimination; but in respect of administrative discrimination he says that where good will and mutual trust is lacking, it is difficult to prevent it (p. 70). In the chapters dealing with "British Trade with India" and "Commercial Treaties," "British Indian" says that there can be no objection in principle to tariff preferences on a basis of reciprocity with Empire countries, as there was to the old doctrine of general Imperial Preference and that provided it is demonstrated that India stands to gain by such preferences, and provided the protection enjoyed by certain Indian industries at present is preserved unimpaired, India would be prepared to enter into such agreements (p. 77). He also wants that India should have the same right as the Dominions to enter into commercial treaties with foreign countries and that certain defects of the existing constitutional position likely to prevent the exercise of such rights should, he suggests, be removed (pp. 88 and 82).

Coming to section 3 on "Federal Finance," "British Indian," after laying down certain general propositions which should form the basis of the financial arrangements in a Federal India, considers the present allocation of resources and says that "naturally, the Provinces are very much dissatisfied with the existing allocation of resources" and quotes the Simon Report to show that if the new constitutional arrangements are to confer a substantial advantage on the people of the country, "the revenues of the Provinces need to be increased by something like 50 per cent." He next considers the practical difficulties in the way of adjusting the allocation of resources that will arise under a federal constitution with the Indian States as constituent units. Every one will be in agreement with the proposition, though it must be recognised that there is every reason and justification for the British Indian people demanding that they and the States should contribute as far as possible equally towards common resources. In the chapter on the "Federal Budget" the author takes the assumptions in the Percy Committee budget forecasts as the basis of discussion. According to the Percy Report, the federal budget would show a surplus of Rs. 450 lakhs. But the Committee did not take account of certain items of expenditure which will become necessary as a result of the establishment of federation, such as the expenditure on the separation of Sind and Orissa, cost of elections to the new Legislatures, the financial claims of the States and the establishment of a Federal Court.

His figures in regard to these various items are as follows:—

	Rs. (in lakhs.)
(1) Separation of Sind and Orissa—	115½
(2) Elections to the Legislatures—	35
(3) Financial claims of the States—	50
(4) Federal Court	(No estimate)

Total ... 200½ lakhs.

Thus the federal budget surplus will, according to him, be only Rs. 350 lakhs, and not Rs. 450 lakhs as estimated by the Percy Committee. This figure however is only the apparent surplus, for it does not cover expenditure on the Federal Court. The financial claims of the States have been put down at Rs. one crore whereas he estimates them to amount to only Rs. 50 lakhs. So that if these items also are considered, the surplus will dwindle down almost to nothing. "The only hope" as he says "of a successful working of the federal regime lies in a

radical overhauling of the entire administrative machinery and bringing it into line with the present-day capacity of the country to pay for it." The only criticism that has to be offered on this part of "British Indian's" proposals is that he has not followed up his able analysis of the federal budgetary position by suggesting that the only method of cutting down expenditure is by a drastic reduction in the cost of the civil and military administration. For then and then alone can the budgetary equilibrium be restored and the system of provincial contributions discussed later on can be dispensed with.

In the chapter on "Adjustment of Inequalities," "British Indian" supports the principle of the Central Government making grants-in-aid for certain specific purposes like the development of roads to the Provinces. He is also in favour of the distribution of the proceeds of a particular tax between the centre and the units, if such distribution is carried out on the basis of the Government collecting it, allowing a fixed portion of it or a basic rate to the other Governments concerned (p. 139). On the crucial question of the transfer of income-tax to the Provinces, the author does not commit himself to any definite opinion, though he agrees that "it is equally necessary to give the Provinces larger sources of an expanding character, and nobody has yet been able to suggest how this can be done if income-tax is not surrendered" (p. 141). With regard to provincial contributions, the author repeats the well-known objection to these contributions based as they are upon the increased spending powers of the Provinces and leading as they do to the penalization of certain provinces in order to save others. His conclusion is that "in the interests of stability and permanence, this bone of contention between the federation and its constituent units should be removed from the path at all" and that "it would be worth while to try to get this result even by "proportionate reduction of the shares of income-tax to be surrendered to the Provinces" (p. 147). As regards contribution from the Federal Government to the Provinces, "British Indian" says that this is not a practical issue at present, though, as a matter of fact, if, under the proposed constitutional changes, Sind and Orissa are separated, the Federal Government will be forced to make contributions for covering their budget deficits, such contributions are however pernicious in principle and effect and mean the pampering of certain provinces at the expense of others and they should, as "British Indian" says, be avoided as far as possible.

