

Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO—OFFICE : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S HOME, POONA 4.

VOL. XIV No. 1.

POONA—THURSDAY, JANUARY 1, 1931.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	1
ARTICLES :—	
Looking Back.	4
Progress of the R. T. C. By D. V. A.	5
The Personal Reminiscences of Lord Birkenhead. By Otto Rothfield.	8
REVIEWS :—	
An Indian Mystic Saint. By Father Verrier Elwin.	10
Conditions of Life in Russia. By F. J. Jagirdar.	11
SHORT NOTICES.	12
BOOKS RECEIVED.	12

Topics of the Week.

Impossible Demands.

PERHAPS alone among the political organisations in India, the All-India Muslim League held its annual session this Xmas under the presidency of Dr. Sir Muhammad Iqbal of Lahore. Like Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, Sir Muhammad is a poet who took to politics. For a political body, albeit a Muslim organisation, there is too much infusion of religion in the Presidential Address. It begins with a dissertation on Islam, and a comparative review of Islam and Christianity, etc. Lest the theocratic propensities of India Muslims should be doubted, Sir Muhammad asserted that "Islam is not a church. It is state." It is the misfortune of India that, while wholly Islamic countries, like Turkey and Persia, are throwing off their conception of the theocratic state, the Indian Muslims still hug to their bosom the antiquated notion.

Sir Muhammad claimed that the Indian Muslim is entitled to "full and free development on the lines of his own culture and tradition in his own Indian homeland" as the only and true basis of permanent communal settlement. Nobody had denied him that. The Indian Christians, the Jews and the Parsees, for instance, are equally entitled to cultural development but they do not seek to attain it by the means, the anti-democratic means, that he advances, namely, "the creation of a Muslim India within India" in the north-west of India. If the carving out of a Muslim State is necessary for the cultural growth of Muslims, how does Sir Muhammad propose to secure it for the great majority of Muslims who live in other Provinces of India?

His solution for the communal settlement of India is the creation of a Muslim State along the

North West Frontier, and he advocates the amalgamation of the western districts, with Muslim majorities, of the Punjab, with the Frontier Province, Baluchistan and Sind. The redistribution of Indian provinces on the basis of homogeneity of language, race, religion and identity of economic interests, and investing them with the status of completely autonomous States which will be represented as such in the federal chamber, is his solution. He favours the Simon Scheme, only he wants responsibility in the centre also. He is prepared to oppose the latter if he does not get the former. In the consent of the Indian Princes to come into a federation with British India he sees a conspiracy between Hindu Princes and Hindus of British India to dominate over Muslim India! To safeguard against this danger, he puts up the Muslim demand for representation in the federal chamber. It is no longer a third of the British Indian representation but a third of the total strength of the federal chamber, exclusive of the Muslim State representatives!

It would be a most reactionary step to accept the solution offered by Sir Muhammad Iqbal for the communal deadlock and carve out avowedly Muslim and Hindu States in India, and every legitimate effort must be made to avert that catastrophe. His second alternative is retention of the communal electorate, which is equally disastrous to the national development of India.

There is one ray of democratic hope in the otherwise heavily overcast communal sky of Sir Muhammad. He recognises, by implication, that a wide extension of the franchise will render communal franchise superfluous. Sir Muhammad would have done better if he had developed this theme.

* * *

Taper it off.

COMMON electorate with a large extension of the electorate is the only common ground that is visible on the horizon.

If, unfortunately for India, the communal electorate were retained, we hope there will be no element of compulsion in it and that provision will be made to eliminate it gradually, but as rapidly as possible. It should not be obligatory on a nationalist Muslim, for instance, to enroll himself on the communal roll; it should be open to him to go on the common roll. Communalism should not be thrust on voters; it should be open to them to choose the separate roll. The procedure in preparing the electoral rolls should be to put every voter on the common roll, unless he specifically desires to the contrary. In this wise, it should be possible, as communalism recedes and nationalism advances, to taper off the communal roll and ultimately eliminate it.

It follows from it that representatives chosen on each separate electoral roll should be in proportion to its strength, and as it thins down, the representation

should also be automatically reduced. It would be unfair, for instance, to retain the same representation for a community when its strength on a separate register is, say, halved.

Illiteracy and the Franchise.

THE November issue of the *American Political Science Review* contains a very interesting and, in view of the discussions regarding Indian franchise now proceeding in London, very topical discussion on 'Literacy and the Electorate' by Dr. Arthur W. Bromage of the University of Michigan. The flood of democracy bore down the limitations of the franchise in the United States of America and "in the rise of the common man, both property-owning and tax-paying qualifications for voters disappeared," and later colour and sex ceased to be disqualifications. The franchise has been extended so far that any further extension would enfranchise "aliens, paupers, criminals and lunatics."

It does not follow, however, that no efforts were made or made successfully to limit the electorate and impose restrictions. In the place of property, colour or sex restrictions, some States adopted the familiar literacy test. Illiteracy was made a disqualification. The underlying idea was that the vote should be extended only to those who could exercise it for the common good, and as Lord Bryce said, "The voter who cannot read a newspaper or the election address of a candidate is ill-equipped for voting." But it was the same Lord Bryce who asked: "How far does ability to read and write go towards civic competence? Because it is the only test practically available, we assume it to be an adequate test. Is it really so?" As Mr Bromage puts it, the question is not how far illiteracy disqualifies a man to vote but how far literacy qualifies him.

The history of the adoption of the literacy test in some of the States points to the fact that it was invariably adopted, not so much, if at all, because it ensured higher civic competence in the voter, but because it was a good means of keeping out some unwanted people from the electoral roll. The first State to adopt the literacy test was Connecticut and it did it because it was "the first to comprehend the possibilities of the literacy test in discriminating against immigrants." Other States adopted it to discriminate against racial groups. "The educational test, no longer in eclipse, became a very effective means for the control of the Negro vote"; it was "an instrument to disfranchise Negroes legally."

Mr. Bromage almost apologises for the retention of the literacy test. He pleads that with the "system of compulsory and adult education, day schools and moonlight schools," now happily prevailing in the United States, "it is no injustice to ask the voter to learn the English language. Nor is it a denial of the right to vote. The ballot is tendered upon the fulfilment of a duty which is not onerous but beneficial in its execution. Such is the virtue of the literacy test pursued in and for itself." While favouring the literacy test, he is not one of those "alarmists who picture millions of illiterates swinging national elections every four years, for there is no proof that illiterates have a class consciousness and group solidarity."

In India, where there is no disposition to restrict the electorate or discriminate against certain classes, literacy can be a qualification, but illiteracy cannot be a disqualification for the voter. In the United States, with its system of universal education, the imposition of a literacy test is not a hardship and is not anti-democratic; but in India, with wide-spread illiteracy, it will unduly restrict the electorate, for which there is no justification. From another point of view, it is equally undesirable to institute a

literacy test in India. Adult franchise is the only democratic solution that will solve the communal problem.

How to Federate.

