Registered B—1330

The Servant of India

Editor: S. G. Vaze. Office: Servants of India Society, Poona 4.

Vol. XXI, No. 44. } POONA—THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 1938. { Indian Subsn. Rs. 6. Foreign 15s.

CONTENTS

Topics of the Week.

Boycott the Chatfield Committee.

WE have already referred to the unsatisfactory character of the Chatfield Committee, and in particular, to the studied insult the British Government offered to the India by excluding Indians from the composition of the Committee. Like the Simon Commission of old, the Chatfield Committee deserves to be completely boycotted by all self-respecting Indians. It appears that the Committee have invited several Indians to give evidence before them, and that some of them, including Mr. Bhulabhai Desai and Mr. Satyamurty, have declined the invitation. It is hard to imagine any difference of opinion among Indians regarding their attitude towards the Chatfield Committee, and we hope that the Committee will be completely boycotted by them.

* * *

WE hope that the Indian States will toe the line in this respect and refuse to give evidence before the Committee if invited to do so, as they are very likely to be. We hope that they will take due note of what Mr. S. P. Rajagopalachari, First Member of Council, Government of Mysore, is reported to have said in Kumbakonam on the 29th October last. He wished that the framers of the Government of India Act had before them the dictum of the Defence Sub-Committee of the Round Table Conference that the defence of India must be increasingly the concern of India rather than of the British Government. He complained that the principle had not been carried out on the ground of practical difficulties. He added that the defence of a country touched the life of a nation as a whole and nothing could be more reasonable than that it should be made the responsibility not only of the Governor-General but also of the people of India. Mr. Rajagopalachari is not unaware that the British Government does not trust even the Indian Princes in defence matters and would not entrust defence to the proposed federation, notwithstanding the heavy weightage which is given to the Princes by law in the federal legislature and will, we dare say, be given to them by convention in the federal executive. The Princes are welcome to place all their resources at the disposal of the British Government in a crisis, but the British Government has no faith in the Princes in defence matters. Its distrust of the Princes could hardly go further.

* * *

States and Federation.

IN his Madras University Extension Lectures at Ernakulam, Cochin, Prof. L. M. Pylee is reported to have said that a just apprehension entertained by British Indian politicians was that the Indian States would be represented in the Federation by the nominees of the Princes and not by the elected representatives of the peoples of the States and that the Princely nominees would act as a conservative *bloc*. The remedy for this, he rightly said, was to bring up the administration in the States to the level of British Indian Provinces and to introduce responsible government in the States. The democratization of the States will thus serve two purposes at the same time, both equally desirable. It will remove one of the chief obstacles to federation as contemplated by the Government of India Act, and secondly, it will improve the lot of the subjects of the States. If federation is abandoned on the ground of the autocracy of the States, it will no doubt save British India from the Princes but it will not save the subjects of the States from them. Independent of federation, it is essential that the subjects of the States should be rescued from the autocracy that they suffer under. It is essential, therefore, that all progressive elements in India, whether from Indian States or British India, should concentrate on the democratization of the Indian States.

* * *

Private Armies and Federation.

THE *Indian Social Reformer* has drawn attention to the implications of the Princes retaining their own State armies even after they join the federation, while the British Indian Provinces will have no armies of their own. It said that the Princes had treaty obligations with the Paramount Power under which they were bound to place their armies at the disposal of the Paramount Power whenever desired to do so. "It is not inconceiv-

able that the Provincial Governments may not always find themselves in agreement with the British Government on matters of moment, and the latter may, by force of circumstances, be driven to advise His Majesty's Government in invoking the aid of the Princes to support the British view in the Provinces, if necessary by the use of their armed forces." Thus it might come about that one armed unit of the federation will march its troops against another but unarmed unit at the instance of the Paramount Power.

* * *

THE status and obligations of the Indian State Forces in recent years were thus described by the Federal Finance Sub-Committee of the Federal Structure Committee of the Indian Round Table Conference, 1931: "The maintenance and availability of these Forces is at present optional for the States concerned." The Indian States Enquiry Committee (Financial) of 1932 reported that the Indian States Forces were divided into three categories and that only certain units of Class A were fit for active service, and added that "though a place has been assigned to these units in the mobilization scheme, there is no positive obligation on the part of the States to release them for service." (para 171) From these it would follow that the States are under no constitutional obligation to lend their armed forces to the British Government. The Maharaja of Bikaner's speech, to which the *Reformer* and the *Pioneer* made reference, would indicate, however that the Indian States were under such an obligation. Sir George MacMunn would have it both ways, for he says that the Indian States Forces were "liable to be employed if the rulers offered them or the Paramount summoned them. Something more definite indeed than an offer became understood and the Army authorities began to take count of them for a major case such as the defence of India." (*The Indian States and Princes*, p. 184) It may well be that in this case, as in so many others, there is no uniformity in the constitutional obligations of the States to the Paramount Power, and but that the obligation is nevertheless uniformly imperative because of paramountcy.

* * *

WHATEVER be the constitutional possibilities, the practical probabilities of the situation arising as envisaged by the *Reformer* seem to be very remote. In any event, federation does not seem to induce any change. Even today the Princes are bound to go to the help of the Paramount Power with their armed forces if called upon to do so. But during the last half a century or more there have been, as far as our knowledge goes, no instances of the Paramount Power invoking the aid of the armed forces of its vassal States to put down trouble in the Indian Provinces. The Government of India, which is both the Paramount Power and the Federal Government-to-be, has an army so far superior in every way to the forces of the Indian Princes that it has no need to indent on the latter. It is only if and when the federal army is transferred to the control of a responsible Federal Government that the Paramount Power will have no army of its own to fall back upon and may have to indent on the armies of the Princes. By that time the Paramount Power will have parted with its responsibility for the government of the federation, and no occasion to differ from the Provinces or the Federal Government is likely to arise. Both the framing of policies and the armed forces necessary to enforce them will be in the hands of the responsible Federal Government. The only conceivable occasion when the British Government may need the forces of the Indian Princes in the internal affairs of India is if and when there should be a violent revolution in British India against the British Government and when all the armed forces of the British Government in India are unable to cope with the situation. But that situation may happen with or without federation. The constitutional conundrum contemplated by the *Reformer* seems to be much too far-fetched.