In the last chapter, the author discusses the "Economic Case of the Indian States" and his conclusions are very favourable to the States. According to his computation, the States' contributions to all-India resources amount to Rs. 972.25 lakhs made up as under:—

	Rs. (in lakhs)
(1) Indirect contribution	762
(2) Tribute	73.50
(3) Cession of Territory	137.75

Total ... 972.25

As against this the amount of Rs. 355 lakhs represents their share of the expenditure made up as under:—

	Rs. (in lakhs)
(1) Share of civil Imperial burdens	64
(2) Share of the cost of foreign defence	180
(3) Share of the interest on war debt	111

Total ... 355

"In other words" the author says, "the States pay roughly Rs. 6 crores per annum more than can justifiably be claimed by British India from them." In these circumstances there can be no justification, according to him, for asking for fresh contribution from them. It is difficult to test the accuracy of the figures given by the author in the absence of any detailed examination of the various financial claims of the States.

C. V. HANUMANTHA RAO.

## Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, April 13.

### THE JOINT COMMITTEE—A FAMILY QUARREL.

PARLIAMENT has been busy this week setting up the Joint Select Committee, which is to determine India's constitutional future, and in both Chambers there were lively debates on its composition. The subject has been discussed almost exclusively from the British point of view, and indeed, mainly with the attitude that the White Paper policy represents the furthest advance of which even a fevered imagination could conceive. Mr. Maxton was about the only member in either House who stated the Indian position.

For the rest the discussion was mainly directed as to which section of the Conservative Party should get the representation it claimed on the Committee. It took the House of Commons nearly four hours to settle this issue on Monday, and during the debate some bitter recriminations were bandied about amongst the various groups. Sir Samuel Hoare was bland and plausible as usual in moving the appointment of his chosen sixteen. He managed to get some laughs out of his description of the awkward predicament in which he had been placed by the task of selection in the endeavour to meet the conflicting claims of rival parties, and his description of Mr. Churchill's non-co-operation movement. He spent a lot of time in mathematical calculations as to the percentage of representation to which the different parties were entitled and in proving that full justice had been done to those Ministerialists who did not approve of the White Paper policy.

From the front bench point of view the Secretary of State made out a very good case for the nominations before the House; but in submitting these names he did not disguise the fact that the Government had taken every precaution to secure their own majority on the Committee.

### MINISTERS ATTACKED.

Then the floodgates were opened. There was a frigid atmosphere on his side while Sir Samuel Hoare was speaking. When he sat down there was a long succession of Tory protestors who complained, some of them in the bitterest terms, of the way in which the Committee had been packed with those who were likely to support what was called by Sir Henry Page Croft "the abdication of the British Government in India." No Indian will recognise this as an accurate description of the scheme contained in the White Paper, but speaker after speaker declared that the personnel had been chosen with nothing less than this in view.

Ministers certainly had a painful afternoon under the onslaughts of many of their own supporters. Captain Crookshank, who had not hitherto been classed with the diehards, made a particularly

damaging speech in which he insisted that the whole basis of the selection had been misconceived. What he wanted was a Committee composed on the principle of "equal thirds," according to which one-third would have been supporters of the Government proposals, one-third would have been declared opponents, and one-third neutral. His complaint, like that of several others, was that no adequate place had been found in the Committee for the large body of Conservative opinion which has so far not been definitely for or against the proposals. They particularly objected to putting so many members of the Government on the Committee, and it was for this reason that the amendment was moved to reduce the total number from 16 to 12.

