

THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. VIII. No. 39. }

POONA—THURSDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1925.

{ INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 10 s.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	455
ARTICLES :—	
Pooj Mr. Tambe. By V. S. Srinivasa Sastri ...	457
The Swaraj Party at the Cross-Roads ...	457
A Desperate Situation. By R. R. Bakhale ...	459
Labour. By Dr. H.C. E. Zacharias ...	461
A LETTER FROM LONDON ...	463
REVIEWS :—	
Environment, Heredity and Selection. Professor	
Walter O. Fitch ...	464
Short Notice ...	465
BOOKS RECEIVED ...	465

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

Indian Demands. IN the address which he delivered as President of the third Berar Liberal Conference held at Amraoti on October 25 and 26, Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru outlined the Indian demands as follows:—"There should be a unitary government responsible to the legislature in the provinces. In consequence of this as well as on the merits of the question, the Government of India should, in matters of civil administration, become responsible to the Indian legislature. It will be an anomaly if responsible provincial governments continue to be controlled by an autocratic Government of India. Indeed, Mr. Curtis went so far as to say that as soon as the maintenance of law and order was handed over to Indians the justification for British control would cease to exist. Indians should be admitted to all branches of the defence forces of the country and the army should be Indianized without unnecessary delay. This would involve not merely that the commissioned officers should be Indians, but also that the British garrison in India should be progressively eliminated and replaced by Indian troops. The expenditure on the Army and Foreign and Political Departments should for a definite period continue under the control of the Governor-General who should have power to appropriate any amount not exceeding a figure to be fixed by a joint committee of experts and members of the Indian legislature. All expenditure beyond this figure should be subject to the vote of the Assembly except in a time of war. The India Council should be abolished and the Secretary of State should approximate to the position occupied by the Secretary of State for the Dominions. After the fixed period referred to above India should have the

power to extend her control over subjects left temporarily in the hands of the Governor-General. To these demands I would add, in order to emphasize the importance of the matter, that the constituencies for the Councils and the Assembly should be smaller than they are, and that the strength of the legislatures should be considerably increased. The number of members of the Council of State also should be increased, but my own view is that the system of election to it should be indirect."

Public Service or
Personal Aggrandisement?

HOW coolly it is assumed in Indian political circles that Mr. Tambe accepted a seat on the Executive Council from motives entirely unconnected with public interests. Pandit Motilal Nehru, instituting a comparison between his acceptance of a place on the Sken Committee and Mr. Tambe's recent action, says, with the charitableness characteristic of him, that what he did was "for the good of the country" but what Mr. Tambe did was "for his own personal aggrandisement." Even the editor of the *Indian Social Reformer*, who usually rises superior to popular prejudice, could not help observing, even while writing in Mr. Tambe's defence, that it was the higher salary of the post of Executive Councillor that made Mr. Tambe give up the Presidentship of the Council in favour of his new billet. We cannot understand however why an unworthy motive should be ascribed to an act which might well have been inspired by the sole desire to serve one's country irrespectively of the personal advantages that would flow therefrom. To Mr. Tambe, as to most people, we presume, money is not unacceptable if it comes his way while performing a public service. It was never suspected by any one that he offered himself for election to the Presidentship of the Council for the sake of filthy lucre. It was then praised as a public-spirited act of great merit. Now he prefers a public service of a higher kind, which also happens to carry with it a higher salary. Is it not but fair to assume, unless anything is known to the contrary, that it was the opportunity for higher service rather than higher emoluments which induced Mr. Tambe to make the change? The *People*, which does not look with particular favour on persons who accept Government jobs, has to admit, however, that an Executive Councillor or a Minister has much wider opportunities of doing public good than a President of the Legislative Council. The Liberal party, to whom it fell, as a matter of sheer duty, to fill the posts of Ministers in the first term of the reformed

Councils in some of the provinces, has silently suffered much undeserved obloquy in the past as a party of job-hunters. We would not, however, like the same obloquy to attach to the Swarajist party just when it is on the threshold of a change in its policy. We have already enough job-hunters in all conscience—in every party; let us not however, on that account cast stones at public workers, merely because they accept a call to office.

* * *

A Grievance — THE present Government of India seems determined not to do anything to conciliate public opinion. It has issued a resolution declining to give effect to the Legislative Assembly's wishes to remove the existing ban on persons convicted of political offences not involving moral turpitude in respect of election to legislative bodies. That "an honest thinker, who might have overstepped the law and might have been prosecuted in a moment of tense atmosphere" should be excepted from the operation of the present disqualification rule the Government of India fully admits. The public too does not desire anything more, but it desires that it should not be left to local Governments, as is now proposed, to remove the disqualification of this or that person, but that a rule should be enacted automatically removing the disqualification of the whole class of political prisoners who have not been guilty of violence or incitement to violence or any other offences involving moral turpitude. This, the Government says, is impossible but why should it be impossible in India, when, as a matter of fact, in the majority of British Dominions, as we have shown before, a distinction is made, not in rules but in legislative enactments themselves, between offences involving moral turpitude and others: and the former offences alone, and then too only those that are of a most heinous kind — "infamous crimes" — are held to constitute a bar to election.

* * *

— and a Remedy. IT is therefore but natural that resentment should be felt at this latest sign of the Government of India's unresponsiveness to public opinion. But Pandit Motilal Nehru has made this the occasion for the rattling of the sword. In the presence of first-rate crises which should have called forth from leaders of popular movements the strongest action possible, greater men than Pandit Motilalji have partly confessed their inability to start civil disobedience. Now on this comparatively insignificant happening, Pandit Motilalji threatens civil disobedience and intimates his intention to ask the ensuing Congress at Cawnpore to give him a mandate to embark on this extreme measure. Such an indiscriminate flourishing of this admittedly impossible weapon before the bureaucracy can only arouse an amused contempt for those who indulge in this bluff. To us this particular gesture of the Pandit appears to be intended for his brother Swarajists more than for the Government. He sees prominent men in his party raise a standard of revolt against the policy of obstruction. They want

him to move so far to the right as to adopt the Liberal policy of responsive co-operation. The Pandit therefore thinks that the best strategy on his part would be to bid his party to move to the extreme left so that at least the party would maintain its present ground. He has however incidentally made one very damaging admission, viz. that the Swaraj party has been sailing all this time very near the wind of co-operation. The Pandit is evidently heartily ashamed of his acceptance of the membership of the Skeen Committee, etc., for he says that the Party must "abandon the perilous course and take again to familiar waters." He of course means civil disobedience, but Mr. Kelkar knows better than anybody else that it is bank cartridges that the Pandit is firing. The Pandit did not feel it necessary to seek the mandate of the Congress or the electorate when he changed the policy of the Swaraj party from one of wholesale opposition to one of discriminating support; it is only when a change in the other direction is contemplated that he thinks of a mandate. But before civil disobedience is even dimly suggested, the Swarajists' part must make up mind on one thing—that nothing substantial in the way of progress is to be expected from the Baldwin Government: for it is not the Liberals but the Swarajist leaders who are holding out the hope to the people that despite appearances, the present Government, Conservative as it is, has some big scheme for constitutional advance up its sleeves. The sanguine optimism which found vent in the Faridpur speech of the late Mr. Das is shared by the Pandit and such fire-eaters in the Swaraj party as Mr. Satyamurti.

