

The Servant of India

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

VOL. XII, No. 29.

POONA—THURSDAY, JULY 25, 1929.

INDIAN FOREIGN SUBSN. No. 153.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	337
ARTICLES :—	
Inwardness of the Opposition ...	340
The Declaration of Land Revenue Policy ...	341
Is the West Decaying? ...	342
What is India going to say? ...	343
REVIEWS :—	
A Great Mahomedan Nationalist. By Professor C. B. Young ...	345
The Trinity : Arbitration, Security, Disarmament. By the Rev. Andrew R. Low ...	346
Indian Culture. By N. G. Chapekar ...	347
Vignettes of Native Life in Australia. By R. Venugopal Rao ...	348
Books Received ...	348

Topics of the Week.

C. P. Ministry.

THE Governor of the Central Provinces has at last found it possible to revive the ministry and keep the diarchic constitution functioning. Messrs. Deshmukh and Bose have been appointed ministers and the two ministers have agreed to work on the basis of joint responsibility. The press communique issued in this connection says, in very guarded language, that "in the existing circumstances" it was decided that "the best course would be to appoint as ministers Messrs. Deshmukh and Bose, the nominees of the Nationalist party." No party perhaps has a decisive majority and the public is thus left vaguely to conjecture what may be the respective strength of the two parties or rather factions whose differences brought about the collapse of the late ministry in March last. Though the constitution is thus revived, it is yet problematic how long it will be allowed to function. The only inference that can be legitimately drawn from all this is that the official bloc and the nominated members will this time back up the nominees of the Nationalist group. The next session of the C. P. Council is to begin on 31st August. One estimate about the respective strength of the two main parties which are in favour of constituting a ministry in C. P. but have so far not found it possible to agree about the personnel is that they are about equally balanced, about a dozen in each group. Another estimate puts down the strength of the Democratic party led by Mr. Rao at about half that number. Between the standing phalanx of about 18 Swarajists whose hands are raised against any and every ministry and internal jealousies and differences between the two ministerial groups and the wreck-

ing tactics of some free-lancers, the new ministry that has been set up will have a hard task before it. Some Mahomedans had withdrawn their support from the late ministry by lure of office in the Cabinet. With that hope gone, the Mahomedans in a body may now go against the ministry. Anything therefore may happen before the next session of the C. P. Council comes to an end. One of the main factors which may make for the stability of ministry now set up is perhaps the fact that the impossibility of forming a ministry at this juncture may lead to immediate dissolution—a contingency which the present M.L.C.'s do not like to face till a real and important issue, such as the Simon Report for instance, arises on the eve of a general election. Of the two ministers now appointed Mr. Deshmukh has had some previous experience as a minister as the colleague of Mr. Raghavendra Rao, while Mr. Deshmukh's present colleague Mr. Bose—a pleader from Jubbulpore—is not known outside the province. Mr. Raghavendra Rao from all accounts is a man of unquestioned ability. It is a pity that a coalition between his group and that of Mr. Deshmukh has not been found feasible. The public outside the province at least has not so far found any real difference in principle or public policy which should divide the ministerial groups into two warring camps.

* * *

Land League Formed.

ON Tuesday last at a meeting held under the chairmanship of Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel, the hero of Bardoli, a Land League for the Bombay Presidency was formed. The decision of the Bombay Government not to bring into effect revision settlements in those talukas in which revised rates have not yet been levied was acclaimed by the meeting as evidence of its desire not to subject other talukas to the injustice from which Bardoli was delivered only by means of a big campaign of civil disobedience. But the scope of this decision is very limited. Only one taluka, viz., Palghar, will benefit thereby. Other aggrieved talukas like Devgad, Baglan, Alibag, etc., where the revised rates have been levied will continue to suffer from injustice. The meeting therefore asked, as we have suggested in our leading article, that in other talukas also where the grievances of the people are similar to Bardoli and presumably equally just, revision settlements should be suspended. The point can really be taken further. If the Bombay Government has, in spite of the Joint Parliamentary Committee's direction to embody the principles of land assessment into legislative shape, failed to carry it into effect, it may well be asked to pay for its dilatoriness by suspending all the revision settlements effected since 1920. Such a resolution was adopted by the meeting. But the reasonableness of those who have organised this agitation is evidenced by the fact that they did not call upon Government to refund to the ryots

the enhancement collected from them over the old assessment, as they were within their rights to do.

The withdrawal of the present Land Revenue Assessment Bill and the announcement of the Government's intention to substitute for it another embodying sound and progressive principles of assessment throws on the Land League the duty of examining this Bill, when it will be published for criticism, and of making constructive suggestions with a view to bringing the principles into accord with the teachings of economic science. The League does not shirk this work either. The immediate work that probably the organizers of the League had supposed would lie ahead of them was that of leading a strong protest movement for the purpose of obtaining redress for the peasants of Baglan and other talukas. The qualities required for organizing the masses are a little different from those required for formulating correct principles governing land assessment. But the Land League has been found ready to shoulder this responsibility also. A committee will soon be appointed by the League's Executive Committee consisting of five representatives for each of the four sub-provinces of the Presidency, who will be charged with the duty of laying down the basic principles of a sound system of land revenue assessment. The work has not been undertaken light-heartedly but with the full appreciation of the difficulties that lie in the way. Unfortunately unanimity has not been reached among non-official workers on this question, and it will be the task of this Committee, very hard but very necessary, to evolve principles that will meet with general acceptance. The League as well as its Executive Committee consists of representatives of all sections of political thought in the country and intends to carry on its activities without reference to the political principles which separate one party from another. The League has started well and promises to do good useful work.

* * *

Muslim Nationalists.

THE Congress Muslim Party, recently formed in Bombay, has not let the grass grow under its feet. It has already launched its campaign, which promises to be very energetic. At the first public meeting held on Friday last, Mr. Mahomed Ali, M.A. (Cantab.), the principal speaker, exhorted the Muslim community to give up their separation and to take their rightful place in the national movement. Mr. Syed A. Brelvi, who is as good a Muslim as a nationalist, felt constrained to tell the Mahomedans that their rank communalism was doing untold harm to the country. Condemning communalists among Hindus as severely as those among his own community, he proceeded: It must be confessed to the shame of the Muslims that the Hindu community as a whole was much more patriotic because they had all along kept up the struggle for the liberation of their country almost single-handed while the Muslims were either keeping themselves aloof or had allied themselves with those who stood between their country and its freedom. It was painful for him to say that his co-religionists had not realised their duty. While all these years they had been demanding their rights, they had forgotten to perform their duty towards their country. They were entitled he said as a minority community to claim satisfaction of their rights and obtain safeguards but they should not imagine that their duty was done by merely urging and advocating their right. They had to perform their duty of helping the majority in the work of winning freedom without which they could not exercise those rights. If Muslims abstained from joining the Congress for

fear lest Hindus, having won freedom, would tyrannize over them he for one would tell his co-religionists that it was better that India was free and that Hindus tyrannized over Muslims than that she should continue to be in bondage. But Muslims' fear was groundless. The history and tradition of Hindus were a guarantee that they would treat Muslims fairly and justly and, he would add, even generously in spite of what the communalists said to-day. If he firmly believed that Hindus would not tyrannize over Muslims, he equally firmly believed, Mr. Brelvi added, that the Muslims would not allow themselves to be tyrannized over. For if they did so they would be false to their own history and tradition of self-reliance and manliness. An excellent beginning of the new Party, to which we wish every success.