The battle between the warring groups was watched with amused interest in other parts of the House. It was soon seen that the new Opposition had considerably increased its strength since the vote on the Page Croft motion was taken some weeks ago. The Secretary of State had based his calculations on the figures of that division, which, the malcontents said, were no fair criterion at all. Nor did the Government get any support from other quarters. The Liberals were either absent or sat still. The Labour Party, through Mr. Attlee, registered a protest against the small allotment of seats given to them, their contention being that they represented a third of the electorate and might before long constitute the Government of the country.

### PROPAGANDA OUTSIDE PARLIAMENT.

Mr. Churchill was buzzing about all the time doing his best to make more trouble for those on the Treasury bench. Whilst on this question he had spiked his own guns in the House by his melodramatic refusal to serve on the Committee, he is going to be anything but a passive non-co-operator. He means to lead an active organization in the country against the Government's policy and to prepare straightaway for the long struggle which he foresees must take place on the floor of the House when the present Joint Committee has done its work. Indian Nationalists would also be well advised to keep that sequel in mind in planning for the future.

In so far as the chief die-hard maintained that the Government had overloaded the Committee with their own supporters one felt some degree of sympathy with the position taken up; but whereas Mr. Churchill wanted it to be a body which would entirely upset any idea of basing the future constitution of India on the principle of responsibility, others are just as dissatisfied with its composition because it is so little likely to do justice to the Indian demand.

One novel suggestion made by the member for Epping was—and there seemed a good deal to be said for it—that the Government representatives should have been placed on the same basis as the Indian delegation which was to be asked to come over. This would certainly have deprived them of the privileged position which they are bound to enjoy in the Committee as it is now constituted.

After a good deal of acrimony on both sides, the amendment to reduce the Commons' section of the Committee from 16 to 12 was rejected by 209 votes to 118. This was the smallest majority the Government have had in an important division during the present session. The vote against them was swollen by the decision of the Labour Party to support the amendment. But what must have been most distasteful to Ministers was that upwards of 80 Conservatives voted against them. There is no doubt that this figure represents more nearly the number of those who for one reason or another



dislike the Indian reform policy of the Government. It has also to be remembered that nearly 200 Conservatives abstained from the division altogether.

#### STRONG LANGUAGE IN THE LORDS!

A very similar comedy was played in the other House on the following day. In this case the attack was opened by Lord Halsbury who denounced the Government in no very choice language for "hiding themselves behind the petticoats of a packed Committee." It is not often that the serene atmosphere of the House of Lords is ruffled as it was on Tuesday in the duel between this critic and Lord Hailsham. Lord Halsbury agreed that it was not desirable that the Joint Committee should resolve itself into a dog-fight, but many who share none of his diehardism are disposed to agree with his remark that what they would get from a body so composed would be a foregone conclusion.

Of course, the motive behind the speeches of the obscurantists who supported the amendment was hatred of any advance whatsoever towards Indian self-government. Lord Banbury showed the extent to which some of them were prepared to go. Their bark was worse than their bite, however, for when the division was called only 13 voted for the amendment, 65 being against it.

But before the division took place Lord Hailsham gave the Upper House an unusually lurid five minutes. He turned with vehemence on the mover of the amendment and denounced as an insult the suggestion that this was a packed Committee. When the Tory leader in the Lords gets angry he shows his teeth. He was particularly annoyed by the allegation that they were trying to trick the House and the country in this matter. He described this remark of their traducer as "an offensive observation", which would not have been made by anyone but Lord Halsbury "who seemed to have brought the tradition of low-class attorneys into the atmosphere of the House of Lords."

The Earl of Halsbury retorted in kind, and altogether it was a very pretty little encounter. Throughout all these wordy debates it has been a question not of giving effect to the solemn pledges made to the Indian people on so many occasions, but whether this section or that of the Tory Party should get a few more or a few less seats on the Joint Committee. India's part and place in relation to the Committee was quite a secondary condition.