* * *

Our Dumb Show. THE Swarajist dumb show in the Bombay Legislative Council continues in this session, too. From the fact that the Swarajist members served on Select Committees one would have thought that they would have no objection to participation in Council debate. But secret committees seem to be a more fitting sphere of work for Swarajists than open Council session. It is, however, wrong to suppose that even in Committees the Swarajist members offered opposition. The amendments which they tabled were in no way different from those of the Liberals, Independents and non-Brahmans. Take for instance, the bill for imposing a tax on totalisator betting. On this matter the Swarajists did not oppose the tax on principle. It was reserved for Mr. Pradhan, a Liberal, and Mr. Surve, a non-Brahman, to take up this attitude. Such a puritan pose does not come easily to our Swarajist friends. Nor do the debates suffer in any way from the non-participation of the Swarajists, from whom no one expects in the Bombay Council a solid contribution. The voting is not affected either, for there is hardly a single motion which was defeated in the Council because the Swarajists withdrew support therefrom. The Swarajists' members have found very much to their chagrin that everything goes on quite as well as before, if not better. Most mortifying of all, no one seems to mind their vow of silence. It was to show to the non-Brahmans how indispensable their support is for non-Brahman measures that this strategy was adopted, but the non-Brahmans particularly rejoice that measures like the Joshi Bill of Mr. Bole are now safe from partisan attacks of the Swarajists. How long is the dumb show to continue?

* * *

POOR MR. TAMBE.*

By V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI.

NOT being a Swarajist, I find it hard to convict Mr. Tambe of a cardinal sin. The case is analogous to that of a religious convert: the members of his old faith curse him as a renegade, while those whom he has joined hail him as an authoritative witness of the truth. Vibhishana was a base deserter on one side of the water, but a champion of international justice on the other side. Swarajists have no doubt that the bureaucracy has bought Mr. Tambe, but we are loth to believe that he was tempted solely by the salary and not also by the opportunities of public service which office brings. There is apparently a wide-spread opinion in Swarajist circles in favour of responsive co-operation, and it is idle to deny that Pandit Nehru and Mr. Patel are themselves infected with a mild variety of it. The C. P. Swarajists some time ago nearly formed a ministry. Some day or other that province was bound to produce a whole-hogger. Mr. Kelkar has shown the utmost good sense in discussing the point; Mr. Jayakar, though he sees the right, will not proclaim it. The fact is that co-operation with a "satanic" government was a black treason only under the stress of over-wrought patriotic fervour. It is not in the nature of that fervour to last long; and well is it for the people that it is not. The passing away of the morbid is a prelude to the restoration of the normal. Provided we keep clear of ethical estimates, Mr. Tambe's action is a proof that health is returning to Swarajist political life.

This is not to say that Mr. Tambe has not laid himself open to censure. He has done the right thing the wrong way. He might have made a public-declaration of his change of faith as soon as that change became clear to himself. We presume that this was long before office was offered him. At any rate he should have resigned from his party before he actually accepted it. It is difficult to follow those who say that he must have consulted his party before taking the step. If it was a ministership which was in view there was a chance of their allowing him the liberty to take it and still retain his position among them. An executive councillorship is in a different category: his political connection would anyhow have had to be snapped in the present state of our constitution. Previous consultation was obviously out of the question. Formal leave-taking, that is to say, a resignation was the only course admissible in the circumstances. It is strange it did not occur to him. If it had, the party would not be under the disagreeable necessity of summoning its executive to pronounce judgment upon his action.

An outsider would not be right to intervene in a matter of domestic discipline. But one may express the hope that in the interests of public life undue severity will be avoided. Even in worse

* This article was to have appeared in last week's issue, but arrived too late for publication.

cases removal of the offender's name has been considered sufficient in English politics. On the pure merits of the case it does not appear that an anathema is called for. Individual judgments published in the press have in some cases been excessively harsh. One hopes that their authors, having given vent to their wrath, will find it possible when they sit in council to view the matter without passion and in its true setting. It should be remembered that a standard of ascetic self-denial is from the very nature of the case unsuited to public workers; that if it was imposed in a time of acute moral indignation it could not be maintained when the feeling had passed away; that the original rigour had already been relaxed in high places with general approval; and that the transgression complained of had best be regarded as a striking method of calling attention to the anachronistic nature of the ban on office.

Even in the very apogee of orthodox non-cooperation municipal and local board work was not included within the scope of excommunication on grounds which were more jesuitical than convincing. One recalls too that when the Swarajist schism first appeared it was in contemplation that legislators should not take the travelling and other pecuniary allowances. Membership of select and standing committees was scorned, but only for a time. A subtle distinction was put forward between nominative and elective membership, but it had to be abandoned when the President of the party himself accepted a seat on the Sken Committee. In the Central Provinces the other day this relaxation was taken advantage of by a number of Swarajists who got appointed to a committee on village unions. If it be said that these are honorary positions, Mr. Patel can claim the credit of having broken new ground. It is true the Presidentship of the Assembly is not an office of emoluments under the Crown in the technical sense; but the common man will feel that it is an office, that it carries heavy emoluments, that it is approved by the representative of the Crown and that the salary is disbursed from the public treasury out of revenues which are notoriously "tainted." A sense of honour will, we hope, save these heretics from the odium of being the first to cast stones at one whose fault is that he saw the inevitable more clearly than his fellows and went farther afield to meet it. In this world of delayed justice and posthumous recognition, Mr. Tambe cannot expect to be honoured as one who points the way. But is it too much to plead that he may be saved from the fires of the stake?

THE SWARAJ PARTY AT THE CROSS-ROADS.

IT is not merely a question of party discipline that the All-India Executive Council of the Swarajist party will have to consider at Nagpur on Sunday next. The question which they will be called upon to discuss and settle, with such finality as is possible in politics, is no less than the whole policy of

the party. However anxious some of the Swarajist leaders may be to avoid the issue, Mr. Kelkar and Mr. Jayakar—the former far more than the latter—have forced it upon them and there is now no escape. Shall the party still pursue the barren course of obstruction, with a talk occasionally thrown in of civil di-obedience and non-payment of taxes, or shall it now turn its energies to the really constructive programme of utilising the newly formed legislative bodies for all they are worth as an instrument of national progress? The policy now followed by the party is neither fish, nor flesh, nor good redherring. It is neither co-operation, nor obstruction, nor non-co-operation. Obstruction, even the "uniform, continuous and consistent obstruction," for which the left-wing Swarajists profess a partiality, has its uses. Non-co-operation of the Gandhian type also has a moral value of its own. But the Swarajists pursue neither of these policies; they manage to combine in their policy the disadvantages of both and the advantages of neither. It was under the influence of non-co-operation that the obstruction policy was at first adopted by the party: the Councils were no doubt *haram*, but they became *halal* only for the purpose of opposition to Government. If this is the basic idea, the Swarajist members ought to have followed it out whether they were in a majority or in a minority in the legislatures. What is sinful for twenty persons together to do cannot be anything but sinful for five to do. Numbers do not create the ethical value of actions. But this fundamental principle was departed from very early in its career by the Swaraj party, and it was decided that while it was the duty of the Swarajists to oppose where they were in a majority, their duty might lie along different paths in provinces where they were in a minority. Those who formulated such an illogical plan of action did not realise that any moral effect that would be produced by non-acceptance of office and the production of deadlocks in a province like the Central Provinces would be more than neutralized by the Swarajist members supporting Government, e.g., in giving protection to certain industries (not to mention their support of such measures as the Contempt of Courts Bill) in the Central Legislature. The conduct of the Swarajists in Councils where they have not obtained a majority is governed by rules which have undergone numerous changes, with the result that all that now remains of the original taboos is the one about acceptance of office, though here again some offices are excepted from the general prohibition. No party which wishes to make an appeal to the intellect and conscience of the country, as apart from popular superstitions, can afford to let its policy lie in such a mess as the Swarajist policy is. The Swaraj party really must straighten itself out according to principles. It may do so by carrying out the policy of obstruction consistently, as they set out to do at first, no matter whether they formed a majority or a minority in the Councils, or, alternatively, they must adopt the Liberal policy of constitutional co-operation *cum* opposition, or responsive co-operation as the

current phrase fancied by the Swarajists goes—of course, not ruling out obstruction, but practising it as occasion would demand.