* * *

APART from the practical polities, it is somewhat of an exercise in pedantry to view the relations of the Princes with the Paramount Power and the federation as a constitutional problem. A federal constitutional problem arises only when the units before the federation are independent. Neither British India nor the Indian States are independent units. With unlimited sovereignty over British India and equally unrestricted paramountcy over the Indian States, the British Government is the only unit left, and it is entirely a matter for the British Government to make such arrangements as it likes and impose it on both. Political expediency may influence the decisions of the British Government and not constitutional proprieties, for there are none. All of which only means that the proposed federation is not a federation, and nobody knows it better than the *Reformer*. The retention of private armies in the Indian States even after the so-called federation will only mean that there will be no uniformity in all respects as between the several units. But that is nothing new either.

* * *

THE remedy for the situation is to promote responsible government in the States as in British India. The armed forces in the States will then come under the control of responsible governments of the peoples. Such Governments may then disband the forces as unnecessary and on the ground of economy if not of constitutional propriety. Even if they be retained, the armed forces of the States will not be available to the British Government for fighting the Provincial Governments in India.

* * *

Anglo-Indians.

SIR Henry Gidney has put forward the plea that the minimum pay for an Anglo-Indian employee should be Rs. 60 per mensum. For his proposal he claimed support in Sec. 242 of the Government of India Act. Sub-sections (2) and (3) of this Section make reference to the recruitment of Anglo—Indians in the railway, customs, postal and telegraph services, and enjoin that the recruiting authorities should "have due regard to the past association of the Anglo-Indian community" with such services, "and particularly to the specific class, character and numerical percentages of the posts hitherto held by members of the community, and *the remuneration attaching to such posts.*" (Italics ours.) The Act, it will be noticed, speaks of remuneration attached to posts and not to races. It does not enjoin that the salary of the same post should vary with the racial character of the incumbent.

* * *

ANY doubt regarding the interpretation of the provision will be cleared by the following extract from the speech in the House of Commons on the 30th July, 1935, of Mr. Butler, then Under

Secretary of State for India, when he moved the amendment to the above effect: "*These words do not for instance fix any special rates of pay for particular communities.*" (Italics ours.)

* * *

SIR Henry Gidney may well recall how no less a friend of the Anglo-Indians than Sir Samuel Hoare, the then Secretary of State for India, who piloted the Government of India Bill in the Commons, vigorously opposed the singling by statute of the Anglo-Indian community for special treatment on the ground that it would rouse the jealousies and animosities of other communities, and how he thought that such statutory preference would only harm the Anglo-Indians rather than help them. It was only under great pressure, and in particular, of the House of Lords, that he ultimately, and even then reluctantly, agreed to this statutory declaration. Sir Henry Gidney's further plea that the Anglo-Indian should have a higher starting pay, apart from the pay of the post, will only make matters worse.

* * *

SECONDLY, it introduces a new policy of rating remuneration by race, which has all along been objected to by Indian publicists. Racial basis for remuneration there certainly was in India; but it was secured by indirect means, by grading the services themselves and appointing certain races to certain grades only. But a differential salary for different races for the same post is, we believe, a new and a most objectionable claim.

* * *

IF Sir Henry had pleaded for a minimum salary of Rs. 60 a month for *all* employees, irrespective of race, he would have been on better ground, though it is a different matter if it will at the moment be a financial possibility.

* * *

Nawanagar.

THE administration report of Nawanagar State for 1936–37 has reached us only recently. It must be said to be an incomplete document in that the statistical tables to be usually met with in all administration reports are absent from it. The detailed statement of accounts, which is a *sine qua non* of all such publications and which enables one to know how the State revenues are collected and expended, is nowhere to be found. In its absence it is difficult to judge whether the proportion of the Privy Purse to the general revenues is reasonable or excessive.

* * *

THOUGH fuller information about other matters is thus a desideratum in the report, it tells us enough to enable us to form an idea as to the educational expansion in the State. For a total population of a little over four lakhs, the total school-age population at 15 per cent. stands at about 61,000. Only about 26,000 out of this total is at present in receipt of instruction, which means that more than half the field is yet to be covered. There can be no doubt that this process would be hastened if primary education is made compulsory. We are glad to note that it is already free and trust that it will also be made compulsory as soon as possible as much for hastening the advent of universal literacy as for preventing educational wastage.

THE STRIKE AND AFTER.

IT is only when reliable statistics become available that we shall know the extent to which the general strike on Monday last has been effective. At the moment of writing conflicting reports have appeared in the press, reports obviously coloured by the subjective attitude of the observers. One thing however seems to be clear. There was no general strike in the full sense of the term. A general strike is much more than a strike in a few industries and in a few places, and it was so intended by the promoters of the strike.

Even when the facts become available, there are bound to be differences in their interpretation. Each side will charge the other with having intimidated its followers and prevented a "free vote" as it were. If the propaganda by means of public meetings, distribution of literature, etc., had all ceased on the previous day, and the workers were left free on the day of the strike to work or strike without any interference by way of picketing or other types of "coercive persuasions" a more definite interpretation of the facts would have been possible. A referendum would have maximised the freedom of opinion of the workers. As it is, it is very unlikely that either party will agree either about the facts or their interpretation.

At the moment we shall not base our plea on the ground that the general strike on the 7th was a success or not. We shall grant for the Government that even if the strike was completely successful and it was perfectly clear that the workers to a man, were stoutly opposed to the Trade Disputes Bill, still they had to consider the general will of the electorate and not be dictated by the so-called workers alone. Granting all these, we shall still be free to ask the Government to note that such moderate and life-long workers in the cause of labour in India, as Mr. N. M. Joshi and Mr. R. R. Bakhale, to mention only two, have expressed strong objections to certain provisions in the Bill. These leaders are not without a following, and they at least believe in the ideals of the International Labour Office which are to harmonise the interests of capital and labour Their criticism of the Bill did not proceed on the basis of the creed of the Communists. Their opinions, therefore, deserve to be better respected.

During the third reading of the Bill in the Assembly it was stated that one of the objectives of the Bill was to save the workers from the influence of the Communists. If that be so, we fear the method of doing it by means of the Trade Disputes Bill is unhappy. We ourselves are

no Communists, nor have we any sympathy with Communism. We would, however, seek to combat the Communists by direct arguments and counter propoganda rather than by the indirect method of Government legislation on industrial conciliation. By linking up pro-conciliation with anti-Communism, the Government have only succeeded in creating a united front of anti-Communists, non-Communists, and pro-Communists. The Communists will exploit the fact that even non-Communists and anti-Communists have a legitimate grievance against the Congress Government.