#### THE FIRST MEETING—LORD LINLITHGOW CHAIRMAN.

The first meeting of the Committee was held at the House of Lords on Wednesday when Lord Linlithgow (an unexpected choice) was selected Chairman. Most people thought that Lord Peel or Lord Rankellour would have been voted to that position. In any case, this appointment strengthens the position of the Government as he has made no secret of his agreement with the White Paper proposals.

Little information was to be gained from the official statement issued after the meeting; but apparently, nothing was done beyond the election of Chairman, approving the names of those who are to be invited to confer with the Committee (the names not yet being announced) and the conditions upon which evidence is to be taken from various bodies and individuals. The first impression to be obtained from this communique is the emphasis which was placed on the attendance of witnesses rather than on consultation with "assessors" from India. The real status of the latter, I gather, has not yet been determined, and although the Committee was sitting on Wednesday for two hours there were various other points of procedure also left unsettled. It is stated

that several members of the Committee, including Lord Salisbury, were very anxious to limit the activities of the Indian representatives mainly to those matters which might be referred to them by the Committee itself. This section of the Committee are prepared to have evidence taken in public but they contend that the deliberations of the Committee must be held in private, the assumption being that all but the Parliamentary members would be excluded from such private meetings.

Lord Salisbury considers (according to his speech in the Lords on Tuesday) that it would be very inconvenient for the Indians to be present "and to hear all the discussions, which must, to some extent, and indeed ought to a great extent to be free. ....To have strangers present as of right would lead to a very different position."

I understand the predominant view of the Committee to have been that it would be inadvisable to place any restrictions on the consultations which must take place with the Indian delegates. They will not, of course, be able to vote on any issue, nor are they likely to have any voice in drawing up the final conclusions of the Committee, but short of this the view generally taken is that the fullest freedom should be accorded to them in expressing their view. This would seem to be the minimum required in the circumstances and it is surprising that anything less than this should have been suggested.

#### REACTION IN LANCASHIRE.

My forecast last week of the political use that will be made of Lancashire's difficulties and in particular her losses in the Indian market is showing signs of early realization. This week there was a packed meeting called by the Cotton Trade League at which a number of the speakers devoted themselves to an attack upon the Government for its lack of consideration for their diminishing market, particular reference being made to India, and to the complaint that only eight or nine of the representatives of Lancashire in Parliament voted against the composition of the Joint Select Committee which has but one representative of the trade in its membership. This gathering of the opposition forces so early in the fresh phase of the movement towards India's political selfdetermination, lends emphasis to the advantage that would be gained by a friendly consideration of the proposal I mentioned for a joint conference between members of the cotton interests of India and this country.

## Reviews.

### DOWNFALL OF THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT.

#### DECLINE AND FALL OF THE LABOUR PARTY.

BY JOHN SCANLON. (Peter Davies, London.)

21cm. 251p. 7/6.

THIS book is an attempt at real explanation of the circumstances which led to the downfall of the Labour Government in 1931. He claims a very close knowledge of the inner workings of the Labour Party. James Maxton has written a preface to the work, agreeing generally with the views expressed by the author.

16 chapters have been devoted to show that he differs from the official view that Messrs. MacDonald, Snowden and Thomas alone were responsible for the downfall and he states that others besides these men

were equally responsible. He says from 1922 onwards, two schools of thought tried to assert themselves in the Labour Party. The one led by Maxton and Wheatley preached loyalty to the principles of Keir Hardie and the other believed in compromises, so much so that a club known as Half Circle was started to train Labour M.P.s and their families how to use forks and spoons and avoid spitting on the carpets and not how to remember the woes of the working-class. In the words of the author, "miners and dockers were deliberately trained to behave as though they were stock-brokers or landed gentry."

