

# The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XVII, NO. 15 }

POONA—THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1934.

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

## CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK. ... ..	169
ARTICLES :—	
The Mahatma's Satyagraha. ... ..	171
The Bantu on the Reef. By the Rev. C. Edgar Wilkinson, M. Sc. ... ..	173
OUR PARLIAMENTARY LETTER. ... ..	175
OUR LONDON LETTER. ... ..	176
REVIEWS :—	
A Critique on Protection. By P. A. Padhye ... ..	178
SHORT NOTICES <sup>a</sup> ... ..	179
BOOKS RECEIVED. ... ..	

## Topics of the Week.

### Berar All-Parties Conference.

THE Conference of the representatives of all the political parties in Berar which met on 31st March at Yeotmal under the presidency of Mr. Aney first expressed resentment at their being excluded from all deliberations at which their future was to be determined and then demanded the status of an independent province being accorded to Berar in respect of legislation and taxation. Now it is perfectly natural for the people in Berar to feel and express bitterness at the fact that while every other interest has had a representative to put forward its view in regard to the new constitution, Berar has been rigorously left out. But that they forget they belong with the Nizam's dominions, that they are legally and juridically subjects of an Indian State and that as such they carry with them certain disabilities which the British Government, even if it wills, is unable to remove. It is morally very wrong certainly "to dispose of millions of subjects as chattels, irrespective of their wishes or will." So was it wrong to frame a constitution for the people of the Indian States without regard to their wishes.

We would of course all have liked both the people of Berar and the people of the other parts of the Nizam's dominions, and of Bikaner and Patiala and other States to have been invited to the Round Table Conferences "in their own right" as the Conference resolution says, though we do not know that the people of Berar have at any time espoused the cause of the States' people in general. But whatever our desire may be, we have to recognise that the British Government had not the constitutional power to extend such an invitation to the States' people. Not only did the British Government itself plead inability in the matter, but eminent constitutional lawyers from British India too expressed

the same opinion. The rulers of States, they said, might appoint some of their subjects to be part of their delegation if they pleased, but the British Government cannot treat with any of these subjects independently of their rulers. Constitutional propriety forbids such a thing. The people of Berar too are the subjects of an Indian sovereign State, and in having their fate decided over their heads, they have not been subjected to any more humiliation than was the lot of other States. British Indians sympathise with them but, unless constitutional law is altered, they can give them no relief.

The other demand of Berar is that she should have a separate legislature and a separate purse. In respect of both these matters her legitimate claims have been largely recognised by the Central Provinces Government. There is already a Berar Legislative Committee, and the Sim formula is already being worked up to in dividing divisible expenditure between her and the main province. Berar is certainly too small to be a province by herself and if she has to throw in her lot with the Central Provinces, she cannot altogether ignore the financial needs of the province of which she forms an integral administrative part. Her own needs too have to be fully met, of course, and if, in order to this, a change in the present arrangements is required, it will have to be fully considered. But the claim to set up house of its own seems unreasonable.

\* \* \*

### The Duty of Good Neighbours.

IT was clearly demonstrated in the course of the Assembly debates on the Princes' Protection Bill that quite a large majority of non-official members (excluding altogether official and nominated non-official ones) were in favour of giving the Princes further protection against attacks from British India—protection which even the Princes had not asked for. The most obnoxious clause in the Bill is the one relating to the press. An amendment introduced by the Select Committee in this clause renders it much less objectionable. If press criticisms are founded on fact and are not intended for the purpose of bringing the State administrations into hatred and contempt, then such criticisms will not come within the scope of the measure; and unless Government proves that that was the object the criticisms will go scot free. Even so, the clause is of course not from objection. In the first place, journalists will not receive judicial trial in the courts, but they will be dealt with administratively by Government officials. Secondly, such assurances carry no conviction with the public at present that innocent people will not be harassed.

The clause found among its supporters such a fire-eater as Mr. Ranga Iyer and among its opponents such mild men as Sir Cowasji Jehangir and Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliar. Certainly a curious phenomenon. It was due to a greater realization by the one than by the others of the approaching

federal union between British India and the Indian States, on which the hopes of the former for the attainment of self-government so completely hang. Mr. Ranga Iyer, himself a journalist, appealed to the opponents of the measure to bear in mind the fact that the States, so far our neighbours, were now to become constituent members of a common polity, and surely something was due to this new relationship. It is a common feature of all federations that the legal protection that is available to one unit should be made available to all the rest; and if British India finds it necessary to protect itself against malicious attacks in the press by special legislation, it is but meet that she should extend the same protection to the States. The principle of inter-statal comity requires it. Mr. Ranga Iyer very forcibly enforced these implications of federation upon the Assembly members, who were apparently convinced by his advocacy.

#### Unity as Remote as Ever.

UNFORTUNATELY, as Mr. Sastri observed the other day, as often as our leaders tried to solve the problem of communal disunity, they had the misfortune to see it left in a more acute and aggravated state than before. The recent Jinnah-Malaviya talks on the subject too have had the same result. It would have been much better if the talks had not taken place or at least if their outcome had not been proclaimed to the world as absolutely nil, as is done by Pandit Malaviya. He issued a statement in which he said that there appeared to be no possibility at the present time of an understanding being reached between Hindus and Muslims. Nor was this all. Mr. Jinnah came out with another statement in which he gave the genesis and narrated the course of the conversations that had taken place between himself and Pandit Malaviya in such a way as to present the latter in a very undesirable light.

The most damaging part of this story, so far as Malaviyaji is concerned, is that in which Malaviyaji is said to have suggested a Hindu-Muslim deputation to wait on the Secretary of State for the purpose of inducing him to force Europeans of Bengal to accept fewer seats in the Provincial Legislature so that Hindus and Moslems may get the desired number of seats for themselves. At the last Unity Conference that was held in Allahabad, we were told unity was on the point of being achieved, and the way in which it was sought to be achieved in Bengal was the very easy way of getting two rival parties to agree that the concessions demanded by them should be got out of the third party, who of course is not too eager to fall in with the arrangement. Professor Toynbee describes how wonderful was the unanimity that was displayed at the Disarmament Conference about the urgent need for a drastic reduction of all kinds of arms, on the assumption made by each power that the reduction could all come out of the other powers and not out of itself. The people in every country believed, he says that, "their own state had already contributed more than its fair share (to the elimination of war) and that the rest of what had to be paid must come entirely out of foreign pockets."

Similarly, Hindus and Moslems believed that they had come to the limit of mutual accommodation and that further adjustment must take the shape of dispossessing the Europeans of a number of seats which had been promised to them and of distributing them amongst themselves. Undoubtedly, Europeans have received too large a proportion of seats, but unity cannot be claimed to have been achieved when it is decided that Europeans, who were not represented at the Conference should be deprived of the excess of

seats allotted to them. When Mahomedans asked how the decision was to be implemented, Pandit Malaviya is said to have suggested that the British Government must impose a solution upon the Europeans. He might as well have suggested that general electorates should be imposed upon the Moslems and thus spared himself the trouble of holding a Unity Conference. Even a Hindu-Muslim *detente* is so difficult, how difficult must be then a real reconciliation between the two communities! Mr. Jinnah's leadership of the Muslim League has not brought this *detente* or reconciliation any nearer, as several people who believed in his nationalist spirit had hoped.