* * *

A Medical Council for India.

IN response to the demand made by the Indian medical profession for establishing a Medical Council in India to do work which is done in England by the General Medical Council, like prescribing the standard for medical degrees and recognition of foreign diplomas, a Bill was introduced by Dr. Rama Rao some years ago. This Bill was withdrawn as the Government of India expressed their intention to introduce one themselves; recently the Government Bill, which has been going the round of provinces, was referred to a conference of ministers and heads of provincial medical departments which has disapproved the Bill. The probable reason is the opposition of the provincial Surgeons-General whose prestige would have suffered by the creation of such a central authority. The creation of a Medical Council has always been a bitter pill to swallow for the European members of the I.M.S. for the simple reason that it supplants the General Medical Council in England which has always been the great friend of the I.M.S. and which has been so far the keeper of the Secretary of State's conscience. Unfortunately the Government of India is inclined to attach more weight to the advice of the European section of the I.M.S. than to the opinions of the Indian Medical men. The whole issue in fact is between the continued domination of the General Medical Council in England and the institution of an indigenous agency for medical supervision. Public opinion in India however has been insistent on the attainment of real self-government in the matter of medical education and medical services and it is sure to view this game of battledore and shuttlecock with great misgivings. The Government of India however is not content merely with shelving the formation of an Indian Medical Council but propose to add to the number of bureaucrats by appointing a Commissioner of Medical Education, who will act on behalf of the General Medical Council in England. The origin of this proposal can be traced to the Walker-Needham report on medical education in India and it has been declared that this officer will be the medium for supplying information to the General Medical Council to enable it to exercise the proper control over Indian medical education. If a central authority is needed in India it is difficult to see why the proposal of a Medical Council for India should be vetoed on the authority of the heads of medical departments and Ministers concerned. It is necessary now in order to enlighten public opinion that the Government should publish a summary of the opinions on the Government proposal, received from the several Provincial Governments. Failing this the suspicion is sure to be engendered that the continuation of the authority of the General Medical Council

is a cherished conviction with the Government of India and that they are not in thorough sympathy with the principle of their own measure.

The Princes' Sabotage.

THE "strong opinion" expressed by the Butler Committee that the Princes cannot be turned over to a self-governing British India for the administration of their treaties has implications which are not fully realised. It does not mean merely that when wider powers are conferred on British Indians to manage their own affairs the Political Department will have to be excepted from those departments which will be entrusted to their control. It means, further, that defence will also have to be reserved to bureaucratic management. Sir Leslie Scott has shown how it is a necessary consequence flowing from the position that the relationship of the Princes with British India cannot be transferred to a Dominion Government. The Butler Committee has not drawn this inference but has maintained discreet silence on the subject. Put there is no doubt that when the British Government once accepts the Butler Committee's recommendation, it will be driven not only to keep the Army immune from popular control but to accept a limitation on its own constitutional power to grant military control. And when military control is denied to the Legislature it follows that this disability will impose similar disabilities in respect of other civil departments. In fine, to agree to the Butler Committee's recommendation is virtually to give full rein to the Princes to sabotage British India's constitutional development in general. Mr. E. A. J. Robinson says as much in *the Nation and the Athenaeum* :—

The recognition of the claim of the States to be defended and to have their individual sovereignty maintained by the British and by none other than the British, implies that the States must in the future have the last word in the rate at which the Central Government can have its powers increased. For clearly the British Government would be failing in its duties to the States as here defined if it would be handing them over "to relationship with a new Government," if the army which defended them were subject ultimately to the orders of a British Indian legislature. It would follow then that, until the States declare their willingness, the army must remain outside the control of that legislature, and without control of the army, and without control of foreign relations, the fullest self-government remains but a shadow of the real thing. The recommendations of this Committee, if regarded as binding on them, would then practically limit the possible proposals of the Simon Commission, or of any future Commission, to an extension of self-government in the Provinces.

British Indians will of course put up the strongest fight they are capable of to smash this recommendation of the Butler Report, but what will the British Government do? Whether or no it extends responsibility to the Central Government will it agree to have its own powers limited? Will it subscribe to the theory that even if it wishes to make a Dominion of India, it cannot do so? Not, at any rate, the MacDonald Government.

A Survey of Financial Policy.

AT the Calcutta dinner held in London recently Sir Basil Blackett who was the chief guest gave a review of his policy in India, which is discerning as well as sympathetic in his usual manner. He referred to the vicious circle which made the invest-

ment of adequate capital impossible on account of the low taxable capacity of the people while the cure for the low capacity lay in the investment of large amounts for improving education and sanitation and economic production. One of his main objectives was therefore the expenditure of all the money he could raise on reproductive capital development. While paying his tribute to the Inchope Committee for its recommendations Sir Basil Blackett pointed out the undesirable effect produced by them in limiting wise and progressive expenditure in improving the social and economic condition of the masses. Sir Basil repeated his conviction that India has already reached the stage where her annual savings are sufficient to provide all new capital she requires for her use. In this probably he is right and we hope that according to his forecast very little external capital would be sought for normal capital expenditure. Sir Basil Blackett believes that the American banking system has failed to deal adequately with the money situation there and he attributes the failure to the intrusion of political influences into the management of central banking. We do not agree with him in either of these opinions; with regard to the latter point the mishaps in U. S. are due to commercial speculation with which politics in the central banking policy has very little to do either by way of commission or omission. We hope his advice to the British business man to co-operate sympathetically with Indian owners of capital will be taken in the proper spirit and promptly acted upon. For supplying the needs of the provinces for expenditure on beneficial services he recommended a central fund for distributing money to the provinces, as well as to the Indian States, if a proper settlement of constitutional relationship is arrived at in the case of the latter; this would solve what is financially the greatest of India's problems, viz. the application of adequate resources on improving the lot of the masses. Along with his rights, the merchant adventurer, he said, has his responsibilities and he advised the Calcutta business community to devote greater attention to organizing itself for playing its proper part in the Legislatures. The pompous dictum that for all times to come the life and happiness of millions depends preeminently upon the spirit of adventure and of service radiating out from the merchants of Calcutta can only be regarded as an unmeaning compliment due to the exigencies of post-prandial oratory.

The Skeen Sub-Committee Report.

WITH regard to the Secretary of the State's reply to a question in the Commons by Major Graham Pole concerning the report of the sub-committee of the Indian Sandhurst Committee we have now a denial from Mr. Jinnah of the reason given for not publishing this report. Mr. Jinnah points out that the larger committee had passed a resolution in favour of publication of the whole evidence and material except matter recorded 'in camera.' In his opinion there is no reason to suppose that the witnesses understood that they were expressing confidential views; and the procedure of the sub-committee described by him leaves no doubt that the witnesses understood that what they said was regarded as public evidence and would very likely be published. The actual 'in camera' evidence was a very small part of the whole affair. For this reason he requests the Secretary of State to scrutinize the question more minutely and critically instead of relying on the ready-made dish prepared by his department. Mr. Jinnah adds that the publication of the report of the sub-committee would absolve the Government in England from the charge that they do not wish to face public opinion.

