

S.S.S.
11/6/29

THE

Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.—Office : Servants of India Society's Home, Poona 4.

Vol. XII, No. 23.

POONA—THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 1929.

INDIAN SUBSN. RS. 6
FOREIGN 15 s.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	265
ARTICLES :—	
Bombay's Simon Seven ...	268
East African Policy ...	269
The Sex Side of Life. By Mrs. Dennett ...	271
REVIEWS :—	
Task Before the League. By P. P. Pillai, Ph.D. ...	273
Western Economic System. By V. N. G. ...	273
Mexican Problems. By K. Venugopal Rao, M.A. ...	274
SHORT NOTICES ...	275
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
Compulsory Theistic Teaching. By D. D. Karve, Ph.D. ...	276
BOOKS RECEIVED ...	276

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

THE Labour success in the British election which has given the party a majority of thirty-three over the Conservatives leaving out the results of a few constituencies not yet declared cannot be said to be quite a surprise; on the contrary those who had been watching the trend of the recent bye-elections and had known something of the working of the mind of electors had foreseen the result. But the small majority which Labour has secured has created a situation which is in some ways analogous to that of 1923, when the Socialist Government was formed with a clear perception of the contingency of its defeat if the other two parties combined to prevent it from carrying on. Under these circumstances the constitutional position will be far from clear since the Conservatives can also claim to carry on government by having a coalition with the Liberals. If the threat of Mr. George that he would never again help to put the Socialists into power is intended to be real, the prospect of a Labour government is far from assuring; with the Liberals continually heckling them the Ministry would be remarkably unstable. One good effect of a narrow majority would be that the Opposition would be put upon its mettle to prevent legislation which will be too one-sided and capricious as also to prevent a sudden break with past legislation which would be very likely with an uncontested large majority. The present election is not in our opinion the proverbial swing of the pendulum but a definite indication that the general direction of the thought of the electorate is decidedly towards Socialism. Unless Labour governments shake their trust woefully, it appears improbable in future that the Labour Party will receive a setback and unless the left wing of the Party succeeds in its intransigence and breaks it up into two, the party with socialism written on its banner has a very bright future before it. It remains to be seen whether

the members of the Party show themselves to be level-headed and conscious of their new responsibilities.

So far as the immediate situation is concerned most of the journals in England hope that a deadlock is avoided and that the new Parliament is given a fair chance of achieving solid work and carrying through a programme of non-controversial legislation. Nothing can be gained by another election which as the *Daily Telegraph* says "would be regarded by the country as an outrage." In any case it seems certain that the task of finding a way out of the troublesome situation will task the utmost ingenuity of constitutional experts in parliamentary procedure. It is to be hoped that party leaders will realize their responsibility of carrying on the King's government and act in the light of what is best for the interests of the country. Mr. Lloyd George has promised not to make an unfair use of the power conferred upon the Liberals by the fact of holding the balance of power; in fact very much depends on the final attitude taken by the Liberal party with regard to their co-operation with either of the other two parties. It was difficult for the Premier to act in the midst of conflicting advice given to him with regard to handing over the reins to the Labour Party; some journals advised Mr. Baldwin to carry on as long as the Liberals gave him support, leaving the onus of ousting him on the Labour-Liberal coalition. But he has preferred to resign and the outcome will be that the Labour Party will again be in office but not in power. So far as India is concerned, the record of the Labour Party does not give much cause for jubilation and we must continue to rely on ourselves and carry on the work of national organization without minding what party is in power in England.

WRITING last week on extension of the life of the Assembly, we said that the "strong representations" that the Viceroy received for postponement of the elections must have obviously come from the supporters of the Simon Commission who were afraid of facing their constituencies at this moment. We must confess however that we were quite out in our inference. For, if the Free Press is to be believed, not only Simonites but strong anti-Simonites like Messrs. S. Srinivasa Aiyangar and M. R. Jayakar pressed postponement upon the Viceroy. Mr. Jayakar has since explained why he is in favour of postponement. The explanation scandalised all Nationalists in the country. But if such was their shock when Mr. Jayakar appeared before them only as an apologist for Government, what would be their feeling now when they know that he is not merely a supporter but was really an inspirer of the Viceroy's decision? The Free Press tells us that not only the

Viceroy himself but members of his Government as well were originally for dissolution, and that representations to the contrary of such as Mr. Jayakar overbore them. If Mr. Jayakar was really instrumental in dissuading the Viceroy from dissolution, we must admire his courage in now giving an unsolicited expression of his real views and showing his readiness to bear the odium. We see however nothing in his statement which can possibly serve as a justification of the infamous advice he gave to the Viceroy. Mr. Jinnah's support of the postponement of the elections one can well understand. He is no less anxious than the Viceroy that the elections should not be fought on the issue of the Nehru-Sapru Report. Mr. S. Srinivasa Aiyengar's support too is not inexplicable. Mr. Nehru's opposition to any measure may well form a ground for support with him. But Mr. Jayakar's action not only, let us repeat, in coming forward after the event to back up the Viceroy, but in contributing to the event by making the latter change his own opinion, must, we are afraid, always remain a puzzle to his colleagues.

WITH three such prominent men of the three great parties in the Assembly like Messrs. Jayakar, S. Srinivasa Aiyangar and Jinnah in favour of postponement, it is obvious that none of the parties can take any strong action to counter the Viceroy's move, not to speak of concerted action among all parties. We had therefore thought that, though he had made much fuss about it at the A.I.C.C. meeting in Bombay, Pandit Motilal Nehru would, after realising that leaders and deputy leaders of all the parties are involved in the matter, would let things slide. But, contrary to our expectation, the Working Committee of the Congress has, under his inspiration, resolved to direct all members of the Central or Provincial Legislatures who belong to the Congress organization to boycott legislative sessions. We do not know what Mr. Srinivasa Aiyangar will do in face of such a resolution. He is not yet openly committed to any view on the question of the elections; and it is possible that he will damp down his own convictions if he cannot take a sufficient number of members with him in disregarding the Working Committee's resolution. Assuming that this will happen, the Congress will perhaps be able to enforce boycott so far as its members are concerned, but, even in the best of circumstances, it will have to face the opposition of other parties—not only of Non-Brahmans and Mahomedans, which goes without saying, but of Responsivists as well. In the Assembly it is inconceivable, supposing they have any cohesion at all, that the Nationalists, of whom Mr. Jayakar is Deputy Leader, will accord their support to the Congress policy of abstention, and in Bombay Presidency and the Central Provinces, where the Responsive Party functions, this policy will have determined opponents. In other Provinces there are other parties, which, though they do not owe allegiance to the Responsivists, have similar aims and may follow the same policy, not necessarily because they are in favour of the postponement of the elections, but because they are not convinced that the abstention policy is in the interest of the country. We are therefore afraid that the measure decided upon by the Working Committee will be inutile either as a mark of resentment or as a means of retaliation. This conclusion is much strengthened by what Mr. K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar has said, viz. that most of the Swarajists are in favour of postponement and will refuse to carry out the Congress mandate for abstention. A far more effective measure would have been, if there were unity among non-official

parties, the resignation of the members and an appeal by them to the country on the issue which Government seeks to burke by postponing the elections. But, as it is, the boycott would be a dead failure.