The author examines the record of the Labour Party when it was in power on two occasions from the manner in which the Party fulfilled the pledges contained, in "Labour and the Nation." His character sketches of some of the prominent leaders of the Labour Party form an interesting reading. Some incidents in Mr. MacDonald's public life are mentioned. On one occasion, he stooped to sending a mysterious telegram from Leicester asking the Labour candidate to withdraw in favour of a Liberal candidate Sir Maurice Levy. On another occasion, when Ben Tillet was fighting as a Labour candidate at Swansea, he was asked to withdraw in favour of Mond. Mac in a telegram stated, "if I were a worker in Swansea, I would vote for Mond." When Kaiser was in London, against the expressed wishes of the English and German Socialists, MacDonald met him although it was with great difficulty that he could be induced to meet the dockers on strike in London at that time. During the war, MacDonald was suspected of being antagonistic to pacifists. In Trade Union circles he was so unpopular for his anti-Russian policy that he was not even invited to the Trade Union Congress which met in Scarborough, while Trotsky was ovated on the occasion.

The author next goes on to show that by a fluke taking advantage of the absence of some on account of delayed Trade Union negotiations, MacDonald was successful in securing the leadership of the Labour Party by a majority of two votes against Clynes. From that time onwards, Clynes' sense of loyalty did not challenge the leadership of Mac. He was admired not because of his socialist leanings, but for the way in which he could play deftly all the parliamentary tricks. His florid oratory always stood him in good stead.

Mr. Thomas was another candidate for Labour Party leadership in the early days. He had his own notions of his destined place in the movement and the intellectuals had always treated him as a boulder with no ability but with much bounce. He was known for his lack of ability and pomposities which were once the subject of amusing comment by MacDonald in *Forward*. It is also stated that Thomas lacked for his task an elementary knowledge of economics, either Marxian or any other kind. It was a surprise to some how Mac could compromise with Thomas in the Cabinet, but to the author it was a conspiracy of similar temperaments.

Sir Oswald Mosley is more sympathetically treated. On account of his wealth, he achieved very swiftly great prominence in the Labour Party, but he was no match for MacDonald in playing to the gallery and therefore he paid for his sincerity.

Next the author analyses the composition of the Labour Party. Originally, it was confined to socialist organisations and Trade Unions, but after the war anybody was eligible to join merely by paying one shilling.

In 1923, with 140 men as Labour M.P.s, with the Labour and the Nation before them to direct the party programme, the record of the Party was very

tragic. When the Labour Party assumed office, the Cabinet was chosen from the Right while the Executive of the Party were chosen from the Left. Men were chosen for important posts without any consideration. As an instance of the selection methods, Scanlon says: "Mr. Shinwell who knew nothing whatever about mines but a little about ships was made Minister of Mines while Frank Hodges who knew a lot about mines and nothing about ships was sent to the Admiralty. Major Attlee, William Leach and C. G. Ammon were placed at the War Office, Air Force and Admiralty respectively." He says when the time came that natives in Iraq had to be bombed, the work was done just as efficiently by Mr. Leach as it would have been done by any fire-eating Colonel. Major Attlee, too, on behalf of the War Office kept the House up all the night resisting the claim of some Labour M.P.s. that "field punishment No. 1 should be abolished and at the Admiralty Mr. Ammon was able always to read off all the imperial reasons why there should be no reduction of Naval Armaments." It was complained that Departments issued circulars and then consulted the Ministers afterwards if necessary. The bureaucracy was all-in-all. However, on account of frequent acts of so-called indiscipline by Maxton and his group, the record of the first Labour Government was much nearer to the Labour and the Nation than in 1931 because the Party was able to move Wheatley's Housing Bill and secure some increase in the unemployment allowances while Snowden remitted some millions of taxation, although the author is doubtful whether this had the effect of relieving the poor classes.

