

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

OFFICE : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S HOME, POONA 4.

VOL. XV, No. 20. }

POONA—THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1932.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK. — —	357
ARTICLES :—	
Prospects of Federation. 	160
Albert Thomas By N. M. Joshi	163
REVIEWS :—	
Co-operation in Bomby. By S. Gopaldaswamy.	162
The Eve of the War. By M. V. Subramanyam.	163
BOOK RECEIVED. 	164

Topics of the Week.

Bombay Riots.

THE communal riots that have disgraced Bombay since last Saturday night are wholly to be deplored. They were attended by murder, arson and pillage on a scale which recall Cawnpore. They are a painful reminder of the electric condition of the communal atmosphere, so electric indeed that the slightest provocation was sufficient to kindle an appalling conflagration. The casualties have been heavy : over a hundred dead and over a thousand wounded, not to speak of property burnt, looted and lost.

The *Times of India* is right in holding that the communal tension was greatly aggravated by the boycott and picketing activities of the Congress. The Muslims have, as a rule, held aloof from the civil disobedience campaign of the Congress, and they did not take tolerantly to the picketing of their shops by Congress volunteers. The action of the Congress in proceeding with their "non-violent" raid on the salt depots at Wadala on Sunday morning, notwithstanding the outbreak of the communal trouble on Saturday night, was, if it was deliberate, little short of a crime. The diversion of the Police to the Wadala sector reduced to some extent the force available in Bombay to deal with the riots when they recommenced on Sunday morning.

But is the Congress alone to blame, if only partly? Has the pro-Muslim policy of the Government no share in the blame? Was it expected that the unconcealed partiality of the Government for the Muslims has not had the indirect effect of encouraging the Muslims to become aggressive and overbearing? Neither the Congress nor the Government wished to promote or provoke mob violence; the former is vowed to non-violence, while the latter is instituted to preserve peace. But their policies, however innocent of violence in intention, are not so innocent in some of their ultimate results.

Simultaneous Reform.

SOME time ago Sir Samuel Hoare assured the ardent expectant in India that, far from delaying matters, a committee under the chairmanship of Lord Sankey was "steadily drafting" a constitution for India. More recently he announced in the Commons that this particular Sankey Committee was merely a "technical committee" to assist a "Cabinet Committee" which was drafting a constitution for India. The supersession of Lord Sankey in favour of Sir Samuel Hoare was ominous, and could not have been for the benefit of India. Now Dr. Shafaat Ahmed Khan, who may well be supposed to know the mind of the Secretary of State, has recommended in a letter to the "Times" that, in as much as even the Moderates did not deny that several years would elapse before the federal constitution could come into operation, the constitution might be divided into two parts, the first dealing with the federal government which might wait till the details get ready, and the other dealing with provincial autonomy which should be introduced forthwith. Sir Tej Bahadur emphatically and promptly repudiated that allegation against the Moderates. Far from striving to accelerate the progress of federation, Dr. Khan and his friends are welcoming delay in order that they may exploit it for the purpose of putting it off and precipitating provincial autonomy. "It would be disastrous," says Sir Tej, "to manoeuvre for position by paying lip homage to the principle of responsibility at the centre on an all-India Federation basis, and postponing, or shelving, its operation by dilatory or obstructive methods." He left no room for doubt that, "Provincial autonomy by itself will never appeal to advanced opinion. It will alienate Moderate opinion and complicate the situation far more than is realised." We hope this warning will not be lost on the Secretary of State.

Whatever be the underlying motives of Dr. Shafaat Khan, there are those who are genuinely concerned over the inter-relation in time of provincial autonomy, central responsibility and federation. If they are to be introduced simultaneously, the last will set the pace. If Dr. Rusbrook Williams is to be believed, "technical details connected with the States' entry are now seen to be so complex that it is doubtful whether constitutional advance in British India can await their elucidation." He further said that there was a danger of States breaking away from the federal idea, (which danger was only saved by the tact of the Jam Sahab) and that at any rate, the Princes and their advisers did not regard the federation as immediately feasible. The Princes have not yet agreed among themselves as to how they should share the representation accorded to the States in the federal legislature. The Princes have to agree between themselves before they can agree with British India, and that is not yet in sight. When that will happen nobody can tell, though Lord Lothian, in his interview of the 10th inst. from Simla contemplated

a general election next year on the basis of his franchise proposals. Should it unfortunately happen that his Lordship was rather too optimistic, what is to be done? The Non Brahmin Party in Madras would link up provincial autonomy with central responsibility for simultaneous inauguration and leave out federation. The *Hindu* of Madras has since felt reluctantly compelled to take a similar view. Let us by all means hasten federation and even utilise the impatience of those who yearn for immediate provincial autonomy to accelerate the coming of the federation, but let us not link up central responsibility with federation. Rather, let us stand for simultaneous responsibility in the centre and in the provinces, with or without federation.