Though theoretically two courses are open to the Swarajists, in practice only one is open. For, in the first place, no Swarajist is really ready to carry out the principle of "uniform, continuous and consistent obstruction" in every legislative body, and in the second place it has not produced satisfactory results where it has been tried. It is only in the Central Provinces that the Swarajists are in an absolute majority and it is only there that the policy of persistent and consistent obstruction has been practised, but it is just in that province that the desire for change is most keenly felt. The latest indication of this change is afforded by the resolution passed by the Executive Council of the Berar Swaraj party at Amraoti on the 25th inst. under the presidency of the Mr. Aney, M.L.A. After "disapproving" (note the mild form of censure) the acceptance of Home Membership by Mr. Tambe "without consulting the Swaraj party," the resolution proceeds to express the opinion that "the all-India Swaraj party should change its present policy for one of responsive co-operation" and that the provinces should be allowed freedom to decide whether ministerships should be accepted or declined. Dr. Munje, the leader of the Swaraj party in the C. P. Legislative Council, and Mr. Abhyankar, M.L.A., were present at the meeting which adopted this resolution, thus showing that the sentiments expressed therein do not go very much against the grain with the Swarajists of the Central Provinces. It should not be imagined that the C. P. and Berar Swarajists are less responsive to a call for self-sacrifice than the Swarajists in other provinces. Indeed, they have exhibited greater self-sacrifice than all the others, and the sympathy of all lovers of the country must go out to them in full measure. The Central Provinces are among the most backward in the whole of India. They have consequently to make a greater lee-way than the rest, which is only another way of saying that they stand in more need of constitutional reform than other provinces. They were also better equipped than other provinces to take the utmost advantage of the reforms. Such ill-success as attended dyarchy is due mostly to the absence of clear and strong majorities at the back of Ministers. In the Central Provinces, however, and there alone, almost ideal conditions prevailed for the successful working of dyarchy—a well-knit party with an absolute majority. Being thus in sore need of constitutional power and having all the means to use it to the best advantage, the C. P. Swarajists are prohibited from doing so in obedience to a principle, which is honoured more in the breach than in the observance in other provinces by their fellow-Swarajists. Mere fairness to the Swarajists in the Central Provinces should lead the All-India Executive Council of the Swaraj party to remove the ban on the acceptance of ministerships in that province and consistency demands that if it is removed in

one province it should be removed in all. Either this or real, live obstruction, for which, however, no one is prepared, all talk of civil disobedience and non-payment of taxes notwithstanding. It is true that if the policy of responsive co-operation is adopted, the Swarajists will find it hard to distinguish themselves from the Liberals, but after all it is not such a great calamity to have unity in name where unity in active creed already exists. If a separate party organization is still found necessary, the Swarajists may retain it, but it would be criminal to pursue a different policy from that of the Liberals merely with a view to be able to put a gulf between the two parties. The Swarajist party stands at the cross-roads: we earnestly hope that its Executive Council will make its choice wisely.

A DESPERATE SITUATION.

IN my article of October 15, I tried to show the unconvincing nature of His Excellency Sir Leslie Wilson's reply of October 12 to the Workers' Deputation in so far as the latter's demand for the appointment of a committee of enquiry was concerned. Today I propose to deal with a few more points in His Excellency's reply which deserve notice and also with the reply which the Bombay Millowners' Association have chosen to give to the Workers' representation made by the Workers' Deputation on October 12 to Sir Leslie Wilson—a reply which, apart from its being disappointing, contains more than one statement and allegation which misrepresent the attitude of the Workers' Deputation about the present controversy.

Sir Leslie Wilson, in his replies of August 12 and October 12 to the Workers' Deputation, alluded to the efforts made by him and his Government for arming themselves with the necessary statutory powers of intervention in industrial disputes and pathetically told the public how, at the eleventh hour, the Government of India frustrated in July 1924 their plan of introducing an Arbitration and Conciliation Bill. I give credit to the Bombay Government for the prudent step they sought to take and I also appreciate the efforts made by them in sending to the Government of India "more than one representation" with regard to the necessity of an early passage of such a measure. But I want to know what pressure they brought upon the Government of India in respect of passing or allowing them to pass in the Bombay Council an Arbitration Bill immediately after the present crisis was apprehended in June last when the millowners put up notices of a wage cut. Did they make any representation to the Government of India urging the latter to allow them to introduce the measure in the Council in view of the impending crisis on condition (if such was asked by the Government of India) that they would repeal their measure the moment an all-India legislation was an accomplished fact? The Bombay Government knew, or, at any rate, they should have known, that the Government of India were not going to introduce their own measure of arbitration and con-

ciliation before the next Delhi Session of the Central legislatures. They could, therefore, have legitimately asked the Government of India to allow them to introduce their own measure with a view to avert if possible, the impending crisis. The Bombay Legislative Council was sitting in August and they could have carried their bill through in one session as an emergency measure. The Bombay Council is again in session; and they could have, if they had the will, rectified their mistake of August last by bringing in the bill now which would have been of some use to them even at this late hour. But I doubt very much whether His Excellency the Governor or his Government ever tried to move in this direction.

Sir Leslie Wilson reiterated what he told the Workers' Deputation in August last, that "unless absolutely essential, interference by Government is undesirable in industrial disputes"—an opinion which has been echoed like parrots by the Bombay mill-owners. If that contention is true, why did the Bombay Government attempt to introduce a measure empowering them to intervene in an industrial dispute and why are they now sorry that there is no such legislation which arms them with a statutory power of intervention? If it is contended that they want it for grave crises, does not the present one involving over 150,000 operatives come under that category? If it does, is not interference "absolutely essential"? The millowners' position is even more inconsistent and ridiculous. In their letter of September 18 to the Government of India urging them to repeal the excise duty as a condition precedent to their agreeing to submit their case before the Tariff Board, the Bombay Millowners' Association cited, in support of their claim for relief, the recent example of the Prime Minister of England when he gave a subvention to the coal industry. The millowners cannot be unaware that Mr. Baldwin gave this subvention after making thorough investigations into the condition of the coal industry by a court of enquiry; in other words, after he had *intervened* in the struggle between the miners and the mineowners. Neither of the parties to the struggle objected to Government's intervention. But our Bombay millowners consider such intervention on the part of Government undesirable and at the same time press Government to adopt a course which can be taken only after the latter's intervention. How to reconcile these attitudes, one does not know.