GRANTING that at the Round Table Conference in London it is generally agreed that British India and the Indian States should federate, the question arises how that object can be achieved. Exaggerated claims are being made for the status of the Princes. Sardar D. K. Sen, Legal Adviser to the Maharaja of Patiala, in an obviously inspired book, "The Indian States", which is more partisan than balanced, claims almost sovereign independence to the States. He goes so far as to claim that in case of war between Great Britain and a foreign Power, Indian States are entitled to remain neutral, if they so wished, though he is compelled to admit that since the British Government has the right to march its troops through the territories of Indian States and station troops in them, the Foreign Power is entitled to consider Indian States as enemy territories and refuse them the rights and immunities of neutrality. Even without conceding the extreme position taken up by the Sirdar, it is evident that neither the Government of India nor the British Parliament can legislate for the Indian States or touch their constitutions. The constitution for British India has to be passed by the British Parliament, but the new Government of India Act will find it difficult to provide for a federation and yet make no reference to the Indian States. It is difficult to see how the British Parliament can avoid determining the composition and powers of the federal legislature and executive and the methods of filling them and yet scrupulously avoid any mention of the States. Federation does involve, in however small a measure, the surrender of certain powers now theoretically enjoyed by Princes, and such surrender does affect the internal constitutions of the States, which are their own concern and immune from outside interference. Will it be necessary for the States to make fresh treaties with British India to create a federation? In which case, will it follow that the treaties will be made with the Crown or with the Dominion Government of India; and in either case, will it be open to the British Parliament at any future time to amend its Act constituting the federation? Or, would it be necessary for the British Parliament here and now to transfer its responsibility for the Government of India finally to British Indians and the Indian States, so that all subsequent amendments to the federal Act will rest with the federal legislature without reference to the British Parliament? The Chamber of Princes was created by Royal Proclamation, and a similar procedure may be advocated for the creation of the federal constitution in India, and that leaves it open to the Crown to alter or amend the constitution at a later stage. But can even a Royal Proclamation compel the Indian States to join the federation? Many Indian Princes have not joined the Chamber of Princes.

The Nind Committee.

SOME time ago the Government of India appointed a Committee presided over by Mr. Nind to collect and collate information regarding the financial relations between British India and the Indian States. The Report of the Committee has not yet been published. Considering the extravagant claims made by the princes and the general confusion on the subject, it behoves the Government of India to publish it at once. The discussions at the Round Table Conference on federal finance will be materially influenced by the Report and it is unfair that the Report should be withheld from the public in India. We

trust that the Government of India will speedily release the Report.

The Government should also publish their Despatch on the Butler Committee's Report on the Indian States.

* * *

Beats Delamere.

For a combination of amazing impudence and childish naivety the British settlers in Northern Rhodesia take the cake. Even Lord Delamere might gasp when he reads the precious Representation of the Elected Members of the Legislative Council of Northern Rhodesia on the British Government's Memorandum on Native Policy. These worthy scions of British stock "hold that the British Empire is primarily concerned with the furtherance of the interests of British subjects of British race, and only thereafter with other British subjects, protected races, and the nationals of other countries, in that order." They are scandalised that the Imperial Government preferred the interests of "alien and barbarous races to their own"; they repel with indignation the "claim of the Imperial Government to a higher sense of duty than that manifested by these settlers"; they are "unaware of any formal or legal duty undertaken by or imposed upon the British Government to act as Trustees to the native races in that Territory" in the place of the white settlers; and they disown "any undertaking entered into with the League of Nations by the British Government" because it has been assumed "without the knowledge or consent of, and without consultation with, the peoples of this territory of Northern Rhodesia, white or black, and no mandate from that body is needed or calls for recognition." It is obvious that the Rhodesian settlers are not guilty of under-estimating their high and mighty importance! They do not mince matters, but talk straight from the shoulder. They will brook no nonsense from the Imperial Government and, with kindly consideration for the nerves of that Government, they give it timely warning that "the virility of our race may manifest itself in other directions"; and solemnly repeat that the "unanimous opposition of the white population may take another direction" and indicate that "they may seek, and find sympathy and aid (interested though it may be) from neighbouring colonies enjoying free institutions and more equitable opportunities."

They must have been surprised that their guns did not bring the Imperial citadel toppling down. The British Government is still in the saddle and Lord Passfield curtly dismissed the "Representation".

* * *

Sir Arthur Slater.

There can never be too much of co-operation between Geneva and India. Every opportunity for the co-operation of the League of Nations in the reconstruction of India should be welcomed with open arms. The League can bring to bear its international outlook, knowledge and experience, on Indian problems, which neither the Government of India nor the people of India possess in any large degree. The courtesy of the League in deputing Sir Arthur Slater, Director of the Economic and Financial Section of the League of Nations Secretariat, to India on the invitation of the Government of India, will be highly appreciated in India.

The procedure adopted by the Government of India, however, could be bettered. The object of the Government was "the creation of some organisation for the study of economic questions, including both the continuous interpretation of current developments and the consideration of plans designed to achieve particular purposes." An excellent

purpose, which will be universally welcomed in India. But would it not have been infinitely better if the Government of India had, in the first instance, taken counsel with Indian economists, and with their consent, issued the invitation to Geneva? The Government of India are not going to pretend that there is no talent in India good enough to be worthy of their consultation. They had no reason to fear that Indian economists would have obstructed their path to Geneva. After all, when, on the advice of Sir Arthur, an organisation is created, Indian talent will find a place on it. Or, do the Government intend to import the whole personnel of the organisation from abroad and keep out local talent rigorously? The ineptitude of the Government is amazing. While it was open to them, without any the least risk, to enthuse the country over their objective, they have by their studied neglect, alienated it unnecessarily and at this time, when India is extra sensitive to national prestige and status. But we forget that Sir George Schuster had constituted himself the financial and economic conscience of India, and his wisdom none may question. The Government of India is wooden!

* * *

On Scavenging.

MESSRS V. V. DASTANE and S. P. Patwardhan, members of the "higher" Hindu castes who recently served out their sentences in prison, have in a letter to the press drawn attention to the arrangements in prisons for scavenging. It appears that, under the Jail Rules, prisoners of certain castes among Hindus are alone compelled to do the work, and members of the "Higher" castes, even if they volunteered, are prohibited from doing it. They argue that, while outside the prison, only those, even if they belonged to the "lower" classes, undertake the job who choose to do so, in the jail there is the element of compulsion. A person is compelled to do that work, simply because he belonged to a particular caste, even though by his upbringing and vocation, he was not used to it. It is a grievance that it ought to be possible to set right without much ado. Scavenging may be put on a paid basis in jails, and if any prisoner prefers that job to other work or undertakes it for the wage, he should be allowed to do so and keep his wage.

But apart from this, the whole system of scavenging in India requires looking into. That a caste should be earmarked for the purpose with nothing better to look forward to is inequitable; that a person should start life as a scavenger and end it as such is a cruel fate to consign him or her to. It ought to be the aim of sanitary development to do away with manual scavenging and make it more mechanical. In all towns and even big villages underground drainage and flush latrines ought to be introduced as early as possible. In smaller places the system of public latrines with septic tanks ought to be tried. It is often said that these are too costly to be had. Perhaps the real reason is that the Indian sanitary conscience is rather primitive. Few Indians will put off the marriage of their daughters because they had no money for the wedding or the dowry. It simply has to be done, money or no money; and parents will borrow money or sell off their property but they will not postpone the marriage of their daughters. If our sanitary conscience was half as keen as our sense of the obligation to marry off our daughters, we would not wait till we have surplus money before we go in for sanitary reform; we will tax ourselves or take long-term loans but insist on better sanitary conveniences. The Government will do well to set the example, abolish manual scavenging in Government-controlled places, and introduce flush lavatories and septic tanks. They may well start with the jails and provide them with modern sanitary conveniences.

* * *

Articles.

LOOKING BACK.

ONE of the most eventful and epoch-making years has just closed on India. The commencement of the year saw Mahatma Gandhi cogitating how and in what form the country should be invited to give non-violent battle to the British Government in India. After prolonged search, he pitched upon the breach of the salt law as least open to conscientious objection to begin hostilities with. The famous march to the sea at Dandi followed—a march which gave his campaign unrivalled publicity and drew for it much world sympathy. A world, sore stricken with a violent war and its aftermath, paused with wonder and hope to watch the inauguration of a non-violent war in pursuit of political and social liberty, and the fashioning of a new weapon which relied on the strength of the will and the spirit of man and not on lethal instruments. The success of Gandhi would go farthest to abolish violent war in the world and give an entirely new direction to it. Even those who doubted the righteousness of his quarrel with the British Government wished him, rather his method, success.