To Delay is to Deny.

MR. V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI has issued the following statement:—

I reinforce Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru's warning that often in politics to delay is to deny. Those who approve of an interval between provincial autonomy and central responsibility on a federal basis play the game of those who do not wish a second step. The difficulties in shaping the federation are exaggerated in the interests of reaction.

I repeat the earnest entreaty made many times before that our Moslem brethren in pressing their claims should not block intentionally or unintentionally the country's advance. Excessive eagerness for one step necessarily weakens the cause of the other. Instead of proving British good faith, the hastening of provincial autonomy will engender profound suspicion and stimulate the forces of disorder.

I would remind the Princes that at their instance we agreed to a federation of All-India in the place of the reform of British India only. By undue hesitancy and proposals to attenuate the federal tie and demands which British India cannot accept they only strengthen the elements of obstruction both here and in England.

Remembering that the failure of federation will involve both British India and the States in an inevitable disaster, we implore them in the name of peaceful progress to continue and complete the good work they began in 1930 by introducing a comprehensive idea of federation.

The Princes *Inter se*.

REPRESENTATIVES of over forty Indian States, and among them Hyderabad, met in Bombay last week and came to some important decisions. One of them refers to the representation of the States in the Upper Chamber of the Federal legislature. The Sankey Scheme allotted eighty seats to the States. The meeting strongly felt that this quota was insufficient in view "of the importance of the States as a body and for the purpose of providing their due and adequate representation". It, therefore, demanded that 125 seats be reserved for the States.

The difficulties of the Princes are quite understandable. Every one of the six hundred and odd Princes claims equality of status in a federation, irrespective of other considerations, and every one claims a seat in the federation. They recognised, however, that it would make the legislature a mammoth in size. A line had to be drawn somewhere to limit the States' representation. Membership of the Chamber of Princes offered a convenient basis. The Princes therefore decided that all present and prospective members of the Chamber in their individual right should each have a seat in the Upper Federal Chamber, the others being represented collectively. The

present members of the Chamber in their own right will account for 108 seats; and the rest are wanted for the collective representation of the others. Hence the Princes' demand for 125 seats.

But it is doubtful if the Princes' representation can be stabilised at this number. For the resolution contemplates that "additional States as may be found qualified under the existing test for admission to such membership" shall also get a seat each in the Upper Chamber. It appears then that only the tests for admission to the Chamber are stabilised, not the membership itself. If more members are admitted, is it intended that the Princes' quota in the Upper Federal Chamber should be correspondingly increased? Was it not possible for the Princes to have applied the tests here and now and ascertained definitely the new additions to be made?

But the most significant of the Bombay decisions was undoubtedly the principle of *equal individual representation* to all States who are members in their own right, irrespective of the rank of a Prince in the Princely hierarchy and the size, population, revenue, etcetera of his State. Did Hyderabad agree to it? Will Mysore and the other States not represented in Bombay agree to it?

Cabinet Retrenchment.

It is some months since the Governor of Bombay announced that he was contemplating reconstituting his Cabinet by reducing its strength and reallocating portfolios among a smaller crew. Yet no decision has so far been taken, but rumours are flying about regarding the impending changes. It was said that the Governor's proposal was frowned upon by the Secretary of State on the ground that it raised the question of the re-constitution of the Provincial Cabinets, which was not confined to Bombay alone but to all the other Provinces, and the question was part and parcel of the larger constitutional changes now under discussion. Under the new regime the probabilities are that the Provincial Cabinets will be larger, though on smaller salaries.