The anti-Communist drive by Government legislation, particularly by a Congress Government, must necessarily imply that Mahatma Gandhi's propaganda for non-violence in promoting social justice, carried on by him with such religious fervour and for so long, has proved failure.

P. KODANDA RAO.

DE JURE NOMINATION AND *DE FACTO* ELECTION.

GREAT significance attaches to the speech on Federation made by Raja-Mantra-Pravina S. P. Rajagopalachari at Kumbakonam on the 29th October last. Mr. Rajagopalachari is not only the First Member of Council of the Government of Mysore but also the Chairman of the Mysore Constitutional Reforms Committee, which is at the moment engaged in considering proposals for constitutional reform in Mysore and her place in the proposed federation. With reference to the representation of Indian States in the federation, Mr. Rajagopalachari is reported to have conceded that election would have been better than nomination. It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of this admission, and it will be widely welcomed by the peoples in British India and the Indian States so far as it goes.

Mr. Rajagopalachari felt, however, that there were practical and legal difficulties in the way of giving *de jure* effect to this principle. Even with the proposed nomination system, there had cropped up, he said, numerous legal difficulties in the matter of agreements between the Crown and the Princes. As a practical way out of the difficulty he suggested that the representatives of the States should be nominated at least in form, though in actual practice the choice might conform to the principle of election, even as Ministers are nominated by the Governor under provincial autonomy. Prof. L. M. Pylee, in his Madras University Extension Lectures in Cochin, referred to a compromise which he said was being discussed and which was much on the lines of Mr. Rajagopalachari's suggestion. It was that a panel of names should be suggested by the representatives of the people from which the Princes should choose their nominees. Both the suggestions have this in common : *de jure* nomination and *de facto* election.

Neither the peoples of British India nor of the Indian States will have any serious objection to this compromise. It is true that it violates the well-established canons of a federation, but in so far as the people are to have the final voice in the selection of their representatives, it is of minor importance if the representatives are subsequently nominated by the Princes.

It may be anticipated that Mr. Rajagopalachari's Committee on Constitutional Reform in Mysore will support his suggestion. It is not clear if it will be accepted by most, if not all, the federating Indian States. For it should be realised that this compromise is really no compromise; it involves a most fundamental change in the constitution of the States. They will cease to be the autocracies which they are and which the Princes and the Paramount Power wish them to be. The whole purpose that the Paramount Power had in promoting the federation will be largely frustrated.

Mr. Rajagopalachari did not, in the speech as reported, elaborate the application of his principle. He did not, for instance, say how the representatives of the States should, in the first instance, be elected, how the electorate should be constituted and if all the representatives should be so elected or only some, the others being nominated without a preliminary election. It will be recalled that under the present Government of India Act, election from British India to the Upper Chamber is direct and to the Lower indirect, and that the electorates themselves are divided on race and religious lines, that the franchise qualifications vary from community to community and from province to province and that the representation is weighted in the case of certain communities. Would it be possible and advisable to introduce this complicated, inequitable and anti-national franchise system in the Indian States? Or, should the States adopt a simpler and a more just system?

If the election to the federal Lower Chamber is to be by indirect election, as in British India, it will be essential that the States should have representative assemblies in the first instance. Most of the States have no representative institutions at the present time; they will have to be created where they do not exist. If the election is to be direct, it is not essential, for this purpose, to have representative assemblies in the States. The franchise system will be further complicated by the consideration that several small States have a representative in common and sometimes by rotation. Though difficult, it

may not be impossible to devise a system of franchise which will create an electorate in the Indian States at least as large in proportion as in British India. But the essential consideration is that the Princes should be willing to nominate only those whom the electorates select.

If the election to both the federal Chambers from the States is to be direct, it is possible that a State need not have a local representative legislature. But it is inconceivable that an electorate in an Indian State, which is given the right to choose federal representatives, will be content to remain long without a local legislature. Once a local legislature on a wide electorate is created, responsible government cannot long be withheld. One step will lead to another; once the principle of election is conceded, representative and responsible government in the States are bound to follow soon. Mr. Rajagopalachari, in conceding the principle of election for the federal legislature, has done a great national service.

ECONOMIC PLANNING.

I.

THE THEORETICAL BACKGROUND.

THE announcement of the personnel of the Planning Committee, and the deliberations of the provincial Ministers in Delhi should go a long way towards dispelling the despair that was generated in thinking minds in regard to the stark unwisdom of the so-called constructive programme of the Congress, dominated by the mystico-ethical doctrine of the philosophy of village industries. A Planning Committee has already been announced, a Planning Commission is about to be created. Even the non-Congress provinces have expressed willingness to co-operate. A shape is to be given to an aspiration for India's economic development formulated along lines likely to be most responsive primarily to the needs of India; and based on the idea of relieving India's poverty through efficient instruments of production that physical and organisational sciences have placed at our disposal. The idea of accelerating the development of backward countries and of rectifying the lop-sided development of industrialised nations through deliberately planned development and control of the economic activities by the state has gained a respectable status in recent economic thought, and even in India the idea has been under debate and is warmly advocated by all sections of public opinion. It is, therefore, a matter for gratification that a policy of planned development is to be inaugurated in India under auspices of competence and authority so widely representative of the views of the nation as is reflected in the personnel of the Committee.

But it must also be emphasised that we should hold this feeling of gratification in proper restraint, because the mere recognition of the principle of economic planning is not economic planning itself. It should be realised that the working out of the details can necessarily be subject to conflicts of opinion so fundamentally divergent as to reduce the Planning Committee to a position of secondary importance unless care is taken to preserve it from the blasts of ideological conflicts, if it could be done at all. To one who contemplates the probable development of the successive steps of the logic of economic planning in a realistic rather than a sentimental vein, the outlook may not be very rosy, and one can only wish to be able to dismiss the gloomy apprehension of having to see this august body reduced one day to a set of people ending their activities in planning against each other. A mood for sacrifice on the part of the "haves," and a willingness to compromise on what to them might appear to be vital issues by the "have-nots" of the community are the minimum conditions for its success. The extent to which such attitudes of mind are actually present in our country may be a matter of opinion, but it needs no elaborate argument to prove that these are the essential conditions of success. A proper and realistic appreciation of these fears would be possible only when we remember the different standpoints from which the economic problem is viewed by different sets of thinkers and how widely divergent on fundamentals are their respective methods of approach to its solution.