Boiling salt out of seawater was too dreary to keep up public excitement for long and the Government declined to come to its aid by refusing to take notice of the breach of the salt law. Something had to be done to save the campaign from premature collapse from inanition and draw the Government into action. The Mahatma promptly dropped his non-aggressive breach of the salt law and launched upon an aggressive raid on the salt depots in Dharasana. He eminently succeeded in his object. Government were drawn into action, and public excitement reached fever pitch. Government responded to the inescapable invitation in the only two ways it knew; non-violent arrest and violent *lathi*. The use of the latter method took the campaigners by surprise but it gained for them ever increasing public sympathy and support. The Government lost more than the campaigners gained; not all joined the Congress but few supported the Government. The moral isolation of the Government was almost complete. Therein lay Mr. Gandhi's triumph.

He was not equally fortunate in other respects. His programme of non-violence, though widely accepted and practised, was marred by some very ugly incidents of extreme violence, and there is reason to apprehend that at the close of the year violence was in the ascendant. His own writings before his dramatic arrest grew more and more bitter in tone and filled the country with a staggering amount of bitterness not only against the British but even against Indians who had the misfortune of differing from the Congress. His main objective of paralysing the Government was as far as ever. As a means of gaining swaraj civil disobedience has not been an improvement on the constitutional method. It has only imposed on the innocent and ill-equipped

proletariat much unnecessary and bootless suffering and privation, from which the latter method would have saved them.

The communal question has been shunned and shirked. During the year the Congress made no effort to find a solution to this question and such little support which it retained from the Muslims was secured only by shirking the communal issue. The Depressed Classes and the Sikhs have, on the whole, held aloof from it. It was non-Congressmen that made repeated efforts towards communal settlement but they received no support from the Congress, and they have failed. Constructive national forces have been driven out of the field, and the non-cooperators and the communalists have it all to themselves. The theory has been hugged with pathetic illusion that the British have only to be eliminated to facilitate communal settlement, forgetting that it is only communal settlement that will facilitate the attainment of Swaraj.

But the greatest misfortune to the country was the breakdown of the peace negotiations initiated by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. M. R. Jayakar. Mr. Gandhi, who was eminently conciliatory, as his earlier authorised interview with Mr. George Slocome showed, chose to surrender to the intransigence of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, refused the invitation to the Round Table Conference to discuss India's future constitution without making impossible stipulations, and let go the only chance of honourable peace to the country. Reconciliation between the Government and the Congress has been rendered thereby impossible until one party or the other laid down arms and ran up the white flag, and neither party has reached that stage. The Congress is however, weakening and the Government is arming itself with more and more drastic powers to cope with the situation. A dozen Ordinances have been promulgated, and some forty thousand people have been cast into prison, and they include some of the tallest poppies, men and women. The Government, by its declarations avowing Dominion Status as the goal of India and its invitation to a free conference in London to discuss how large a devolution of power was possible immediately, put itself in the right, while the Congress, by its refusal to meet, put itself in the wrong.

The only escape from this *impasse* was in exploring ways for a settlement honourable to both combatants. The defeat of the premier national institution or the triumph of civil disobedience was alike disastrous to the country. The non-Congressmen accordingly decided to accept the invitation to the Round Table Conference, notwithstanding that they had no large following in the country, and the composition of the Conference was far from satisfactory.

Though in its main objective the civil disobedience movement must be pronounced a failure, the response it received in the country surprised everybody, including the Mahatma himself. Whatever the merits and the usefulness of the programme, it received an unprecedented amount of support. Never before was such a spectacle witnessed and on such an extensive scale and through the

length and breadth of India. No longer can it be said with any truth that the Congress represented a small intelligentsia; its writ runs through the whole country, if only for certain negative and demonstrative purposes. The masses have been infused with political consciousness as never before.

One of the striking features of the campaign was the support, if secret and cowardly, it received from the merchant class. The merchants financed the movement, and put up with much loss on account of the boycott of foreign cloth of which they had large stocks, though they had to some extent mitigated it by selling in secret. Another achievement of the campaign was the thorough rousing of public opinion in England to the intensity of the national urge in India. It may be a pity but it is nevertheless true that British conscience has been quickened in a remarkable measure only by the civil disobedience campaign in India.

No movement of this kind and dimensions, notwithstanding its negative and suicidal character, can be without adventitious advantages, even as the Great War, though primarily destructive, was not without its beneficent repercussions. The way the women of India have come out from their seclusion in their homes, and taken their share in the battle is a marvel, a miracle. They have taken their share in the thick of the fight, borne the brunt of the picketing campaign, enthused and led their men comrades. The cause of the removal of untouchability, of swadeshi and economic self-sufficiency, self-consciousness in the labour ranks, prohibition, have all received great, though fitful and not always healthy, impetus. In short, India has been roused to political consciousness; the sleeper has been awakened and dormant energies have been released. India is fully awake and vigorously kicking.

Those who have accepted the British Government's invitation to the Round Table Conference realised that the success of the Conference was the only way out of the impossible situation, and were sustained in their hopes by their appreciation of the single-minded devotion of Lord Irwin to the cause of Indian self-government and of the sympathy, if not wholly revealed, of the Labour Cabinet in England. Their difficulties have been immense, and are growing every day. The entry of the Princes into the Conference is no unmixed blessing and the communal question is stiffening instead of softening. The aims of the Princes, the Muslims and the Nationalists are as divergent as they can be. The Princes want a nominal federation with British India and a release from paramountcy; the Muslims want some provinces made over to Muslim rule, and the Nationalists are straining for a united, national Indian State. After six weeks of discussions in several sub-committees, nothing definite has emerged. Even the question of the separation of Burma, which seemed least controversial, is in the melting pot again. The Federal Structure Committee has rivetted its attention on federation and the question of dominion status for British India has taken a back seat. The communal wrangles have become the despair not only of Indians but of the British as well.

The picture is gloomy enough and the year closes on a pessimistic note. It can be said, however, of the delegates to the Round Table Conference that at best they are engaged on a high and mighty task of designing Swaraj for India by peaceful means, of reconciling England and India and of restoring peace and ordered progress in India, while at the worst, they have chosen the lesser evil in preferring the Conference to civil disobedience.

May the current year dispel the clouds and usher in sunshine.

PROGRESS OF THE R. T. C.

DURING mail week Burma occupied much space in British thought, and no wonder she did.

The question of her separation from India had already been debated at the Round Table Conference and it had agreed to separation in principle. What were to be the conditions on which this was to take effect? That was the only point that remained to be thought out and was duly remitted to a strong and representative Committee. The Burmese representatives were of course all for cutting Burma off from India. There was nothing surprising in that; but what did cause some surprise was their going about and speaking as if everyone in Burma wanted separation here and now. That of course was not a fact and the General Council of All Burmese Associations which had prepared a weighty representation against separation and sent it broadcast had seen to it that its voice was heard. Some members of the Burma sub-committee, Mr. Chintamani among them, strongly contested the view that Burma was unanimous on the point and objected to Sir Charles Innes, the Governor of Burma, acting as if he were a separation propagandist. This drew from Lord Reading a certificate of merit for Sir Charles whom he had known for years as a very discreet administrator. But whatever the Buddhists may say, separation of Burma will, very probably, go through the Conference without difficulty. Among the non-Burmese at the Conference, the Princes are strongly in favour of separation for their own reasons. Separation, according to the *New Statesman*, would mean the reduction of the total area of British India from 1,094,000 miles to 860,000 square miles, while that of the Indian States will continue to be 711,000 square miles as before. So that with Burma off the map of India, the relative importance of the Princes in Indian polity under a federal government will doubtless increase. The Princes have not been slow to see this and have naturally encouraged Burma to cut herself adrift from India.