A serious charge has been brought against the Workers' Deputation both by the Governor and the Millowners' Association that the former did not exert themselves in influencing the operatives for not going on strike. I have answered this charge more than once in the public press; but in view of the very high quarter from which it has emanated this time, my answer may well bear repetition. In the first place, the charge is not wholly correct. It is known in Bombay that some of the members of our deputation did try in their individual capacity to avert a strike; but their efforts did not bear fruit. In the second place, the Workers' Deputation as a

body could not, in fairness to the workers, undertake the responsibility of persuading the workers not to go on strike for the reason that they had no other effective alternative to propose to the workers by which they would have been able to restore their wages to the original figure. It may be that even a strike may not succeed in having the wage cut abolished but by resorting to a strike they have at least demonstrated to the world their keen resentment against an injustice done to them, which they could not have otherwise done. Moreover, the Workers' Deputation tried their utmost to avert a crisis by negotiating both with the millowners and the Government and offering to the former terms by way of compromise and putting before the latter concrete proposals to avert the strike and terminate it after it was begun. But the Deputation miserably failed in their negotiations, owing to the obduracy of the employers. How can they then ask the workers to submit meekly to the dictates of their masters? It was indeed impossible for them to do so.

There is one more common point placed before the Workers' Deputation and the public by Sir Leslie Wilson and the Millowners' deputation, that if the state of the Bombay mill industry was really very bad it was for the shareholders who have invested their money in it to demand an enquiry into it in order to safeguard their interests. It was no business of the Workers' Deputation to ask for an enquiry when the shareholders were silent. The latter point was emphasised by the millowners. But they forget that in taking this view they are cutting the ground under their feet. If it is legitimate for the shareholders to demand an enquiry, it is ten times more legitimate for the workers to do the same; the former have invested their money; but the latter have invested their lives in the industry. Do the millowners think that capital, which is the creation of human beings, is more valuable than the human lives themselves? If so, let them say so openly and unreservedly. Secondly, it is a known fact in Bombay that a majority of the shares in the local mill industry are controlled by those who manage the industry or whose interests are dependent on those who manage it. How can they bring the management to book? Moreover, it is notorious that the Bombay capitalists are past masters in the art of inflating and deflating the prices of the shares; they control the share market. Only the other day I heard—though I cannot vouch for its truth—that a big mill firm in Bombay purchased a few hundreds of its own ten-rupee shares at 12 annas each. Under these circumstances, it is too much to expect anything from the shareholders.

Besides the two suggestions about the enquiry committee and the suspension of the notices of the wage cut, the Workers' Deputation had made two more suggestions for His Excellency's serious consideration; grant of facilities to the workmen to go to their villages by giving them free passages and consideration of the problem of industrial unemployment. Sir Leslie Wilson's reply does not contain any reference to these suggestions. What His

Excellency did after we saw him last was that he received the Millowners' Deputation and placed before them our copy of the representation. The public do not yet know what concrete proposals His Excellency made to them to end the strike and what reply he gave to the views expressed by the mill-owners about our suggestions. I am, therefore, constrained to say that the Bombay Government did not contribute anything to avert the strike; nor did they do much, if anything at all, to end it soon.

I now come to the millowners. In their reply to our last representation to His Excellency the Governor they made serious allegations against the Workers' Deputation, the correctness of which I promptly challenged in the daily press of Bombay. They said that the Workers' Deputation "were apparently satisfied that the (Millowners') Association were adopting the best course open to them under the circumstances to help the industry to tide over the difficulty." With the help of a few questions from our published statements, I have already shown that this allegation is an entire misrepresentation of the attitude of the Workers' Deputation. The latter have consistently condemned the millowners' action in reducing the wages. The second allegation was that the attitude of the Workers' Deputation to the wage cut had undergone a change. This again is a most misleading statement and I want the millowners to cite a single sentence to support the statement they have made. Their third allegation against us is that we had advocated the appointment of an enquiry committee *merely* to go into the management of the mills. We have never said anything of the kind. What we have been advocating is the investigation into the *whole position* of the mill industry including its management.

It is thus clear that it is not the Workers' Deputation that has changed its attitude. It is really the millowners who have changed their attitude in one or two respects. Recently they have been making desperate efforts to show that they have neither asked for protection nor for an enquiry. This is wholly untrue. So long ago as February 1924, the Bombay millowners asked for protection for their industry. In March 1924, Mr. Kasturbhai Lalbhai, representative of the Ahmedabad Millowners' Association, moved a resolution in the Legislative Assembly which, besides asking for the abolition of the cotton excise duty, requested the Government of India "to direct the Tariff Board to further examine the question of protection to the Indian cotton mill industry at an early date." In April last the Bombay Millowners' Association placed before the Hon. the Commerce Member of the Government of India two definite proposals—one for levying a duty on raw cotton exported from India and the other for imposing higher import duties on coarser yarn and cloth—with a view to granting assistance to their industry. Moreover, the repeal of the excise duty *now* is demanded on the score of bad times—in addition to the ground of the "historic" wrong being righted. All these are proposals for protection. Mr. Kasturbhai's resolution asked for an enquiry with-

out any condition. But when His Excellency the Viceroy and the Government of India offered them an enquiry by the Tariff Board, they first rejected it and then modified their rejection by saying that the abolition of the excise duty should be a condition precedent to the enquiry by the Tariff Board. This is an attitude which it is very difficult to comprehend. When they have asked for an enquiry they ought to have readily consented to it, because they ought to know that no Tariff Board in the world can recommend protection without an enquiry. The excise duty has nothing to do with such an enquiry. In fact the Government of India have themselves stated in their letter of September 21, that "such an enquiry was not intended in any way to postpone or to prejudice the repeal of the excise duty." Any fair-minded man will, I now hope, be in a position to judge who has changed—the millowners or the workers.

Such is the position. The Bombay Government have not done anything to end this disastrous strike. The workers resorted to this last weapon only after exploring all possible avenues of amicable and honourable settlement. But they failed; and they are the greatest sufferers in the struggle which is now going on for nearly a month and a half. They have no resources to fall back upon; many of their women and children have begun to starve. Their condition has become really desperate and one does not know how much more suffering is still in store for them. Relief work has been organised on a large scale and appeals for funds have been issued by the President of the All-India Trade Union Congress and the local Committee of Assistance to the Textile Workers. May I join my humble voice to those appeals and implore the public to come to the rescue of the poor, helpless, starving workers?

R. R. BAKHALE.

LIBERALISM, SOCIALISM, AND CATHOLICISM.

III. LABOUR.

AS I tried to show last week, Economics is a science of certain human needs and of their satisfaction: it therefore must be humanistic, if it is to do justice to the subject. This fundamental fact emerges perhaps nowhere more clearly than in a consideration of human labour. Liberalism treated labour as a mere commodity: to be bought and sold in the open market at a price subject to the "iron" law of supply and demand—and so we still talk of "the labour market", of the number of "hands" employed in a factory and, generally speaking, think of labour in the impersonal manner of a natural phenomenon and hardly ever in terms of fellow human beings. As a reaction against this soulless conception of Liberalism, Marxism tried to make out that labour, so far from being merely one of many economic factors, was really the sole factor of importance. Human labour has been defined as "conscious and ordered activity with a view to produce" (I, 43), productive labour being "such labour as succeeds in adding to the sum total of goods or to their usefulness" (I, 44). Marx thereupon based the whole of

his theories on the fallacy that labour alone was the productive agent, just as the Physiocrats of the 18th cent. had based themselves on the other fallacy that nature alone was the productive agent, and just as many Capitalists in their day have gone near it to assert that in practice it is capital alone that counts as a productive agent—nature and labour being so much raw material, which only capital can fructify into "goods".