A SUMMARY statement has been published of the Report of the Simon Seven of the Madras Presidency, who, although no less backward in politics than their brethren in Bombay, have produced a better Report. Their recommendations go just as far as those of the most progressive member of the Bombay Committee, viz. Sardar Mujumdar. That is to say, they have recommended the transfer of all the departments in the province and of all but defence and foreign and political departments at the centre. While in Bombay only one member has had the courage to recommend reforms which were the Liberal Party's demand in 1921 and which were adopted as the National Demand by the Swaraj Party some years after but which have now already become out of date so far as all progressive parties go. In Madras these reforms are urged by all the seven members of the Committee. The Madras Committee has thus done better than the Bombay Committee. But it has recommended, also unanimously (and in this respect it is worse), the institution of the second chamber and the retention of communal electorates. In Bombay the second chamber is opposed, as we have said in our leader, by the three Hindu members and communal electorates are opposed by Sardar Mujumdar. When we remember that these Simon Committees have been filled with men who are among the least advanced politicians in the community, we shall have little reason to be disappointed with their proposals. It only remains to be seen whether Sir John Simon will remember this fact when he indites the Report. And if he forgets it will Ramsay's Government too forget it?

WE wholly endorse the *People's* criticism of the A.I.C.C. and the States. A.I.C.C.'s failure to consider the subject of the Indian States at its meeting in Bombay although its session happened to take place at the same time and place as that of the Indian States People's Conference. As a matter of fact the Butler Committee's Report is a greater menace to British India than to the people of the Indian States. The latter stand to lose little if the recommendations of the Report are put into effect. They are at present absolutely without a shred of constitutional power in most of the States and no Committee, however reactionary its report may be, can possibly make their position worse. The only ray of hope which they have at present, apart from the strength which comes from self-help, is the right of intervention which the British Government threaten to exercise in cases of gross misrule. Whatever defects the Butler Report may have, it does not suffer from the defect of freeing the Princes from such intervention. On the contrary it emphasises and to a certain extent enlarges the Government's power of intervention. This is the secret of Mr. Chudgar's jubilation at the publication of the Butler Committee's Report. To British India however the Report is a most serious danger as it places not only Swaraj but popular control over the army at the sweet will of the Princes. Such a Report must be condemned more by British than by Indian India. The A.I.C.C.'s failure therefore is altogether inexcusable. It is of course due for the most part to the traditional Congress policy of non-intervention in Indian States, which, when Indian States threaten to sabotage the whole movement of

British Indian self-government, must be abandoned as extremely ruinous in its effects. Not only must British India think out its relationship with Indian States in the future constitution but, as the *People* observes, "even the question of their (the States') internal administration cannot be altogether ignored. Several federal constitutions rule out certain forms of government in the component States; some republican federal constitutions, e. g., definitely rule out the monarchical form for all component States. In India the central government may tolerate crowned heads in the States, but it will certainly have to demand a democratic form (with a wide franchise and a representative Assembly in charge of legislation) in every constituent State."

THE eighth session of the *Dakshini Samsthana Pradeccan States japarishad* has been a great success owing to the great enthusiasm of its secretaries. A number of useful resolutions were passed which were

intended to further the interests of the subjects of the States. Prof. G. R. Abhyankar, in his Presidential address, criticized the Butler Report and impressed upon the Princes that their interests would be better cared for by a Government of India which is responsible to the Legislature than by the Governor General acting alone as the sole representative of the Crown, and untrammelled by any rules of procedure. He also exhorted the subjects of the Deccan States to continue their constitutional agitation ceaselessly till their demands were granted. Amongst the resolutions passed we must note the one which requested the Viceroy to insist upon the institution of a High Court, the limitation of the Civil List to a definite amount, the establishment of an Assembly or a House of Representatives, the separation of the Executive and the Judiciary and the stability of the civil service in the States, where the enquiry instituted had shown the absence of such arrangements. The Conference did well in thanking the deputation of the All-India States Peoples' Conference which performed great service by drawing the attention of the Butler Committee as well as of the English people to the cause of the States' subjects. Another important resolution criticized strongly the procedure of the Butler Committee and its secret confabulations, as well as the reactionary recommendations of its Report. A resolution was moved congratulating the subjects of the Miraj State for the perfectly constitutional agitation they carried on against the inordinate assessment of the land revenue and requesting the Chief of the State not to realize the revenue except in accordance with the agreed compromise between the authorities and the people and only after an open enquiry giving ample opportunities to the subjects to present their complaints individually. Another resolution reemphasized the demands made at the previous sessions of the Conference about village panchayats, compulsory primary education, drink prohibition and the uplift of the untouchables in the States. We welcome the resolution moved from the chair, requesting the authorities of the States to make public and issue for sale their annual reports, their budgets and other important documents and press notes; the Mysore State for instance has long been making the publications available for all and sundry and there is not the least reason for other States to regard these publications as not intended to see the light of day.

THE Report of the Broomfield Committee has created a mild sensation in England and many people are rubbing their eyes to see if it can be true that the administration has made such grievous mistakes. The

Manchester Guardian is very outspoken and regards the Report "as a blow to the régime of the Indian Civil Service" which has always prided itself upon the perfection of the land revenue system. It admits with apparent reluctance that it is necessary to transfer the ultimate responsibility for the system of revenue assessment to the Provincial Legislatures. The *Nation* and the *Athenæum*, commenting on the Report, says that the present is not the time when the Government can afford to leave legitimate grievances uninvestigated or unremoved. Another journal admits that the Report is rightly described in the Indian Press as one of the most significant documents in recent years. The *Near East and India* admits that the attempt of the Settlement Officers to introduce a semi-official method must be written down a failure. Apparently the journal is not satisfied with the Report because it regards the increased share of the Government to the extent of 5.7 per cent. as incompatible with the great rise in agricultural prices for the last thirty years. But it bows to the inevitable since the Government of Bombay themselves have accepted the figure and have bowed their head to the storm of criticism. In spite of this the journal is constrained to remark that a serious blow has been administered to the prestige of Government and its revenue officers. The journal also expresses a doubt whether the system of placing practically complete reliance on the rentals to which the Bombay Government pinned the official flag, is likely to give reliable results, in the absence of other data. On the whole it appears, that the Broomfield Report has given the Britishers enough material for heart-searching and self-introspection.