#### Non-Co Operation ?

WE are rather concerned to read the passage in the Panditji's statement in which he asserts that the Hindus will not accept the communal award even by implication. Does it mean that he will advise the Hindu community not to work the reforms because they embody the communal award? If it is just rhetoric intended to impress the Government with the perturbation of his mind at the treatment which the Hindus have received at the hands of the Government in solving the communal problem, as the new Swarajist leaders obviously use rhetoric when they say that their policy consists of "rejecting" the constitution, we do not mind very much. Politicians often find it necessary to say a great deal more than they really mean, and we have certainly no desire to deny to Panditji what we allow to others. It cannot really be that Panditji is seriously thinking of non-co-operation when everyone else is giving it up, but we must give a warning that in case Hindus interpreted his words literally and boycotted the constitution it would be a great disaster to the country.

And, after all, why does Panditji show such a fright at communal electorates? He has not breathed a word of dissatisfaction so far with nomination by the Princes. He does not even ask the rulers of Indian States to substitute election for nomination even after a certain period. He gaily leaves the whole matter to be decided by the Princes as they please. Are communal electorates so very much worse than nomination that he should threaten to non-co-operate if the former are introduced while accepting the latter without question for all time? In fact, is not nomination very much worse than communal electorates? The latter one can tolerate, being a form of election, while nomination, being sheerly a negation of election, should be intolerable. We do not of course blame Panditji for accepting nomination; he showed far-sightedness in doing so. For, as *United India* said recently, in summarising the Rt. Hon'ble Sastri's recent speech at Kumbakonam, it is really a case of "No federation without the States, and no Dominion Status without federation." They would be kicking against the pricks who would resist princely nomination. We are therefore thankful to Malaviyaji for realising this fact, but is not resistance to communal electorates in the present circumstances equally a case of kicking against the pricks? If insistence on election in the States would make an all-India federation and therefore central responsibility impossible, insistence on mixed electorates throughout British India would make impossible even a much smaller thing, viz. a modicum of reform in British India. Acceptance of communal electorates is therefore even more urgent than acceptance of nomination. So far as our new constitution is concerned, resignation is the virtue to be practised all along; we can't pick and choose, as Panditji tries to do—at any rate we can't do it in the way in which he does. If one of the two is to be

resisted, it is clearly nomination and not communal election.

#### C. D. Movement's Purpose.

A QUESTION has been raised by the *Free Press Journal* whether the civil disobedience movement that was started early in 1932 was not a movement initiated with a view to securing the redress of specific grievances, viz. the grievances of the tenants of the United Provinces in regard to the payment of rent. The question assumes great importance in view of Mahatma Gandhi's statement relating to the suspension, on the part of all Congressmen except himself, of the movement of civil disobedience intended for the purpose of achieving complete independence for India. The Mahatma has no objection to Congressmen launching the movement for the redress of any particular grievances. The *Free Press Journal's* point is that the present movement does not fall under the ban, but really falls in the category of exceptions that Gandhiji allows.

Looking to the terms of the resolution of the Working Committee which sanctioned resort to civil disobedience, the *Journal* is undoubtedly right. The movement that was then inaugurated had no relation whatever to the attainment of swaraj. That was never its object. Its object was specifically limited to the removal of the injustice from which the U. P. tenants were suffering. But compared to the change of policy that the Mahatma wants to bring about this is a small point. All that the Mahatma need do is to say that the present civil disobedience movement, started for whatever purpose, should be brought to an end, so far as all other Congressmen than himself are concerned, and that no such movement on a large scale should be undertaken for the purpose of bringing relief to a large class of people like the tenants of the U. P. This is probably what he has in mind, and all that is required is that his intention should be made clear beyond a possibility of doubt.

## Articles.

### THE MAHATMA'S SATYAGRAHA.

MAHATMA GANDHI'S action in giving permission to Dr. Ansari and other Congressmen to follow a course of action which the Congress under its present leadership reprobates was most puzzling and intriguing to people who had no conception of what was passing through his mind at the time. But his later statement straightens out the situation and explains it fully. For at the moment he showed willingness to let Congressmen enter the Councils, he had made up his mind to urge the Congress organization to suspend, for all Congressmen excepting himself, its ruling official policy of civil disobedience. No Congressman will now be at liberty to perform what he was so far taught to regard as his one religious duty. The whole of the moral code of the Congress is now to be under suspension; and therefore Congressmen may now as well be allowed to do things which they were hitherto asked to avoid as evil and sinful in themselves. In fact, the entry of the leading Congressmen into the legislatures without renunciation of civil disobedience would have been not only logically incongruous but politically ineffective. As we said last week, the continuance of

civil disobedience even in name, though not in fact would have given Government a good excuse to continue measures of repression, and between a regular enforcement of the repressive policy and sporadic acts of defiance of the law, the country would be seething with discontent and unrest and the public at large would refuse to take any interest in the working of the constitution, whether it be the present one or the one that is in the process of formation. If the Swarajists are to have any chance at all, it was necessary that the country should be brought back to normal conditions by the discontinuance of the illegal activities of the Congress, and not only Swarajists but all constitutional politicians will therefore be grateful to Mahatma Gandhi for the momentous step he has taken. Even so, it would be too much to hope that, in the existing conditions, the Swarajists will be able to achieve any brilliant success — not at the polls (which may be possible), but in the Councils. Particularly, a modification of the White Paper in the desired direction is an utter impossibility, and the Swarajists will do well not to build too high hopes on it. Indeed, one doubts whether the formal withdrawal of civil disobedience will not help to relieve Government of the sort of vague fear which the movement, although it has ceased to be an active force for some time, serves to inspire in them. Anyway, the reforms, whatever they are, will now have a fair chance. They will not suffer from the initial handicap of a non-co-operation movement which made the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms so exceedingly unfruitful. If the new constitution fails to bring contentment to the people, as we are convinced it will, it will be due to the inherent defects contained in it.

Very often, in the case of the Mahatma, it is a trifle that leads him to effect revolutionary changes in his plans; so it has happened, it seems to us, on the present occasion. An old friend of his preferred the reading of books to the performance of the gaol task. This small incident convinced him that no one had grasped the essentials of satyagraha, and that the movement must be brought to an end. It appeared to us that there were signs galore, long before this incident took place, that even in his closest followers the faith in the potency of his movement had dimmed quite a great deal. It was the unanimous impression of all independent observers of the Poona Conference of July last that most Congressmen had tired of mass civil disobedience and that none believed in individual civil disobedience, which he forced upon the Congress against the earnest entreaties of his most ardent disciples. He enjoined upon all Congressmen, good and true, to seek imprisonment by defiance of some law or other and to repeat the process to the end of their lives immediately after coming out of gaol. The first time they could not very well avoid going to prison, but after their terms expired, they were not in too great a hurry to make straight for prison once again, as they were ordered to do. This can be said of most of the prominent leaders on whom Gandhiji relied to keep up the movement. Some difficulty or other

always popped up, which made them tarry a little outside the gaol. Ordinary men would form but one conclusion from such a phenomenon, viz. that the movement must be liquidated, but it made no difference to Gandhiji. What has decided him now to take that course is something to which the average man would attach little importance.