The assassination in broad daylight of Col. Simpson, Inspector General of Prisons in Bengal, by the shots of a revolutionary provided the sensation of the week. It is interesting to compare the comments of the *Morning Post* and the *Manchester Guardian* on the incident. The former has so far lost its balance as to discuss matters which are still *sub judice*, as, e. g. when it says "the connection with Russia was proved in the Meerut conspiracy case." Now, every one who at all reads newspapers knows that nothing is yet proved in the Meerut case, for the trial is still going on.

For the crime itself it holds the Terrorist organisation responsible and refers to its "network over India," quite oblivious of the fact that there are still some provinces like Madras and Bihar and Orissa where no terrorist activity is yet visible. But it surpasses itself when it goes on to connect the Terrorists with the Congress which is as near the truth as the South is near to the North. Then follows the usual patting on the back of the police and the usual blaming of the Government for not supporting such a fine body of public servants as it should be. Finally, the Government is asked "to make it understood that there would be an end to any thought of political change unless these crimes stopped." Having examined this picture, let us now look at the other. The *Manchester Guardian's* comments are, as might be expected, very level-headed. It holds Mr. Gandhi indirectly responsible for the Calcutta outrage, just as it holds Lord Irwin indirectly responsible for the "kind of beastliness" on the part of the Police to which we in Bombay have lately been accustomed. "On the whole," it proceeds to remark, "considering the revolutionary character of present-day Indian Nationalism and the complete irresponsibility of the Central Executive, the amount of violence in India during the last year has been miraculously small." Its diagnosis of the present trouble is also equally commonsense. "Behind this unhappy state of affairs, bringing it to pass, is a restless sense of injustice. Injustice, being wrong, always breeds violence in one form or another." The Round Table Conference is devising ways and means of "making political injustice in India cease to be." If it succeeds, as succeed it must, "the spirit of violence" it thinks "will die." "The way to bring terrorism and repression to an end is not to flourish a big stick, not to agitate against this or that shameful episode, but most earnestly to put right all that is wrong in our relationship with India."

The same contrast can also be observed in the comments of both the papers on the speech delivered during mail week by Sir Claud Jacob who will be recognised in India as a former Commander-in-Chief. Speaking about the Indian demand for Army Indianisation, he gave expression to typically bureaucratic views:—

India has not got the men who can take the place of our officers, and the people who are agitating for the Indianization of the army belong to those races which do not supply a single recruit to our army. Indians who can take the place of British officers may be evolved in time to come, but they are not there to-day and I do not know where they are to come from. We pass a few through the military colleges in England, but the military races in India are uneducated. I see no chance of the Indianization of the Indian Army without bringing the whole structure down with a crash. I do not see how we can possibly withdraw the British Army in India. If we do so the whole fabric of our administration in India will fall to the ground, for it depends on the army. I know that is unpalatable to some people but I am quite certain that I am right.

While the *Morning Post* merely says ditto to all that the ex-Commander-in-Chief has to say on the subject, the *Manchester Guardian* finds him "distinctly sceptical." So far as Sir Claud Jacob is concerned, he cannot conceive of the Indianisation of the Army

during such period of time as he can foresee at present; the *Guardian*, however, does not share this view. It concedes that "Indianisation must take time" but the time so taken must be "measurable."

Though at the Plenary Session the Princes were lavish in their love for Federation, when it came to a question of putting it into effect they have shown little desire to make the necessary sacrifices to make it a real federation. Their idea seems to be to restrict the number of federal subjects as much as possible; and their sole anxiety for the moment appears to be how to bring this about. While so far the Central Government, in exercise of the rights of paramountcy, co-ordinated a common railway policy for the whole of India, the Princes would now appear to insist that the principles on which such authority is to be exercised hereafter should be embodied in the constitution and should be subject to interpretation by the Supreme Court. But obviously it is difficult to foresee all conceivable circumstances in which the Central Government may have to take action for the common good and to provide for it in the constitution. The Princes must therefore be prepared by their voluntary action so to modify their treaties as to enable the federal Government to do so, failing which it would be unsafe to set aside the doctrine of paramountcy. This is realised in official circles and the desirability of making the list of the federal subjects as big as possible is being impressed upon the Princes.

Then, they are reported to be averse to a declaration of rights to be included in the constitution for which Indians have been pressing all these years. Such a declaration has, it is true, little practical value: but its educational value cannot be underestimated, especially in Their Highness' territories. But this too cannot be enforced in their case if they choose to take their stand on the letter of the treaties. From all this it was feared in mail week, if the special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* is to be believed, that the Princes may reduce the powers of the proposed central authority 'so low that federation must prove a fiasco'. But it is hoped better counsels will eventually prevail.

Another question is how and when the Indian States are to come into the federation? On this point the Princes seem to have made it clear that they would do so individually by means of supplementary treaties and that too at their leisure, "each state being left free to remain outside the federation till such time as it judges it expedient to negotiate a supplementary treaty and come inside." This would mean that for some time to come at any rate the Indian federation would consist of all the Indian provinces and very few States. In this case the Princes are afraid that in framing the federation the convenience of the former would be the main consideration. To avoid any unfairness to themselves, several expedients are suggested. One suggestion, according to the special correspondent in question, is that

the Central Executive should be removable only by a vote of both Houses sitting together, as in the Czechoslovakian Constitution. This might be agreeable to those States who desire representation in the Upper rather than in the Lower House. But it is encouraging to find that

the spokesmen of the States realise that they must be represented in that Chamber which exercises effective power by the control of the purse, and that they are therefore prepared to consider sending representatives into a Lower Chamber if necessary.

It is clear from this that the idea of their representation in the Lower, and more popular, Chamber was an after-thought with them, their original intention being to confine their representation only to the Upper Chamber. What is more, they are now asking for equal or almost equal representation with British India in both these Chambers! But why should they be so shy of coming into the Lower House? The explanation is vouchsafed by the Diplomatic Correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* who says that if they were to have any representatives in that Chamber,

it would involve the grant by them to their subjects of a franchise identical with that in force throughout the provinces of British India. The consequence of such a measure would be not only a diminution of their internal sovereignty, but the rapid assimilation of their autonomous States to the mere provinces.

A refusal by the Princes to acquiesce in this proposition may safely be assumed. Nor would it be regretted by the (Hindu Sabha) Extremists in question, who wish for a Centralist or Unitary Government, and would welcome the failure of the Federal conception, because of the influence which the States would undoubtedly exercise in a Federal Legislature and Executive.

The following statement made on behalf of the Princes at a meeting of the Federal Structure Sub-Committee in mail week explains their position

Among the more important statements made on the Princes' behalf were the following:—

1. That they would agree to a federal legislature of two Chambers;
2. That they would require to be represented in both as equal co-partners by nominees chosen by their respective Governments;
3. That they would consent to deal in the federal legislature only with federal subjects, taking no part in matters concerning British India only; and
4. That in matters of dispute involving a joint session of the two Chambers they suggested a 75 per cent. majority as necessary for a settlement.

It was further emphasised on behalf of the Princes that they were not prepared to forgo their sovereignty, but that they did not expect the Provinces to part with uniformity in legislation. They therefore suggested as a solution that laws passed by the federal body should be ratified by the several State Legislatures.

Although an undertaking amounting to a pledge was given that federal laws should be passed by the States' Legislatures, the British Indian delegates were not satisfied with the position, and the matter was left over for further discussion. It is not considered likely, however, that the point will be pressed by the Princes.

A further claim advanced on behalf of the Princes was that with regard to defence, external relations, and other Crown subjects they should have equal rights of discussing and influencing policy in so far as these subjects were not retained by the Crown.