ON the 23rd April last a Mrs. Mary Ware Dennett was convicted in the federal court at Brooklyn (U.S.A.) of circulating obscene matter through the agency of the post office and sentenced to pay \$3000. This case has created a sensation in America, for the offending pamphlet, the major portion of which is printed elsewhere, under the sub-title "An Explanation for Young People", with the "Introduction for Elders", will be judged by all clean-minded persons as not only an unobjectionable but a very meritorious attempt to tackle the exceedingly difficult problem of introducing the young to the mysteries of sex life. No other evidence of the high quality of the pamphlet is needed than the fact that it was first published as an article in a high-class medical magazine and was subsequently printed in pamphlet form on its strong recommendation, and that it is being used for the last ten years by leading educators, doctors, clergymen, and social workers in the education of the youth. What has apparently shocked the moral susceptibilities of the federal court is the last passages from it "which describe the physiology of the reproductive organs and of sexual intercourse." These passages have been omitted for reasons of law in the paper from which we have made extracts on another page, but the paper, which is no other than the *New Republic*, assures us that "the passages we omit are dignified, straightforward and entirely in the tone of those we print." One cannot help being struck while reading the pamphlet by its utter lack of salacious matter and its emphasis on "the idealism of love and the boon of health." Verily, as the *New Republic* says, "if anything can purge young men's minds of unwholesome repressions, and counteract the over-stimulation of sexual impulses to which their environment usually condemns them, such a booklet as this will do so." And yet it is just such a pamphlet that is held "obscene" and likely to corrupt the morals of the young folk in the U.S!

BOMBAY'S SIMON SEVEN.

EARLY last month the Committee of the Bombay Legislative Council elected to participate in the investigation of the Statutory Commission signed its report. This will not see the light of day till it is published as an appendix to the Report of the Commission. It would therefore have been meet for the Press to have maintained silence regarding its contents up till then. But the Anglo-Indian newspapers which never miss an opportunity of playing the rôle of mentor to their Indian *confreere* on the subject of journalistic morals have thought fit to divulge an outline of the Committee's recommendations. If this premature publication had been accurate the only objection to it would have been that it was unauthorised. But we happen to know that the summary of recommendations they have published is misleading. We cannot in presence of such knowledge refrain from disclosing the true facts, and since we will scrupulously limit our disclosure to the extent of correcting wrong versions already published, we hope we shall not be held morally guilty of having given undue publicity to what should have been a dead official secret.

The Committee consisted of seven members : one European, three Mahomedans, one Brahman Sardar, one non-Brahman and one member of the depressed classes. It was thus composed exclusively of the non-progressive elements amongst Indian politicians, the progressive elements having decided to leave the Simon Commission severely alone. It was therefore only to be expected that the Committee's recommendations would be of a very backward character, and so they are. Advanced politicians knew as much when they decided upon boycott. They have therefore no cause for disappointment, but they can derive some consolation—for which we believe they had not bargained—from the fact that in making these backward recommendations the Committee is not unanimous. They are too backward for the more forward members of even this Committee. The three Hindu members would like to have the proposals cast in a larger and more generous mould than the four non-Hindu members would allow. Among the former is one who is by far the most enlightened member amongst the depressed classes, which disposes once and for all of the convenient plea of Government that the caution it habitually observes in parting with power to the people is dictated by the sole desire to protect the lower classes from the oppression of the higher. Dr. Ambedkar speaks for the lowest of them and, thus speaking, demands for the people at large a wider autonomy than the local Government in its proposals was prepared to concede. That Dr. Ambedkar is not a man to be bribed or overawed into subscribing to what he does not in his innermost heart believe the general tenour of his separate Report proves to demonstration. He is convinced, as every rational man must, that the replacement of autocracy by democracy is far more urgently necessary in the interest of the

submerged than in that of others, provided only that the democracy is genuine and that power is diffused to its widest extent.

The recommendations of the Majority Committee (i. e. its non-Hindu part) are, briefly, as follows:— (i) the transfer of land revenue to the control of a wholly elected legislative council; (ii) the transfer of law and order five years after the reformed constitution comes into existence on a vote to that effect being passed by the legislature; (iii) the institution of a partly nominated and partly elected second chamber; (iv) the retention of communal electorates for Mahomedans, Europeans and Anglo-Indians; and (v) the transfer of education, public health and agriculture in the Central Government to the control of the Legislative Assembly. When these recommendations are analysed they will be found to be extremely meagre and insubstantial, but in the Report they are so put forward as to give the appearance of a very liberal measure of reform. It is said that all subjects except law and order should be immediately transferred in the provincial field. This statement has a very imposing look about it, but those who are conversant with the existing situation will know that it amounts to nothing but the transfer of only one more important subject, viz. land revenue. For, with law and order still reserved that is the only subject that is left to be transferred. But the Committee represents this slight concession to popular aspirations as "the transfer of practically the whole administration." Having recommended such impossibly precipitate reforms, the Committee naturally seeks to counterbalance them by certain checks. To this end it recommends the creation of an upper chamber of the legislature, which is to consist partly of official as well as nominated non-official members. This chamber is not like the second chambers in other countries; it is specifically intended—and the Committee's frankness in putting it so bluntly is very praiseworthy—to take the place of the Governor's "special powers of vetoing and certifying". In judging therefore of the net advance proposed to be made in the provincial sphere, we must set, over against the addition of one more subject to the transferred list, the creation of an avowedly overriding second chamber, which is to override popular wishes not only in this subject but in all the subjects on that list. The little gain made in one respect must be measured against the heavy loss sustained all along the line; and when the necessary deduction is made it will only be found to leave a debit balance behind. We do not leave out of account the possibility, five years after, of law and order also being transferred to the transferred list; but the possibility seems rather remote when the transfer is made contingent upon the votes of the second chamber—and such a second chamber composed of representatives of the larger landed and commercial interests.

But the recommendation of the Committee which has the largest amount of plausibility about it is the one for the introduction of dyarchy into the Central Government. The Committee here assumes the air of a very go-ahead body and argues that, when an irremovable executive is confronted in the legislature by an elected majority, the only way of curbing the irresponsibility of the latter is to throw on them definite responsibility for certain things. This of course is true enough; but let us see how far the Committee carries this very sound principle. It recommends the transfer of—what? Commerce and Industry? Posts and Telegraphs? Railways and Communications? Currency and Finance?—oh dear! no, but of Education, Public Health and Agriculture—just those subjects which, of great importance in themselves, have very little importance as administered in the Central Government. These subjects are mainly dealt with in the provinces and have really no place in the Government of India. Does the Committee believe that a sense of responsibility is best promoted in legislators by confiding to their care the least important subjects? We should have far preferred the Committee to say plainly that the time has not yet come for introducing an element of responsibility at the centre. That would at any rate have been straightforward. It has however elected to make a pretence of a big advance while in fact making no advance whatever. We shall say nothing here as to its recommendation for retaining communal electorates; we will only add that it also recommends increase of the existing Muslim representation in the central legislature! It is not very difficult to understand after this how the Mahomedan members must have been persuaded to fall in with the reactionary recommendations of the Report.