He now wishes to purge the movement of the impurities that have come to be associated with it. Satyagraha, as he understands it, is a spiritual movement; it has, however, degenerated in the hands of his followers into a purely political or nationalist movement, and a narrowly nationalist one at that. They like it only to the extent that it causes serious embarrassment to the Government which they want to fight. A disarmed people can fight Government only by organising boycotts, strikes, non-co-operation movements and defiance of law. Congressmen took to this weapon because, in their belief, it was more powerful, though also it involved greater risks, than the constitutional weapon, to the use of which alone Liberals and other non-Congress parties have pledged themselves. Congressmen knew nothing of the superior ethical qualities which Mahatma Gandhi claims for satyagraha and cared even less. If he could invest it with an aura of saintliness reflected from his own personality they would not mind basking in it. But they always felt great annoyance and exasperation with anyone who reminded them that the fight that they had to wage with Government must be waged on the moral plane. To them it was first and last a political fight, in which all weapons were permissible but satyagraha was most to be used because non-co-operation and civil resistance were likely to bring Government down on their knees sooner than others. Mr. Nariman in his interview scouts the spiritual aspect of satyagraha and says it was wholly political, and he is typical of the average Congressman. Mahatma Gandhi expresses surprise that in the view of his followers satyagraha consisted only of non-co-operation and civil resistance. There is no need however for him to feel any surprise. The political side of satyagraha is represented only by these two phases and they have never recognised any other side to satyagraha than political. Satyagraha, as they understand it, is one form or another of what is aptly called Non-Violent Coercion. Government, they believe, can be made to change their anti-national policy by pressure, and satyagraha is to be prized only because it puts a much greater amount of pressure on them than the methods of constitutional agitation. The Mahatma may speak of bringing about a change

of heart, of persuasion, of strict abstention from coercion, and all the rest of it, but his followers know that the whole movement is one of coercion, coercion without physical violence perhaps, but coercion all the same.

Mahatma Gandhi complains that the message of satyagraha was adulterated in the process of transmission to the masses through unspiritual media, and for that reason he has now decided not to let these unspiritual media meddle any longer with civil resistance. We cannot be too sure, however that the contamination does not lie at the source, and that Mahatma Gandhi himself was not responsible on some occasions for taking the movement on to unspiritual lines. His advice to civil disobedience volunteers to raid the salt pans or to hold a pinch of salt in their fingers till they were forcibly made to part with it, his determination to continue the movement even if physical violence should break out and several other things like that do not show him as a leader who always kept the spiritual aspect of satyagraha to the forefront or evinced a Tolstoyan horror of the use of physical force. In the course of his movement intimidation and compulsion have been frequently brought to bear by his volunteers on those who took a different view of politics. It may have been the case that he was powerless to prevent such acts; but the fact remains that he let the movement go on in spite of them. Whatever may be pleaded in extenuation for these things, there have been instances enough in which he himself was the prompter of the use of physical force against his adversary, which invalidates his claim for the preaching of the gospel of a pure and spiritual sort of satyagraha. Now he alone is to carry on the movement. If he does, satyagraha, as he will practise it, has not in it the capacity of propagating itself. He considers himself to be on parole as it were till August. When, on regaining his freedom, he will offer civil disobedience, he will be sent to gaol but will very likely either come out again on parole to do harijan work, or obtain facilities for doing the work as if he were a free man. In any case his activities will continue. If he were to undergo continuous imprisonment, the sympathy that the public will feel for him will probably impel others to desire to do likewise. But, as it is, there is not much of the martyr's blood in his case. There is of course none but would like Mahatma Gandhi to do harijan work rather than rot in gaol, but the public would find it rather difficult to remember, while he is doing this work, that he is also offering civil resistance.

## THE BANTU ON THE REEF.

THE race problem in South Africa is one that must be tackled sooner or later. Up to the present it has merely been drugged to prevent undue disturbance. The coalition and possible fusion of the two European political parties is the solution of a large aspect of the problem, but not the largest.

In fact the Native policy of the two coalescing parties is vastly different. The Nationalists led by the Prime Minister, General Hertzog, would like to pursue a segregation policy; the South African Party under General Smuts has always been more liberal towards the Bantu. Hence the delay in bringing the

Prime Minister's Native Bills before Parliament is due to the fact that the support of as large a section of the population as possible is desired, and this cannot be had until the spirit of coalition and fusion has had more opportunity to entrench itself; until the country can say as a whole, "Now we can all agree upon this."

In the meantime the problem remains unsolved, and the Reef—the economic back-bone of South Africa because of its vast resources of gold and wealth—continues to rear its head above all possible solutions and dictator-like seems to say, "You must first and foremost and always consider me in any solution of the Native problem." Indeed Johannesburg is the focal point where all aspects of the problem centre; where public opinion is most prevalent and relevant; where a large proportion of the more educated Bantu congregate, and where any practicable solution must be approved and endorsed. For consider some of the facts concerning this great city and its relation to the rest of the country.

Fifty years ago it was bare veld. Pretoria and Potchefstroom were the largest towns in the Transvaal, and no one could say the European settlers in the Free State or Transvaal were ousting the Bantu. For in those days there were scarcely any there! In fact the only portions of South Africa which the Bantu could really call 'Our country' were in the Eastern Province, Natal, Pondoland, Zululand, Basutoland, Swaziland, Bechuanaland and small sections of the Transvaal to the west and north. And in these areas the large Native Reserves and Protectorates have been formed. At first they were large enough to meet the needs of the population, but this has since increased so rapidly that they are quite inadequate, and more land must be made available. Indeed the Native Economic Commission Report of 1930-1932 comes to the conclusion that the solution of the whole Native problem lies in the Reserves, and it is more than likely that one of the new Native Bills will deal with this need possibly on lines of further segregation. And we agree, provided that it is recognised that this will only solve ONE PORTION OF ONE ASPECT OF THE WHOLE PROBLEM, the economic in the Reserves. There would still remain the economic situation in the towns and industrial areas, and also the main question of inter-racial relations of both White and Black in South Africa as a whole. And it is on the Reef that any new relations must work, and from the Reef that they must be patterned in other parts with due regard to peculiar circumstances.

On the Reef gold was discovered in 1886 and in less than fifty years one of the largest and finest cities of the world has come into existence. In one recent month alone the cost of buildings passed in plan-form by the municipality was over a million pounds. Cloud-scrapers of ten to fifteen storeys are rising rapidly and so the whole aspect of the place is still changing. New mine shafts go down into the bowels of the earth periodically. The Reef gold mines pay nearly ten million pounds per annum to the Union Government in taxes. Such progress is one

of the dramas of South African history, but it is not all the White man's work. There are 220,000 Bantu employed on the mines alone, and nearly another 100,000 in domestic service and other occupations. Segregate these and where will the mines be? Or our dinners? We may smile at this, but there are not 300,000 unemployed Europeans in the whole of South Africa!

Already the municipalities along the Reef are pursuing a modified segregation policy in their locations and townships, and no one can conscientiously object to this. But if it is a prelude to total segregation—well, we dare not attempt to prophesy the consequences. It seems as if the word segregation is the wrong one, and one more in keeping with what is being and will be done will have to be found. Or it will have to be qualified by calling the policy social segregation, but not economic. Such a policy, as has been said, is being pursued by many municipalities and Johannesburg is well to the fore especially in a scheme at Orlando. This is situated about ten miles from the centre of the city, and has cheap railway facilities. "Orlando seems to be the outcome of ripe experience in settling urban Bantu under hygienic and progressive conditions. It is designed to cover 3,000 acres of ground, and to house 80,000 people. Already about 2,000 houses have been completed, and these are of different types. Each house has a neat veranda and either two or three airy compartments. The roofs are corrugated iron and windows of the steel type. A recreation ground, hall and other buildings, and a vegetable garden to each home, have been provided. The Bantu so liberally provided for cannot help taking a real pride in their new homes and surroundings so long as the Johannesburg Council carry out their duty of providing the amenities of a civilised life to make the scheme attractive. The Council is prepared to build houses for Bantu who cannot build for themselves, and will very seriously consider applications from Bantu who want to build their own houses. A town hall is to be built, and a police station established for the administration of law and the preserving of peace and order. Altogether Orlando is a model township well worth emulating by other authorities eager to pride themselves in having in their environs a happy, peaceful and progressive Bantu community." This is very encouraging when one compares it with such a disgraceful location as the one at Benoni. There filth and crime, squalor and sordidness abound. At one period the infant mortality rate was over 95 per cent!