The prospects about a Hindu-Muslim settlement were also gloomy during mail week. After the Hindu and Muslim delegates had failed to reach a settlement Mr. MacDonald offered his good offices to act as a conciliator (and not an arbitrator, as seems to have been wrongly believed in some quarters) and the parties to the dispute met the Prime Minister who was accompanied by the Secretary of State for India

and the Attorney-General. The Muslims seemed doubtful if in regard to any decisions in London the Hindu leaders present at the Conference could "deliver the goods". The latter, according to the *Times*, pointed out that the work of Hindu-Muslim settlement would be considerably facilitated if

at some early date Mr. MacDonald could make an announcement on behalf of his Majesty's Government—in association, if possible, with the Opposition parties—that they were prepared to accept the principle of full provincial autonomy, the introduction of the element of responsibility at the Centre, and a more rapid "Indianization" of the officer ranks of the Army—these being among the outstanding Nationalist claims.

It is reported the Prime Minister was non-committal but said that any agreed policy between the British delegates was itself dependent upon a proper settlement of the Hindu-Muslim problem and "agreement on the general meeting of minority claims," so that it was a vicious circle in which all the parties were running. We have since been told that the negotiations ended in smoke. But it is instructive to note the latest terms proposed in mail week by the Moslem delegates for a settlement. The *Times* says that these

provides that the share of seats in Bengal and the Punjab should be not a bare majority but should be based on population. This would give them 54 per cent. of the seats in Bengal and 56 per cent. in the Punjab. These changes would be made without depriving the Moslem minorities—for the most part relatively small—in other provinces of "the weightage" which exists at present. If the official element in the legislatures of these Provinces disappears they ask that the "weightage" should be proportionately increased.

It is also stipulated that any territorial redistribution that may at any time be necessary should not have the effect of depriving the Moslems of their majority in Bengal, the Punjab, the North-West Frontier Provinces and the newly created Sind. Other Moslem claims—such as adequate safeguards for the protection of their religion and personal law under the Constitution, and their proportionate representation to the extent of at least one-third in the Cabinets, provincial and central—were conceded in principle in the earlier discussions.

Thus while we seem yet to be as far from an understanding between the two great communities as ever, the negotiations themselves have led to some unfortunate results. One of these is Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru's resignation from the Liberal Party with a view to preserve his freedom to go as far as he likes in meeting the wishes of the Muslim delegates. This is, of course, not to say that his erstwhile Liberal colleagues failed him of their support in any attempts he may have made to bring about a Hindu-Muslim settlement. The special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* mentions the facts which, he assures us, are being borne in mind by those engaged in framing a constitution for this country. These are:

1. The Conference does not represent the popular party in India. No scheme for a cautious, tentative advance could possibly attract what is needed—the co-operation of Nationalist India. Hence the Conference must seek to produce a scheme sufficiently drastic, thoroughgoing, and far-reaching to win support even from suspicious, reluctant, and embittered Congress leaders. It would make things easier, too, if Congress leaders could be called into consultation before the scheme is given its final shape.

2. British India will not look at any scheme for an irresponsible executive (unless, perhaps, to tide over a

period of transition), so the All-India Executive must be made responsible to an All-India Legislature.

3. British India will insist that the power of the purse must be in the hands of a Chamber which can fairly be described as being constituted on popular or democratic principles, so far at least as the British Indian portion of it is concerned.

4. It is obvious that the life of the Executive must depend in the main on the goodwill of this Chamber since it has the power of the purse.

5. The States, therefore, if they mean to come into the Federation at all, must send a proportionate share of representatives into this democratic Chamber.

6. British India must agree that it shall be left to the discretion of the States Governments to decide by what methods the representatives assigned to them shall be selected.

8. Some kind of separate British-Indian Chamber or an in-and-out arrangement may have to be devised to enable the democratic Chamber to exclude representatives of the States when discussing purely British Indian questions. It would be better that any question on which the life of the Cabinet depended should be regarded as an all-India question, and that the Speaker should be given discretion to decide doubtful cases.

9. In the constitution of the Cabinet representatives of the States and of British India should be on the same footing.

These bear testimony to a realisation, on the part of the framers of the Indian constitution, of the difficulties of the Indian situation, though they seem to under-rate the strength of feeling among the people of Indian States on the subject of States' representation in the federal legislature by election instead of by nomination by the Princes which seems to be in contemplation.

D. V. A.

PERSONAL REMINISCENCES OF LORD BIRKENHEAD.

WITH Lord Birkenhead's death one of the most vivid personalities of modern political life passed away. He had his enemies as he had his friends: and there were many who disapproved his activities and censored his opinions: but no one could deny the vitality or the stupendous energy and vigour of his character.

When I came up to Oxford, F. E. Smith, as he then was, was still an undergraduate at Wadham College, several years senior to myself. Wadham at that moment had the honour of sheltering three undergraduate celebrities, F. E. Smith, C. B. Fry and—some way after them—John Simon. No one of the three was distinguished by any particular modesty or was the least bit likely to hide away his qualities or abilities; so that it was often suggested in other Colleges that Wadham had better build an extra quadrangle for their sake alone. It was a fact, however, that the three men lent brilliance to a College which had otherwise been obscure. Of the three F. E. Smith was the one most obviously marked out for future distinction.

While he was still an undergraduate my intercourse with the future Lord Birkenhead went little beyond a nodding acquaintance and a few words in passing in the High or at the Union. But when he had brilliantly taken his degree and the Vinerian

University Prize, he was elected to a Fellowship at Merton, my own College, where I was still an undergraduate. His rooms were in Mob Quad, the oldest quadrangle in Oxford which dates from the first years of the 14th century, where I was also fortunate enough to be, and which at one time had also sheltered that erratic but brilliant undergraduate, Lord Randolph Churchill. F. E. Smith was kind enough to invite me to come freely to his rooms, and I saw a fair amount of him in that way, though the difference in seniority naturally kept me outside the closer circle of his friendships. It was impossible to be with him without feeling his power and the magnetic force of his character, and without recognising instinctively that he must rise to somewhere near the highest in his chosen profession of politics.

At that time indeed one of the questions which violently excited undergraduate opinion was the future which awaited both F. E. Smith and the rival orator at the Union, Hilaire Belloc. The two men were contemporaries. They held, or at any rate proclaimed, contrary political beliefs. Their methods of argument and debate were different. Belloc was a convinced and fervid democrat, a believer in the people, a preacher of human equality, views which he combined with an ardent faith in God and in the Catholic religion. When he spoke, it was obvious that he felt what he said with his whole soul, and he rose easily to a poetic and impassioned oratory that held his audience silent and spell-bound. F. E. Smith never created an impression of this kind. The feeling of sincerity and impassioned belief was wanting. One felt always that he was arguing to a brief and might as readily maintain the opposite. Of poetry there was no touch within him. He was hard, material, disputative. But as a debater he was unsurpassed. Though he never inspired, he could often persuade and always ridicule. He was unequalled in quick retort, in sure analysis, and in clear and rapid exposition. He had the House of Commons manner raised to a high degree of wit and brilliance. Belloc's was the oratory of France, of great speakers firing a crowd to vengeance or leading a people to perilous rising and adventures.

Undergraduate opinion on the whole was right in its estimate of the two men's fortunes. They felt that Belloc deserved the highest but hardly hoped he would attain it. The qualities he had were too rare for popular consumption. Besides he was too French, not sufficiently an Englishman: he would never last out the rough and tumble nor tolerate the give and take of public life in England. Of F. E. Smith, on the other hand, there never was any real doubt. He was just the type of man, both on his good and his less good sides, whom the people wanted; who would go down in a Directors' meeting of a Company, in the Law Courts, or at a Select Committee of the House of Commons. Brilliant and exceptionally able as he was, his brilliance and ability were still in kind and class those of the ordinary man raised higher. He had no ideas which might not be shared by everyone, no feelings which transcended the soul of the common herd. He gave quicker and clearer expression to what most Englishmen thought and felt, that was all.