That the Hindu members have kicked against these is however a source of satisfaction to us. The members who have done so are at bottom sectionalists caring above everything else for their class interests. They have thus asked for larger representation for their respective sections, which is natural enough. But they have not entirely forgotten in these narrow sectional interests the wider interests of the nation. They have recommended, all of them, the immediate grant of full provincial autonomy; and they have opposed, all of them, the creation of a second chamber. Two of these three have not made any recommendation for political power at the centre, presumably because they felt that it was not their primary concern. This is rather unfortunate, as their silence on this aspect of the matter may possibly be interpreted, quite wrongly we believe, as agreement with the Majority's conclusions. (This statement, however, must be qualified in so far as the non-Brahmin representative is concerned, who says that Dominion Status should be the basis of the country's constitutional revision, whatever it may mean.) We are therefore particularly glad to find that the third—Sardar Mujumdar—has very ruthlessly exposed the hollowness of the advance recommended by the

Majority of the Committee at the centre and has himself recommended the transfer to popular control—even if it should be as a venture of faith—of all Departments except Defence and Foreign and Political Relations. This of course falls short of the National Demand. But who ever hoped that that Demand would be voiced by those selected to cooperate with the Simon Commission? The significance of Sardar Mujumdar's recommendation lies just in this, that it is made by a representative of the aristocratic classes who can never by any chance be found to be mixed up with any political agitation, however innocent. If a Committee consisting of men like him votes, nearly by half and half, for full provincial autonomy, what, we wonder, would Sir John Simon think of the recent growth of political consciousness in the country and how would he react to it? For we are sure that he realises, in spite of the prevailing boycott, that the measures he will recommend must have for their object the satisfaction of the aspirations, not of the least aspiring such as appeared before him as witnesses or sat with him as semi-demi-colleagues, but of the most aspiring, those who are forward in political agitations but who kept him at arm's length throughout his peregrinations in the country.

EAST AFRICAN POLICY.

IN the paper read by Mr. J. H. Oldham before the Royal Institute of International Affairs on March 19th last an elaborate defence was attempted of the main conclusions of the Hilton Young Report and in the discussion that followed these conclusions were subjected to a searching criticism by men like Mr. Charles Buxton, Sir Robert Hamilton, and Sir John Sandeman Allen. The defence and the criticism, both of which will be found recorded in the Institute's *Journal* for May, are well worth careful study in India. Our own reading of these has confirmed us in the criticism we ventured to offer when the Report was published. We were almost alone in pursuing the line of thought we did at the time and naturally had misgivings about its soundness. We are therefore very gratified to find corroboration of our views in the *Journal* and would draw the attention of all those who wish to gain a real insight into the problem to read and ponder over its pages.

The one thing Indians in East Africa have set their hearts upon is the substitution of a common for a communal electoral roll. We shall of course be the last to minimise the importance of this reform, but that by itself will not go very far. They do not seem yet to have given their consideration and made up their minds as to the change of policy which was effected in 1927. They do not realise that the statements of policy issued by the Duke of Devonshire in 1923 and by Mr. Amery 1927 are not only different but contradictory and that a reversion to the former is essentially necessary if not merely exploitation of natives is to be prevented (which to East African Indians is perhaps a secondary affair), but anything like equality is to be established between Indians and Europeans. The short-

range policy which they are at present following, by which they content themselves with attacking the existing differential arrangements without attacking the underlying principles embodied in Mr. Amery's White Paper has to our mind little chance of success. The Imperial Government itself and many British politicians have contended that the two White Papers are merely complementary of each other and that there is no contradiction between them. In Mr. Oldham's paper we get for the first time a frank admission that the White Papers contain statements "which are contradictory of one another." The contradiction is of course patent: in the earlier White Paper rights of trusteeship are reserved exclusively to the Government, while in the later the very people from whom protection is needed are made part trustees or protectors. We need not repeat our arguments here as to the relative merits of the two policies; the important thing is for Indian settlers to remember that both cannot be in force together and that they must make a choice.

Our chief objection to the Hilton Young Commission's Report is that while in part it emphasises the principles of the Duke of Devonshire's White Paper it also seeks in part to give effect to those of Mr. Amery's White Paper. Thus it is quite excellent when it preaches from the former text, but when it comes to devise machinery for implementing the policy of the latter it goes wrong. The chorus of enthusiastic approval which the Report has aroused is due to the fact that public attention is attracted by the reaffirmation of trusteeship but it fails to take notice of the other part by which immigrant communities are admitted to a share in native trusteeship. In so far as the Commission recommends increase of native representatives in the Kenya Legislative Council from one to five, it will receive hearty support, though one cannot help feeling misgivings, to which polite expression was given by Sir John Sandeman Allen in speaking on Mr. Oldham's paper. He said: "I wonder whether those (Europeans) who are nominated as representatives of the native population would really be able to stand up against their brother white men if there was an independent Legislature such as is suggested. (By "independent" the speaker meant a Legislature free from the domination of officials.) In other words I should like personally to be quite satisfied that the real balance of the dual policy could be maintained by having the natives represented by certain selected white people." But it is the least grave defect of the Commission's scheme that the natives are to be represented by Europeans from whom as a class they have the most to fear. On the Council there is to be a non-official majority. This recommendation is in pursuance of the 1927 White Paper which enunciates the principle of association of immigrant communities in native trusteeship. The 1923 White Paper would have required the retention of the existing official majority till natives were able to secure an effective share in elective representation. The Commission, however, sets up a non-official majority

while desiring to keep all decisive power in the hands of Government in regard to all questions affecting the relations of races, one to another.