INWARDNESS OF THE OPPOSITION.

THE storm of opposition that the Working Committee's proposal in Delhi has evoked is even stronger than we had expected, and the opposition is the strongest from those who are at the extreme left in the political movement like Mr. Subash Chandra Bose. The latter has now issued a statement which, by its cogency of reasoning and incisiveness of expression, will easily take the first place in the statements issued by the oppositionists so far. If boycott of Councils is rendered necessary by the arbitrary extension of the life of these bodies, then surely, argues Mr. Bose, in provinces where such extension has not taken place boycott should be unnecessary. And every one will agree that Mr. Bose has the Working Committee here. In Bengal, e. g., nationalists had an opportunity, which they utilised to the full, of demonstrating that the country has a nausea for the Simon Commission and its works—an opportunity of which other provinces complain to have been deprived by the postponement of the dissolution. There is therefore no valid reason why Congressmen in that province, having obtained a thumping majority over pro-Commission parties, should vacate their seats. If they were to resign their membership now they would be regarded everywhere as having been sent on a fool's errand in going to the constituencies, for, as Mr. Bose pointedly puts it, they were egged on to fight the elections just by some of those men who are now ordering them out only a few days after they had put them in! Nor do Bengal Congressmen intend to do routine work in the Council such as "university reform, local self-government amendment bills, tenancy laws and land revenue settlements," (which true N.C.O.'s profess heartily to condemn and which the *Janmabhumi* of 18th July mentions as utterly unworthy of Congressmen,) but they intend to do work which, if anything, falls into the category of paralysing the Government (which our Machilipatnam contemporary admits even the gentlemen of the Congress can do without breach of the N.C.O. principle): they are bent upon doing no less a noble thing than prevent the formation of a Ministry. If the A.I.C.C. now withdraws them from the Council, the Province is foredoomed to have a portion of governmental work being transacted by elected members under the control of the legislature instead of having it beautifully transacted by heaven-born bureaucrats who can defy the legislature. What can be a more elevated endeavour for N.C.O. Congressmen than to avert such a disaster? We are sure the *Janmabhumi* has no answer to make to this question unless it be that Congressmen may busy themselves in "constructive work" which, paraphrased, means plying the *charka* or the *takli*. Mr. Bose probably anticipated this answer, for he says in the statement right out that "a very large percentage of our M.L.A.'s and M.L.C.'s are not very keen on constructive work," a thing which is as well known to Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya as to Mr. Bose himself. The only thing therefore that you will succeed in doing, says Mr. Bose in effect, by taking Congress members out of the Bengal Council is that

you will keep them idle at home, and, what is infinitely worse, enthrone popular representatives instead of official in the places of the mighty—which must be prevented at all costs. This of course clinches the matter, so far as Swarajists are concerned.

But the intensity of the opposition that has been aroused cannot be explained in this way. Looked at in that way, the opposition seems out of all proportion to the occasion. For, as the *Janmabhumi* puts it, "this decision of resignation is not for all time to come; all being well, the new era of reforms will be inaugurated in November 1930 and people will be astir from July next year onwards, if not even earlier. . . . After all, then, these friends are called upon to make a sacrifice in the cause of nationalism only for a period of six months or, say, a year." The sacrifice may be gratuitous and even injurious, but the opposition would not be so heated if Swarajists felt sure that things would return to the normal after a time. They are however afraid that Mr. Gandhi, having taken the helm, would order things, even under the new dispensation, after the N.C.O. fashion. Nor is this fear wholly groundless: the *Janmabhumi* itself says: "When the new reforms are implemented even the Congressmen will be divided into two sections, one willing to co-operate and the other pleading for non-co-operation." It is but natural that Swarajists should decide to give a fight to the N.C.O.'s now if they have to give them a fight at all. The latter had practically fallen out of the political movement. But by Mahatma Gandhi's intervention in Calcutta they have been allowed to re-enter the arena. It would be a grave mistake, however, if they think that Swarajists would let them dominate the political field again. If N.C.O.'s lend themselves to be used as bug-a-boos to Government, they will of course be very serviceable. But if they presume too much on Swarajists' forbearance and dictate policy to them, they must be told that they had better mind their own business, which is spinning. Such is apparently the reasoning of Swarajist leaders. Nor are their apprehensions confined, we believe, to what may happen after a new orientation of the political situation resulting from the coming reforms. They are also apprehensive lest all the methods of political agitation associated with N.C.O. will be re-introduced immediately. Here again the N.C.O. leaders are making a huge blunder: for they seem to think that, by accepting the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi in the campaign of mass resistance that may possibly be launched next year, Swarajists have given a blank card to the Mahatma to take any or all of those steps which he considers to be preliminary to such a campaign. Resignation from Councils is, Swarajists fear, only the thin end of wedge: it will pave the way for all the other boycotts with which we have been familiarised in recent years and which proved such a dead failure. And this psychology of boycotts will, it is feared, be carried over into the post-reform period. Swarajists therefore desire to check this tendency at the very first occasion when it is discerned. That, to our thinking, is the true in-

wardness of "the widespread opposition", as the *Janmabhumi* says, "which Congress members of Councils have evinced towards the proposed step." Otherwise the opposition now offered would appear to be almost as disproportionate to the Working Committee's proposal as the proposal itself is to the prolongation of the life of the Councils to which it is meant as an answer.

By the bye, we would like to disabuse our valued contemporary of the ideas that it cherishes about "Moderates" and other parties who stand out of the Congress. The *Janmabhumi* is unable to understand why *they* should be opposed to the Delhi proposal. By all considerations of self-interest and national interest they should be glad of it. "One should have thought," it says, "under these circumstances that all these parties would jump with joy at the news that this pest of Congress members pursuing a dog-in-the-manger policy—forming ministries neither themselves nor allowing their comrades to form such ministries—would be wiped out altogether from the Council Chambers and leave the field open to those that wanted to co-operate with Government." If "Moderates" merely consulted their separate party interests they would no doubt, if not "jump with joy," inwardly rejoice at the turn N.C.O.'s are giving to Swarajist politics. But "Moderates" are very moderate in studying their personal interests: they are given to looking beyond their nose, and subordinating party advantage to the common weal. They are very much grieved, more grieved than they can tell, that opportunities of doing service to the nation opened to them by the Reform Act have been largely thrown away in pursuance of a will-o'-the-wisp. It is not enough that a party or two should undertake to work the reforms. Every party must pull its full weight and make its special contribution to the up-building of political life. Moderates have never felt happy about such monopoly of power as the abstention of Congressmen gave them in the first term of Councils: their one thought has been that of regret that their brothers of other parties have not shared the power with them, to use it for such ends as might seem to them best. Such sentiments, however, seem to be foreign to some of our non-co-operators, who are popularly credited with a larger dose of the emotion of self-sacrificing patriotism than any other set of politicians. To the *Janmabhumi* it is inconceivable that, where party interests would suggest enthusiastic acclamation, Moderates should exhibit mental distress, for opposition they have not offered and cannot offer to the Delhi proposal. What then could be the explanation of this strange phenomenon? The *Janmabhumi* is pat with an answer: "The Moderate and Justice parties fear this (Council ban) as a measure that is pregnant with infinite possibilities for improving the tone of the coming reforms and if this should happen they feel that the credit will all be taken by the Congress and not go to themselves." This of course is none too charitable a suggestion, but the *Janmabhumi* is driven to this hypothesis as no other would work. It goes on: "Otherwise it is impossible

to understand the feelings of people" &c. &c. Well, we would only ask our contemporary whether, in its opinion, a little less low estimate of the possible motives actuating the conduct of its political opponents would be entirely destructive of the high moral plane on which we are told the N.C.O. campaign and the N.C.O. campaigners always move.