After an interesting chapter about the famous Campbell case for which the Labour Government was obliged to face a general election, the record of the Party on the next occasion when it again assumed power taking advantage of discontent of the working classes, is examined. The Cabinet was constituted as usual on the principle whether it would be safe to leave anyone outside the Cabinet from the viewpoint of leadership of MacDonald and not on personal ability. The appointment of Margaret Bondfield as Minister of Labour despite her opposition to the Trade Union Congress position regarding unemployment benefits was a great surprise. Wheatley was dropped out because "he refused to buy a tall hat in 1924 and wear a Court suit" to the accompaniment of the Labour Premier. Coal miners were promised restoration of a seven-hour day. Workers were hoping about the repeal of the Trade Disputes Act and Mr. Thomas in spite of his pomposities and much advertised negotiation with the Canadian Government proved himself to be a Minister for Unemployment during whose tenure unemployment figures mounted highest. Sir Oswald Mosley and others who saw the betrayal of the Premier and his colleagues in not fulfilling their pledges to the workers, were still supporting them till it was too late. The Party did not take any real interest in the affairs of the working class and Mac was slowly transforming the Labour Party from a party of the working class to a party of the nation. Most of the time of the party was devoted not to the overthrow of the capitalist system but to dealing with what the author terms the fate of great seals, rocks and rabbits, access to mountains and similar trifles. The Labour M.P.s had no faith in socialism and made no attempt to realise it when they were in power. Their only consideration was to retain the name that the Labour Party was carrying on the King's Government and to look respectable, even more respectable than the best dressed men in the West End. When Wheatley, Maxton and others protested and tried to show where the movement was being led,

they were called traitors while the leaders were applauded. The composition of the Party was such that many of them fought Labour, Liberals and both within the space of three years.

The book is of absorbing interest and one regrets to note that the author has not written detailed sketches of Henderson, Snowden, and Clynes while Thomas and Mosley get comparatively more attention.

This book deserves to find a prominent place in any library worth the name.

V. V. GIRI.

## PRINCIPLES OF CIVICS.

### PRINCIPLES OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

PART I. By AKSHAYA K. GHOSE, PART II. BY SACHIN SEN. (Taraporevala.)

1932. 25cm. 322p. & 187p. Rs. 7 & 5/8.

IN these days of specialisation and a clearer demarcation of the social sciences, it is somewhat curious to find an introduction to economics included under "Principles of Civil Government." The publishers claim that these volumes have been prepared especially to meet the requirements of students appearing for the Intermediate in Arts and B. A. degree examinations. We doubt whether this claim is fully justified. Many of the chapters are of too general a nature to be useful to the average student.

Part I practically covers the entire syllabus in civics prescribed by the U. P. Board of High School and Intermediate examination. But it is not detailed enough. We believe, however, that it will serve as a valuable guide to teachers. The chapters on British Policy towards Feudatory States, Local Self-Government, and Government Activities of Public Benefit are well written.

One chief defect of the book is that it attempts to cover a very vast field within a limited space, with the result that it lacks in detailed information. It not only deals with the theory of civics, but also describes in outline the constitutions of England, the U. S. A., the Swiss Confederation, the Union of South Africa, the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Irish Free State, Egypt, and Japan.

In some places the language is somewhat difficult for the average student. The book lacks in illustrations of the principles and theories discussed.

Part II gives a very general survey of the principles of economics. We doubt whether it can give the student a thorough grounding in the fundamentals of economics. A book of this kind should aim at a clear and precise statement of fundamentals and avoid controversies as far as possible. We fear that, judged from this point of view, the book is not a great success. At the same time, we are willing to admit that some of the discussions contained in the book are illuminating and even thought-provoking.

The treatment of the Indian portion is inadequate. Frequently opinions are given on controversial questions, without any attempt to cite recognised authorities. Like the companion volume, the work lacks in details and presents a very general view of things. It does not give enough facts and figures. It is likely to be more serviceable to the publicist and the general public than to the serious student of economics. The last two chapters, however, are an exception and are likely to be useful to both groups of readers.

E. ASIRVATHAM.

## INDIAN JOURNALISM.

JOURNALISM AS A CAREER. By ABDUL MAJID RAU. (The Commercial Book Co., Lahore.) 20cm. 137p. Rs. 2/8.