Mr. Oldham admits that "it is this feature of the proposals of the Commission which, perhaps most of all, needs examination, because we are proposing something which is in some ways a new experiment." The experiment consists in so fixing the composition of the Council that the non-official majority in it, being a mixed or, as Professor Buell says in *Foreign Affairs*, an interracial one, should, while being effective when the diverse elements in the population are in agreement, be ineffective when they are in disagreement. This is no doubt an ingenious device and appears on paper to be an effectual safeguard against the domination of one community by another. But this proposal, which as Mr. Oldham says is a novel experiment in government, is open to the same objection which Mr. Oldham himself takes and anybody would take to responsible government or to entrusting political power to an unofficial European majority in the Legislative Council provided that the Imperial Government has reserved to it sufficient powers of intervention for the protection of native interests. This arrangement appears on paper to be quite unexceptionable, but Mr. Oldham himself thus objects to it: "Experience has shown, however, that once responsible government is established, powers of intervention by an outside authority are in practice difficult or impossible to exercise". Our objection to Mr. Oldham's proposal is no other: Once an unofficial majority is established, it is difficult or impossible to ensure that the nice balance now effected between the various races will not be disturbed in future to the advantage of one and disadvantage of another. Mr. Oldham need not make experiments or exercise his inventive power. A non-official majority such as he contemplates must by its very momentum lead in the future to a majority in which one element (in this case the European) acquires a dominant influence over the others. We know of course that there is the Imperial Government to prevent it. But is there not the Imperial Government to protect the natives under responsible government by Europeans? But just as in that case the Imperial Government is, by Mr. Oldham's own admission, in fact impotent to afford adequate protection, whatever its theoretical powers may be, so it will be impotent, when it once grants an unofficial majority, to interpose its authority effectually in order to hold the balance between the various racial groups.

In the discussion that took place on Mr. Oldham's paper this point of view was forcibly voiced by several speakers. Among these Sir John Sandeman Allen, whom we have already quoted above, was most explicit. Continuing his argument that the legislature should in the existing conditions be predominantly official, he says:

I feel that we are much safer with somebody to hold the scales who is outside the issue entirely and is not directly interested. After all, East Africa is quite different from an ordinary British Colony. We have an enormous native

population with a very small white settlement. *It cannot but be necessary for us, I was going to say for all time, but at any rate until the population has properly developed on civilised lines and is thoroughly able to take care of itself, to hold fast and under our own control every part of the community. It seems to me that it is absolutely essential.*

The relations that the Commission envisages between the Governor General and the Secretary of State are also very sharply criticised, particularly by Mr. Buxton and Sir Robert Hamilton, but it is a matter in which little interest will be felt in India, though it is a question of great importance. We do not therefore wish to tire our readers by reproducing the criticism here. We are however clear that the protection of Indian interests requires among other things that we should object to the Commission's proposal to set up a non-official majority in the Council, and independent opinion supports such objection.

THE SEX SIDE OF LIFE.

INTRODUCTION FOR ELDERS.

IN reading several dozen books on sex matters for the young with a view to selecting the best for my own children, I found none that I was willing to put into their hands, without first guarding them against what I considered very misleading and harmful impressions, which they would otherwise be sure to acquire in reading them. That is the excuse for this article.

It is far more specific than most sex information written for young people. I believe we owe it to children to be specific if we talk about the subject at all.

From a careful observation of youthful curiosity and a very vivid recollection of my own childhood, I have tried to explain frankly the points about which there is the greatest inquiry. These points are not frankly or clearly explained in most sex literature. They are avoided, partly from embarrassment, but more apparently, because those who have undertaken to instruct the children are not really clear in their own minds as to the proper status of the sex relation.

I found that, from the physiological point of view, the question was handled with limitations and reservations. From the point of natural science it was often handled with sentimentality, the child being led from a semi-aesthetic study of the reproduction of flowers and animals to the acceptance of a similar idea for human beings. From the moral point of view it was handled least satisfactorily of all, the child being given a jumble of conflicting ideas, with no means of correlating them—fear of venereal disease, one's duty to suppress "animal passion," the sacredness of marriage, and so forth. And from the emotional point of view, the subject was not handled at all.

This one omission seems to me to be the key to the whole situation, and it is the basis of the radical departure I have made from precedents in most sex literature for children.

Concerning all four points of view just mentioned, there are certain departures from the traditional method that have seemed to me worth making.

On the physiological side I have given, as far as possible, the proper terminology for the sex organs and functions. Children have had to read expur-

gated literature which has been specially prepared for them in poetic or colloquial terms, and then are needlessly mystified when they hear things called by their real names.

On the side of natural science, I have emphasised our unlikeness to the plants and animals rather than our likeness, for while the points we have in common with the lower orders make an interesting section in our general education, it is knowing about the vital points in which we differ that helps us to solve the sexual problems of maturity; and the child needs that knowledge precisely as he needs knowledge of everything which will fortify him for wise decisions when he is grown.

On the moral side, I have tried to avoid confusion and dogmatism in the following ways: by eliminating fear of venereal disease as an appeal for strictly limited sex relations; stating candidly that venereal disease is becoming curable; by barring out all mention of "brute" or "animal" passion, terms frequently used in pleas for chastity and self-control, as such talk is an aspersion on the brutes and has done children much harm in giving them the impression that there is an essential baseness in the sex relation; by inviting the inference that marriage is "sacred" by virtue of its being a reflection of human ideality rather than because it is a legalized institution.

Unquestionably the stress which most writers have laid upon the beauty of nature's plans for perpetuating the plant and animal species, and the effort to have the child carry over into human life some sense of that beauty, has come from a most commendable instinct to protect the child from the natural shock of the revelation of so much that is un-aesthetic and revolting in human sex life. The nearness of the sex organs to the excretory organs, the pain and messiness of childbirth are elements which certainly needed some compensating antidote to prevent their making too disagreeable and disproportionate an impress on the child's mind.

The results are doubtless good as far as they go, but they do not go nearly far enough. What else is there to call upon to help out? Why, the one thing which has been persistently neglected by practically all the sex writers—the emotional side of sex experience. Parents and teachers have been afraid of it and distrustful of it. In almost none of the books for young people that I have thus far read has there been the frank, unashamed declaration that the climax of sex emotion is an unsurpassed joy, something which rightly belongs to every human being, a joy to be proudly and serenely experienced. Instead there has been all too evident an inference that sex emotion is a thing to be ashamed of, that yielding to it is indulgence which must be curbed as much as possible, that all thought and understanding of it must be rigorously postponed, at any rate till after marriage.

We give to young folks, in their general education, as much as they can grasp of science and ethics and art, and yet in their sex education, which rightly has to do with all of these, we have said, "Give them only the bare physiological facts, lest they be prematurely stimulated." Others of us, realizing that the bare physiological facts are shocking to many a sensitive child, and must somehow be softened with something pleasant, have said, "Give them the facts, yes, but see to it that they are so related to the wonders of evolution and the beauties of the natural world that the shock is minimized". But none of us has yet dared to say, "Yes, give them the facts, give them the nature study, too, but also give them some conception of sex life as a vivifying joy, as a vital art, as a thing to be studied and

developed with reverence for its big meaning, with understanding of its far-reaching reactions, psychologically and spiritually, with temperate restraint, good taste and the highest idealism." We have contented ourselves by assuming that marriage makes sex relations respectable. We have not said that it is only beautiful sex relations that can make marriage lovely.

Young people are just as capable of being guided and inspired in their thought about sex emotion as their taste and ideals in literature and ethics, and just as they imperatively need to have their general taste and ideals cultivated in preparing for mature life, so do they need to have some understanding of the marvellous place which sex emotion has in life.