A DECLARATION OF LAND REVENUE POLICY.

DURING last week Mr. C. R. Shroff, M.L.C., wrote a letter to H. E. the Governor of Bombay pointing out that the recommendations of the Joint Parliamentary Committee and of the Taxation Enquiry Committee with regard to land revenue had been slighted and set aside by the Government so far; after referring to the unsatisfactory character of the reports of the survey officers in several talukas where recently revised settlements have been completed he warned the Government that if the policy of increased revenue was pursued ruthlessly the people might be compelled to resort to passive resistance. Mr. Shroff made particular reference to the Punjab legislation which has conceded the public demands and requested H. E. the Governor to reconsider the problem and make the necessary change in the present Land Revenue Code. A prompt reply came from the private secretary to H. E. the Governor which might be taken almost as an official declaration of policy; in this reply it is stated that the Bill for amending the Land Revenue Code, which was on the agenda of the Council during the last session, has been dropped and that a fresh Bill framed on sound lines will be prepared shortly. What is more important, so far as the agitation about the revisions pending in the several talukas is concerned, is that an assurance is vouchsafed on behalf of Government that the revised rates which have not yet been levied will be suspended until they are re-examined in the light of new principles that will be ultimately accepted. We are greatly relieved to find that the Government has done the inevitable; after the principles governing the present method of revenue assessment had been challenged by the Broomfield and Maxwell Report it would have been sheer obstinacy to tread the same path when the whole system is on the anvil and likely to be hammered into unknown shapes. We heartily congratulate Sir Frederick Sykes for closely studying the land revenue problem since his arrival and deciding to restrain the unbounded enthusiasm of his officers for prestige and precedent. In fact it has been sickening to hear repeatedly all these months that the Government is simply following the existing practice and time-honoured precedent. What the representatives of the people desire now is a new orientation based on reason, which will bring about adjustments to recent developments and altered circumstances. For instance, the Wingate system, as R. B. Kale has pointed out, has been proved to be out of date owing to the extreme fragmentation of land which did not exist at its inception.

The Broomfield Report has shaken the contention of Government that all the assessments are made

scrupulously according to the rules laid down for the purpose. It is not surprising then that people are everywhere inclined to distrust the accuracy of the data which have been utilized for revised settlements in other places too and it is no use expressing indignation at the sustained agitation for voicing the general feeling against over-assessment. Now that the Government has decided to introduce fresh legislation it is incumbent on them to see that the complaint of over-assessment becomes a thing of the past by the adoption of principles which would commend themselves to the representatives of the people. It is desirable therefore that in drafting the new Bill the Executive side of Government would proceed in consultation with the leaders of the various sections in the Legislative Council instead of starting off at a tangent; in this way they would arrive at a draft legislation which would pass with the least opposition and which would forestall many of the points of contention which are sure to be raised later on. The complete indifference which Government have so far displayed towards the report of the Land Revenue Settlement Committee needs to be replaced by a sincere attempt to profit by the suggestions of the members of the legislature. Much mischief has already resulted from the Executive and the Legislature working at cross purposes in this matter and it is quite obvious that it ought not to be perpetuated.

The question is sure to be raised that if the Broomfield Report has shown the possibility of "demonstrably incorrect" statistics used as a basis for prevailing revised assessments why should not all the revisions in which new rates have been already levied during the last few years be set aside? As a matter of fact a Resolution moved by R. B. Kale in March 1927 actually recommended to the Governor-in-Council to introduce legislation giving effect to the earlier Resolution of March 1924 and make provision "for giving retrospective effect to such legislation in view of the fact that new revision settlements were proceeded with after the Resolution of the 15th March 1924." The reply given by the Revenue Member on behalf of the Government at the time showed the willingness of the Government to accede to the point about giving retrospective effect to the new legislation that would be adopted. After having gone so far as to suspend the revisions that have not yet been realized, it is quite appropriate that the Government should make a declaration about re-examining all the revised assessments which have been realized since March 1924—the date of the Resolution calling upon the Government to suspend all revision of assessment—on the simple ground that being based on likely incorrect statistics and having been arrived at according to a system which has been declared to be vicious, they are unjust as well as inexpedient. It has to be remembered, besides that all the revised assessments have been pressed on in spite of repeated remonstrances from the Council, and have no moral sanction in the light of the principle enunciated by the Joint Parliamentary Committee that the Executive must act with the consent of the Legislature. We think therefore that

the Government would at the earliest opportunity make some sort of pronouncement on this matter which if left in suspense would very likely lead to some misunderstanding.

While we are glad to learn that the Bill which merely put in black and white the existing practice of the Bombay Government with respect to revenue assessment has been definitely, withdrawn, we hope the new Bill will really satisfy the expectations roused by H. E. the Governor's letter making a declaration of Government's future policy. The principal topic on which the legal advisers of Government will have to concentrate will be the rental value and its proper place, among the factors which are considered in deciding the equitable share of the State. Another question equally important from the point of view of constitutional development will be the degree of control exercised by the Legislature over individual assessments, apart from their sanctioning the general principles underlying the assessment and administration of land revenue. It is understood that the Provincial Governments are likely to be fettered in their action by the instructions received from the Government of India, and it is very probable that the outlines of the legislation proposed in this province cannot be fixed unless the Resolution of the latter, which has been promised, has shaped itself. In the meanwhile it is the duty of the Bombay Government to collect all available material that would assist them in arriving at a final judgment.

Now that the Broomfield Committee has given a rude shock to the conscience of the Bombay Government they should lay down the foundations of a more rational system of assessment which would not require tinkering every few years and which would once for all incorporate principles underlying equitable taxation. If the happiness and contentment of the peasantry are to be secured a system will have to be devised which will leave them ample margin of subsistence and reasonable profits on agriculture which in the least ought to amount to the interest on all capital spent. A tax system that does not fulfil this requirement stands condemned.

IS THE WEST DECAYING?