For, although economic planning has come to be advocated by all kinds of people, the Communists, Fascists, and the various types of democrats, as a matter of historical fact, the idea is an exotic to the theory of economic Liberalism. It may be even stated without much fear of contradiction, that an advocacy of economic planning would be inconsistent with the preaching of Liberalism, with its belief that economic institutions have an ability for automatic functioning and are, therefore, in need of no intervention and regulation by the state. If it is contended, as liberalism in fact did, that with proper regulation of the law of property and contract combined with freedom of enterprise and a price mechanism to help exchanging the produce of the community, the dynamics of economic progress would be necessarily maintained in a condition of equilibrium and justice, the idea of planned regulation would be inconsistent with it. The Communist, on the other hand, has an outlook and philosophy, radically opposed to this view. With his apparatus of analysis comprising of the economic interpretation of history, the labour theory of value, the appropriation of surplus value by the non-producing agents, of class conflict and the inevitability of periodical crises in a capitalist society, he has no faith in the spontaniety

of economic enterprise consistent with justice and human welfare. He regards exploitation of one group by another as an inevitable adjunct of any society based on the incentives of competition and profit-seeking. This is made possible, he believes, by the various institutions of our present order of society like private property, the privilege of inheritance, the inequalities of income, the freedom of competition which implies the freedom to organise for its elimination, and the exchange relations of the market place which function without any of the assumptions of their theoretical analysis being even approximately true in reality. Logically, from this hypothesis he derives the conclusion that the extinction of exploitation is impossible without the extinction of all these institutions; and since all the indices for the guidance of economic activity like price, income, etc. will be destroyed, the state should undertake a planned activity in consonance with the welfare of the community. And as a necessary corollary, he holds that the belief in the practicability of economic planning within the capitalist frame-work is at best ignorant, and at worst hypocritical.

Unfortunately it so happens that in this matter the orthodox Liberal or the apologist for classical economy chants in unison with the Communist. He has no difficulty in demonstrating to the satisfaction of his followers that planning and Communism are essentially one and the same. He argues, with considerable analytical acumen that once the state starts planning and sponsors the development of certain lines of industry, it will not permit it to be wantonly destroyed by external competition; this must lead to an intervention in the freedom of foreign trade; this in its turn will lead to changes in internal production; more so, if such interventionism becomes regular more universally. To control one line effectively, our planner will have to interfere with the allied lines of production. If this were to be a real success it might be necessary to control the investment market and the monetary policy and credit distribution, which means a thorough-going control of nearly all economic activity. Under any system of economic planning, however moderately it might commence at first, such extensions will become inevitable, it being only a matter of time. The end of it, therefore, would be the insidious emergence of Communism, and the elimination of free enterprise. And all this is unnecessary, because it is his conviction that the same ends could be better achieved, and more economically too, with the help of the Liberal institutions themselves. Thus the orthodox Liberal criticism of economic planning has a negative as well as a constructive aspect.

On the negative side, starting with the hypothesis that planning will necessarily end in Communism, he expresses the same repugnance to planning as he does for Communism itself. In fact, he admits that he has no quarrel with the ends of the Communist as such; and he even admits the many similarities of the Communist with the Liberal in that they are both rationalist and utilitarian by outlook, and are cosmopolitan in aims. His objection to Communism is mostly an objection to the means he proposes—viz. economic planning designed to eliminate Capitalist anarchy. An ardent advocate of international division of labour, the Liberal shrinks from the prospect of its enormous shrinkage which is bound to follow in the wake of planned economies of an autarchic and nationalist variety. Economic planning implies for him not the destruction of vested interests in the community but the creation in their stead of vested interests of national groups which are bound to be much more intractable. Such groups of planned national economies would tend to contract the area of international co-operation in matters of trade, investment and travel, and will slow down to an almost static stage the pace of economic progress. He denies vehemently that it would even contribute to stability, if not to prosperity, because under economic planning the profitability of different lines of production would fluctuate more widely than under competitive capitalism, and crises would be more general. He deplores the politicalization that is bound to set in, and the insidious intertwining of diplomacy in lending, borrowing and trade across the frontier,—matters which ought to be decided purely on grounds of economic advantage. He deplores most the inevitable control under economic planning of the freedom of enterprise and the workings of the price mechanism, for, to him the market is incomparably superior to any other substitute so far suggested for ascertaining the preferences of the people as consumers. "It permits, as it were, a perpetual referendum with due weight for minorities on all the possible issues which concern the sphere of private consumption." With the breakdown of the apparatus of rational valuation, he concludes, the system of production would be purely arbitrary; for, to him, it is not merely enough that agents of production should all be engaged but it is also necessary that they should be engaged at the point of highest return, which would be impossible unless distribution is carried on subject to the pulls and counter-pulls of the consumers' preferences and producers' costs. Even supposing that pricing and the market mechanism were retained alongside of the planned activity, they will merely reflect the power of the state rather than the preferences of consumers. Further, the spontaneous elasticity with which adjustment of factors takes place to changing conditions of population, resources, tastes and technique would not be there, and its place will be taken by the arbitrary choices of the planning committees. In the last analysis, planning is arbitrary; it is bound to be bureaucratic, and will end not by adjusting the plan to the people but by adapting the people to the plan.

On the constructive side, his contribution lies mainly in resurrecting the doctrine of *laissez-faire*

as an adequate basis for economic progress. There was a time not many years ago when this philosophy of *laissez-faire* was supposed to have been given up as being too simple minded for our complex age. It was held in responsible quarters that it was buried fathoms deep by Prof. Pigou, and that Mr. Keynes had written for it an elegant epitaph. But thanks to the hypnotism of Dr. Hayek and the siren logic Prof. Robbins, this philosophy of economic liberalism is once more on its feet promising peace and plenty to its followers. To these resurgent Liberals, Liberalism is not a plan that has been tried and found wanting but is one that had been given up without being fully tried. They hold that it is not the Liberal institutions that are at fault but rather the inefficient handling of them by ignorant politicians. The paternalistic activity of governments in the preserve of private enterprise is the real cause of the trouble and larger doses of state regulation which are the objectives of planning would make the confusion worse. To them the imperialism of Britain was made in Germany by Bismarck's policy of the "social state", and it was practically forced on the British Liberal Party by German ambitions! Believing that the idea that the causes of war are largely economic, is nothing less than a "malignant invention", they proceed to argue, that if only the Liberal institutions were really triumphant, such a denouement would be inconceivable. They do not believe in the theory that left to itself competition would tend to eliminate itself by the growth of monopoly and in proof of their faith they point to the smaller development of monopoly in free trade England contrasted with such excessive overgrowths of monopoly in protectionist America and Germany. They do not, of course, assert that the state should not have any part in the game. On the contrary, they are even angry with those who interpret the classical doctrine in that fashion. They hold that governments should be active, and that their field of action should be extensive. But it should not encroach on the freedom of private activity; on the contrary, it should attempt to preserve an atmosphere within which the Liberal institutions can function freely. To them property and free market are alone conducive to the most efficient utilization of resources and the very preservation of liberty and culture are bound up with them. They do not deny that the Liberal apparatus is not perfect. It will never achieve the perfect equilibrium of theoretical analysis; it may be subject to the influence of collective error; it would not under any circumstance do away with inequalities of income. But with all these shortcomings it still offers, according to them, the only plan of activity that is free from large internal contradictions like those that characterise planned economies. There is the further advantage, they point out, that Liberalism could be practised in isolation, and in instalments. In any case, Liberalism is a faith which is not older than scientific socialism itself, having originated only during the middle of the eighteenth century. And with faith in the effectiveness of Liberalism and its institutions as guarantors of economic progress and hope in its ultimate triumph, they warm up in praise of the idealism underlying it, which is superior to that of any the other plan. To express it in the words of Prof. Robbins:

> The idea of co-ordination of human activities by means of a system of impersonal rules, within which what spontaneous relations arise are conducive to mutual benefit, is a conception, at least as subtle, at least as ambitious as the conception of prescribing positively each action or each type of action by a central planning authority; and it is perhaps not less in harmony with the requirements of a spiritually sound society.

In between these two antagonistic groups there are a large number of economists and statesmen who have no faith either in the omniscience of Communist planned economy or in the beneficent spontaniety of Liberal institutions. They are critics of both, and are the ardent champions of a judicious admixture of the ingredients of both. As amongst them again there are any number of varieties differing in their respective estimates of the intervention necessary and its quality and method of achievement. They reflect the numerous elements of thought ranging from the social controls of Mr. Keynes who is move or less a seceder from the inner temple of economic Liberalism, to the opportunist pragmatism of Mussolini and Goering who are willing to dally with the devil of planning to the extent to which it is necessary for the preservation of values regarded by them as fundamental. The better variety of this group are the people who have too much admiration for the Liberal tradition to be able to forsake it altogether; and are yet sobered by the perspective of historical evidence that has made intervention on the part of the state an unavoidable necessity. Scientists as all of them are, they are anxious to dispel the confusion that economics is explanatory of actual behaviour. Pursuing their analysis with utmost rigour, they admit that economic theory "is restricted to stating conditions of equilibrium; it could never determine the path of movement towards that state from any other." Revelling too much in the contemplation of mathematical equilibria they are, nonetheless, realists enough to concede that the world of reality needs some deliberate planning even to realise the states of mathematical equilibrium. The best of them are people who hold that the problem of social organization is a problem of discovering "the right proportions between individualism and socialism and the various varieties of each and to use each in its proper place." They are all planners with degrees of difference, planners within the capitalist framework.

They are frankly critical of the competitive enterprise of the orthodox Liberal. An ideally free individual of economic theory is to them a myth. They do not find it difficult to assert that a competitive order may tend to form character in a manner that would be far from ethical. They find in the world of reality divergences from the assumptions of free competition more real than the assumptions themselves; and, what is more fundamental, they are not prepared to believe—and this belief is the keystone of the arch of classical economy—that "competence" as measured by the price system corresponds to ethical merit.

And they are no less critical of the Communist mechanism, for they cannot conceive how economic activity could be made to run without a money measure or without the controlling pulls of demand and supply. They are sceptical about the *real* distribution of wealth being equal even under Communism. Nor can they visualise how the emergence of groups within the state with similarity of interests could be prevented. They have doubts about the progressive character of its economy run by a "wooden" bureaucracy. For them production for use rather than profit is good enough as a slogan, but it clears no more ground without begging questions of itself. It would not function, despite theory, without dictatorship, and they are democratic enough to decry it on this score. For them the problem at bottom is a moral problem and they are cynical enough to argue that the political problem is merely one of preventing (too much!) cheating and unsportsmanly practice. (For this line of thought please see C. F. Knight, *Ethics of Competition and other Essays*, particularly the essay on *Economic Theory and Nationalism*). It may be stated with a fair measure of approximation to accuracy that these are the people who back up the New Dealers in America, who are the left-wing Liberals and Fabians in England, the social Democrats in pre-Nazi Germany, and the various dubious brands of Socialists of the continental democracies and New Zealand and Australia. They are all believers in a planned co-ordination of the capitalist anarchy without having to sack the citadel of individualism.

Now, turning to our own country, it should not be difficult to appreciate the importance of these differences in relation to the planning of our economic policy. Not merely in regard to the degree of control necessary for economic planning, but also in regard to whether such control is essential or not there are differences of opinion. A planning committee consisting of Stalin, Hitler, President Roosevelt and Mr. Lansbury with Prof. Robbins for their economic adviser, may be an imposing body, though it may be a matter for research to discover the area of agreement existing between them, and it may not be a very useful bit of research either. If and when the Government-of-India decides to co-operate with the Planning Committee—if it ever does at all—it may be relied upon to represent the viewpoint of resurgent Liberalism with the doyens of the London School as its advisory counsels. With the heavy ballast of conservative and romantic princely India, with socialist and capitalist interests duly represented on the Planning Committee we need not expect very great results. But great or small, efforts in this direction are really commendable and are indeed worthwhile for reasons other than immediate results. If nothing else, they will at least enable us to feel the way more accurately and to gauge the probable trends of sectional reactions to suggested measures of reform.

P. S. NARAYAN PRASAD.

(To be continued).

PEACE IN INDUSTRY.

The most wretched slavery they call peace.

—Tacitus.

TOWARDS the end of the third reading of the Bombay Industrial Disputes Bill, the Hon'ble Mr. Kher, Prime Minister of Bombay, emphasised the desirability of establishing industrial peace as a necessary precondition to industrial prosperity of India. Very rightly he pointed out that during the last few years, great damage was caused to Indian industries on account of the enormous number of industrial disputes that arose in most of the centres of industries—especially Bombay. And he declared that any Government that did not endeavour to put an end to this state of affairs would be simply criminal in the country's eye.