WHATEVER its past or future, journalism to-day is a necessary, almost an indispensable part, of our modern social organisation. Hence it is surprising to find that books on journalism in India can be counted on the fingers of one hand—with some fingers to spare. In spite of our limited literacy and our rigorous press Regulations and Acts, there can be no doubt whatever that the time is upon us when the future newspaper will, side by side with and second only to the primary school, teach to our masses that there are happier ways of life than what they know to-day. "Journalism as a Career," is therefore more than welcome at this juncture. Unfortunately, however, it is one of those books which the reader takes up in high expectation and finishes in a mood of regret, almost with a sense of disappointment, for, obviously enough, it is too "sketchy" for the subject. Whatever other merits it may possess, it is certainly not "the first comprehensive work on the subject," as Mr. Sachchidananda Sinha seems to have expected it to be from his statement given on the cover. There are 24 chapters covering over 122 pages, which only works out on an average of about 5 pages per chapter.

To the aspirant who is bewildered and lost on the pathway of journalism that he seeks, the book is a helpful milestone. The something here is better than the nothing everywhere. But it is a milestone that will discourage rather than encourage the would-be journalist from pursuing the intended path. On no less than three different occasions does the author advise his readers not to take to journalism (vide, pp. 75, 83, 92). Not otherwise is his advice to all those who think of starting a paper. This is as unexpected as it is surprising. The author is welcome to give his considered opinion based as it is on his extensive experience. But the reader nowadays is to be convinced only by definite proof. Statements such as "of all the papers in India there are only about three that yield a profit", such as "a newspaper in India at any rate, is not generally a paying venture," cannot by themselves carry much conviction unless they are backed by further adequate proof. Some of the estimates given seem to be very hasty and uncertain. In one place it is mentioned that to start a daily paper to-day Rs 3,00,000 would not be sufficient, whereas in another place it is mentioned that to do the same thing "even two lakhs is a small affair."

The author seems to be overconfident in making certain remarks which cannot be accepted in toto. For example, he remarks that too often journalists in India consider failure to qualify in any other profession to be in itself a qualification for the profession of journalism; or that "blackmail" is still a source of revenue to some of our Indian-owned English newspapers, or that the "Mussalman" of Maulvi Majub-ur-Rahman does not represent the views of the majority of Muslims. No paper in India can be said to represent the views of the majority of Muslims for it is a debatable point as to what are precisely these views. And besides one is almost inclined to believe whether it would not be desirable for enlightened Muslim papers to lead public opinion rather than be led by it, in these days of fanaticism on religious issues.

Chapter II of the book called "An Historical Note" is the least satisfactory, though not the least important, of all the chapters in the book. The

author is the Muslim Political Correspondent of the "Civil and Military Gazette" and editor of "Eastern Times" of Lahore. He does not do sufficient justice to the history of some of our nationalist papers. No account has been given of the peculiar difficulties Indian nationalist papers have had to face. It is shown readily enough how lakhs of rupees have been wasted by our leading nationalist papers without becoming a paying proposition. But no attempt whatever is made to show what difficulties the press of a renaissance country such as India has to contend with. He refers to the "sad fate" of the "Indian Daily Mail" but no mention whatever is made as to the immediate political causes of the fate of this paper. The fate of the now defunct "Forward" will not easily be forgotten by those interested in journalism, but nothing is mentioned as to that. The recent controversy about the failure of (a foreign-controlled) public body like the Port Trust, to give advertisements about the Howrah Bridge to the "Amrita Bazar Patrika" also carries its own moral as to the peculiar difficulties our papers have to face in obtaining patronage.

Apart from such shortcomings, the book contains many interesting and instructive chapters. Chapters No. 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9, will be found very useful by anyone who aspires to serve the Fourth Estate of the Realm either as a reporter, or as a sub-editor, assistant editor, or an editor or manager of a newspaper. Parts II and III of the book contain some useful chapters from the pen of such eminent writers as Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer, M. L. A., Mr. H. J. Rustomji, Bar-at-Law, etc. Our only regret is that like almost everything else in this book, these writers are also too brief for their themes. The topic of Law and Journalism however is treated at greater length in Part III. The author is aided here by two Barristers each of whom has contributed a chapter. The author has a witty style and his humour enhances the value of the book. For example, the author in speaking of the necessity of having a good knowledge of general affairs points out how absence of this prerequisite led a sub-editor to refer to "a certain Chinese party organisation as Mr. Kuo-Min-Tang."