THE *Week* has reproduced from the *New York Forum* an interesting reply given by Mr. G. K. Chesterton to a criticism of the present tendencies of Western civilization by Mr. V. B. Mehta, formerly art critic of the *Bombay Chronicle*; we comment upon a few points in the reply as they are immensely interesting *a propos* of severe strictures passed upon Indian culture by writers of Miss Mayo's ilk. With regard to Mr. Mehta's contention that the Western people regard progress as synonymous with change, Mr. Chesterton admits that the preoccupation with progress in modern times has in fact led to a vast amount of senseless and aimless change which amounts to little more than an appeal to follow the latest fashion and the latest stunt in trade; he equally admits that the presumption that

things improve in process of time so that every century is superior to the one that precedes it, is thoroughly bad philosophy. His retort however is that all the best minds in the West would agree with Mr. Mehta; for instance, Plato, Dante, Montaigne, Swift, Shakespeare, Wordsworth, even Julius Cæsar. In fact according to Mr. Chesterton, Mr. Mehta exaggerates the extent to which the West did worship progress; the worship of it is not a character of the West but of the last century as compared with the previous centuries in the West as well as in the East. The Western world is progressing according to him in the sense that whatever is worth doing will be done more and more successfully so that the good pursued for the time being will be increased in a considerable measure. This we believe has certainly to be granted and it is this propensity which the East is trying to copy for the present. But so far as progress means the concentration of energy in order to achieve something which is regarded as a good or adventure it is, he says, older than Alexander and Aristotle. Mr. Chesterton next proceeds to lay down that even change when it is not progress is welcome if it gives a sort of holiday or a relief from the most spiritual contemplation or active work for society. Mr. Chesterton is in agreement with Mr. Mehta when he says that much of modern democracy has sinned against the ideal of liberty; it daily interferes with the citizen in things in which many of the despots, both oriental and occidental, have in practice left him free. Mr. Mehta says for instance:—"A compulsion, permanent in some countries and periodic in

others, forces the citizen to join the army. Minor prohibitions extend to what he may eat or drink, between what hours he may buy and sell and where he must register the births, marriages, and deaths which take place in his family". But may it not be said that all these things are done for the social good and therefore for the good of the citizen himself? Mr. Chesterton retorts however that such a tyranny did exist in Eastern custom and it was much less easy to alter it or even to criticize it. And he is quite right in this; very likely the appellation 'unchanging' applied to the East is based upon the perception of this phenomenon in the East. Mr. Chesterton again objects to the religious system prevailing in the East which identifies morals and manners too much in one's routine and lacks the sort of ideas that can maintain a continual criticism from within. In the West, Mr. Chesterton attributes such critical activity not to the doctrine of progress but to the Christian doctrine of the Fall; in other words it is based upon a suspicion that everything left to itself is continually falling. The East, he thinks, does not allow for the fact that sin is perpetually rotting away the institutions of men and hence some of the Asiatic systems of religion make the social system too sacred. Another defect of the East according to him is that the feeling of incessant vigilance and fight against sin is far less present in Eastern mysticisms, than in Christian mysticism. This is a very debatable point but so far as India is concerned we should think that Buddhism has this feeling in ample measure.

WHAT IS INDIA GOING TO SAY?

INDIA will be consulted: what is going to be her answer?

The Speech from the Throne (July 2) contains no mention of India's domestic affairs, but in making a declaration of the Imperial Government's foreign policy, India is mentioned thrice along with self-governing Dominions as being invited to offer advice on three questions relating to external affairs, viz. (1) naval disarmament, (2) the Optional Clause of the World Court's Statute, and (3) resumption of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Government. In such matters India is entitled to co-operate with Dominions and Great Britain herself on a footing of perfect equality in evolving a common imperial policy, and, in the event of failure to reach agreement, she has a right to independent policy, the same as other "autonomous communities within the British Empire." There may perhaps be some question as to the expediency of India working out in practice the fullest expression of "autonomy" in particular circumstances, but her right to do so is beyond dispute.

Of the three questions referred to above, that of the Optional Clause is one in regard to which the public would like to know whether India will exert her influence on the side of signing and ratifying the Clause or on the other side. Such an inquiry becomes necessary in view of the sinister part

India was made to play in connexion with the Geneva Protocol. She was then represented—a sheer misrepresentation—as being unwilling to accept the Protocol. There is no doubt that she was then used as a stalking-horse to cover the British Government's own reluctance. If the India Office, which presumably spoke for "India," had then nothing in mind but to say ditto to its supposed master, the Imperial Cabinet, we have nothing to fear: for the Labour Government, which is now installed at Downing Street, will probably be able to get from the India Office with equal facility an answer directly contrary to what it gave to the Tory Government. Still it is of importance for the people of India to let their views be known to the authorities who act as their spokesmen in questions of foreign policy and to make these accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court—not because the British Government wishes it, but because the people of India demand it.

Now what is the Optional Clause? Machinery has been provided in the Permanent Court of International Justice for international disputes not settled by diplomacy being submitted for juridical decisions; and in proportion as use is made of this machinery would resort to war be unnecessary, and reduction of armaments possible. In order, however, that this kind of arbitration may be re-

garded as a satisfying equivalent for war, it is not enough merely that nations occasionally take their controversies to the World Court, but it is necessary that all nations should bind themselves to refer all their disputes to the Court and to accept its decisions unreservedly. Unless such a universal and comprehensive arbitration system is established it is obvious that fear of war cannot be exorcised and a feeling of security induced. As a first step to this all-in arbitration, an effort is being made to persuade all nations to submit all their legal or justiciable disputes involving questions of fact or of accepted international law to the World Court, leaving on one side for the present other questions of a political or non-justiciable nature. It goes without saying that of these two categories of question the former will be more readily accepted as suitable for arbitration than the latter. In the British Government's Note to the League of Nations (Jan. 1928) justiciable questions are defined as those in which "the parties are in conflict as to their respective rights" and non-justiciable questions as those in which "the dispute arises because there is a divergence of view as to the political interests and aspirations of the parties", and the Note itself declares that "non-justiciable disputes are less suitable for submission to a tribunal invested with the power of giving a binding decision." The attempt is therefore confined at present to get all the countries who have joined the League to submit to judicial process all their controversies capable of being settled with reference to law. The League members are already under a kind of obligation to arbitrate justiciable disputes, for Article 13 of the Covenant says: "The members of the League agree that whenever any dispute shall arise between them which they recognise to be suitable for submission to arbitration, or judicial settlement and which cannot be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole subject-matter to arbitration or judicial settlement." But the Article leaves it to the nations concerned to regard any particular dispute as suitable or unsuitable for submission to arbitration, and therefore it is in the power of any nation to evade the obligation to arbitrate merely by declaring the dispute to be unsuitable. In the first draft of the World Court's Statute, the Committee of Jurists had invested the Court with compulsory jurisdiction over all justiciable disputes (i. e. "disputes as to (1) the interpretation of a treaty, (2) as to any question of international law, (3) as to the existence of any fact which if established would constitute a breach of any international obligation, or (4) as to the extent and nature of the reparation to be made for any such breach"). But, owing to the opposition of Great Britain and France, the Council was obliged to delete this provision. And the Statute contains what is known as an Optional Clause which is open to the States signatories of the Statute to accept or decline as they think fit. If a State signs and ratifies this clause it recognises as compulsory, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all justiciable disputes.