We conclude then that in the towns the Bantu have come to stay. They must, and South Africa can only realise its fulfilment in the co-operation of all the races, living peaceably and amicably together, each seeking not its own selfish ends alone, but the good of the whole community. To this end there are many agencies at work preparing the soil of public opinion, both European and Bantu, Asiatic and Coloured. These conduct recreational, educational, social and religious activities and spread healthy propaganda on these lines. Among these on the Reef are the churches, the Joint Councils of European and

other races, and a very liberal press so far as race-relations are concerned.

Football, tennis and cricket have now a prominent place in Bantu recreation on the Reef. The following paragraph indicates the need that is and must be satisfied chiefly in this way. "The decreased sales of kaffir beer are not due so much to illicit brewing as to the increased interest the Bantu are taking in week-end and holiday sport. A visit to the sports ground provided for Bantu would very soon convince any person of the changing habits of the Bantu in this respect, for the grounds are filled in the off-hours with young Bantu either practising or taking part in a match, with the older ones looking on. It is very likely that sport, by providing an outlet for the Bantus' energies, will play a far greater role in weaning them from excessive beer drinking than the combined attempts of all the reforming bodies."

In Bantu education, however, the Reef is by no means prominent. The financing of such education is a Union Government matter, while the organisation is Provincial. Much of the criticism of the financing of Bantu education is wrongly directed at the provincial department, which is in reality little more than a clearing house which allocates the funds voted by the Union government for the purpose from the Native Development Fund. In the Transvaal out of nearly 300,000 Bantu children, only 78,000 are in registered government-aided schools. The grant from the Union government for this number is about £100,000 per annum, but this has been reduced by ten per cent. during the past year. Hence if compulsory education were introduced, the cost would be raised to about £300,000 a year. If the province takes over the provision of buildings and equipment as well (which is at present being done most generously by missionary bodies), the cost would be over £2,000,000. This money is not available, and so the present situation can only be eased by economy and co-operation, until such time as the Union Government sees fit to put more money at the disposal of the provincial department. Very few will welcome further taxation for this purpose. The province is financing Bantu education from its own funds to the extent of paying the salaries of inspectors of Bantu schools and officials directly concerned with Bantu education in the department. Most of the schools in the Transvaal are at present understaffed; indeed to staff them adequately 1,000 more teachers would have to be employed. The real need of Bantu education therefore is an enlightened public opinion especially on such points as these. Until the public realises that the Bantu in South Africa are an integral part of the population very little can be done. The Government cannot legislate ahead of public opinion.

Socially, missionary and other bodies are providing a certain amount of activity for the Bantu. The Bantu Men's Social Centre is a club for Bantu men who can spare the time and pay the ten shillings per annum membership fee. Indoor and outdoor games, music, a wireless, gymnasium and library are among the chief attractions. Many churches carry on night school work for men who have to

labour all day but who have never had ample opportunity even for primary education. Five such schools are under the supervision of the writer, the largest being attended by nearly two hundred men of ages ranging from fifteen to forty. They are given the rudiments of education up to standard VI, and encouraged in their social and religious aspirations. Bioscope films are shown them each week, the school being one of a large circuit including mine compounds, reformatories and halls, which obtain the hire of the films when they have been discarded as no longer up to date for European audiences. In the Pathfinder and Wayfarer movements are the equivalents of the Boy Scout and Girl Guide movements. The full status of Pathfinders and Wayfarers as Scouts and Guides respectively, however, has not yet been recognised by the latter movements, and in this way South Africa lags behind other countries in certain ways not so far advanced. By these means many Bantu are kept away from such harmful and lawless influences as liquor dens, and given some satisfaction for their social and intellectual ambitions.

Inherent in the Bantu is the heritage of a deeply religious tribal life and ancestral customs. He is truly "a religious animal." Some aspects of his primitive life are good and a powerful force in his moral behaviour: others are as definitely bad. Christian missionaries endeavour to find practical expression for the good and to sublimate the bad by replacing it with Christian teaching. But it is no easy task. Though deeply religious, the Bantu does not find it easy to adjust his ethical ideas to the new religious experience he finds in Christianity. It will take time before Christianity has the same moral power over him as his primitive tribal sanctions had. So outwardly Western civilisation has brought about the moral degradation of many of the Bantu. Nevertheless Christian missionaries, some of whom are now also trained in social anthropology, seek with all their power and persistence to remedy this evil.

We would suggest further that the majority of urban Bantu have reached the stage that may be called the awkward stage in the transference from one culture level to another, just as the average European youth passes through a similar stage soon after leaving school. The adjustment to the new environment cannot be expected to take place immediately. Let it be stressed, however, that the adjustment is not inherently impossible. One could quote instances upon instances of remarkable mental development among the Bantu, which the findings of psychology and social anthropology confirm. The whole question is the best way of assisting this adjustment, or to quote from the Native Economic Commission Report, "how best to help the Native on the upward march toward civilisation."

C. EDGAR WILKINSON.

## Our Parliamentary Letter.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

NEW DELHI, April 8.

### SUGAR DUTY.

**A**FTER two days' heated debate over excise duty on sugar, the Bill was referred to the Select Committee on Tuesday last. Government had taken the wind out of the Opposition's sails by warning that their financial scheme stood as a whole, and that any attempt to cut it out would mean that the provinces of Bengal, Bihar and Assam would have to forego the contributions. Provincial interests thus clashed and stifled much of the opposition to the two financial Bills before the Assembly. Mr. Hariraj Swarup brought to the notice of Government that the provincial Councils had unanimously condemned the excise duty on sugar and appealed to the House to follow in their wake, and throw out the Bill. He challenged the Finance Member's statement about the high profits made by the sugar factories and made out that the industry got hardly ten per cent profit, when all the factors were taken into consideration. Mr. Morgan thought that the Finance Member was too pessimistic about the import of sugar and Government could safely count on getting perhaps double the amount they had budgeted for. Bhai Permanand deplored that the present Government had no national outlook and did not come forward to foster a developing industry; instead they were out to kill the hen that laid the golden eggs. Mr. A. Das showed that whereas the Tariff Board had recommended that after the deduction of the price of sugar cane the margin should be Rs. 4-7-0 per maund it hardly worked out now at Rs. 2-7-6 and the industry thus could not bear the additional burden of the excise duty. Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliar referred to the Finance Member's remarks about the sentimental pleasure of the protectionist policy and pointedly asked whether the United Kingdom itself did not spend more than 35 crores for the same sentimental pleasure. If there was any industry that required encouragement at the hands of the Government it was this, and curiously enough, it was the very industry that Government had set themselves out to destroy by such a measure. Haji Abdulla Haroon warned Government that from personal knowledge of the industry, he had no doubt that within a year about one third of the factories would close down owing to the imposition of the duty. Mr. Aggarwal considered it absolutely unfair on the part of Government to impose an excise duty at so early a stage of the industry, after giving it a promise of protection for some years. He was afraid that a serious industrial crisis would follow if Government persisted in their policy. The Finance Member in replying to the debate repudiated the charge that he was killing an infant industry. Government still held to the policy of protection, and they were satisfied that their proposals did not deviate from that policy. The Bill was then referred to the Select Committee.