But the rapidity of his grasp and the concentrated intensity of his thought were beyond praise. He had talent of the highest grade; it was only genius that he lacked. And it should in fairness be added that he would always have been devoutly thankful that he had it not. The undergraduate view was unerringly that F. E. Smith would soon be in the Cabinet and would probably become Lord Chancellor. But even at that time most men felt he could never be Prime Minister. Many would have added that he would not even rise to first rank in the Cabinet. They felt in other words, even at that age, a certain want of sincerity, a certain excess of pushful egoism and self-interest which would, or at any rate ought to, preclude him from the highest offices. But of his becoming a Law Officer of the Crown hardly any doubt was possible. In essence the prognostication was true of his career, for his being Secretary of State of India was more an accident than a fitting evolution.

One of the most striking incidents of F. E. Smith's University career was the occasion when he was wrongfully arrested by the police on a charge of assault; and as it happened, I was with him only a couple of minutes before the arrest. King Edward, at that time Prince of Wales, had come to Oxford to open the new Municipal Buildings; and there had been rumours for some days previously that the occasion would be used to revive one of the old Town and Gown Rows when townspeople and undergraduates met and fought in the streets, only fists being used and the fighting being mostly goodnatured. There would have been no harm at all in the row, if it had been left alone. Unfortunately the City Magistrates got it into their heads that such a Town and Gown Row must not be allowed, and therefore imported London police, foot and mounted, who had no experience of high-spirited undergraduates and looked on a bit of playful, if exaggerated, fun as if it were a serious riot and, God knows, an attack upon the Prince of Wales, actually the most popular of man at Oxford. At any rate they began using their batons and charging on horseback into the undergraduate crowds. They were soon to learn that two could play at that game, and the result was that some of the London police were dragged off their horses, others were severely hammered, and by the end of the evening there was not one whose bones did not ache confoundedly all over. The joke of the whole affair was that, with one exception, the few undergraduates arrested were all of the "smug" or working variety, harmless men who had not done anything whatever except be in the streets. By midnight, of course, the business was over, as all undergraduates must be in their Colleges or rooms by that hour. But just a few minutes before midnight I found myself at the door of Vincent's Club, talking to F. E. Smith and young Ridley, the son of the then Home Secretary. The latter was furious at the bungling and gross attacks by the police and talked big about writing to his father to have them punished and so on. F. E. Smith, on the contrary, took a severely tutorial view, saying the police had behaved reasonably on the whole and the undergraduates had brought the trouble on them-

elves. While we were talking, however, we saw a Merton College servant on the other side of the street being taken under arrest to the police station through the streets which were by this time almost deserted. Smith, with his usual *bonhomie*, said he would go and bail the man out; and Ridley and I left him to run to our respective rooms before midnight. Next morning my servant grinned as he pulled up the blinds and said: "Do you know, Sir, Mr. F. E. Smith has been run in?" I threw on my clothes quickly, snatched a hurried breakfast, and tore off to his rooms. There was no question now in his mind of the police having behaved well. On the contrary, there was a volume of lurid and picturesque invective from F. E. Smith. It was I now who reminded him with a smile of the duties of the police and the misconduct of the University. The short and the long of it was that the matter came to trial. It was obvious that the police story was an entire fabrication; they had themselves assaulted Lord Birkenhead, merely because he wanted to bail out the unfortunate servant, and they were sore and took him to be an undergraduate. Smith was defended by Professor Dicey and brought a counter charge. But the sagacity of the local magistrates discharged both parties!

It was about this time too that I remember Lord Birkenhead taking to hunting. He had had no chance before, but he had a real taste for all sport and a desire to excel in each: he had moreover a very keen practical eye to what was socially advantageous and likely to be useful to him in his career. Hunting afforded opportunities for becoming intimate with "the right sort of people." I can still remember him as he was at his first attempt or two with the South Oxfordshire, the pleasant old-fashioned pack, with whom one "rode to hunt" rather than "hunted to ride." It must be added that once he began, "F. E." became a keen follower of hounds and a stout horseman.

After I went down from Oxford and came out to India, I saw nothing of F. E. Smith for nine years till I came home on leave when I next met him in the House of Commons lobby while I was waiting for my host for dinner. I could unfortunately not help being impressed by the difference in his manner when he first saw me sitting humbly alone and afterwards when he saw with whom I was dining. I met him again after the war one day in Paris at Voisin's, the famous restaurant near the Embassy, where he came in with Mr. Bonar Law and another of the British representatives at the peace negotiations while I was at lunch. On this occasion I certainly could not complain of want of cordiality, for he left the distinguished party at once to come and speak to me for quite a long time, an attention which I should have felt as very flattering, had I not happened to be lunching with a very charming French actress. Lord Birkenhead, among his many very human qualities, had no bad eye for a pretty woman.

India, of course, did not like Lord Birkenhead and had no reason to do so. The texture of his mind was not such as to fit him for the office of Secretary of State for India, an office which requires insight, sympathy, and a certain fine and almost poetic feel-

ing. He was unpopular even with the staff and alienated both ex-officials and would-be Indian visitors by being unapproachable to them, though accessible to the London celebrities of the moment. In his time, for instance, the India Office receptions, paid for by public money, were crowded by actors and journalists, while retired officials and Indian visitors of talent and position asked in vain for invitations. There was an unfortunate incident also when he could not recognise one of his colleagues on the India Council from another. Most unfortunate of all was the appointment of the Simon Commission as made on his recommendation with his old Wadham comrade as its Chairman; and his subsequent language when the sagacity and humanity of one of India's best Viceroys strove to undo the mischief already wrought.

It is indeed an unhappy and striking circumstance that Lord Birkenhead, within his own limitations one of the most talented men of his generation and not without a good deal of true, if narrow and interested, patriotism, should twice in his career have all but succeeded in doing his country the greatest disservice possible. It was he, next to Lord Carson, who was responsible for the Ulster "rebellion", which encouraged Germany to think Great Britain's hands to be tied and thereby persuaded her to make war when she did: and it is he again who has been responsible more than any other human being, though less than the general environment of economic distress and general dislike of European industrialisation, for the exasperation of opposition and the bitterness of strife which have led India and Great Britain into such depths of despond.

Apart from these fatalities it is true to say that Lord Birkenhead was a typical Englishman of his class and generation. He would have been unthinkable, for instance, as an Irishman or Scotsman. It was more than an accident, it was predestined that he should bear the name of Smith. He was the typical middle-class Englishman of the industrial cities and might almost have stepped out of a novel by Mr. Arnold Bennett, a keen businessman, judging success by material results, blind to the craving of the soul, ambitious, not over-scrupulous, deep in prejudice and national or racial arrogance, no little of a snob, yet tolerant of all opinions as long as they did not interfere with his comfort or convenience, good-natured, free of malice, quite devoid of fineness or subtlety, and unhesitatingly convinced of the essential rightness of imperialism, big business, and the Protestant Constitution, because they had brought him and his class solidity, respectability and material comfort. With money he was lavish and he was vigorously and insatiably avid of the pleasures of the senses, especially those which derive from quick activity in the open air. Yet his pleasures would never have led him seriously to doubt the foundations of conventional morality, and no amount of excess can ever have made him hesitate about the permanent verities of Protestant and Conservative ethics. He would have been equally contemptuous of anyone who really practised Christianity and of one who denied its validity. There was an undeni-

able coarseness of fibre, a toughness and callosity of inner texture in the man. But his faults were those of his age; they belonged to the character which made him what he was; and future historians will never be able to understand the period without a complete study of the careers of Lord Birkenhead and Mr. Lloyd George. Yet, all said and done, one cannot but admire the machine-like precision of his mind, the intensive concentrated analysis of his thought, the undeflected push and purposeful drive of his whole career, and more than all, the unslaked vigour of his enjoyment of life.