This Clause is now in force between seventeen States, but Great Britain is not among them. It is the policy of the MacDonald Government to accept the obligation for compulsory arbitration on behalf of the British Empire, and India will be consulted in regard to it. We have no doubt that the people of India will desire to give unreserved and enthusiastic support to Mr. MacDonald, and they must see to it that whoever has the authority under the existing constitution to speak for India will answer in the same sense. They must not allow "India" to be used to pull out chestnuts out of the fire for the British Government as they did without protest in 1925. The matter is so important that the text of the statement then made by Sir Austen Chamberlain should be recalled to mind. He said:—

His Majesty's Government have found it impossible, in the time at their disposal, to confer personally with the representatives of the Dominions and of India, who are also members of the League, but we have been in telegraphic communication with them, from which it appears that the Governments of the Dominion of Canada, of the Commonwealth of Australia, of New Zealand, of the Union of South Africa, and of India, are also unable to accept the Protocol. Their views will be made known in such a manner as they may think fit either by a communication to the Secretariat, or to the Assembly, or otherwise.

I am not yet in possession of the views of the Irish Free State.

When the views were made known in the Assembly in September they appeared to be quite different from what they were represented to be by Sir A. Chamberlain. "The only one of the Dominions to take part in the discussions of the Protocol at that time was Canada; her delegate stated that while the Government of Ottawa found certain objections in the Protocol as drafted, it was prepared to go considerably further toward compulsory arbitration than the mother country. The feeling that the British Foreign Minister had not adequately expressed the attitude of the Dominions on the Protocol was not an inconsiderable element in their decision to secure direct representation on the Council; the Irish Free State, in fact, was ready to accept the Protocol and was with difficulty persuaded not to do so". (Howland in "Survey of American Foreign Relations, 1928.")

It would be interesting to know why India's spokesman expressed an adverse opinion by telegraph earlier and was silent later at the Assembly meeting; and, further, who this spokesman was. Was the opinion arrived at by the Government of India? or by the India Office? or was it forced upon the latter by the British Cabinet? The question is very important in the present anomalous relation of India to the League. She enjoys autonomy in foreign affairs but occupies a position of subordination in internal affairs. We should know if autonomy which is hers in theory in the former sphere is nullified in practice by her subordination in the latter

Other members of the League too would like to know, for they would surely object to Great Britain being given an additional vote on account of India. It is clear that in the matter of signing the Optional Clause too the British Government has been using India and the Dominions as a cover for its own inaction. Where it feels keenly it either takes no account of India and the Dominions or manages to persuade them to share its own view. It had strong convictions about the necessity and expediency of bringing about Locarno accords and pledging its whole resources in enforcing them and this it did without even consulting the Dominions and India. The Locarno accords merely applied to a limited region the principle of compulsory arbitration which the Optional Clause is intended to apply to the whole world. As Mr. Howland has put it, having prescribed the medicine to France and Germany, the British Government cannot now refuse to take it itself. The Labour Government of course is committed to signing the Optional Clause. The Liberal Party is strongly in favour of it, so are a number of Conservatives. The signature would therefore present no difficulty in England. India must interpose no difficulty of her own, but show her readiness to join in. If the settled policy of the Government in India is to dance to the tune of the Government in Great Britain, no difficulty would perhaps be raised at this end. But the constitutional position must be clearly defined: what is the amount of influence or pressure that the India Office, and through the India Office the British Government, exercises upon the Government of India? So far as the Indian people are concerned, their desire undoubtedly is that the British Government should pledge itself to accept arbitration in all justiciable disputes without excepting cases affecting "vital interests or national honour" and should undertake in no circumstances to go any more to war.

Reviews.

A GREAT MAHOMEDAN NATIONALIST.

ZAKA ULLAH OF DELHI. BY C. F. ANDREWS.
(Heffer.) 1929. 220m. 159p. 7s. 6d.

MR. ANDREWS is rapidly adding to his other notable services to India by the production of invaluable documents for the benefit of future students of Indian history. Last year he edited a volume of Tagore's letters, of which the reviewer in the *Times Literary Supplement* remarked that no student of Indian affairs could afford to miss a book of such outstanding importance for the understanding of the Indian mind during the non-co-operation days. He is now, we learn, engaged on a full length biographical study of Mr. Gandhi. Meanwhile in his *Zaka Ullah of Delhi* he has given us the story of another of his Indian friends, who, though a far lesser figure than the other two, was a notable product of the new age which the introduction of the western learning into Delhi in 1827 ushered in, and his life and work, in his biographer's estimation, anticipated some of

the aims and ideals embodied in Rabindranath Tagore's work at Santiniketan. Munshi Zaka Ullah, who was born in 1832 and died in 1911, was "the last relic in Delhi of an age that has passed away". His life covered a period of transition, and in his personality Mr. Andrews discerns "a remarkable combination of the past and the present," "the old world of India blending with the new". He draws for us the portrait of one who, "wandering between two worlds" had nevertheless one foot firmly planted in each, and embodied in his character and activity ideals and convictions of permanent value for India.

The book, besides being a moving personal record, includes an attempt to sketch the historical background of Zaka Ullah's life. There are vivid pictures of life in old Delhi in the last days of the Moghul Court, of the coming of the New Learning and of the Mutiny in Delhi, while an illuminating and critical account is given of the amazing hold upon the imagination of idealistic Indians during latter part of the nineteenth century exercised by a semi-mythical idea of Gladstone and Queen Victoria as the perfect patterns of virtue and religion and political liberalism. The reconstruction of the earlier period is based upon conversations with survivors and needs, as the author himself admits, to be critically tested in the light of contemporary documents. But the general picture carries conviction, the lights and shades seem judiciously distributed in the portrayal of the old Moghul Court with its faded splendours, the shadow without the substance of sovereignty, its decadent sports and empty ceremonial, senile dilettante puppet monarch, who yet, amid quarrelling princes and sycophantic courtiers, fostered the fine arts and gave to Indian literature a new birth. Historical research may modify the details of the picture but is not likely radically to alter its broad outlines and its perspective.

Of the chief subject of the book Mr. Andrews writes from personal knowledge and as an intimate friend. This fact, which gives its peculiar value to the biography, may also create some doubts in the minds of future historians. The record is suffused with a deep personal affection which may tempt students to distrust its objectivity. The personal estimate of the man may indeed have taken a brighter colouring from the eye of friendship; but there is no reason to suspect that contours of character are blurred or distorted. The portrait is eulogistic, but leaves on the mind a clear impression of individual traits, and even of limitations which witness to its essential truth. Zaka Ullah is differentiated from his great contemporary and friend Dr. Nazir Ahmad as belonging to the gentle rather than the forceful type. "He had all the 'sweetness and light' that were needed, but he was not" (like his friend) "a 'son of Thunder'". The excellent pair of portraits in the book confirms this estimate. His friend and biographer surmises that the lack of a masterful personality, even while it endeared him the more, was responsible for the small attention paid by his contemporaries to his original and independent views, and

his pioneer work in popularizing the new western knowledge through the vernacular. Fifty years of his life were devoted to the writing of innumerable books in Urdu on all branches of western learning. The books he himself sadly confessed cumbered shelves and gathered dust unread. The anglicizing tendency of the times was too strong for him and he doubted whether "his life work had not been altogether wasted." Mr. Andrews, however, points out that the issue he raised is still undecided and believes that the final issue will vindicate him as a prophet and pioneer of the true way of education.