### EXCISE DUTY ON MATCHES.

This Bill did not excite so much opposition as did the Sugar Excise Bill. During the debate Mr. Joshi pointed out that Sir George Schuster had clearly hinted that the duty was needed to give contributions to Bengal and other provinces; opposition in that case would then mean opposition to the contribution to those provinces and this made the position of members difficult. The President, however, ruled that a vote on the Bill

did not mean a vote either in favour of or opposition to the contributions, but merely on the merits of the Bill. All the same the association of the proposal with the contributions to the provinces did weaken the opposition, no doubt. Sir George Schuster, when he moved for reference to the Select Committee, did not make a fighting speech as in the case of the Sugar Excise Duty Bill, but merely told the House that some technical modifications were required and they would be dealt with in the Select Committee. Mr. B. Das was afraid that Government would not get much revenue out of the duty as already large stocks had been accumulated in the markets and the rise in the prices would only put the difference into the pockets of the middlemen. He and Sir Cowasji Jehangir asked Government to exercise stricter control over the collection of excise from the State territories, otherwise the object of the Bill would be defeated. Sir Cowasji asked Government to make sure whether their collecting machinery acted efficiently, before they came to the Assembly for more taxes. He complained that the Government had come to the House three times for money when they had neglected their duty in allowing diversion of trade by unfair means to some of the ports in some of the States. Members must be assured that every rupee that was voted was being collected by the Government. His accusation that Government had not shown a due sense of responsibility in the matter was repudiated by the Finance Member when he replied to the debate. The Bill was then sent to the Select Committee.

### STATES PROTECTION BILL.

The States Protection Bill came up for further consideration on Wednesday last and discussion remained unfinished when the Assembly rose on Saturday afternoon. Sir Harry Haig in moving for the consideration of the report of the Select Committee laid emphasis on the fact that mere narration of facts in the press would not be penalised under the Bill. The attack on the Bill was started by Sardar Sant Singh who complained that Government had been lately adding to the repressive laws. If the new law did not penalise legitimate ventilation of grievances against a State, it at least did make it difficult and impossible. If the States claimed the protection the Bill tried to give, Sardar Sant Singh claimed that they should first improve their autocratic administration and put it on a legal footing. It was not the States that stood in need of protection so much as did the subjects of those States. Sir Abdur Rahim failed to understand the very necessity of the Bill when Government possessed sufficient powers under the ordinary laws. The Indian Penal Code did make provision for the cases which the Bill meant to provide against. Government had hardly made out any case for emergency in taking recourse to such drastic legislation. Mr. Neogy did not think that the Bill would achieve the purpose of stopping blackmail, for the attacks in such cases were directed more against the person of the ruler or the members of the ruling family. He would be prepared to support some measure to that end if Government would bring forward one. Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer would, however, not care to legislate for the person of the rulers or the members of their family unless they became constitutional rulers. He welcomed the Bill in certain respects, as it would prevent the fanning of communal jealousies in the States. Sir B. L. Mitter explained that the States were entitled to some protection as 'our neighbours' and Government merely wanted to protect them against the mischievous activities of certain persons in British India. Mr. Puri bitterly complained the autocratic ways of the Princes and he said it would be hypocrisy to speak in moderation about it.

Maulvi Shafee Daudi feared that such legislation would only drive discontent underground and would be a greater menace to be contended against. He warned that people had already become desperate as in some States even 'a whisper of grievances' was not allowed. Sir Harry Haig replied that as the sending of jathas had stirred up feelings in British territories it was in the interest of British India as also in that of States that such movements should not develop. It, therefore, obviated the necessity of the States themselves asking for such legislation. Already under the press laws they had certain powers and they did not therefore introduce any emergency legislation. In the end he assured the House that the fear that conferences of States' subjects would be prohibited was a groundless fear. The motion was then passed and the bill was taken up clause by clause. Sardar Sant Singh attempted to get the clause regarding conspiracy deleted but failed. He then attempted to substitute an overt act in place of a conspiracy being made punishable and also tried to lessen the punishment but also found little support and the second clause remained as reported by the Select Committee.

---

## Our London Letter.

---

( BY AIR MAIL. )

( From Our Correspondent. )

LONDON, March 29.

### THE PRINCES AND FEDERATION.

I DO not know how far it is known in India, but I have reason to believe, from the very best authorities available, that the opponents of the Indian reforms scheme here have recently been exercising pressure upon the Princes, or the most important of them, with a view to arousing their alarm as to their position under the reforms, and urging them to put their case as high as possible in the hope that by doing so they will lay down such embarrassing conditions as to kill all prospects of the Federation and thereby of Central Responsibility. This rather blatant programme of hostility to the reforms rather than of friendliness to the Princes has, it would appear, signally failed, and the parties concerned have had to swallow one more snub added to the many that have been administered to them of late. Whilst I do not see Sir Henry Page Croft as amongst those who have resorted to these very dubious methods, which are, indeed, primarily associated with a newspaper that is notoriously opposed to the reforms, he has, since my last letter was sent, replied to Sir Samuel Hoare, reiterating his belief that the Princes are disillusioned and wish to withdraw their support from the Federation proposals, or alternatively that they are being compelled to do so under pressure from the India Office, or as a result of their support being purchased at a price. He obviously has in mind the matters to which the Duchess of Atholl alluded in her questions to the Secretary of State, last week, on the status of Barar, under the reforms, and also the position of the cantonments in Bangalore. It is an extraordinary mentality, this imputation of motives by the opponents of the reforms to us, official and non-official supporters of them, whilst being egregiously blind to the fact that their own motives for opposition are so obvious and ill-concealed. If they cannot drag in the States as illustrations in aid, they will drag in untouchability, child marriage, the Hindu-Muslim problem, the alleged failure of the Ceylon Constitution and any other matter with which they think they can

successfully belabour the Government. They appear to be full of resources, but to those in a position to judge a little more objectively a great deal of this noisy and malicious opposition appears to be stale, flat and unprofitable.

### THE TORY MEETING.

Sir Samuel Hoare, who was announced to speak on the reforms proposals at the Bonar Law College on the 25th May, had made it clear that when he accepted the invitation he had anticipated that by that date the Joint Select Committee would have reported. If such is not the case he will strictly adhere to the undertaking entered into that no members of the Committee should address meetings on the White Paper prior to the issue of the Report. This makes it more difficult for the opponents of the Government's proposals to charge the India Office with a breach of faith, leaving them freer than they otherwise might have been to conduct their usual anti-Indian propaganda. It is as well that this temptation should be removed from them as, in any case, it is always easy, when people are busy and are unable to study the facts, to scare or irritate them by the suggestion that there has been an absence of fair play or something in the nature of a breach of faith.

It was by playing upon this psychology that Mr. Churchill hoped to turn the tables on the Government's supporters at yesterday's meeting of the Central Council of the National Union of Conservative and Unionist Associations at the Friends House meeting. Mr. Churchill had given notice of his desire to move at the meeting a resolution expressing "deep and increasing anxiety at the proposals of the White Paper now before the Joint Select Committee, and particularly the proposals to hand over the control of the Police to Indian Ministers, and the introduction of diarchy in the Central Government of India." The Birmingham Unionist Association, "tired of the guerilla warfare which alarmists bring to every meeting of the Council", sought to anticipate Mr. Churchill by putting down a motion to the effect that no further resolutions on the subject of the new Constitution for India shall be considered by the organisation until the Joint Select Committee has made its recommendations. It was here that the question of psychology entered. Lord Fitz Alan, on behalf of that section of the Tory Party that objects to what it is pleased to call a "muzzling order," moved an amendment affirming "the right and duty of the Conservative and Unionist Party to consider and discuss the Indian problem in all its bearings at any meeting which its duly constituted bodies may desire." This ungrammatical amendment was supported by Mr. Churchill, Lord Lloyd, and others who protested against being muzzled. Mr. Churchill, with a cunning that is the natural product of a long career of Parliamentary tactics, sought to support the amendment by suggesting that, as the sponsors of the resolution denied that it had official inspiration, no question of confidence in the Government was involved. Once again Mr. Churchill and his supporters were checkmated, for the resolution was adopted by a majority of 105. In spite of his appeal Mr. Churchill could not secure for the amendment as many supporters as on the last occasion when he entered the field against the Government. On the other hand his reference to the fact that the resolution had no official inspiration probably induced a considerable number of delegates who would otherwise have supported the movement, and who, in any case, would naturally have been in favour of freedom of speech, at least within the Tory Party, refrained from voting. In addition a very considerable reduction in the number of delegates present, most of whom would have supported the Government proposals, was