Only such an understanding can be counted on to give them the self-control that is born of knowledge, not fear, the reverence that will prevent premature or trivial connections, the good taste and finesse that will make their sex life when they reach maturity a vitalizing success.

AN EXPLANATION FOR YOUNG PEOPLE.

When boys and girls get into their "teens," a side of them begins to wake up which has been asleep or only partly developed ever since they were born, that is, the sex side of them. It is the most wonderful and interesting part of growing up. This waking is partly of the mind, partly of the body and partly of the feeling or emotions.

You can't help wanting to understand all about it, but somehow you find yourself a little embarrassed in asking all the questions that come into your mind, and often you don't feel quite like talking about it freely, even to your father and mother. Sometimes it is easier to talk with your best friends, because they are your own age, and are beginning to have these new feelings too.

But remember that young people don't know nearly so much about it as older people do, and that the older ones really want to help you with their experience and advice; and yet, they, like you, often feel rather embarrassed themselves and don't know how to go about it. I suppose it is because it is all so very personal and still remains somewhat mysterious, in spite of all that people know about it.

If our bodies were just like machines, then we could learn about them and manage them quite scientifically as we do automobiles, but they are not like that. They are more than machines that have to be supplied with fuel (food) and kept clean and oiled (by bathing, exercise and sleep). They are the homes of our souls and our feelings, and that makes all the difference in the world in the way we act, and it makes what we have to learn, not limited to science only, but it has to include more difficult and complicated things like psychology and morality.

Maybe I can't make this article help you, but I remember so well what I wanted to know and how I felt when I was young that I am now going to try. And I will tell you, to start out with, that there is a great deal that nobody knows yet, in spite of the fact that the human race has been struggling thousands of years to learn.

Life is still a mystery, especially human life. Human life, in many respects, is like plant and animal

life, but in many ways it is entirely different, and the ways in which it is different are almost more important for us to think about than the way in which it is similar. In all life, except in the very lowest forms, new life is created by the coming together, in a very close and special way, of the male and female elements. You have studied at school about the plants and you probably have observed some animals, so you know something about what this means if you do not understand it thoroughly.

But what you want to know most of all is just how it is with human beings. You want to know just what this coming together is, how it is done, how it starts the new life, the baby, and how the baby is born. You want to understand the wonderful sex organs, that are different in men and women, what each part is for and how it works.

If you feel very curious and excited and shy about it, don't let yourself be a bit worried or ashamed. Your feelings are quite natural, and most everybody else has felt just the same way at your age. Remember that strong feelings are immensely valuable to us. All we need to do is to steer them in the right direction and keep them well balanced and proportioned.

Now in order to understand something of why this subject stirs us so, we must notice in what ways we human beings are *different* from the plants and animals. About the lowest form of life is the ameba. It looks like a little lump of jelly, and it produces its young by merely separating itself in two. One part drifts off from the other part and each becomes a separate live being. There is no male and no female and they didn't *know* they were doing it. In the plants a higher stage of development is reached: there is the male and the female and they join together, not by coming to each other, or because they *know* they belong together, but quite unconsciously, with the aid of the bees and other insects and the wind, the male part, the pollen, is carried to the female part—they meet, and at once the germ of a new plant begins to grow.

Then come to the animals. In all higher forms of animal life, the male creature *comes* to the female creature and himself places within her body the germ which, when it meets the egg which is waiting for it, immediately makes a new life begin to grow. But animals come together without *knowing why*. They do it from instinct only, and they do it in what is called the mating season, which is usually in the spring. The mating season happens once a year among most of the higher animals, like birds and wild cattle, but to some animals it comes several times a year, as with rabbits, for instance. You doubtless know already that the more highly developed the animal, the longer it takes the young one to grow within the mother before it is born, and the longer the period when it is helpless to provide its own food and care.

Now we come to human beings, and see how different they are! They have no regular mating season, and while there is a certain amount of instinct in men and women which tends to bring them

the threshold how man has escaped want by several devices; amongst these they attach great importance to responsible parenthood. After examining the present economic system they confidently assert that it has in it possibilities of improvement which will bring us nearer our ideal of perfection; in this examination they point out the great merit of the U.S. in having succeeded better than other countries in removing political and social handicaps from individual effort and in having followed the ideal that productive achievement is more desirable than passive consumption. On the whole it is their belief that great principles of social justice determine the present use of the economic system in the U.S. and therefore the system has in that country unlimited possibilities of progress. The analysis of liberalism given by the authors makes it very clear that liberalism is not synonymous with democracy, some of the most democratic governments being the most coercive; but they adhere to economic liberalism. So far as it favours freedom of contract and opposes exercise of authority except in cases where a large benefit is secured to offset the undesirable consequences of an authoritarian regime. As against socialists it is retorted that no superior method has yet been found to distribute the factors of production as compared with freedom of contract. On the question of competition their conclusion is that it is on the whole better to direct the competitive spirit into productive channels eliminating as far as possible all its destructive forms than to try to eliminate competitive tendencies altogether; this is an essentially sound conclusion. Voluntaryism is supported by the authors as against authority on the ground that the widest possible extension of this method is the surest way of coordinating the efforts of large numbers of men, the only coercion allowed being that by an orderly and responsible government. As for economic equality they do not believe that in the U.S. at any rate there are any appalling inequalities of wealth, if ownership and control are left out of account and only the differences in actual enjoyment are considered; they regard equality of average money income among different occupations as more important than equality so far as the ownership of capital is concerned. It is proved in detail that on account of the wide application of the concept "due process of law" the equality before law is realized in the United States in greater degree than in other countries; the result has been favourable to the system of voluntaryism.

So far as the problem of the pressure of population on food supply is concerned, the authors give great prominence to the problem of how each acre may be made to produce more food, which will become acute when new areas of land are no longer available. One important phase of the population problem is the congestion in certain occupations as opposed to a general overpopulation; the proper remedy for this is in their opinion a system of universal and popular education which large number would enable to fit themselves for the less crowded occupations. Instead of having low-grade poorly paid labour for muscular work they would have machinery to do the work of man. The menace of differential birth-rate, whereby the more capable multiply less than those who lack initiative and creative power, is to be averted by the operation of criminal law and a rigid minimum wage law which would make a pauper of everybody below a minimum standard efficiency; similarly young men in professional life might be enabled to marry without having to wait till they have achieved economic independence. The authors do not believe in a normal surplus of labourers for the maintenance of the present system; they believe

that sooner or later the business cycles would disappear and profits and interest would be stabilized, so that over-expansion as well as depression are both successfully prevented. They even recommend a scarcity of labourers by controlling immigration and establishing a stable equilibrium at a high level of wages and thus making labourers more independent; they also expect that with the increase of savings a time would come when interest would tend practically to disappear. This dream may be perhaps realized in the U.S., but in other countries it seems impossible of realization; apart from that the ideal adumbrated by the authors is certainly worth striving for. The surest way to raise wages and equalize wealth is according to them to encourage accumulation of capital and at the same time to thin out the ranks of labourers that are poorly paid by providing educational opportunities for the rising generation to work their way to well paid occupations. Reviewing the progress of the last fifty years in the U.S. the authors show how that country has realized the ideal of free opportunity for all and special favours for none; that drunkenness and other by-products of alcoholism have greatly decreased and that there has been a phenomenal development of man power and power-driven machinery. They apprehend however the danger that the masses will succumb to the same evils which have destroyed aristocracies in the past and base their only hope in the citizens who will still cultivate the fundamental virtues of industry, sobriety, thrift and will regard their wealth as tools to be used in further production. The authors confess however that the U.S. people are not interested in graceful consumption and elegant leisure. We should think it rather a sorry confession, considering that consumption is the final cause of production.