OTTO ROTHFIELD.

Reviews.

AN INDIAN MYSTIC SAINT.

THE LIFE OF RAMAKRISHNA. By ROMAIN ROLLAND. (Trs. from the French by MALCOLM SMITH.) [Advaita Ashram, Mayavati, Almora, U. P.] 92cm. 338 p. Rs. 6/8.

I have no hesitation in describing this work of exquisite sympathy and vast knowledge as one of the most important contributions to the literature of mysticism during this century. In describing and assessing the mysticism of the East, the difficulty has always been to obtain authentic records of first-hand experience. The saints of India have been less ready than their brethren of the West to describe their spiritual adventures. Many of them have not been men of letters; all have honoured that profoundly significant anonymity so characteristic of Eastern religion. Ramakrishna Paramahansa, however, lived in an age which was beginning to realise that the best apology for religion was the religion of the religions. He was surrounded by disciples of scientific and literary ability who have made themselves our debtors by recording so much of their Master's life and words. At last, in the life of Ramakrishna we have a "document" of supreme psychological and spiritual importance. In the hands of M. Romain Rolland, that "document" has been given superb literary form, a universal quality which should carry it across the world, and best of all a grace and beauty which will kindle every reader with a love of God. I myself, an orthodox believer of another creed, nurtured in the very different philosophical tradition of Platonism, reared under a cold grey Northern sky, felt my heart "strangely warmed" as I read, and I was filled with the sense of the warmth, the colour, the passion of religion such as is revealed in the saints of Italy or Spain. I am not afraid to ask every missionary in India to read this book. Were I a millionaire, I would be ready to send a copy of it to every Englishman in India, indeed to every lover of religion in the world. M. Rolland's great mission, I believe, is to the West. "I have dedicated my whole life", he says, "to the reconciliation of mankind. I have striven to bring it about among the peoples of Europe, especially between those two great Western peoples, who are brethren and yet enemies." If England and India are ever to be reconciled, they must understand one another. If England is to understand, she must penetrate deep into the philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi and must appreciate the religion of Ramakrishna. If any Englishman will read *and understand* the two books of M. Rolland on these two key-figures of humanity, he will be a friend of India all his life. And if any Indian will also read them, he will

draw the strength and vision that will enable him to remain a friend of Britain. May M. Rolland win many to his cause of Love!

M. Rolland tells the life-story of Ramakrishna as only he could tell it, illuminating it with many side-lights from the Western mystics. The trend of the narrative is rather unfortunately interrupted, however, by a long chapter on "the Builders of Unity", the makers of modern India, which leads up to a not very edifying controversy between the author and his publishers, the Ramakrishna Mission, adding an appendix to refute certain of M. Rolland's statements. This is surely unnecessary, and we earnestly hope that in future editions of the book, this will be omitted. But this is the only flaw in a book which is otherwise all grace and beauty.

The character of Ramakrishna is drawn in all its vivid attractiveness. We see his power over men, the delicacy and sympathy he gave to Sarada Devi, his wit and humour, the gentle mockery with which he met the portentous and the great, his generous love for all mankind, his universal tolerance, his colossal spiritual capacity. He had the power of epitomising a whole gospel in a sentence. "Jiva is Shiva," he once exclaimed. "Who then dare talk of showing mercy to them? Not mercy, but service, service, for man must be regarded as God." This is the foundation of the innumerable acts of service done by the Ramakrishna Mission. The case against spiritualism has never been put more clearly than this: "If you always think of ghosts, you will become a ghost. If you think of God, you will be God. Choose!" Nor has the purifying influence of sickness been expressed more beautifully. "Illness digs round the roots of your being." He had little patience with silly other-worldliness. "A devotee ought not to be a fool." Our hearts warm to a man who could pray, "O Mother, let me remain in contact with men! Do not make me a dried-up ascetic."

There is no room here to describe the long and beautiful journey of Ramakrishna's soul, his visions, his ecstasies, his ever-deepening spiritual insight, the courage with which he trod the path that leads to the formless Absolute, the love which he poured out at the feet of the Mother who had so often appeared to him. In Ramakrishna, Hinduism is displayed in its deepest, its most moving, its most attractive form. His life was "a living commentary on the text of the *Upanishads*, was in fact the spirit of the *Upanishads* living in human form."

VERRIER ELWIN.

CONDITIONS OF LIFE IN RUSSIA.

A GIRL IN SOVIET RUSSIA. By ANDREE VIOLLETS. Trs. from the French by Homer White. (Thomas Y. Crowell, Co., N. Y.) 1929. 20 cm. 347 p. \$ 2'50.

THE NEW EDUCATION IN THE SOVIET REPUBLIC. By ALBERT P. PINKEVITCH. (John Day Co., New York.) 1929. 24 cm. 403 p. \$ 3'50.

THE 'girl' in "A Girl in Soviet Russia" is a French girl, a journalist, who records her impressions as she visits a few places in Russia. To those acquainted with the theory and history of Bolshevism this book will not only be a delightful reading but it will help them to visualise the new life in Russia. Others, however, will fail to appreciate the sketches it contains.

Among other things, she tells us "How Moscow lodges." "Every citizen has the right to sixteen square *archines* (an *archine* is a little less than a square metre), and pays a rental which corresponds at once to the size of the room he occupies and to his

income." In the course of such distribution of space, the refined and the coarse are huddled together, giving rise to many tragi-comedies. The author sketches the simple restaurants of Moscow, a committee meeting of Kazan, a Soviet factory, the youth, the defunct aristocracy, President Kalinin, surrounded by supplicants (the best of these sketches), the school, and married life.

To judge from this book, Russia seems to be getting along splendidly. Though the country is far from prosperous, the grievances against the Government are soothed by the thought that the motives of the Government are above question; for there no longer exists the exploiting class of capitalists. On the other hand, the Government in their New Economic Policy have gone half way to meet the popular feelings. But besides these, there is a third factor. Bolshevism is an established fact; and the citizen cannot do anything but to adjust himself to it. And this does not seem to be a very hard task, except for the rich, who still remember the old days. The youth have learnt to admire the new order.

And to these three forces must be added the fourth, viz. propaganda, which is as important as education. In fact the two are merged together; and this does not mean that education is degenerated, but that the new view of life permeates the whole system of education, both of the young and the old.

A. P. Pinkevitch, the President of the Second State University of Moscow, in his book on "The New Education in the Soviet Republic," divides the process of education into two classes. "The one embraces the growth and development of the native powers of the individual" which may be called *nurture*. "The other is concerned with the shaping of attitudes, the moulding of character, and the formulation of a philosophy of life". This is called *instruction*. To discover the aim of Soviet education, Pinkevitch puts the test question: What aim of education, under the contemporary social conditions, conforms most completely to the interest of the proletariat as a class? The aim of *nurture* is that the individual should develop into a strong and healthy organism. This general statement would not seem to raise controversy. But it is in the detailed methods and in the concrete applications of principles that the Marxian differs from the bourgeois. The aim of general *instruction* is the development of an outlook upon the world. "This involves the introduction of the individual to an understanding and evaluation of the entire cultural heritage of the present time. Our socialistic understanding and Marxian evaluation will of course differ fundamentally from those of the bourgeoisie. We must educate warriors for socialism who clearly understand the problems of their class."