evident on this occasion, whereas Mr. Churchill put forward all his efforts to poll his maximum strength. By a strong freak of imagination, which reveals him to be the ungrown-up school boy, or *enfant terrible*, he chose to lead the cheering of "the rebels," upon the ground that the vote brought the numbers of the parties on either side closer together than they had been before, from which fact he derived great encouragement for the future, and strong inducement to make such greater efforts as would transform a minority into a majority against the reform proposals. The real fact, however, is that the great bulk of the Conservative Party are quite content to leave matters as they are until the Joint Select Committee reports, probably a couple of months hence.

#### THE JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.

Whilst Sir A. McWatters, Financial Secretary to the Government of India from 1921-1933 in addressing the India Committee of the Conservative Party at the House of Commons this week, expressed the view that on a number of grounds, all of them of a financial character, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to bring the proposed Federation into existence at an early date. The Joint Select Committee has been sitting regularly examining all the relevant facts surrounding the White Paper proposals. It is interesting to note that yesterday's *Times* editorial, evidently with some knowledge, stated expressly that not even the members of the Committee themselves know what form the Report will take and to what extent the White Paper scheme may be modified by their deliberations. The *Times* does a public service by recalling Mr. Baldwin's reminder to his Party that by its very composition the Committee should carry an extraordinary weight of authority, including as it does three ex-Viceroy's, two recent Governors of Provinces, three ex-Secretaries of State, and three ex-Under Secretaries of State for India, four members of the Simon Commission, six members of the visiting Committees appointed by the Round Table Conference, two Conservative M. P.s who have had long public service in India, and "a miscellaneous group of such trusted men of affairs as the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor, Lord Salisbury, and Lord Derby". The paper also points out that it is no fault of the Government that a larger number of their outstanding critics was not included too. "They had their chance and refused it". This particular factor will certainly be brought still more emphatically to public notice when the Committee's Report comes up for discussion and criticism. It is doubtful whether even Mr. Churchill, who, as a friend has said to me, "is less anti-reform than anti-National Government", is believed by reason of his contacts all too brief with the Indian delegates at the Joint Select Committee, has had brought home to him some deeper realisation of the inherent dangers of his attitude towards the reforms, and he is likely to become much more cautious from that point of view than formerly.

There is an important and instructive paragraph in the *Times* editorial, which it is as well to have on record. "Those of us who are convinced of the general wisdom of the Government's policy may well hope that they, too (Sir Austen Chamberlain and Lord Derby), have been convinced by this time of such essential propositions as, for example, the hopelessness in practice of combining complete Provincial Autonomy with a completely rigid Centre. We may also be allowed to hope that they will not shrink from pressing for certain desirable, but less fundamental, changes in such spheres as the police, the franchise, and the size of the Central Legislature." The exact bearing of this last sentence is somewhat obscure, and it is to be hoped that the *Times* is not to be found, in emphasising that this is not a

"rubber stamp" Committee, among those who are for weakening the White Paper proposals from the Indian Nationalist point of view.

#### OF INTEREST TO INDIA.

The *Daily Herald* this week has a cable from its Bombay Correspondent, reporting amazement in India of reports appearing to indicate that the Cabinet is preparing to give way before the diehard campaign against the White Paper. The Secretary of State for India is stated to have sounded the Viceroy as to whether Law and Order could not be turned into a reserved subject in the Provinces under the new Constitution. The aim of this alleged suggestion is said to be to buy off diehard opposition to the White Paper. It is interesting to note that the Correspondent reports Lord Willingdon as having been "profoundly shocked" by the suggestion and to have replied that any watering down of the White Paper proposals was bound to lead to disorder in India. He is reported to have added that he would not care to continue as Viceroy if Law and Order were reserved. As an addendum to the message the *Sun*, the new Bombay daily, is recorded to have stated that Mr. Churchill is intending to visit India himself during the summer vacation in order to mobilise opposition there to the White Paper. I should imagine that there is not a word of truth in any of these rumours, but if Lord Willingdon should have received such a suggestion and should have replied, as he is alleged to have done, his reputation in Indian Nationalist circles for high statesmanship will have been restored at a bound. As for Mr. Churchill, if he should be contemplating a monsoon trip to India, he is more likely to return to bless rather than to curse.

Whilst some young Manchester manufacturers are leading an attack upon Indian manufacturers, upon the ground that underpaid Indian labour is bound, as in the case of Japanese competition, to ruin Lancashire industry, it is reported that Liverpool Conservatives are still solidly supporting the Government on the question of the reforms, to the extent at least of suspending judgment pending the production of the Select Committee's Report.

In reply to Mr. Hammersley, M. P., Mr. Neville Chamberlain, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, said on Tuesday that he saw no necessity for the Government to provide facilities for the purchase of Indian raw cotton. He added that he had no recollection of having made any offer to advance £15,000,000 for the purchase of Indian raw cotton.

An amendment relating to military discipline in the Indian Air Force is contained in the Air Force Annual Bill issued this week. It regulates the relations between the new Indian Air Force with an Indian personnel and members of the Military forces when serving together. A member of either body is to be treated for purposes of command and discipline as if he were a member of the other body holding relative rank.

Now that Miss Neila Cram Cook, who has been described ad nauseam in all the papers variously as "Mahatma Gandhi's ex-disciple" and as "Blue Serpent Goddess", has been, let us anticipate, happily remarried upon her arrival in New York. Let us hope that we shall now have heard the last of her as far as any Indian association is concerned. It has been placed upon record that her young son, apparently under a sense of filial duty, has described the Mahatma as "a grumpy old bear, with elephant ears"—a hardly recognisable portrait, at which Gandhiji himself will probably laugh aloud.

Mrs. H. A. L. Fisher writes appreciatively in the *News Chronicle* upon Miss Eleanor Rathbone's book "Child Marriage: The Indian Mina-

tour." On the other hand, the Women's International League has issued a new pamphlet entitled "Mother India's Daughters" emphasising the significance of the women's movement in India. Surprisingly there is little, if any, reference, to Mrs. Sarojini Naidu and none at all to Mrs. Subbarayan, though ample and deserved praise is given to Raj Kumari Amrit Kour, Mrs. Hamid and Dr. Muthuluxmi Reddi. The pamphlet concludes: "The final decisions for the new constitution for India now rest with the British Parliament and with us as electors. Is it too much to ask that British women should do all in their power to support and make known the attitude of those women of India who are working for all that stands for progress in their country, and see to it that the six million women they want enfranchised may be placed on the electoral roll in the new constitution?"

## Reviews.

### A CRITIQUE ON PROTECTION.

THE INDIAN TARIFF PROBLEM IN RELATION TO INDUSTRY AND TAXATION.  
By HIRENDRA LAL DEY. (Allen & Unwin).  
1933. 22cm. 304p. 16/-

IT is one of the unwritten laws of economic science that protective tariff is liable to political corruption, promotion of inefficiency and an excessive burden on some—generally the lower—sections of the community. The history of the American tariff is both a proof and a warning. The Indian Fiscal Commission, which inaugurated the regime of protective tariff in India, was sensible of these dangers and hit upon the formula of "discriminate protection" with a view to obviating the abuses which generally creep in under protection. Dr. Dey's thesis is designed to examine the operation of this formula. He examines the three main industries of India cotton textile, iron and steel and sugar—which even when he wrote had enjoyed a reasonable period of protection, only to conclude that protection in our country has been anything but discriminate.