The desire of the Governor of Bombay to secure economy is laudable and the only way he can achieve it is by reducing the number of the Executive Councilors and Ministers. Other Provinces may profit by the example of Bombay. The value of the proposal will, however, be reduced the longer it is postponed. The reconstitution of the Cabinet is not an easy task. Communal considerations obtrude themselves forcibly not only in the constitution of the Ministry but of the Executive Council as well. The tradition has set, and it will be hard to ignore it. Nevertheless, the Governor will be doing the right thing if for once he set aside communal considerations and appointed the best men to whatever community they belong. Will a Ministry of the kind retain the confidence of the Legislative Council or will the communalists make a dead set against it and drive it out of office? There is that element of risk. But it is quite possible that the Ministry will survive. In the past the Government have not hesitated to use their voting strength to sustain in office a communal Minister; they may use it with better justification to sustain a national Ministry for once. Secondly, some twenty seven members of the Legislative Council have promised the Governor in advance that they would support any national Ministry chosen for the efficiency and integrity of the personnel. Thirdly, it is not often that a Ministry in office is thrown out when once it is in office. A national Ministry once set up will by its work justify itself and gather increasing support from the Council. It is an experiment well worth trying. At the worst, the Ministry will be defeated and it will open to the Governor then to revert to the communal Ministry.

Foreign Recruitment.

THE Committee of the United Provinces Indian Civil Service Association is reported to have prepared a memorandum for presentation to the Government in which it was urged that further recruitment to the Indian Civil Service, either in England or in India, should be stopped, that the present members of the Service should be "bought out" and that the service itself should be abolished as soon as possible. Apart from the considerations urged by the Committee, there is an immediate need to suspend further recruitment for a time at least, since, on account of retrenchment and economy, several posts have been abolished and there is a surplus of officers without work. The reasons urged by the Committee are for a permanent stoppage of recruitment and the "liquidation" of the present incumbents. The first reason is that past experience in other countries has demonstrated that it was not possible to impose on India under Home Rule a service recruited by the Secretary of State. It may be said, however, that even to-day though the Secretary of State recruits the members of the Service, he does not control them in their daily duties; they serve under the Provincial Governments, and under the Government of India. This argument, though there is much in it, is not conclusive. The second reason is that Indians regard such a Service as intolerable and any safeguards imposed to protect the members in their rights will prove illusory. This is rather unfair to Indians. If they give their free consent to any safeguards, there is no reason to apprehend that they will not keep their promise, unless the Service goes back on its tradition of loyalty to the Government it serves under. Whatever the adequacy of the reasons urged by the Committee, there is no doubt that it is very advisable that further recruitment from England for any service in India should be stopped, except for special cases.

The demand of the Committee that a special committee should be appointed to decide whether the new constitution would adversely affect the existing rights and future prospects of the present members and to fix the compensation payable to them for such loss, is unreasonable and untenable. Those who entered the Service since the inauguration of the Montagu Reforms knew full well that the Indian constitution would not mark time at that stage but was on the high road to *Swaraj*. They knew what was in store for them, and cannot now pretend that they would suffer losses which they did not anticipate. The question of compensation, therefore, does not arise. Existing contracts will be scrupulously observed because it is not only a matter of honour with India, but because, India will not wish to change horses in midstream and will be anxious to retain the existing members for their normal term. But if any members do not care to serve the new constitution with loyalty and efficiency, they are welcome to resign.

While it is very necessary that recruitment by the Secretary of State should forthwith be stopped, it would be unwise to abolish the all-India basis of the Indian Civil and some other services. Provincialisation of all the services will not be to the advantage of India; it will only aggravate the fissiparous tendencies so conspicuous in India. Moreover, some Provinces are not in a position yet to supply the required number of officers of the requisite calibre. The present system of recruitment on an all-India basis has brought about certain uniformity of standards of administration and efficiency, which it is worth while to preserve. Recruitment on an all-India basis will, to some appreciable extent, correct the communal idiosyncrasies of provincial recruitment and provide a comparatively neutral element in times of communal tension. At least the Indian Civil and

the Indian Police Services should, for a long time to come, be recruited on an all-India basis by the public Services Commission with the Government of India.

Railway Strike.

THE Trade Union Congress has done the Railwaymen no good when, at its recent meeting in Nagpur, it recommended a general strike on the railways to be brought about as soon as possible. Granting that their grievances are only too true, the railwaymen must realise that there is very little prospect of their agitation bringing them appreciable relief. The political and economic conditions are not at all favourable, and they will only be burning their fingers. They are relying on a broken reed if they hope that the general public will come to their rescue in a substantial and adequate measure. The Union has not the reserves to sustain the strike for any length of time. Except for those who wish to fish in troubled waters, the strike will do nobody any good. It will add to the present economic and political chaos.

Geographical Enterprise.