Equally important in its message for our own times is the spirit of Zaka Ullah's religion and patriotism. A devout Moslem, he yet loved and was beloved by many Hindus and valued and respected the best elements in the Hindu religion. His own simple faith was so tolerant and free from dogmatism and form alike that he was suspected in early life of an intention to become a Christian and was accused in later years of 'free thinking' and even atheism. His "essential conservatism" renders the first charge highly improbable and his deep though simple piety makes the second incredible. The combination in him of transparent devoutness with a horror of fanaticism and his insistence upon the identification of Indian Moslems' interest with India as their very own motherland, are much needed lessons for to-day. Once when asked what in his view was the greatest need of India, he surprised his questioner by answering—not 'education,' but 'religious toleration'. The record of all this constitutes the book a true "Tract for the Times."

For the student the most illuminating aspect of the book is the insight it gives into the thoughts and feelings of the generation that preceded the age of aggressive nationalism. Zaka Ullah by hereditary association and personal contact in childhood was closely connected with the Court of the last of the Moghuls, and though he frankly acknowledged its corruption and evil he retained a sense of loyalty to the old Emperor himself. At the age of twelve he became one of a group of eager open-minded students of the old Delhi College, who imbibed with avidity all that the new western learning, especially on the scientific side, had to teach. Without ceasing to love the traditions and culture of the great Islamic past, he assimilated the best in modern western culture and learning; his educational work was an attempt at a real synthesis of the two. In politics likewise there were blended together a passionate patriotism and belief in his country's greatness with the conviction of a permanent place for the English in India as a "balancing power" between Hindus and Moslems. He had passed through the horrors of the Mutiny in Delhi and of the English reprisals which followed, but no trace of bitterness remained; the idealisation of Queen Victoria and the faith in British liberalism, incarnated for him in Gladstone and Ripon, displaced the memories of darker pages in the story of British rule. In the interesting record of discussions between him and his friend on India's future destiny, Mr. Andrews sets before us some of

the pros and cons of the burning present-day question of independence or retention of the British connection. Zaka Ullah's views in that controversy wear an out-of-date air but are valuable as a glimpse into an Indian point of view of less than a generation ago and have not all lost their relevancy; and the whirligig of time may even yet bring back their force and point, and Zaka Ullah may prove here also wiser than some of his successors.

At present, as one reads the book, one is conscious of living in a bygone age. The record is at once inspiring and depressing. Mr. Andrews himself feels that in the educational realm we are fallen on wintrier days, and have but a meagre harvest to set beside the amazing growth and vitality of the earlier spring time. The high hopes and noble ideals of the pioneers of the Renaissance have not been completely fulfilled. And even as "we have had no brilliant array of students in modern times (in Delhi)" "such as existed in Zaka Ullah's days", so one is tempted to think we may look to-day as vainly for men to compare, in vigour and hopefulness and beauty of spirit and character, with the little circle of great and good men here described. But such comparison of past and present is as unprofitable as it is uncertain. For Mr. Andrew's purpose in writing the book, it is beside the point. He would have us remember with reverence and gratitude the men into whose labourst as into a rich inheritance, we have entered and profited, by their example and their teaching. And no one who reads this book with an open mind can fail to derive from it both inspiration and light amid the problems and tasks of the present day.

C. B. YOUNG.

THE TRINITY : ARBITRATION, SECURITY, DISARMAMENT.

ARMS OR ARBITRATION? By H. WILSON HARRIS. (Hogarth Press, London.) 1928. 7½ × 5. 93p.

THIS is an excellent little hand-book written from the point of view of a practical man who, while accepting the facts of life as he finds them, is sufficiently optimistic to discover a reason for all the irrational acts of mankind as well as for the illogical utterances of present-day statesmen, who inquires patiently into the validity of that reason, and who, through clear thinking and lucid exposition, brings the reader face to face with certain well-defined and challenging conclusions.

The most important of these is that we have now reached a stage in the evolution of international relations, when governments and peoples have to choose between continued expenditure on armaments and the frank adoption of arbitration as the chief means of settling international disputes. That is to say, so long as any considerable number of materially strong powers refuse to commit themselves to the policy of arbitration, other nations cannot be blamed if for their own security they persist on spending freely on their army or navy or both, as the case may be.

A statement made by Sir Austen Chamberlain before the League of Nations Assembly in 1925 is the text on which the homily of the book is based :

"Our object is not merely that there should be peace, but that all should feel that peace is secure. Disarmament through security and security through arbitration are the common platform of the whole League of Nations."

It is shown that limitation of armaments is a difficult thing, and that no real sense of security is gained thereby. Only when nations agree to refer all sorts of questions to arbitration and are prepared to submit to the decision given, will the fear of war be removed. All who believe, therefore, that disarmament must come through security and that security must come through arbitration ought steadily to be pressing for the signing of comprehensive arbitration treaties, either between individual nations or through a common agreement arrived at by some co-ordinating body like the League of Nations.

Although a British statesman supplies the text for this book, it has some searching questions to ask regarding Britain's attitude during the last five years. An ancient writer has said, "Where there is no vision, the people perish." It is also true that through undue timidity in following its gleam a powerful nation may hold back the moral progress of the world. By always inserting, when formal treaties and declarations are being signed, clauses which provide a loophole for resort to war in exceptional cases, Britain has not given the lead she might have given in the movement towards arbitration. It may be quite true that Britain in some matters has been better than her word, and that she may to a large extent be trusted to make no use of these qualifying clauses. Yet, by refusing to commit herself freely to the principle and practice of arbitration for even those disputes that involve "vital interest" and "national honour", she has discouraged other nations from going forward.

Amongst the pioneers of "all-in" arbitration treaties, as they are called, that is, treaties that make no reservations, Italy and Switzerland hold an honourable place. In spite of their common frontier, "with all the possibility of provocative incidents arising", they were the first pair of European States to reach an agreement of this nature, and this they did twelve months before Locarno! A similar agreement between Germany and France was one of the big achievements of Locarno. For those who have been inclined to be down-hearted because of the slow progress of the arbitration movement, it must be reassuring to know that no fewer than thirty of these "all-in" arbitration treaties had been registered with the League of Nations by the end of 1927. It will be a good day for the world when the so-called "great powers" frankly recognise that, in the words of a Canadian delegate to the League of Nations Assembly in that year, "even a bad compromise is better than being victors in a war".

ANDREW R. LOW.

INDIAN CULTURE.

INDIAN CULTURE THROUGH THE AGES.

Vol. I. By S. V. VENKATESWAR. (Longmans.)
1928. 23cm. 336p. 12s. 6d.

THE volume before us is doubtless indicative of the author's assiduity and his close intimacy with the ancient lore of the Hindus. Prof. Venkateshwar of the Mysore University has presented to the English readers a graphic and exhaustive account of the system of education as obtained in the Vedic and post-Vedic times in India. The references, though numerous, are quite correct and the renderings of the Sanskrit and Vedic passages into English are faultless as well as appropriate, though, we fear, some of the authorities quoted in the text do not establish the propositions for which they are cited. See for instance, the references in the Rigved on p. 66. Similarly the renderings in some cases are a bit inaccurate. For example, it is not correct to say that the teacher who flogged otherwise than in the prescribed manner was guilty as a thief (p. 149). What Manu says is that the flogging teacher should be given the same punishment as is ordained for a thief. The offences of theft and flogging are not treated as similar in nature but punishments prescribed for both are identical.