Mr. Dey, however, puts his case in rather ambitious fashion. Arguing in a perfectly correct way that the protective tariff on consumption commodities is doubly regressive inasmuch as it transfers wealth from the lower to the higher strata of the population, he goes on to examine the ground on which the Indian Fiscal Commission makes out a case for a policy of rapid industrialization of India. He points out that industrialization is not likely to be an effective remedy for unemployment. Even on the most optimistic supposition that industrial production in India would double up within the next decade it would not mean employment for more than 1.6 per cent. of the population whereas the census figures of 1931 reveal a rate of population-rise of about 10 per cent. in a decade. And what if the production is speedily rationalized? Would it not mean a shrinkage in employment? Why not give up this fetish about industrialization and try to bring about an all-round development of agriculture and allied occupations? Much is made of the argument that industrialization would build up the Indian national character which is suffering from an all too literary bias of our education. But the development of a national character is not a miracle to be wrought up within a short spell of time. It must necessarily wait upon the slow process of changes in the mode of living so as to counteract the disabilities imposed by climate

as well as deep-rooted social and religious traditions, upon thorough-going alterations in the content and methods of education, and upon the right development of self-governing political institutions. The argument that protection leads to the growth of capital resources makes the damaging admission that it transfers wealth from the rural masses to the industrial classes and in fact makes for national loss inasmuch as the living of these latter is expensive and extravagant. The case of the military industries must be examined in relation to the problem of Imperial Defence and should not be mixed up with the problems of industrial development.

It is true that we are likely to develop a sort of mystic faith in the development of industries as a solution of our economic ills and, in our efforts to bring it about, to lose sight of the evils it may promote or of other problems which are more or less equally significant. But this need not blind us to the all too important problem of industrialization. That industrialization is one of the revolutionizing factors in the life of a nation cannot be easily denied. Nobody says that our intellectual and other weaknesses are *entirely* due to lack of industrial development. But to underestimate the importance of industries by pointing to the agricultural nature of our economy is to take a mechanical view of things. For in a country like India, sufficiently rich in the potentialities of economic development, agriculture and industry must be viewed as organically related. A flourishing agriculture is a sound asset for industry; industrial development, in its turn, brings about significant changes in the technique of agricultural production. Both history and argument seem to prove that industrialization gives a vigorous tone to a nation's life and it should be agreed that India needs a fair measure of industrial development before she takes her place in the proud rank of the flourishing nations of the world.

But the necessity of industrialization need not necessarily mean protective tariff. It has first to be decided as to what proportion of the national income may appropriately be devoted to the encouragement of industrial enterprise, and also how the burden of expenditure should be equitably distributed among the different sections of the community. And, again, since protective duties are not the only, nor often the most economical, way for the promotion of industries, other avenues of progress, particularly those that are collectively known under the comprehensive name of 'rationalisation' touching practically every aspect of industrial organization, should be explored and examined, and freely adopted. Finally, Mr. Dey would rationalize the method of industrialization by giving more scope for the grant of bounties. In that way the burdens as well as the benefits to the community would be both direct and definite. More care would be taken while making a grant. The administration would be more careful and rational on the one hand, and more subject to public scrutiny on the other. Unlike the protective tariff it does not involve the inequitable distribution of the burden of protection among the different sections of the community. The burden can be easily shifted on to those who directly benefit by it. And finally it should be noted that the administration of the bounty system would involve nothing more serious or radical than the simple addition of a new spending department to the many others, e. g. departments of agriculture and public health, that are already in existence, and it can and should be financed exactly in the same way as the other departments are.

In the light of these observations Dr. Dey goes on to examine the work of the Tariff Board during

the seven years (1924-31) of its administration. The result is a severe indictment of the work of the Tariff Board during this period.

"The Indian Tariff Board (he concludes), in practically every important case where they have recommended protection, do not seem to have sufficiently realised the cumulative effect of protective import duties in their reaction on the agricultural and export industries of the country. In recommending a series of tariffs in the last seven years, while they have been at considerable pains in each case to argue that the burden of the tariff in question on the average individual is comparatively small, they have never examined the cumulative burden of all the protective tariffs on the agricultural and export industries of the country, nor paused to consider whether these industries were in a condition to bear that burden in recent years of falling prices, shrinking exports, and increasing weight of interest and debt" (p. 286).

He supports this conclusion by a lengthy examination of the three major industries, which is at the same time a thorough piece of research. He traces the history of the cotton industry to show that the industry was making a steady, continuous, and sometimes even marked progress, that it was getting an increasing share in the home market and that the foreign competition was not really hampering its course in an unusual degree. These facts should have been taken into account before deciding on the ever-increasing protective tariff. Of course appeals for protection are usually accompanied by a great array of figures designed to show the financial plight of the industry. But Dr. Dey marshals evidence to show that the critical financial condition of a great many of Bombay and some of the upcountry mills is due to incompetence, inflation of capital, extravagant dividend payment, grave labour unrest, inelastic wage rates, and serious and sometimes fatal defects in the institution of managing agency, which practically controls the cotton industry in Bombay and elsewhere. These defects should not be covered up and perpetuated by the method of protection but should be corrected by a thorough process of "rationalization."

The iron and steel industry of India is another important industry to enjoy protection. The Tatas started their concern without the slightest idea of the grant of public assistance and therefore it is reasonable to suppose that the promoters of the project, having foreseen certain losses during the initial years, were prepared to meet them out of their own resources. The fact, however, remains that the Tatas did ask for protection and their request was complied with. Dr. Dey is perfectly justified in levelling his criticism on the ground that protection, in this case, was designed to help a particular firm to tide over the financial difficulties that had been brought about largely, if not wholly, by its own mistakes. The determination of the "fair selling price" was done with reference to the administration of this one firm. It was, therefore, the duty of the State to examine whether the firm is endowed with a sound organisation and efficient management.

The evidence of history as well as the data of comparative cost would strongly indicate that the protective tariff is neither the most effective nor the most expeditious instrument for the development of sugar industry in India. On the other hand, as is so well shown by the examples of Java and Hawaii, an appropriate organization for guiding, controlling and co-ordinating extensive and continuous research and experiments on the different phases of the agriculture and manufacture of the sugar industry will undoubtedly function as a much more efficient and trustworthy machine for achieving the desired development. He would immediately adopt the scheme outlined by the Indian Sugar Committee

more than a decade ago for the organization of a representative Sugar Board which would promote and co-ordinate research, experiments and technological training through a Sugar Research Institute and a Sugar School.

The book ends with a strong plea for "rationalization" and bounties. Bounties are distinctly preferable to customs duties as a method of protection for industries. The real reason why the Tariff Board as well as the Government of India have fought remarkably shy of substituting the bounty system of protection for import duties is that the Government of India, having so far failed to sufficiently develop the direct taxes of the country such as income tax and death duties, are compelled to augment the import duties under any plea whatsoever; and since the adoption of a protective policy by the Legislature they have in the plea for protection a very helpful and popular pretext for increasing the revenue by means of import duties. Dr. Dey might add that the shyness of the Government in developing direct taxes is easily seen when we remember that 69% of the capital doing industrial business in India is estimated to be British.