IN a recent issue the *Hindu* of Madras wrote that "it was humiliating to India that more is known about Siam in Europe than in this country through from many points of view things should be exactly the other way." There is no need to go so far as Siam to justify the lament of the *Hindu*. Nearer home, in India itself, there are things of which the foreigner knows or cares to know more about than Indians do. The latest instance is the expedition consisting of Germans and Americans to scale the mountain *Nanga Parbat*. The Himalayan explorations, the attempts to climb Mount Everest and Kanchan chunga are other instances that leap to one's mind of geographical adventure in India undertaken by non-Indians. We hope the Geographical Association of Madras which recently held the third Geographical Conference in Madras, will examine the possibilities of organising geographical exploration in India to begin with. Apart from the scientific value of such work, it will provide a new field of adventure for Indian youth and besides, wipe out the stigma which the *Hindu* lamented, and add to India's stature.

The Transvaal Bill.

IT is very gratifying to learn that, true to his promise to the Indian Delegation and the Government of India, Dr. Malan has incorporated in the revised Transvaal Asiatic Tenure Bill all the amendments which he had undertaken to introduce. These amendments will eliminate from the Bill some of its worst features from the Indian point of view. *Indian Opinion*, which judging, as it naturally would, from the standpoint of equality of rights between the European and the Indian in South Africa, was tempted to discount the renewed Cape Town Agreement as a "scrap of paper", admitted that "the Transvaal Land Tenure Bill has no doubt been greatly modified" though it was not free from "ambiguity".

The Bill was down for the second reading in the Union House of Assembly. There is no reason to apprehend that the amendments newly introduced by Dr. Malan will not go through. Parliament. Dr. Malan had taken the precaution of consulting informally the members of the Select Committee which drafted the original bill and which consisted of representatives not only of the Government but of the Opposition. Unless the unexpected happens, we may breath a sigh of relief.

Seva Samiti.

THE Seva Samiti, Allahabad, is one of the largest and best known institutions of Social Service in India. Its annual report for 1930-31 gives an interesting and complete account of the many-sided activities of the organization which was founded seventeen years ago. The Samiti is conducting a High School for Boys, in which scouting and games are a special feature, a reading room and a library and a well equipped hospital with a highly qualified honorary medical staff in Allahabad. In addition to these it maintains at various places small libraries and reading rooms and runs a number of night schools with a total of 520 students on their rolls. It is gratifying to note that most of the students that attend these schools come from the labouring class and agriculturists and include some untouchables also. The Ayurvedic dispensaries of the Institution continue to render free medical aid to the poor and the suffering and relieve them of their bodily ailments. The medicines used in these dispensaries are manufactured in the Samiti's own Rasashala or Pharmacy which is run under the supervision of a trained and qualified Vaidya or an Ayurvedic physician. The Widows' Home at Cawnpore rescues fallen women and orphans and gives them shelter

till they are married or makes them useful members of society by training them up as teachers, midwives or sewing mistresses. The Physical Culture department is conducting a gymnasium in charge of an expert who has been trained in Yogic Physical Culture by Swami Kunalayananda of Lonavala. At the Maghamela and Nagbasu and Sheokoti fairs relief campaigns to the pilgrims were organised by the Samiti. Scouts and very valuable services were rendered by provision of shelters, restoration of stolen property and lost children and old persons, controlling of traffic and prevention of communicable diseases. In Almora, Nainital and Garhwal the Samiti is carrying on propaganda amongst the Naik community with a view to prevent them from bringing up their daughters and young girls to lead a life of shame and prostitution. As a result of this pressure has been brought to bear on the local Government which has very recently passed the Naik Girls Protection Act. The total expenditure of the Samiti amounts to not more than fifty thousand rupees and it is really very creditable to social workers in the United Provinces that such a large volume of work was managed with such economy of funds and speaks volumes for their readiness to render honorary social service.

PROSPECTS OF FEDERATION.

THE deliberations of the Princes and their Advisors who met in Bombay last week have certainly not helped federation; rather, they have made it more difficult. The most weighty reason why the idea of federation was generally welcomed in the first instance was that thereby it would be possible, after a short transitional period, to eliminate British control over India and secure full Dominion Status for India, with all its implications. India would then be governed from India and not from England; the future evolution of the constitution of India would rest with India; and India would be practically independent and wholly free to shape her future without reference to England. This was common ground between the Princes and British Indian leaders; both were keen on eliminating British control over them, and their combination would facilitate the change. The reiteration at Bombay of the resolutions passed at Delhi completely frustrate this primary object. The Princes desire that the Crown should guarantee them certain safeguards. They are not content with internal sanctions for them; they want an external authority to guarantee them. The safeguards are not of a temporary character which, it may be defended, are necessary in the early days of a new and untried experiment; they are of a permanent nature. England is thus to guarantee in perpetuity certain safeguards secured by the Princes.