Mr. Kher would argue thus: industrial prosperity is absolutely essential for the well-being of the nation as a whole. But unfortunately it has not been possible to attain it in India owing to the prevalence, especially during the post-war period, of frequent and harmful industrial strife. During the last twenty years there have been numerous strikes and lock-outs in Indian industries and as a result of them thousands of working hours and lakhs of rupees in the form of wages, have been lost to the industry and to the workers respectively. This has resulted in the crippling of industries and the impoverishment of the workers. If, therefore, we want to raise the standard of living of the workers, we must see that our industries prosper, and in order to bring about the latter result we must do all that we can to put an end to all forms of industrial disputes. Stop, therefore, all strikes and lock-outs by legislation if necessary and up will arise industrial peace like the rising sun.

Peace means prosperity to the industries and the latter means the raising of the workers' standard of life which we all desire. The whole working class, therefore, Mr. Kher would have us believe, owes a debt of gratitude to the Bombay Government for this new Labour Bill which is "one of the finest attempts" to bring about peace and prosperity.

We have no hesitation in associating ourselves unreservedly with the ardent desire of the Hon. Mr. Kher to bring about peace and prosperity to the industries of this country. But we suggest that the noble-minded Premier, in the line of his argument summarised above, has made absolutely unwarranted assumptions. He has arrived at extremely desirable conclusions but unfortunately his premises have no relation to facts as they are and hence his whole argument will collapse like a pack of cards at the first touch of practical test.

His first assumption seems to be that industrial prosperity depends only on industrial peace. As anybody will see, this is too naive an assumtion to make. We would, therefore, leave it at that and turn to the second and more important and perhaps more unwarranted assumption that the prosperity of industry necessarily means the raising of the workers' standard of living. We submit this is not so. The relation between the financial condition of industry and the workers' standard of living in a capitalist society has never been as simple as Mr. Kher would try to make out. It is needless to go into rates of profits, which indicate the prosperity of capitalist industries, and the state of real wages, which show the workers' standard of living, to prove that the realisation of higher rates of profits on the part of the masters of industry is a phenomenon not necessarily accompained by a relatively higher living standard for the workers. The living standard of the average British worker is considerably higher to-day than it was a century ago. The average rate of profit, according to Mr. Kher's theory, should have been enormously greater than what it is. In fact, it is actually lower. The present relative wel-being of the British worker is due neither to enforced peace in industry nor to increased rates of profit as a result of this peace, but something altogether different—that is militant and efficient Trade Unionism coupled with ruthless colonial exploitation. The workers in a capitalist society can get only what they take. But for their militant organisation, they would not be given anything beyond what is absolutely essential to enable them to live and—we are loath to be brutally frank—to breed; for that is a fact. The history of industrial revolution in any capitalist country will show that the prosperity of industries and the welfare of the workers have little to do with each other.

Be that as it may. As we have said above, we entirely agree with Mr. Kher when he says that peace in industry is an extremely desirable end and that it is the duty of every Government to endeavour to achieve it. We confess that we also have a weakness for that magic word 'peace' whether in industry or elsewhere; but we also have to confess that we are of the view that, however desirable an end may ba, the possibility of its achievement does not exist as long as the causes which lead to the prevalence of its negation in the existing order of society, are not scientifically analysed and ruthlessly done away with. In this particular case, we submit that Mr. Kher's analysis of the causes of industrial strife is extremely simple and uncritical. It is almost tautologous, for he says there is no peace in industry because there are strikes in it. His remedy, therefore, is equally simple and not only ineffective but positively harmful. His remedy is to stop all strikes in order to bring about peace.

We wish the Premier had taken somewhat greater pains fully to realise the implications of the fact of industrial strife. Instead of stopping at strikes and lock-outs in his chain of argument cited above, he could have, with advantage, gone a step further and enquired into the genesis of frequent and enormous labour troubles which he so rightly deplores. He could have found a very instructive pointer in the following observation of the Royal Commission on Labour in India:

> The prevalence of strikes affords an indication of the extent of unrest, but strikes are merely the symptoms most evident to the public of underlying discontent. The attempt to deal with unrest must begin rather with the creation of an atmosphere unfavourable to disputes than with machinery for their settlement.

But why go to the ponderous volumes of the august Royal Commission? Mr. Kher's own mentor in labour matters, Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda, whatever he might say to-day, had in the year 1934, in a statement on the then Trade Disputes Conciliation Bill, said on behalf of the Ahemedabad Labour Association:

> Unless it is determined by an expert enquiry as to what would be a reasonable scale of wages in the textile industry in Bombay as it is situated to-day, and as it should normally be, and unless steps are taken to secure for the workers wages on this scale it would be vain hope to win for the industry the advantage of a prolonged peace without workable standards of this nature.

For reasons best known to himself, Mr. Nanda to-day sings a different tune and the pity of it is that Mr. Kher dances to it.

We would like to point out to Mr. Kher that permanent industrial peace and the capitalist system of society are, strictly speaking, mutually exclusive terms. The capitalist system, by its very nature, is based on the extremely insecure and even explosive foundation of two classes of the people whose interests are

bound to clash, for it is only by depriving one class of its existing advantages that the other can thrive. Under these circumstances, peace in industry is and can be only of the nature of a truce and nothing more. Mr. N. M. Joshi, speaking in the central Legislative Assembly on 17th March, 1938, observed:

> I agree . . . that a strike is a declaration of war. But is the Honourable Member surprised that there should be strikes in a system which is based upon the principle of war, the principle of struggle—we call it by the milder term, the principle of competition. If your whole system is based upon the principle of competition and struggle, what else do you expect except a strike?

It is, therefore, clear that lasting industrial peace is impossible of achievement in the capitalist system, for it is entirely dependent upon the harmonious working of two warring classes which have contradictory ends to achieve. Industrial peace can be established only by the abolition of one of the two classes. It is a very unpleasant idea, but it is none the less based on facts as they actually are. The best way to solve the difficulty is boldly to face the facts and not deny or ignore them. If Mr. Kher is, therefore, a real lover of industrial peace, all his energies should be directed towards the establishment of a socialist republic in India. But we fear he is going exactly in the opposite direction. He apparently seeks to bring about peace in industry by abolishing, for all practical purposes, the inherent rights of the working class on which the whole burden of the country's production rests. That is the way of Hitlers and Mussolinis. Their endeavour is to keep the working class under perpetual and complete subjugation and thus to effect at least a temporary solution of the inherent contradictions of the capitalist system. It is needless to say that this is only a temporary measure; it cannot be made lasting as it itself helps to heighten the acuteness of the capitalist contradiction.