The book contains an appendix, index, and portraits. But though the first-mentioned contains some very useful material, like a list of books on journalism, a list of Indian newspapers, a list of schools and societies for journalists, etc., the portraits may be considered from the reader's point of view to be very much a superfluity, specially if their omission would contribute to a reduction in the price of the book.

P. N. DRIVER.

### SHORT NOTICES

**QUEER INDIA.** BY H. GEORGE FRANKS. (Cassell, London.) 1932. 23cm. 273p. 8/6.

HATE'S labour is never lost. If a new proof of this is wanted it will be found in the sinister stimulus that *Mother India* has provided to cheap authorship, wishing to flourish at the expense of India. Of late, muck raking among the social and religious evils of India has become a paying concern, and *Queer India* is but another evidence of this. When the present interest of the Churchillites in India — which is not dissimilar to that of the wolf in the lamb — wanes, books of this kind will be relegated to the section known as "Indian Coprology".

Let us give the devil his due, however. Mr. Franks has taken great pains to gather his facts, not from one, but from all corners of India; his stories of crime and vice, of caste tyranny and superstition, of priestcraft and the marriage-market are not merely narrated in racy language, but supported with laborious statistics whose only mischief consists in their highly misleading character — statistics having the miraculous virtue of proving anything that their collector is out to prove. Mr. Franks has made up his mind that India is "queer", as Mr. Trevor Pinch made up his, at the time of the Simon Commission, that India was "stark". To support this *a priori* conclusion Mr. Franks gerrymanders his illustrations with considerable cleverness. The result is that the book is as readable as it is one-sided — and, of course, it will have a galore of readers. If *Queer India* is *ex-parte*, it reveals honest research and will well repay pondering by all our priests, pundits and Acharyas — be they of politics or of religion.

R. SADASIVA AIYAR.

**MAHATMA GANDHI AND HIS SIGNIFICANCE.** By KIRBY PAGE. (Eddy & Page, New York.) 1930. 20cm. 55p. 15 cents.

THIS interesting booklet gives a careful and discriminating biographical interpretation of the Mahatma and the analysis of the political situation in India that accompanies shows how carefully Indian problems are being studied abroad. Mr. Gandhi has awakened world interest in India such as no propagandist mission would ordinarily have done; and a growing number of clever and admiring writers about him and India in Europe and America is rendering distinct service. The facts are pithily stated, the conclusions logically drawn and in the space of fifty-four pages the author has given a very vivid portrait of Mr. Gandhi. We recommend this booklet to all students of Mr. Gandhi's life.

A.

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

**SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, 1931.** By ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE. (Oxford University Press.) 1932. 25cm. 554p. 21/-

**ECONOMIC TENDENCIES IN THE UNITED STATES.** By FREDERICK C. MILLS. (National Bureau of Economic Research, New York.) 1932. 25cm. 639p.

**THE UNITED STATES IN WORLD AFFAIRS, 1932.** By WALTER LIPPMANN. (Harper Bros., New York.) 1932. 22cm. 355p. \$3.00.

**STATISTICS IN THEORY AND PRACTICE.** By L. R. CONNOR. (Pitman, London.) 1932. 23cm. 371p. 12/6.

**AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PRACTICE OF FOREIGN EXCHANGE.** By H. E. EVITT. (Pitman, London.) 1932. 23cm. 102p. 3/6.

**BUSINESS BUDGETS AND BUDGETARY CONTROL.** By A. W. WILLSMORE. (Pitman, London.) 1932. 23cm. 229p. 10/6.

**THE MYSTERIES OF ELEUSIS.** By GEORGES MEAUSIS. (Theosophical Publishing House, Madras.) 1932. 22cm. 67p.

**INDIA'S STRUGGLE TO ACHIEVE DOMINION STATUS.** By ANNIE BESANT. (Theosophical Publishing House, Madras.) 1932. 24cm. 12p.