The Princes demand that "under the Constitution their rights arising from the Treaties or Sanads or Engagements remain inviolate and inviolable" and "the sovereignty and internal independence of the States remain intact and be fully preserved and fully respected and that the obligations of the Crown to the States remain unaltered." At the moment the Princes enjoy such "independence" and "sovereignty"

as the Government of India chooses to tolerate; but under the safeguards that are now demanded, Princes will have to be invested with full powers of internal independence and sovereignty. The obligation of the Crown to secure the Princes in their "inviolable and inviolate" autocracy will remain unaltered. There is no mention, however, of the reciprocal obligation towards the Crown now resting on the Princes that they shall govern their peoples well and progressively. These safeguards will effectively block any prospect of change in the constitution of India. Like the laws of Medes and Persians, the constitution of India will remain unalterable for all time. If the Princes have their way, India can never have Dominion Status.

The Princes are not content with these safeguards, which refer primarily to the autonomy of their States. They have drawn up others which apparently refer to the federation and which are as comprehensive as they are vague. The official *communiqué* goes to say that the "determining factors in the decision of the great majority of the States about entering the Federation are:— (1) The essential safeguards and adequate guarantees and assurances to be given by the Crown by means of Supplementary Treaties, buttressed by Conventions, and due provisions in the Federal Constitution itself, in regard to constitutional and political and fiscal and financial matters, including matters relating to the Federal Court, and (2), the representation of the States in the Federal Legislature, with particular reference to the allocation of seats among the States *inter se*." The *communiqué* does not tell us what exactly are the safeguards that the Princes desire, except that, whatever they may be, they should be guaranteed by every possible means, by external as well as internal sanctions.

As regards representation in the Federal legis-

lature, the Sankey Scheme already allows the Princes, the great bulk of whom are mediæval autocrats, larger representation than is due to them on any rational basis, and further allows representation by nomination by themselves, instead by election by the peoples of the States. The Princes have since demanded fifty per cent share in the Federal Upper Chamber as against forty per cent "noted" in the Sankey Scheme. The Federal Finance Committee has, as we showed last week, altered to the greater disadvantage of British India the already unfair proposals of the Peel Committee with regard to the financial obligations of the States and British India.

Even under these conditions the Princes do not seem to be clear that they should federate at all. The idea of confederation has not yet been scotched. According to the Dewan of Jhalawar, one of the conditions precedent to the Princes joining the federation was the formation of a Confederation of the States, "which many Princes regard as indispensable to their future existence under a federal constitution." Prof. Rushbrook Williams has also said that the Princes would enter the Federation only through a Confederation of States. The All-Parties Ministers' Committee explained the idea to mean that the "policy of the States should be to enter the Federation as a collective unit, but that it should be permissible for those States that may so desire to go in and act individually." If that be the case, the Princes, whatever be the differences among themselves on any question when they meet in their Confederation, will in the Federation act as one unit. This must disillusion the optimists who thought that there was very little in common between the States so separated by distances and so varied in interest, and that, therefore, they would not act as one *bloc*. The fears of those who apprehended that the Princes' *bloc* would replace the present official and nominated *bloc* in the legislature, and, in view of its larger size and of the dependence of the Princes on Britain as their guarantor, would be more reactionary and subservient to British interests, will come true.

The Princes have further decided that for the federation to come into being States representing 51 per cent. of the members of the Chamber of Princes in their own right and whose population was 51 per cent. of the aggregate population of the Indian States was necessary. The second was the only condition "noted" in the Sankey Scheme. The first eight States in the order of their populations together with another small State with only a million population would satisfy that condition. The Princes who met in Bombay contend that the inclusion of these nine States would not amount to "full representation of the States or sufficient or effective participation of the States." They, therefore, would arrest the formation of the Federation unless 51 per cent. of the members of the Chamber in their own right also consent to join. There may be something in this if the decisions of the Federation were binding on States which kept aloof from it. But

if States are free to join the Federation or not, and the decisions do not bind the non-federating States, there seems to be no justification why even a single State which wishes to federate with British India should be prevented from so doing. This apparently un-called-for stipulation is evidently not intended to facilitate the forming of the Federation.