Against all these fallacies the Church strictly adheres to the fact, that nature, labour and capital are all three productive agents and that modern production can not dispense with any of these three factors. Marx asserted that only labour produces economic value, with a view to monopolising for labour all values: as if a spoilt piece of pottery had the same value as a successful one, because, forsooth, the potter spent an equal amount of labour on either; or as if the value of a diamond was merely the equivalent of the value of picking it up and cutting it! Natural resources enter into the production of all goods, whether as raw material or as energy during the process of production: and capital is merely "the storage of products for the purpose of production", as Fr. Fallon (I, 59) well defines it. Capital is therefore already a compound of natural resources and human endeavour: and the principles necessary in the production of "goods" are therefore ultimately two—natural resources and human endeavour, which masters, guides and organizes these natural resources, whether by labour of hand or of brain. In our Scholastic parlance therefore we might express it, that nature is the "matter" and labour the "form" of all goods. We would further say that "nature" is not merely something extraneous upon which man by a lucky chance has hit, but is God's creature and that it is God's design that man should expend his energies upon these resources.

We thus see that for the Christian the primary fact underlying all productive activity on the part of man is that of man being God's steward. From that it follows that there is no such thing as an absolute human right to anything and that all human appropriations of natural resources are subject to the proviso that God's design is being fulfilled. That design, as we already pointed out, is a moral one: God sets man ever more difficult and complicated tasks, in order to train his free will and to elicit choices of the good and refusals of the evil. These human tasks, as concerns production, are therefore tasks to train man to free creative acts of his own; and because creativeness is so Godlike, it is therefore also so satisfying and joyful. We all know that work can be like that, that all our best work is just like that, whether it be brainwork or artistry or craftsmanship. But we know also that all work is not like that; that in fact there enters into most of it in varying measure a very disagreeable element indeed, to wit that of drudgery. This element Christian philosophy explains as a somewhat bitter but most wholesome medicine, become necessary since man has not invariably elected to make the grand design of Divine harmony his own, but has only too frequently set it at naught and thereby landed both himself and the world at large in a mess. One result of that unholy disorder is suffering: but, according to the Christian philosophy, suffering is its own remedy; by suffering man can be saved from the consequences of his own rebellious folly and by resolute acceptance of suffering can indeed help to redeem what has become a "fallen world," to use another term of Christian theology.

To us therefore drudgery is a necessary ingredient of all labour and we sum up this idea in the saying that "in the sweat of his face shall

man eat bread" (Gen. 3.19), But naturally enough man has ever tried to get out of the consequences of his folly, not by the unpalatable way of labour, but by that of leisure. Leisure every worker has, be it much or little, for until the invention of robots (machinemens) materializes, the capitalistic ideal of every worker doing daily three shifts of 8 hours each can not be realised. Now it is a curious fact, that man, at least the moment he proceeds out of the food-collecting stage into that of even archaic civilization, can produce more than he consumes. This very fact and its universality proves that man is intended, not only to work, but to have leisure ; and, as civilization advances, the excess of individual capacity for production over individual capacity for consumption grows. Now it is obvious that if only a person could beg, borrow or steal one minute's leisure each from sixty-different producers, he would have one hour's leisure more than they : and this brilliant idea, needless to say, has struck not a few bright intellects, indeed not merely those aiming at a modest extra hour, but those who would make a fine art of the thing by filching one day's leisure annually from each of at least 365 producers. That was the idea on which ancient slavery was founded and classic antiquity divided society into the people who had *otium*, leisure, and those who had not got it and therefore found themselves saddled with *negotium*, non-leisure. Yet the idler's dream of a 365 days' holiday per year is ever incapable of fulfilment : and the *otium* of the ancient Greek and Roman consisted in practice mostly in conducting the business of public affairs ; so that in fact the free man did not necessarily work less than the slave, but at a different kind of work. Take as another example the Western Society woman of today who is supposed to have 24 hours' leisure per day every day and who yet has invented for herself a system of hard work as futile as it is exacting—work which not only pulls her relentlessly about most of the hours of the day, but even keeps her whirling about perspiringly the greater part of the night too. The fact is that man is meant to have both labour and leisure and, do what he may, he cannot get out of this necessity which has been laid upon him.

Socialists therefore are mistaken, when they preach leisure as an end and as a good in itself. To read their utopias one always finds depicted a world in which machinery has eliminated all drudgery work and where the pressing of a button takes the place of all present day equivalents of hewing wood and fetching water. No doubt electricity, gas and water, municipally laid on, have obviated much drudgery work in the household already ; and if the worker thus set free devotes that "leisure" to work more productive or otherwise more valuable, the change is all to the good. But let it be noted, that the change must be from one kind of work to another ; and that, drudgery being inseparable from all work, we must not expect ever to be able to circumvent that law of our nature. But take even one who like Mr. Penty calls himself a Christian Socialist and who is far removed from the vulgar cry for shortest hours and largest pay ; one in fact who puts creative work in the forefront of his Socialism and who would only be glad to smash up all machinery simply because it has made "creative work" impossible. To him, work should mean creative work and nothing else: drudgery is for him not part of the divine plan of salvation, but a mere bye-product of human stupidity. According to that school of thought, all that is needed, is to organize human society according to a rational plan, and automatically all human work will become a joy.

Against this facile optimism the Catholic econo-

mist considers the inherent laziness of man and recognizes frankly that large masses of humanity—the rosy pictures of our Medievalists notwithstanding—do not seem cut out for "creative" work to any large extent. In fact these large masses of humanity actually prefer routine work to the fag of having to think for themselves all the while. Which does not mean that they cannot enjoy their work : they can and do so enjoy it, because they do their work conscientiously, but not because it is "creative." Socialist Utopians à la H. G. Wells conceive of all work in their fancied "perfect" Society as in the nature of scientific work—as if there was no drudgery in scientific work! Nobody who has ever carried on chemical analyses, or biological breeding experiments or medical reaction tests or tried to get at biometrical data by statistical methods, or collated manuscripts or hunted up baptismal registers for historical dates, or verified quotations and sources—nobody indeed who has ever done a stroke of solid scientific work, whether of a so-called "realistic" or "humanistic" nature, but is aware of the vast amount of drudgery work with which it is inseparably linked. There is no such brain-work, real work that is and not mere superficial amusement, that does not essentially depend on drudgery and lots of it, but is all "interesting" and "creative." Whether to breed 100 generations of *Drosophila* or to count the number of certain cells in a microscopic slide is more monotonous and "soul destroying" (as Medievalists are fond of calling it) than to watch a machine producing 10²⁴ pinheads per hour, seems to me quite open to question. Nor does it follow that one's soul is destroyed by either drudgery : on the contrary, drudgery willingly accepted and conscientiously done, because it has got to be done, is one of the finest forms of discipline for the human soul. St. Benedict was the genius who first organized a society of men on that principle : it was he who prescribed for his monks not only prayer, not only study, that is to say, not only congenial occupations, but who made it obligatory upon them to do daily a large amount of drudgery work, such as farming operations, book copying and the like. It is the glory of Benedictinism that it has shown men, how to drudge for the love of God : it is this temper born in Benedictine monasteries of taking infinite pains over uninteresting work which has civilized Europe and which has made possible all that great modern scientific culture of which for instance German *Gründlichkeit* (thoroughness) is so fundamental and famous an ingredient. Indeed it is no accident that Germany is the proverbial home for this kind of "apostolate of labour" as it has been called : for it was Benedictinism which won Germany for Christianity and culture, it was in Germany that Benedictinism became universal in a degree probably unexcelled anywhere else. If today in our India there is no love of learning for its own sake, if all that our students are concerned about is to pass examinations, that distressful fact is no racial accident : there was plenty of love of learning for its own sake in previous generations when students sat at the feet of their *gurus*. Today that is all gone, because no study today is carried on for the love of God. It is divorced from religion ; it is largely an attempt to ensure merely plenty of leisure for the future. There is here none of that monastic tradition, which still lives on in the old universities of Europe, and which keeps work there sweet and uplifting. No, it is not in dodging drudgery, that lies man's salvation, but in doing it conscientiously, for the love of God.