We do not wish to accuse Mr. Kher of any deliberate Fascist designs on his part. But we may be free to indicate that, that is what his policy logically amounts to. G. D. H. Cole very aptly observes:

> There are, unfortunately, people who really believe in social peace from disinterested motives, and are earnestly engaged in its furtherance. They have been deceived by the nonsensical or hypocritical talk of those who pretend that "the interests of Capital and Labour are identical" and that all that is needed is "a better understanding of economic truths on both sides"—especially on the side of Labour. Let it be understood once for all that the interests of Capital and Labour are diametrically opposed, and that although it may be necessary for Labour sometimes to acquiesce in 'social peace,' such peace is only the lull before the storm.

Under these circumstances, we cannot help giving a friendly warning to Mr. Kher that the industrial peace that he dreams of and that he wants to establish with the help of the new Labour Bill, will be a veritable chimera, if not the Hitlerian peace of the burial ground. It is, in Cole's words, "a sham and a trick", if not personally to him, at least to those who know better and under the influence of some of whom he is conducting his Government. However, it would be well for Mr. Kher to note the view of others that, may be with the best of intentions, he is letting lose forces of reaction which will be detrimental to the working class movement and as such to the country's movement for freedom itself.

N. V. PHADKE

TANGANYIKA.

AT the time of the Munich Agreement Hitler declared that there was one other "awkward question", that of Colonies, to settle, but that it need not lead to war, meaning that, although he had Colonial ambitions, he was prepared to negotiate on the subject and that he would not ask too much. One thing, however, has long become obvious that Germany will not be satisfied until she has some at least of her ex-Colonies back. It is equally obvious that the British Government is willing to return some of these Colonies. Perhaps some such undertaking has already been given. In any case, this matter must form a part of the impending Anglo-German agreement.

Most of the former German Colonies were taken over by the British Empire. Three of the more important of these are under the Colonial Office. These Colonies were not annexed, but the British Empire was given a mandate to govern them under the supervision of the League of Nations. It will be interesting to see how many of these Colonies go back to Germany; how many and which of them will satisfy her ambitions.

There is another rather interesting point. Will the Imperial Government consult the local indigenous inhabitants, who are vitally interested in this matter? At present there are no signs that the Imperial Cabinet is at all keen on taking them in to their confidence. Strictly speaking, why should they be consulted now when they were not consulted at the time the mandates were given?

Then there are the immigrant settlers to consider. In one of the ex-German Colonies, i. e., Tanganyika, there is quite a respectable number of British settlers, who came to the territory after the war and on the assumption that the Colony would not go back to Germany. The number of Indians has more than doubled in the last twenty years. It is quite certain that a good number of these would not have gone to this territory if it had remained under Germany or if they thought that there was a chance of the Colony going back to Germany. It is necessary, therefore, that these two communities should be consulted before anything is decided about this Colony. The British

and the Indians have a dominant position in the business and finance of the territory. Sisal, one of the main products of the country, is mostly produced on the British and Indian-owned plantations. Quite 60,000 tons out of a total of 85,000 tons of it are produced on Indian and British-owned plantations. Practically the whole cotton crop—about 40,000 to 50,000 bales—is handled and ginned by Indians. The whole of the distributing trade in imports is in the hands of Indian merchants. India does a considerable business each year with Tanganyika. So that there is a considerable amount of Indian capital invested in the country. All this shows that Indians are vitally interested in the future of Tanganyika. India must, therefore, take notice of Indian interests in Tanganyika and represent their case to the British Government. British interests are sufficiently strong and vocal in England to be able to protect their own interests. There is danger of Indian interests being ignored, as they were after the war.

Indians of this Colony have joined hands with British settlers and have protested against its transfer to Germany. They prefer the known British administration to the unknown Nazi rule. Indians, in particular, have most to fear from Nazi rule as Europeans settlers have a tendency to consider Indians as a superflous nuisance, and Germans are not free from this tendency. It is feared, with some justification, that life under German rule may not be bearable to Indians. In any case, one cannot blame Indians for entertaining such fears.

Kenya as well as South Africa have expressed themselves against the return of Tanganyika to Germany. It is to be seen, however, what effect these protests will have on the British Cabinet, which is after all the final arbitor in this matter. It is to be seen also whether Hitler can be pursuaded to drop the demand for Tanganyika. One does not even know whether any such proposal has been made to Germany.

One thing is quite certain. Indians in Tanganyika prefer to remain under British rule and have thrown the weight of their voice against transfer to Germany. It is for the Indian Government and the British Government to see that Indian opinion and interests are not ignored. Whatever is ultimately decided upon, it cannot be doubted that Indian vested interests in the Colony should be adequately safe-guarded. It is necessary to give a timely warning both to India Government and the British Government because Indian interests have been overlooked before.

M. P. CHITALE.

Correspondence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR—I see that you have charged some journals, especially those conducted in the Indian languages, with having descended to deplorable depths of bad taste in attacking the Mahatma. I am not concerned to defend every remark of every journal about the Mahatma, but I would like to point out that such attacks are a direct reaction to the absurd and unreasoning hero-worship in which his admirers and followers continually indulge. If these latter had been more moderate in their praise, the former would have been equally moderate in their criticism. The very word *Mahatma*, to which he objected in his early days but to which he now seems to be reconciled, is a challenge to those who object to Mahatmic or dictatorial methods. The appellation means to imply that he is above and beyond criticism. Some of us, though perhaps a minority in the country, refuse to regard every word said by him and every action done by him as sacrosanct. But this is exactly the claim made on his behalf by his followers. Take, for instance, the tragic accident, involving three deaths, recently at Wardha. There was no mention of it in the *Harijan* which often deals with much less important matters but which did not answer the charge made against him that he wrongly influenced the opinion of medical experts and led perhaps to a wrong treatmeut of the patients. Or, again, consider the recently published letters of Mr. Gandhi to an unmarried young woman devotee. To any rational man the detailing of unsavoury sexual experiences of the Mahatma to a young woman and their cold-blooded publication as a souvenir of the great man appears little short of obscenity, and in any other case would have led to an agitation for the prosecution of the writer and publisher. But these scandalous letters are held up as a remarkable document for the edification of the public.

The more public activities of Mr. Gandhi are, of course, a legitimate subject for criticism. His inconsistencies in defending many things against which he formerly inveighed, his unabashed defence of his favourites for doing things which in any other case would have opened the phials of his wrath, his continued insistence on his being all the same a staunch adherent of truth and non-violence, all these stink in the nostrils of those who have not given up the use of their rational faculties. His methods in dealing with Mr. Nariman and Dr. Khare show that he can stoop to depths of which any ordinary man would be ashamed. If his admirers persist in defending the indefensible, his critics are justified in debunking him by harsh methods.