V. N. G.

MEXICAN PROBLEMS.

MODERN MEXICO AND ITS PROBLEMS*

By J. W. BROWN. (Labour Publishing Co., London.) 1927. 19 cm. pp. 128. 4s. 6d.

MEXICO, so long regarded as a hotbed of eccentric revolutions, now under the Presidentship of Calles, for the first time promises to be the mistress of her own house. From the time Cortez landed in that country she has had no integrity of her own. At first she served the purpose of enriching the pockets of the Spanish king and his grandees. With the popular revolution, she became a plaything in the hands of opportunist politicians who were in the pay of American financiers. Never till Labour came to the forefront, was Mexico known to have really belonged to the children of the soil. "For centuries ever since the Spanish conquest the Indians and the mixed Indians were ground down under a terrible tyranny. The Spanish ruling class and the Catholic Church held them in bondage".

Porfirio Diaz, under the hypocritical garb of an emancipator, brought about superficial changes in the administration but the spirit underwent a worse change. For with the help of American money and navy behind him, Diaz oppressed the people even more than the King's legates did, and provoked the Labour movement which he had suppressed to lend its aid to Caranza in overthrowing him. Caranza, though he enjoyed the favour of Labour and with its support became President, soon degenerated in his turn into a tyrant and even rescinded the social legislation, he had enacted to keep Labour in good humour. General Obregon then stepped into its good graces and drove Caranza out of office. It was during Obregon's regime that the constitution granted.

by Caranza and later revoked by him was revived and improved upon, laying stress on the sovereign right of the State over the material resources of the country. When Calles succeeded Obregon, he pushed forward the same legislation and other laws affecting the welfare of Labour in a manner that adversely affected the vicious dictatorship of the Dollar Kings of the United States.

New Mexico is a creature of Mexican Labour and as such its history is of monumental significance. It was Nicasio Idar who laid the nervous beginnings of the Labour movement in 1880. In spite of the opposition of the Church and the State, it attained importance enough to engineer an unsuccessful strike known as the Cananea strike of 1906. As a distinct power, however, the Labour movement dates from 1910 and in the capable hands of Luis Morones, it develops into the mature confederacion regional obrera Mexicana and serves as the constitutional army behind the established power. With such a sanction behind it, the Calles Government introduces measures calculated to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of foreigners and the clergy. "Large estates have ever since been steadily divided, the owners receiving compensation". The Ministry of Agriculture is empowered to start agricultural schools and loan societies in all villages, so as to encourage settlement of the idle and the landless. Public finance is thoroughly rehabilitated and the National Bank of Mexico is started in order to finance the indigenous agricultural and mercantile interests. Gigantic irrigation operations are taken in hand and roads are built where there were none before. The Government is pledged to start 1000 schools a year so as to provide for 10,00,000 children. The total number of public schools now owned by the Government is 7,356 and "the twenty-eight Mexican states are spending 40 per cent. of their budgets on education in addition to what the federal Government does."

So far so good, for even the Alien Land Act works well in spite of the vocal protests on the part of the American capitalists. But when the same match stick of reform is applied to the fortress of religion, the Church exhibits all the inordinate land and money hunger it organically suffers from.

The question of oil wells somehow remains yet unsolved in the sense that the oil magnates of the United States are unwilling to submit to Mexican authority. The Mexican Government gives them the choice between naturalisation or confiscation of their wells.

"Although the danger of armed intervention by the U.S.A. in Mexico seems to be past, grave danger still exists in the refusal of the American oil magnates to recognise the law of Mexico. It not only encourages all rebellious and reactionary elements in Mexico but induces an uncertainty for traders, manufacturers, and financiers that tends to handicap Mexico in its efforts at stabilisation, ordered government and social and industrial progress". The Mexican troubles therefore are the making of Uncle Sam, as J. W. Brown's facts clearly disclose. As the self-appointed leader of "the two Americas", the idea of a Mexico freed from his financial grip is distasteful to him. In Uncle Sam's providence Mexico exists for his "economic penetration" and if she resents it then he waves his big stick. To understand such a perplexing problem as is found in Mexico, J. W. Brown's masterly book is undoubtedly the most suitable.

K. VENUGOPAL RAO.

SHORT NOTICES.

A PIONEER TOBACCO MERCHANT IN THE ORIENT. By JAMES A. THOMAS. (Duke University Press, Durham.) 1928. 21 cm. pp. 340. \$ 3-50.

YUNNAN. By MRS. M. M. DYMOND. (Marshall Brothers, London.) 1928. 19 cm. pp. 95. 2s. 6d.

'A Pioneer Tobacco Merchant in the Orient' has been written by Mr. James A. Thomas who went to the East nearly a generation ago to see whether it would be a good market for American tobacco. He visited many countries in the Orient, and in the book before us has given us his impressions of the Orient. The book belongs to the category of light literature. Nearly a third of the book consists of irrelevant matter, but the remaining two-thirds contains some useful information. Chapters entitled 'Chinese Business Methods,' 'Chinese Social Customs,' 'Some Chinese Characters,' 'Some Chinese Towns and Cities' and 'Problems in the Orient' are interesting and informative. On the whole, the book is well written.

If Mr. James Thomas examines the conditions and problems in the Orient, Mrs. Dymond deals with the age-long customs which have made life intolerable to the girls of Yunnan, a province in South West China. Much as we admire the humanitarian spirit that has actuated the authoress to write this book, we cannot help protesting against her excessive missionary zeal. Mrs. Dymond sincerely believes that without the religion of Jesus of Nazareth, there is no hope for Yunnan. We demur to this view. But few readers will regret these sermons, as the preacher is always caustic, never cynical, and certainly never dull.

M. V. SUBRAHMANYAM.

THE PEOPLE OF TIBET. By CHARLES BELL. (Oxford University Press, Bombay.) 1928. 9 x 6. pp. 317. 21s.