The editor makes a noteworthy remark about the system adopted and the aim in view. "On the one hand, we see an educational programme organised from top to bottom for the purpose of achieving a fairly definite objective—the building of a collectivistic social order; and, on the other, we see an educational programme of extraordinary scope", consisting not only of boys' and girls' schools but of schools for adults, of the press and the library, of the theatre and the moving picture, of art galleries and museums, of young people's clubs and communistic societies.

Talking of the schools alone, how are they actually different in Russia than those in other countries? Space does not permit us to answer this question. But two features of the Russian school may be noted. Firstly, importance of manual work in the educational system is there recognised more than elsewhere, and practical and theoretical study of the social role of labour is made the central theme. Secondly, the children grow up in their own

collective organisations. The teacher is an organiser, assistant, instructor, and older comrade, but not a superior officer. Every school is a children's commune with its own rules and laws, social work, and enterprises in which both children and adults participate.

The chapter on "The School and Society" is very interesting, briefly tracing the relation between the educational system and contemporary social organisation through different periods of history. The author, throughout the book, surveys in detail the views of eminent educationists in the world. Undoubtedly the specialists in education will find this book interesting, if not enlightening.

P. J. JAGIRDAR.

SHORT NOTICES.

SOME ASPECTS OF HINDU MEDICAL TREATMENT. By DOROTHEA CHAPLIN. (Luzac, London.) 1930. 19 cm. 71 p. 3/6.

THIS small book is sure to prove an eye-opener to many a Westernised Indian doctor. The authoress was herself a patient, and then a disciple, of the late Mr. S. M. Mitra who was practising Hindu Medicine in London from 1905 to 1925. Mr. Mitra's successes were so brilliant that many patients, doomed as *incubables* by Western specialists in England, America, Norway and other countries, began to seek his help and were ultimately *cured*, by Hindu medicines. Mr. Mitra had nothing to conceal about his remedies. He openly showed them to many, published their formulæ, subjected them to chemical tests, and proved their efficacy by actual practice. His remarkable cures won for him a seat, as a representative of Hindu Medicine, in the International Congress of Medicine held in London in 1913, and that body published many of his excellent papers in its Transactions. He thus got a world-wide reputation not only for himself but also for the Ayurvedic Science he represented there.

Mr. Mitra believed, like Sir James Mackenzie, that underlying many diseases there must be some one cause, and that was "Depletion of Nerve-force." According to him Western Medical Science is also slowly recognising it, and Dr. Muthu has clearly shown in his book on Tuberculosis that it is the depleted soil, and not the germ, that causes T. B. Mr. Mitra not only believed in it, but actually based his Ayurvedic treatment on it, and got success in his practice. He had wonderful faith in the efficacy of Makaradhvaja and Chagladya, and it is no wonder that the world-famous firm of E. Merck of Darmstadt in Germany is now preparing Makaradhvaja according to Ayurvedic formula. It is a great pity however that our Westernised Indian doctors have not yet shown the slightest inclination to exploit the golden mine of such world-famous Ayurvedic medicines, and are sheepishly following the Western methods and using the Western drugs. If they were to probe Ayurvedic Science, learn and practise it, then not only will they succeed in their practice, but they will confer an incalculable boon on their helpless brothers and sisters who are dying by thousands for want of medical help and sustenance. We hope Mr. Mitra's wonderful successes in the Ayurvedic Medicine will persuade some of them at least to follow the true Swadeshi method and art in Medicine to the everlasting good of their country.

V. M. BHAT.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE UNITY OF THE WORLD. By GUGLIELMO FERRERO. (Albert & Charles Boni, New York.) 1930. 20cm. 196p. \$2.50.
- GOLD, CREDIT AND EMPLOYMENT, FOUR ESSAYS FOR LAYMEN. By G. D. H. COLE. (Allen & Unwin.) 1930. 20cm. 165p. 5/-.
- EUROPE SINCE WATERLOO. By UPENDRA NATH BALL. (Atma Ram & Sons, Lahore.) 1930. 20cm. 427p. Rs. 3/12/-.
- THE INDIAN PUBLIC DEBT. By D. L. DUBEY. (Taraporevala, Bombay.) 1930. 20cm. 382p. Rs. 8.
- A PEEP INTO THE EARLY HISTORY OF INDIA. (2nd Edn.) By R. G. BHANDARKAR. (Taraporevala, Bombay.) 1930. 20cm. 75p. Rs. 2.
- H. H. OR THE PATHOLOGY OF PRINCES. By KANHAYALAL GAUBA. (Times Publishing Co., Lahore.) 1930. 25cm. 306p. Rs. 7/8.
- THE LONG VIEW, PAPERS AND ADDRESSES. By MARY E. PICHMOND. SELECTED AND EDITED BY JOANNA C. COLCORD. (Russell Sage Foundation, New York.) 1930. 24cm. 648p. \$3.00.
- THE POWER OF INDIA. By MICHAEL PYM. (Putnams, London and New York.) 1930. 23cm. 316p. \$3.50.
- TALES FROM THE PANCHATANTRA. Translated from the Sanskrit by ALFRED WILLIAMS. (Basil Blackwell, Oxford.) 1930. 23cm. 207p. 7/6.
- THE ECONOMIC WAR. By GEORGE PEEL. (Macmillan, London.) 1930. 23cm. 284p. 10/6.
- INDIAN ISLAM, A RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF ISLAM IN INDIA. By MURRAY T. TITUS. (Oxford University Press.) 1930. 23cm. 290p. 12/6.
- LABOUR ORGANISATION. By J. CUNNISON. (Pitman.) 1930. 23cm. 272p. 7/6.
- IS IT SAFE TO WORK? A STUDY OF INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENTS. By EDISON L. BOWERS. (Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston.) 1930. 21cm. 229p. \$2.50.
- MARY'S ASSUMPTION. By RAPHAEL V. O'CONNELL. (The America Press, New York.) 1930. 21cm. 166p. \$1.50.
- RICHARD HENRY TIERNEY, PRIEST OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS. By FRANCIS X. TALBOT. (The America Press, New York.) 1930. 20cm. 200p. \$3.00.
- INDUSTRIAL VILLAGE CHURCHES. By EDMUND DESBRUNNER. (Institute of Social and Religious Research, New York.) 1930. 20cm. 193p. \$1.50.
- AGRICULTURAL MARKETING. By BRIJENDRA NATH BHARGAVA. (Longmans, Calcutta.) 1930. 20cm. 109p. Rs. 2.
- AN INTRODUCTION TO THE MONEY AND BANKING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES. By JOHN PERCIVAL DAY. (Macmillan.) 1930. 20cm. 120p. 4/6.
- RELIGION AND SHORT HISTORY OF THE SIKHS, 1469-1930. By GEORGE BETLEY SCOTT. (The Mitre Press, London.) 1930. 20cm. 96p. 5/-.
- THE SIMON REPORT ON INDIA. AN ABRIDGMENT BY R. W. BROCK. (Dent.) 1930. 20cm. 146p. 2/6.
- THE BEGINNINGS OF LOCAL TAXATION IN THE MADRAS PRESIDENCY. A STUDY IN INDIAN FINANCIAL POLICY, 1863-71. By M. VENKATARANGAIYA. (Longmans, Madras.) 1928. 20cm. 107p. Rs. 3.
- SOCIAL WORK YEAR BOOK, 1929. ED. BY FRED S. HALL. (Russell Sage Foundation, New York.) 1930. 25cm. 600p. \$4.00.
- THE THEORY OF INTEREST. By IRVING FISHER. (Macmillan, London & New York.) 1930. 22cm. 566p. 25/-.
- THE INDIAN STATES, THEIR STATUS, RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS. By D. K. SEN. (Sweet and Maxwell.) 1930. 22cm. 234p. 10/-.