Hence I do not consider him to be exempt from criticism and even from ridicule. Absurdities like these can best be attacked by methods of ridicule. People are influenced by ridicule even when they will not listen to a rational discussion. If he has suffered more than others by these methods, it is because greater claims have been made for him by his devotees. Let this excessive hero-worship diminish and I confidently predict a diminution in an equal measure of the attacks on him. Your criticism had better be directed to his own irrational and blinded followers.

R. P. PARANJPYE.

[It is with all the great respect that is due to Dr. Paranjpye that we venture to offer a few comments on his letter. If we understand him correctly, Dr. Paranjpye concedes our contention that remarks have been made against the Mahatma which he was not concerned to defend and that "harsh methods" have been used in "debunking" him. The difference between is that, while we deplored the remarks and methods which even Dr. Paranjpye is not prepared to defend, he finds an excuse for them. The chief justification for the attacks against the Mahatma is not what the Mahatma himself has claimed or done, but what his followers have attributed to him. It is not that the Mahatma himself claimed to be a Mahatma or claimed sacrosance for his words and deeds, and threatened disbelievers with dire penalties here and hereafter, but that some of his admirers are blind adorers of him. How many there are of such we are not told. But it is with a view to salvaging these blind adorers that Dr. Paranjpye would justify the attacks on the Mahatma, however harsh they may be on the Mahatma, and indefensible in themselves. He would redeem the guilty by punishing the innocent. To recall a story. It appears a son-in-law thrashed his innocent wife in order to teach good manners to his father-in-law. A vicarious punishment, when invited by the victim, may ennoble him, but when inflicted on the victim may not redound to the sense of justice of the awarder.

As regards the public views and actions of the Mahatma, we have not been slow or soft in criticising them. If anything, we have on occasions erred on the side of severity. Mr. Sastri is no blind adorer of the Mahatma; he has not hesitated to criticise the Mahatma's views. But he always did it with courtesy, charity and chivalry and not, on that account, less effectively. Notwithstanding our own occasional lapses, we would prefer the methods of Mr. Sastri to the "harsh methods" which Dr. Paranjpye would uot himself defend but would excuse.—Ed.]

SHORT NOTICE.

A HISTORY OF BENARES. (FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES DOWN TO 1937.) BY A. S. ALTEKAR. (The Culture Publication House, Benares Hindu University.) 1937. 25cm. 74p. Re. 1-8-0.

THIS small booklet was originally published in the Journal of the Benares Hindu University and later in a separate book form. The book is divided into five chapters, the first two dealing with the pre-Muslim period and the third with the Muslim period upto 1707. The fourth chapter is devoted to the history of the temple of Vishwanath. The last chapter deals with the recent history of Benares from 1707 to 1937.

Benares is essentially a Hindu place of pilgrimage. Even before the advent of the Aryans, it was a famous centre of non-Aryan worship. In the course of the subsequent fight between the Aryans and the non-Aryans, the Aryans found it necessary to make peace with the non-Aryans by making room for Mahadeva in their pantheon. In the Mahabharata war the King of Kasi was on the side of the Pandavas. Since then, Kasi continued to be a separate independent province ruled by Brahmadatta Kings during the 3rd century B. C. upto the time of Mauryas who seem to have absorbed it in their empire. To-day Kasi is the same as Benares but formerly Kasi was a province of which Benares, i. e. Vārāṇasi, was the capital.

In spite of very careful research, Dr. Altekar has not been able to say definitely when Benares acquired the position of the premier *tirtha* of the Hindus. From its first prominent mention in the *Matsya* and *Linga Purāna*, Dr. Altekar puts down the 3rd or the 4th century A. D., as the probable date of the commencement of such importance. In pre-Muslim period Benares was not only a religious centre but a centre of learning, fine art and commerce. Subsequently under the Muslims Benares lost a good deal of its importance, and the temples in that holy place, including Kasi-vishweshwar temple, were several times razed to the ground. Aurangzeb went a step further. He created masjids in places of temples destroyed. On page 37 the author tells us that a mosque was built on the site of Vishwanath and two high minarets on the site of Venu-Madhav temple. Reference to the Bharat Itihas Samshodhak Mandal Quarterly Vol. VII page 27 would show that the writer, Mr. Navangul, is of the opinion that the two constructions, of mosque and minarets, are of different times, the mosque belonging to olden times, i. e. prior to the 17th century. The same writer comes to the conclusion that very probably Vishwanāth temple escaped the notice of Aurangzeb.

Modern Benares is largely a creation of the Mahrattas, who although never in actual possession of the holy place, were very keen on its protection. Maratha rulers and sardars like Ahalyabai, Sardar Vinchurkar and Baijabai Sindia did their part in restoring to the city its ancient holy grandeur. Recently Mrs. Annie Besant founded her Central Hindu College in 1898 and made Benares a prominent centre of the Theosophical Society. The Benares Hindu University and the Kashi Vidyapitha are the outcome of the perseverance of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and the munificence of Babu Shiva Prasad Gupta.

Dr. Altekar has brought together different references to Benares and sifted them in a critical manner. Religious-minded Hindus and all students of historical research in general will be greatly interested in the book. In a sense it would be true to say that the history of Benares is a history of the vicissitudes of Hindu culture in a nut-shell.

One or two mistakes of topography may be noted. The first line on page 37 is unconnected with the last line on page 36 and it cannot be connected elsewhere. On page 36 there is a new paragraph opened, although the line contains running matter from page 35.

R. V. OTURKAR.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE GREAT CREMATION GROUND (MAHASMASANA), A CRITICAL DISSERTATION ON INDIAN PHILOSOPHY. By ELIZABETH SHARPE. (Luzac,) 1938. 21cm. 48p. 2/6.

MODERN CHINESE HISTORY: POLITICAL, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL. By Prof. TAN YUN-SHAN. (Registrar, Andhra University, Waltair.) 1938. 24cm. 83p. As. 8.

Printed and Published by Mr. Anant Vinayak Patvardhan at the Aryabhushan Press, House No. 915/1 Bhamburda Peth, Poona City, and edited at the "Servant of India" Office, Servants of India Society's Home, Bhamburda, Poona City, by Mr. S. G. Vaze.