But if toil is in the nature of things human, so also, as we have already seen, is leisure. Man is no robot : he does not live to work, but, to live "the good life" (to use the Aristotelean term), he needs

must work. In quite analogous a manner man does not live to have leisure, but leisure is needed by him to make "the good life" possible for him. Toil and leisure therefore are to be judged, not as ends in themselves but according to the extent that both promote "the good life." The Church naturally and rightly ranks the spiritual needs of man highest: and she therefore insists that at least one day in seven man should be freed from mere toil and be given the opportunity in the Mass of "lifting up his heart to the Lord" of all creation. Making ready for this great act of worship on Sunday mornings implies the desirability of keeping Saturday evenings free for worthy preparation; and joyful and healthy secular recreation after Mass for the rest of Sunday is another natural and rightful consequence flowing from it. But if the Church puts the things of the spirit first, it does not follow that she ever thinks of her children here on earth as if they were disembodied spirits. She fully realizes that they have bodies and that no "good life" is likely to eventuate if the needs of the body are flouted. She therefore insists on a maximum of daily toil, i. e. she will not allow work to be prolonged for such length of time or to be of so exhausting a nature as to injure the body. She therefore limits particularly the work of children or women (especially before and after childbirth); she rules out all conditions of labour as are either negatively (e. g. lack of ventilation) or positively (e. g. white lead manufacture) injurious to health; or which do not "safeguard the morality and dignity of the worker." (I, 231). And if the capitalist angrily retorts that industry cannot stand the expense of all such restrictions, the Catholic economist can only reply, So much the worse for "the industry." Work being merely a means to "the good life" of the individual, it is this good life and the possibility of living it which must decide whether a particular industry is worth embarking upon and preserving; and not the possibility of certain shareholders receiving a dividend; nor could even the possibility of achieving some abstract "progress," be allowed to dictate the stunting of any man's life.

Indeed the Christian doctrine of work, which at first seems so splendid an apology for Capitalism and all its excesses, is soon found to be a double-edged sword of great ruthlessness. And this same doctrine does not even stop short of demanding a certain amount both of toil and leisure: it also asks for opportunities for all men to develop such mental capabilities as they may possess, so that the life they lead may not only be a good, but a better one, of ever new responsibilities shouldered, of ever more self-determination rightly exercised. But if such philosophy cuts at the very roots of a Liberalism, which fondly imagines, that the more unrestrainedly universal cupidity is indulged in, the better will be the resultant life of all members of such Society: it is equally obnoxious to a Socialism which is so busy with workers' rights that it has not yet had time to insist on their duties. Indeed, if the Marxian philosophy of economic determinism is true, all philanthropic sentiments for providing maternity benefits and sending children to school and preventing the spread of anthrax and what not, are as much out of place in industry as they would be in an alembic: what is, is; and feel what we may, the final class-war will soon sweep us all indiscriminately away, as a tidal wave would the sand-castles built by children on the sea shore. For Liberalism the worker is a cypher in a Profit and Loss Account; for Socialism a molecule of a highly explosive substance: only Catholicism can say—*ecce homo!*

H. C. E. ZACHARIAS.

A LETTER FROM LONDON.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

LONDON, October 8th.

THE CHURCH AND RACE PROBLEMS.

THE Church Congress that is being held this year at Eastbourne opened this week with a vigorous sermon by, that vigorous and venerable personality, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who took occasion to speak words of thanks to the eminent men and women of letters who had recently made such valuable contributions to the religious thought of the day, a task in which, as the Archbishop reminded his congregation, too many of the clergy were singularly remiss, owing partly to rustiness and routine and partly to defective equipment, to the scandal of the Church and the detriment of religion. Yesterday, the Congress, having made so good a beginning, continued along similar lines of straight talk, the two subjects discussed, in some ways dovetailing, being "the ever increasingly important problem of racial equality" and the relations of Churches founded in new lands with the Mother Church in this country. The Rev. S. P. Waddy, who opened the discussion on the latter topic, with the title "Self-Determination in a Young Church Among a Non-Christian People", urged that great elasticity of treatment must be meted out, and that the young Churches should be allowed to develop along lines defined by their traditions.

But it was on the larger subject of racial relations that the gravest warnings were offered by Lord Willingdon and Mr. J. H. Oldham. The former confessed that he approached the race problem with considerable anxiety, and he dwelt upon the delicacy, difficulty, and urgency of the question. The only solution, in his view, was that the white races must realise the necessity of treating all coloured men in a spirit of absolute equality, and relinquishing the attitude of colour superiority. If they could do this, they could help the coloured races through their growing pains. "There is only one way of doing this," he said, "and it is, in a word, by always carrying into our relations with the coloured races the principles and teachings of our Christian faith, by remembering that, if we have any religious belief, whatever may be its particular form, there is a Being who controls all our destinies 'that shapes our ends, rough hew them how we will'; and that, if in our lives here we give as much attention to the spiritual as we do to the material affairs of life, we shall be more likely to bring peace, contentment, trust, and confidence among all the peoples that inhabit the civilised world."

Mr. Oldham stressed economic rather than religious or racial differences as fundamental causes of friction and conflict between the races. He had to admit, nevertheless, that, if they were asked how the racial problem presented itself to the mind of the non-white peoples, it would be found that it resolved itself very largely into a claim for equality. In that connexion, he said that leading Moslems, with their eyes wide open to the fundamental and irreconcilable differences between Islam and Bolshevism, were yet inclining, against the whole weight of their judgment, to throw in their lot with Bolshevism, for the sole reason that they felt that the Bolsheviks treated them as equals, while the Western nations did not. Mr. Shoran Singha, who is attached to the Foreign Department of the headquarters of the Y.M.C.A. in London, and who appeared in turban complete, passionately urged Christian people to get rid of the idea that God had ordained

that the white man was to rule over the black man, and must realise that it was God's will not that men should rule one another, but that they should serve one another. Altogether a memorable session.

DR. BESANT'S ACTIVITIES.

Dr. Annie Besant is getting through what would be considered to be a prodigious amount of work for two persons half her age. Though she seems to enjoy a multiple personality, she is endowed with only one physical body, which accounts for the fact that she was unable to be present when the resolution on Indian self-government was moved at the Conference of the Labour Party held at Liverpool last week. She attended the next day's session, however. Mr. Cramp, the president, made a happy reference to her birthday and said that the Conference felt honoured by her presence. A remarkable ovation greeted her as she rose to acknowledge the good wishes, and the delegates demanded a speech from one whom many of them revered as an old colleague. But the Conference observed a stringent rule this year of not permitting any non-delegate to address the gathering, owing to the influx of Communists and their efforts to obtain a hearing. Later in the day, however, under the chairmanship of Mr. Lansbury, she spoke to a packed audience in the well-known Picton Hall on the Commonwealth of India Bill. Dr. Besant has addressed similar meetings at Birmingham and one or two other places, and will speak in London on the same subject next week. Her Queen's Hall lectures on the World Problems of To-day are extremely well-attended, and it is needless to say that India bulks considerably in her treatment of the subject.