THIS is another book written by an officer who has utilised the opportunities afforded by his official position (as British Political Representative in Tibet, Bhutan and Sikkim) in the interests of ethnographical investigation. The author is not indeed a professed anthropologist but his residence of nearly twenty years among the Tibetans and his intimate knowledge of the Tibetan language and long social intercourse with the Tibetan people have enabled him to prepare an illuminating account of the social and economic life of the people of Tibet which will be highly appreciated by all students of anthropology. Chapters dealing with the condition of the peasantry, the position of women, marriage customs, etc. are very interesting. The book contains a bibliography and two appendices, one on the unit of land taxation, and another on the Lerchok Estate: Its management and Rentals. Two maps and a number of good illustrations add to the value of the book.

S. C. ROY.

THE MODERN MALAY. By L. RICHMOND WHEELER. (George Allen & Unwin Ltd. London.) 1928. 8½ x 5. pp. 292. 15s.

THE author has spent seven years in Malay and is well qualified to handle the subject about which he writes. He has supplemented his personal knowledge about the country by patient research. The result is a book which deals with Malay in all its aspects. It is a book not only for the tourist but for one who wishes to study Malay and the Malays. We how-

ever miss in it information about the constitution and administrative machinery of the country. If the author had supplied this, he would perhaps have had to travel beyond his object which is merely "to give an account of the Malay race." The book admirably serves this purpose.

S. G. D.

HOLLAND. (Ward Lock & Co., Ltd. London.) pp. 174. 6½. × 4½.

"WINDMILLS with their thatched and hooded caps; great brown-sailed barges, whose capacious bellies hold the contents of one of our rattling trains; little single-street towns, with gardens dipping into the water; and long, long meadows, full of black, and white cows, and spring green, that before you know it slip into cities whose streets are of water; scores of little bridges, and swarms of laughing children on them; little lakes, dotted with white sails and embosomed in clear grey skies; miles of rushes, their tops brushed by the lovely flight of the sea-swallow; red church towers, ending in fine fret-work; red-roofed villages by the Zinder Zee, and broad-based villagers to live in them; few slums and no deserts; not too much humanity, but enough of it—that is Holland." Thus is Holland described by Mr. H. W. Massingham; and the contents of this tourist handbook and the fine pictures with which it is interspersed prove that the description is by no means overdone.

S. P. T.

CORRESPONDENCE

COMPULSORY THEISTIC TEACHING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—Prin. G. N. Gokhale has tried, in your issue of the 9th May, to answer my arguments against the compulsory teaching of theism in Colleges. My correspondence with him has been confined only to a discussion of our respective views on religion, god and the proposed compulsion to attend theistic discourses. It was absolutely impersonal in nature, and I never thought that I was being in any way unfair to Prin. Gokhale when I published the fact that he admitted his not having studied logic. I am however quite prepared to apologise to him if he believes that I should not have referred to the matter publicly.

The reason why I alluded to it was that the existence of god *cannot* be proved by a process of reasoning. Prin. Gokhale has not even attempted to do so in his reply. All that he does is to state dogmatically some theorems which *he says* are true and are the common factor of all religions. I again state that an all-powerful *and* merciful god could not have possibly created a world so imperfect as the one we live in. The existence of misery in this world is the fact and Mr. Gokhale's god is the hypothesis, and still Mr. Gokhale does not want to modify the latter to suit the former. A misery-creating god can *either* be all-powerful and wicked *or* merciful and weak.

Prin. Gokhale's example of thought-transference has nothing to do with either religion or god. After all, thought must be a process of some sort of change in the brain cells, and it is perfectly within the range of imagination (although there is as yet absolutely no proof for it) that that change may be transmitted

to other distant brain-cells. What god or religion can have to do with this process any more than with the process of transmission of electric energy, I am unable to understand.

And now about my alledged proposal to call meetings to abuse god. I must make it clear that I am a non-believer in god. It is therefore not possible for me to have any desire to abuse a non-existent thing. What I said in my Marathi article was, that if Mr. Gokhale wanted to be consistent, he and other theists should call meetings to abuse god in exactly the same way as they wanted to pray to him. For, if a god who created good things is to be praised, the same god, who has also created bad things, should be abused also. It is only a matter of consistent reasoning. If this is not acceptable to Mr. Gokhale, let him say that plague, wars and famine are not created by god, and that he (god) is powerless to prevent them. A god that wants to take credit for having created roses must also take the discredit of having created the plague germ.

Prin. Gokhale, the champion of toleration, wants to compel the students to attend lectures about religion and god, in exactly the same way as European and American nations are arming themselves to the teeth under the pretext of preventing war. Toleration simply *cannot* be taught by force, for the very process of teaching it is a negation of the idea contained in it. Let Mr. Gokhale be tolerant towards those who do not want compulsion, and he will be setting a much better example.

There is one point on which I agree perfectly with Mr. Gokhale. Let everybody read his pamphlet and form his own opinion about the proposals. No arguments brought forward by me would be stronger than the pamphlet. It is a perfect example of muddle-headed thinking.—Yours, etc.

D. D. KARVE.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- SURVEY OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS, 1928. By CHARLES P. HOWLAND. (Oxford University Press.) 1928. 25cm. 610p. 24s.
- ADMINISTRATIVE POWERS OVER PERSONS AND PROPERTY. By ERNST FREUND. (University of Chicago Press, Chicago.) 1928. 24cm. 620p. 22s. 6d.
- BLACK AMERICA. By SCOTT NEARING. (Vanguard Press, New York.) 1929. 22cm. 274p. \$3.00.
- AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS. By GEORGE O'BRIEN. (Longmans, London.) 1929. 22cm. 195p. 10s. 6d.
- THE HUMAN FACTOR IN INDUSTRY AND POLITICS. By ALFRED HOOK. (King.) 1929. 22cm. 211p. 8s. 6d.
- WHITE CAPITAL AND COLOURED LABOUR, By LORD OLIVIER. (Hogarth Press, London.) 1929. 22cm. 348p. 12s. 6d.
- THE CHALLENGE OF THE AGED. By ABRAHAM EPSTEIN. (Vanguard Press, New York.) 1928. 22cm. 435p. \$3.00.
- GERMANY UNDER THE DAWES PLAN. By MAX SERING. Translated by S. MILTON HART. (King.) 1929. 22cm. 251p. 10s. 6d.
- THE EMPIRE AND THE ARMY. By JOHN FORTESCUE. (Cassell.) 1928. 22cm. 338p. 10s. 6d.

WANTED—Candidates for Telegraph and Station Master's Classes. Full particulars and Railway Fare Certificate on 2 annas stamp. Apply to:—
Imperial Telegraph College, Nai Sarak, Delhi.