Dr. Dey has presented his thesis in a clear, straightforward and delightfully vigorous manner. He writes with a grace with which Prof Laski writes his books on politics. It is to be hoped that his argument will go home.

P. A. PADHYE.

#### SHORT NOTICES.

ON RAMA-RAJYA AND THE SLAVE-MENTALITY OF OUR ORTHODOX. By S. D. NADKARNI. (Samaj Samata Sangh, Dadar, Bombay.) 1932. 24cm. 75p. As. 12.

THIS is a well-reasoned appeal to the rational mind of the Hindus (the nominal addressee being Mr. Gandhi) intended to rouse it to repudiate all unfair Shastric authority which sanctions lowliness of castes and professions, the degradation of womanhood and the sin of untouchability. Mr. Nadkarni, who is a righteous crier in the wilderness, is no irresponsible breaker of idols, for he will have the Hindus cling to whatever is irreproachable in their sacred books. There is nothing nobler for the young Hindus to do than, as Mr. Nadkarni fervently suggests, to undertake the mission of suppressing all sanctified crimes, indignities and false prophets so that there emerges a Hinduism worth whole-hearted devotion. It is bootless to expect Mr. Gandhi to take the lead in cleaning our religious Augean stables of the filth of ages, for being a victim of religious self-deception, he hypnotises all Hindu mankind into entertaining beliefs which are irreconcilable with good life. Himself casteless and human to a fault, he throws his weight on the side of the pernicious institution called the Caste System. For all outward purposes he is a conventional Hindu, to whom the Brahmo Samaj and the Arya Samaj are disagreeable and who, while condemning the inhumanity of our religious conduct insofar as we practise untouchability, animal sacrifice and other abominable customs, tells a Buddhist priest with an all easy conscience that the principles of Buddhism are better preserved in Hinduism. This is spiritual muddle or Rama-rajya in which Mr. Gandhi lives and has his being. It is the young Hindu who by his own efforts must rescue all that is glorious in his religion so as thereby to grant democratic freedom of spiritual and social comfort to all who are now condemned to suffer the rigors of unblestness and pollution. Whatever Mr. Gandhi's religious predilections, the

progressive Hindu must join hands with Mr. Nadkarni in following the dictates of reason and humanity that are enshrined in Buddhism, which is only Hinduism rendered unimpeachable.

K. V. R.

#### AN AFRICAN SPEAKS FOR HIS PEOPLE.

By PARMENAS GITHENDU MOCKBIE. (Hogarth Press.) 1934. 20cm. 95p. 3/6.

WE generally hear the views of the British Government on its administration in Kenya, of the white settlers and the Indian community in East Africa, but it is seldom that one comes across the views of Africans, the children of the soil. This very interesting book, written by an African in the English language, puts before the public, perhaps for the first time, the authentic views of Africans on the situation in East Africa. The learned author has many interesting things to say on a number of points. He divides the book into six chapters:—1 A visit to Europe, 2 Life in Kenya, 3 Kikuyu Tribal Institutions, 4 Kenya under British Rule, 5 Education, and 6 A Social Survey in Kikuyu. There is an appendix of the Memorandum from the Kikuyu Land Board Association, presented to the Joint Select Committee in East Africa. The Committee did not hear the representations of the Kikuyu Central Association, of which the author was the leader, nor did the authorities publish their Memorandum in the Blue Book. The appendix, therefore, is all the more important. It is a masterly denunciation of British Rule in East Africa.

The author narrates his experience in a very interesting simple language of his trip to Europe. A European missionary told him and his African companion on the boat—they were second class passengers—to stand up when a European was strolling on the deck beside them! They replied, "If we stood up whenever a European was passing we should get tired before we got to our destination." There is a pathos in the reply suggesting utter helplessness before the might of the votaries of the Christian religion. In Copenhagen some American tourists tried to prevent the author from being served in a restaurant, but the Danish manager told them that they could leave the restaurant if they objected to his presence.

After the Joint Select Committee had refused to hear the African representative, a few British sympathisers organised a meeting in the House of Commons to give them an opportunity to express their views. After the meeting a young Imperialist went up to the author and said that he was disgusted to see an African speaking in the House of Commons, which was a place for white men.

The book is replete with interesting and pathetic incidents of the nature quoted above.

Those who are of opinion that African natives are incapable of progress, will do well to peruse the pages of this book. The learned author is a living proof of the innate capacity of the Africans.

S. A. WAIZ.

#### THE WORK PROMETHEAN. By JAMES H.

COUSINS. (Ganesh & Co.) 1933. 20cm. 122p. Rs. 1/8.

THIS is one of the few books whose reading is education. There are many people who love Shelley in a vague sort of way, taking him for a beautiful futility. For these Dr. Cousins has glorious revela-

tions to make. In the light of his interpretation, Matthew Arnold's criticism seems little better than an elaborate misunderstanding, and Carlye's remarks are exposed as an expression of anger due to lack of that essential affinity without which no critic can pretend to be worthy of the name. As a rule, the author keeps his head cool while dealing with the assailants of Shelley. There appears some loss of temper only once in the whole book, and that in the following sentence:—"Their age regarded them (Arnold, Carlye and the like) as judges: we know them now to have been only advocates."

The book is not meant to beguile the tedium of weary hours. It abounds in technical terms, abstract and difficult expressions lit up here and there with exquisite similes and metaphors. It will doubtless prove alluring and even inspiring to the student, though a little trying to the casual reader. Without it one would find it hard to rise to a perfect understanding of Shelley and his works.

Such a book is a necessary antidote to the profound influence of certain personalities who, raising their prejudices to the dignity of principles, often judge a poet wrongly and mislead his readers.

A. H. PADHYE.

#### SIDELIGHTS ON THE PROBLEM OF INDIAN NATIONALITY. By ISHWAR NATH TOPA.

(Allahabad Law Journal Press.) 1933. 20cm. 48p. As. 12.

"It is a patent fact," says Dr. Topa, "that the India of to-day is suffering and suffering terribly from socio-political and pseudo-religious causes and also from the after-effects of false intellectual interpretation of her past history which are hindering the development of an Indian nationality." Dr. Topa has no cut and dried remedy for India's ills. Instead, he makes a rapid survey of conditions in ancient India and has much to say in favour of Islamic rule in India. He has tackled his subject in a way "uncommon to the present-day historians, and has thrown out hints and suggestions which, if followed closely, cannot but indicate a way to the reaching of a common Indian nationality. This book can be recommended to all serious thinkers for its novel interpretation of historical facts and for its promise of finding a solution of a problem which is harrying the minds of present-day Indian politicians.

K. D. AGA.

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

AUSTRALIA'S GOVERNMENT BANK. By LESLIE C. JAUNOEY. (Cranley & Day.) 1934. 20cm. 288p. 7/6.

FROM MOSCOW TO SAMARKAND. By Y. Z. (Hogarth Press.) 1934. 32cm. 134p. 6/-.

THE PRIVATE LETTER BOOKS OF JOSEPH COLLET. Ed. by H. H. DODWELL. (Longmans.) 1933. 22cm. 256p. 10/6.

TWO THOUSAND YEARS OF LONDON. By C. WHITAKER-WILSON. (Methuen.) 1933. 22cm. 330p. 12/6.

A NEW APPROACH TO THE VEDAS. By ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY. (Luzac.) 1933. 21cm. 116. 5/-.

INDIA ANALYSED, Vol. II: ECONOMIC FACTS. By BRIJ NARAIN and Others. (Gollancz.) 1934. 20cm. 176p. 5/-.

REFORMATION OF OFFENDERS IN INDIA. By O. H. B. STARTE. (Government Central Press, Bombay.) 1933. 23cm. 93p. Re. 1/2.