The author has called his subject the Indian culture. This is quite in keeping with orthodox opinion, which the author still maintains, that the fathers of Vedic literature were the original residents of North India like their Dravidian brethren of South India. Madras, therefore, in company with Bengal, seems disinclined to share the view which the thinking mind of Bombay has adopted in this respect. This however does not affect the main theme of the book; but we fear one is likely to be lost in bewilderment if one essays to find out a continuously and steadily evolved thought in India. India presents an admixture of conflict between different societies; both Aryans and non-Aryans, with different codes of morality and religion and standing at different stages of evolution, were amalgamated and unified with the inevitable result of strange emission and absorption on the part of each of them. The penetrating insight of the Vedic Aryans which aimed at assimilation instead of destruction is the real cause of the survival of the Indian culture. The modern Westerners do not possess this insight and here lies the seed of their annihilation. The Vedic civilization as reflected in the Vedas received a decisive setback when Chaturvarnya was established by admitting within its fold communities representing lower cultural grades. True, these latter surrendered to the Vedic Aryans and acknowledged their supremacy. But the Vedic Aryans had to make tremendous sacrifices to attain this object. The Smriti code is essentially different from the Vedic code, and the Dravidian morals were probably still further distant from either. The learned professor has possibly no definite opinions as to the stock to which the Dravidians originally belonged. He does not believe in the speculative theory of the Dravidian invasion of India. But was their culture Asurian in character? The author thinks it was. Many people however take the Pauranic Rakshasas as the ancestors of the present Dravidians. But in the opinion of Mr. Venkateshwar the Asuras were non-Aryans like the Pishachas. It is problematical whether there is enough evidence pointing in that direction. But whether Aryans or non-Aryans, Asuras seem to be different people from the Rakshasas and hence the importance of the question whether the Dravidians were originally Asuras or Rakshasas.

The aim of the book is described as explaining India's contribution to the world's culture. But we

think the author has overlooked the necessity of prominently and emphatically mentioning to the uninformed readers the special contribution as originally planned by him. On the other hand his remark at p. 305 that Indian education will be seen to compare favourably with that of other countries excites a suspicion that he is apologising to his readers for intrusion on his time.

We are glad to observe that the author has a correct idea as to the real cause of the decline of Indian industries. He rightly states that the Hindu social life was one compact and organic force. It is the disintegration and disorganisation which undermined the foundation of the social fabric and everything else instantly got out of order. It is not however suggested on what new foundations the dismantled house should again be raised.

But apart from these comparatively small defects the book is extremely readable and instructive. The enormous labour spent upon it by the author is fully justified. We therefore await with keen interest the next promised volumes embracing four different subjects as Art, Philosophy, Religion and Public Life. We wish however the immediately following volume to be one on Religion rather than on Art.

N. G. CHAPEKAR.

VIGNETTES OF NATIVE LIFE IN AUSTRALIA.

COO-EE TALKS. By W. ROBERTSON. (Australian Book Co., London.) 1928. 22cm. 198 p. 12s. 6d.

THE Australian native is still a savage possessing all the fine and revolting qualities attached to the barbarous state. To him human energy is something to be cast away and intended to be put to severest trials. If a person stood the test for its own sake of a brutal method of blood-letting which is characteristic of him, and on the top of that went through a lifelong course of tortuous exercises, he received the applause of the tribe and was admitted into the "Inner Bora Circle". Being brought up in an atmosphere of fear and terror, the life of the Australian Children is

"Not all fun and play. There came a time when the boys and girls who had reached the age of about 10 years had to submit themselves for tribal markings. One of the old warriors, or the medicine-man made long cuts with sharp stone or shell knife across the boy's or girl's abdomen. Into these cuts charcoal was rubbed to stop the bleeding and afterwards white clay was used to pack them and cause the skin to heal in hard prominent ridges."

The bull-roarer, the boomerang and the crystal are some of the many tortures, his imagination as well as his body has to endure. He has his gods of good and evil but even they are conceived in the likeness of blood-thirsty monstrosities. Mythology is all his diversion from sanguinary concerns and he is supremely ignorant of the fact that there are more things on earth beyond his narrow legendary ken, enough to baffle a civilised man. The medicine man is the one evil destiny of his life, who introduces bitterness into his quiet tribal life, and sucks the blood out of him whatever the malady he may be suffering from. Corroborees are the spice of his monotonous existence, and blood sometimes flows freely here as on all other occasions. A Corroboree is a communal merry-making attended by dancing,

music, mock fighting, and hunting, all regulated with strict regard for the animal origin of the participant.

But he is not all barbarian; he possesses certain qualities of the heart, which would excite the envy of his civilised neighbour. To him the community is everything, the individual nothing, and it is the sense of communal loyalty that decides the fate of the individuals. He is also the proud inheritor of a paleolithic culture containing a complicated and esoteric ritual and obscure writing, which now he little understands.

The doors of his intimate tribal organisation are sometimes open to the tried white man. Ordinarily, the embittered native sings the song of "Death to the white man" and not without good reason. For instead of letting civilisation do its painless work of ending or mending them, in the arrogance of his ill-assimilated culture, the white man mercilessly massacres the unfortunate natives who have every right to live and be civilised.

Robertson's remarkable *Coo-ee Talks* are so many fascinating vignettes of a life which is the nursery of civilisation. It is a book which can never be read and done with, for there is so much that is of perennial interest in it.

K. VENUGOPAL RAO.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- SELECT STATUTES, CASES AND DOCUMENTS TO ILLUSTRATE ENGLISH CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY. (5th Edition.) Ed. by C. GRANT ROBERTSON. (Methuen.) 1928. 23cm. 599p. 12s. 6d.
- FOREIGN COLONIAL ADMINISTRATION IN THE FAR EAST. By HESKETH BELL. (Arnold.) 1928. 23cm. 307p. 16s.
- CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS. By ERNEST J. EBERLING. (Columbia University Press.) 1928. 23cm. 452p.
- THE NEGRO IN OUR HISTORY. By CARTER G. WOODSON. (Associated Publishers, Washington.) 1928. 22cm. 628p. \$3.00.
- THE STRUCTURE OF POLITICS AT THE ACCESSION OF GEORGE III. Vols. 1 & 2. By L. B. NAMIER. (Macmillan.) 1929. 23cm. 616p. 30s.
- A SHORT HISTORY OF THE BRITISH WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT, 1789-1927. Vol. 3. By G. D. H. COLE. (Allen & Unwin.) 22cm. 237p. 6s.
- CREDIT CONTROL: THE PATH OF INDUSTRIAL REVIVAL. By FREDERICK THORESBY. (JOHN BALE.) 1929. 20cm. 89p. 2s. 6d.
- SOCIAL WORK AND LEGISLATION IN SWEDEN. 1928. 22cm. 289p. 5s.
- THE TRUTH ABOUT EVOLUTION AND THE BIBLE. By HARRIETTE AUGUSTA and F. HOMER CURTISS. (The Curtiss Philosophic Co., Washington.) 1929. 20cm. 243p. \$2.50.

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, Dheli.