It is impossible to overrate the effect of her propaganda, which is not confined to the platform alone. She has seen some of the members of the last Cabinet, including, I learn, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, whose prestige has gained immensely as a consequence of the Liverpool Conference. The Commonwealth of India Bill, which would have been even more boldly supported by the Labour Party Conference but for the rather indiscriminate protest of the leader of the Swaraj Party expressed through Mr. Fenner Brockway, is in the hands of skilled Parliamentary draftsmen and is expected to be ready before the end of October. The question of further procedure has not been finally settled, I believe, but your readers do not need to be told that Dr. Besant is not the person to allow a moment or an opportunity to be wasted. How her programme, carried forward through many years of indifference, hostility, and discouragement of every form, with wonderful faith and energy, will ultimately materialise is a matter on which it is yet too early to speculate. But that it will have far-reaching consequences on India's political status is a certainty. It is a thousand pities that personal considerations should so often have prevented this fact from being given due weight by all parties in India.

SLAVERY AND THE LEAGUE.

A well-equipped friend, with inside knowledge, tells me that the question of "slavery in all its forms" has been taking an increasingly prominent position in the discussions of the League of Nations, but special point was given to it on the occasion of the recent gathering at Geneva by reason of the British Government's placing before the Assembly a draft Protocol. The issue had first been raised by Sir Arthur Steel-Maitland in 1922, and following upon this the League of Nations appointed a Commission to inquire into and report upon "slavery in all its forms." This Commission, composed of eight

persons, many of whom possessed wide Colonial experience, reported to the Council of the League in July of this year. This Report is in many respects a disturbing document, showing how widespread, how varying and how deep-seated are systems of slavery in different parts of the world. The Commission also dealt with forced labour, and made certain recommendations with regard to this evil.

The British Protocol, as introduced by Lord Cecil, included not merely slavery, but also forced labour. The Protocol, after having been considered by the Commission appointed by the Assembly, has emerged from the discussions strengthened in so far as the slavery clauses are concerned, but weakened on the question of forced labour. There is, however, a year before public opinion, during which it is hoped that Governments will agree further to strengthen the measure before it becomes a Convention open for signature at the Assembly of 1926.

It is particularly unfortunate that upon the question of forced labour for public works, the Convention falls short of the stipulation of the Mandates. It will be remembered that in the clause covering forced labour in the mandated areas the following principle is laid down, that the Mandatory "shall prohibit all forms of forced or compulsory labour, except for essential public works and services and then only in return for adequate remuneration."

In the Protocol nothing whatever is said about remuneration. But the worst feature of the forced labour clause is that it certainly does give a temporary permission to force labour for private profit, a form of labour hitherto recognised as barely, if at all, distinguishable from slavery.

The most encouraging part of Lord Cecil's speeches was the re-iterated statement that the British Government would have been prepared to go further had it believed that other nations were willing to do so. It is now the duty of public opinion to see whether it cannot strengthen the attitude both of the British Government and of others whose signatures will be appended to the Convention.

REVIEWS.

ENVIRONMENT, HEREDITY AND SELECTION.

THE CHARACTER OF RACES. By ELLSWORTH HUNTINGDON. (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.) 1925. 9 x 6. pp. 373. \$5.

THE idealizing tendency of the modern newspapered mind demands a symbol to represent a group; and therefore demands that any group shall have certain well-defined characteristics which may be attached to the symbol. So our cartoonists supply us with John Bull, Uncle Sam, Fritz the German, and so on. Conversely, this leads us to regard such characteristics as being far more universal than they are. Some Englishmen are thin, some unathletic, and some given to thinking! Some Americans are modest, and many Germans are the reverse of phlegmatic. At the same time, the very fact that such symbolic representation is possible does reflect a certain truth; it is possible to make broad generalizations about the character of peoples; though such generalizations do not apply nearly as universally as is commonly thought.

Professor Huntingdon explains the character of races (or peoples) by natural selection occasioned by environment. The thesis is set forth very attractively and for the greater part convincingly. When migrations or climatic changes have destroyed the

weaker and less resolute of a people, the remnant form a finer people. That is clear; but in assuming that their descendants will inherit their mental traits he is going farther than ascertained facts will warrant. The inheritance of acquired physical characters is a disputed point among biologists; the inheritance of psychological traits is a dogma that at present admits neither of refutation nor proof, but the onus of proof rests with the dogmatist; the same effect is certainly obtained by the environment of each successive generation; the example of parents and companions, the social traditions instilled into the mind in childhood—all these things will make such characteristics as selection has produced last into later generations. And this, while it renders it impossible to prove or disprove the inheritance of psychological traits, also renders it unnecessary to postulate it.

Selection may take different forms. Among the Siberians, Northern Chinese, and Esquimaux, it has been the stolid endurance of suffering that has provided the means to live; accordingly the more agile and intellectual types have been killed off. But more common are the cases where migration has produced a cream of energy and resource and determination. Such a selection were the Khmers of Cambodia, who seem to have migrated from India; their long journey out out all their feeble stock and a highly selected people reached Cambodia; and about the fifth century had risen to great power, having left buildings of extraordinary magnificence. Yet they declined with equal suddenness and by the fifteenth century disappeared completely.

The Icelanders, on the other hand, have maintained a very high degree of culture and vigour for a long time. They also experienced rigid selection in getting to their present habitat, and ever since. Isolated by climate, they have, except for certain bad periods, continuously produced great work in Science and Art.

On these data Prof. Huntingdon attempts a justification for the policy of American exclusiveness. His rationale is worth attention as it is the opinion of a sober scientist, not a Lothrop Stoddard. He attributes the continued greatness of Iceland not only to the selective and stimulating influence of climate but also to their isolation; and he views with horror the dilution of the pioneer New England and Colonial stock with alien blood. We take the liberty to doubt whether such mixture can materially hasten the degradation of American character. The first settlers, Puritans, Friends or Southern aristocrats, were undoubtedly fine men, and established fine traditions. But selection must always be a specializing process and a specialised type is the less likely to flourish when conditions alter. The climate of Iceland has remained suited to the same type; but modern America is different from the country of the pioneers and different traditions are needed to meet the altered conditions. The modern immigrant needs more of the fine qualities of the early settlers; to this extent, immigration is likely to lower the character of the population as a whole. But conditions are so far altered that such degeneration is probable in any case. Prof. Huntingdon regards the position as parallel to that of the Icelanders; it is surely far more similar to that of the Khmers.

Two other points may be noticed. It is a commonplace, though sometimes contradicted, that the form of the head furnishes a valuable criterion of race. Prof. Huntingdon arranges the different types of head in a series of merit, regarding the broad head of the Alpine and Mongolian Race as showing the "highest" type. In this, he is not likely to be followed by many scientists.

Secondly, in social and material culture he appears to be evolutionist, regarding practices like tattooing and mummification as allied to culture of a certain level, and accompanied by a certain head-form. Anyone is at perfect liberty to disagree with the views of those who regard all primitive culture as diffused from a single centre. But in view of the prominence of these views at the present time, the objector should show some grounds for disagreement or at least signify that other standpoints than his own are taken up. Though he discusses some of the very culture-elements which form the basis of Dr. Elliott-Smith's theory, that theory, as far as the layman can gather from this book, might never have been advanced.

WALTER O. FITCH.

SHORT NOTICE.

THE DIRECTORY OF TRADE UNIONS. Edited by R. R. BAKHALE. (Trade Union Congress Office, Bombay.) 1925. 7¼ × 4¾. pp. 63. Rs. 1.

A MOST timely publication and one which, we venture to prophesy, will become historic in the days when Indian Trade Unionism will have risen to the fullness of its stature. Meanwhile these are the days of small things and of small beginnings: and the slender little booklet before us bears eloquent testimony to the still inchoate nature of the whole movement. When one considers that Trade Unionism is barely five years old in India, the wonder indeed is not how little, but how much has been done in that short time. As Mr. Bakhale says, "the development of labour organisation is in direct proportion to the degree of education the workers have received and of their contact with the outside world:" and when one knows how backward in both respects the average manual worker in India is, the extent to which Trade Unionism already has got hold of Indian workers is indeed a matter of congratulation. The great general public, however, who are not manual workers also badly need educating—to a realization of the present state and potentialities of Indian Trade Unionism: and to them let me earnestly recommend Mr. Bakhale's little "Directory" as a quite indispensable *First Reader*.

Z.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- LECTURES ON COMPARATIVE RELIGION. By ARTHUR ANTHONY MACDONELL (University of Calcutta.) 1925. 10 × 6¼. pp. 190.
- A SCHEME OF MASS EDUCATION. By A. B. MANDE. (Saraswati Press, Nagpur.) 1925. 7 × 4½. pp. 81. Rs. 1.
- PAPER BOATS. By K. S. VENKETRAMANI. (Ganesh & Co. Madras.) 1925. 7¼ × 4½. pp. 123. Rs. 1.
- THE MASTER AND THE DISCIPLE. By K. VYASA RAO. (V. Ramaswami Sastralu & Sons, Madras.) 1925. 7 × 4½. pp. 58.
- MIGRATION MOVEMENTS 1920-23. (International Labour Office, Geneva.) 1925. 9¼ × 6½. pp. 104. 2s.
- REPORT OF THE SEVENTH SESSION OF THE NATIONAL LIBERAL FEDERATION OF INDIA, Lucknow, 1924-1925. 12¼ × 8¼. pp. 107.
- REPORT OF THE FIFTH UNITED PROVINCES LIBERAL CONFERENCE, Cawnpore, 1925 (Bai Braj Narain Gurtu, Civil Lines, Cawnpore.) 1925. 12¼ × 8¼. pp. 93.
- REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE HOLKAR STATE for 1924-1925. 12¼ × 8¼. pp. 96, lxxxix.
- ADMINISTRATION REPORT OF THE LIMBDI STATE for 1924-25. 1925. 12¼ × 8¼. pp. 26-25.
- ADMINISTRATION REPORT OF THE JATH STATE for 1924-25. 12¼ × 8¼. pp. 26.
- REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE MIRAJ SENIOR STATE for 1924-25. 12¼ × 8¼. pp. 33.

A Rare Opportunity-A Special Offer

Dr. Annie Besant's 79th Birth Day.
Special Concession during October.
A Selection of Her Valuable Writings.
POLITICAL.

	Rs. A.	Rs. A.
1. India and the Empire. A lecture and various papers on Indian grievances. pp. 155	0 6	0 4
2. How India Wrought for Freedom. The story of the National Congress told from the official records.	3 0	2 0
3. Birth of New India. A collection of writings and speeches on Indian affairs—Political Educational, Social and Religious and Farewell to Her Brothers and Sisters in India on the eve of Mrs. Besant's Internment.	1 0	0 12
4. India: A Nation. A famous and forcible plea for Indian Self-Government. Revised and enlarged.	1 8	1 0
5. The Future of Indian Politics. A contribution to the understanding of present day problems. pp. 350.	3 8	2 8
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	9 6	6 8

All the five books together Rs. 5.

The Theosophical Publishing House,
Adyar Madras

THE INDIAN BOOK SHOP
NEW INDIA OFFICE.

George Town, Madras.

CHEAPEST SILK SHOP.

Silk handkerchief 1st quality Rs. 3-0 per dozen.
Silk necktie 1st quality Rs. 5-4 per dozen.
Silk muffler 1st quality Rs. 1-12 each.
Silk turban white 7 yds. long 1st quality Rs. 6-0 each.
Silk saree most beautiful 1st quality 6 x 1¼ yds. Rs. 9 each. Apply to the Manager,

Prem Kutia House Silk Merchant,
LUDHIANA (Punjab).

Hon'ble Prof. V. G. Kale's Works.

	Rs. a.
1. Indian Economics— (4th edition). Featherweight paper Demil. 8 vo. pp. 700. Cloth Bound. Revised & enlarged.	8-0-0
2. Gokhale and Economic Reforms— Crown 16 mo. pp. 250. Cloth Bound.	2-0-0
5. Indian Industrial and Economic Problems— (2nd edition). Crown 16 mo. pp. 340.	1-8-0
6. India's War Finance and Post-War Problems— Crown 16 mo. pp. 164. Cloth Bound.	2-0-0
7. Currency Reform in India— Crown 16 mo. pp. 130.	1-0-0

These books can be had of r—

The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City.

KARNATAKA

AND

INDIAN REVIEW OF REVIEWS

Published Monthly
An Independent Organ for the People of
Indian States
AND

A Register of the Progress of Indian Nationalism
Annual Subscription Rs. 4, (Post free.)

D. V. GUNDAPPA
Editor

BASAVANGUDI P. O.
Bangalore City (S. India.)

THE LUCKNOW UNIVERSITY JOURNAL,

A high class University Journal for the promotion of original research.

Four issues will be published during each academic year viz., in September, December, February and May.

Editor—W. Burridge, M. A., M. B., B. Ch., L. M. S., B. A. and N. K. Siddhanta, M. A.,—supported by a strong Consultative Board representative of all the Departments in the University.

Special Features.

The Journal will contain original contributions from members of the Lucknow University and will also publish Vernacular contributions in Hindi or Urdu of a suitable character. It will contain portraits and illustrations from time to time. It will also publish Reviews and Notices of all important Books and Reports coming out in the educational world. Another important feature of the Journal will be the publication of the latest news about University affairs and other interesting informations about educational matters.

Annual Subscription

	Town.	Mofussil.	Foreign.
For Students of the University,	Rs. 2 0	2 8	} 10s.
For all others	Rs. 4 0	4 8	

Matters for publication should be sent to the EDITOR. All business communications relating to subscriptions and advertisements should be sent to the Business Manager.

The Journal is an excellent medium for advertisement. For advertisement rates and other particulars apply to—

M. B. REHMAN,
Business Manager,
LUCKNOW UNIVERSITY, }
LUCKNOW, } Lucknow University Journal.

LUCKNOW: UPPER INDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, Ltd., 41 Aminabad Park.

LONDON: P. S. KING & SONS, Orchard House, 2 & 4 Great Smith Street, Westminster, Lond., S. W.

THE KENYA PROBLEM.

A Selection from the Speeches and Writings of
The Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P. C.

A vigorous and lucid exposition of the
Indian point of view. Contains also
the full text of the Cabinet decision.

Pages 147. Price As. 12.

Apply to:

The Aryabhushan Press,
BudhwarPeth, POONA CITY.