Under the circumstances even the most ardent advocate of federation must feel disheartened and desparate. The inclusion of the Princes may stabilise the constitution, but under the conditions now laid down by them, it will fossilise a reactionary constitution beyond hope of redemption. With every desire to invite, welcome and facilitate the entry of the Princes into a federation, British Indian leaders will be compelled to drop the project, and concentrate on the evolution of the British Indian constitution. This feeling, widely shared, is well expressed by the "Hindu" in its issue of the 13th inst:-

These conditions precedent are calculated to delay, if not thwart, Federation and they may rejoice the hearts of those Conservatives who, when they stipulated that Central Responsibility should hinge on Federation, had devoutly hoped that Federation would never materialise. But His Majesty's Government should clearly understand that if a Federation is blocked by the Princes, British India will not allow constitutional advances to be held in check on this account. It will press for the immediate grant to it of the substance of full responsible self-government, central and provincial. Federation may come later, but when it does, it should be the coping stone on the edifice of a free and united Indian nation.

There are optimists, even on the side of the Princes, who do not share this gloomy view of federation. They are not inclined to take the impossible demands of the Princes at their face value; they do not take them seriously at all. Considering the mediævalism and autocratic traditions of the Princes, it was only to be expected that they would be very over-hesitant, over-cautious and on the defensive when a new idea was proposed. Time and experience of the new constitution will gradually reconcile them to the inevitable changes. The agitation in their States is bound to grow and will soon be irresistible. And willy nilly, the Princes will be compelled to consent to democratic evolution. Moreover, the safeguards now insisted on by the Princes and guaranteed by Britain will, when a crisis comes, prove to be no better than paper safeguards. Witness Ireland. Moreover, the centralising tendency in all federations will assert itself, and a crisis will accelerate the process. The recent example of Australia need not be overlooked. Even in the United States, the federal Government was, by Amendment XVI of the Constitution, empowered to levy direct taxation on the States.

Reliance may be placed on these tendencies if the Princes did not stipulate for an external authority to guarantee an unchangeable constitution. Anomalies and defects may be tolerated at the start provided they are temporary, and the constitution is responsive to public opinion in India.

We realise full well that the action of the Princes will increase British India's difficulties in

attaining responsible government. It may not hurt them very much that British India will not be able to attain self-government and eliminate British control. But they themselves will be no better. It is no secret that the Princes are not enamoured of the present system, that they are sick of the domination of the Political Department and that in practice, their "independence" and "sovereignty" and the integrity of their "treaties, sanads and engagements" are but scraps of paper as often as the present autocratic Government of India wills it. Princes have been deposed; "advice" tendered to the Princes which they might not disregard; officers have been foisted on them whom they did not want; and a thousand other things said and done which considerably militated against their ideas of independence and sovereignty. By their action now, they are but perpetuating the autocracy of the British Government over themselves. It may suit some of the British Conservatives to dissuade the Princes from joining a federation, but will it be to the lasting advantage of the Princes themselves?

ALBERT THOMAS.

BY the death of Albert Thomas the world has lost a distinguished international statesman. He started his public career as a journalist and a writer of the socialist persuasion and subsequently entered the French Parliament as a socialist member. Like most of the socialists of the right wing he took part in the Great War and served in the French Cabinet as a Minister of Munitions and was sent to Russia on a diplomatic mission. At the end of the first session of the International Labour Conference towards the end of 1919 he was appointed by the Governing Body of the Organisation as its first Director and executive head. Mr. H. B. Butler, who acted as the Secretary General of the First Conference, was appointed Deputy Director. It is a high tribute to the great personality and ability of M. Thomas and to the tact and loyalty of Mr. Butler that these two persons, very capable in their own ways, should have, by their perfectly harmonious co-operation, raised the I. L. O. to its present eminence and achieved results of which any two men may be proud. The history of the I. L. O. since its beginning to this day is also the story of the life of Albert Thomas during the last twelve years. Started as a subsidiary branch of the League of Nations, the I. L. O. has attained a status in the international world which is hardly exceeded by the League itself, judged by the widespread development of its activities, by the loyalty with which its decisions are respected by the member-nations, by the results achieved in the sphere with which it is concerned and by the spirit which it inspires in all those who are connected with it. It is true that the broad policy of the I. L. O. is decided by the annual conferences and by the Governing Body, but by his forceful character and personality, by his enthusiasm for the cause of social reconstruction, by his capacity to infect others who came into touch with him with the same enthusiasm, by his great industry, by his tact and by his skillful diplomacy and by his real international spirit, Albert

Thomas has left his mark on the policy and administration of the organisation as no other single man has done. Though by temperament and by culture a genuine Frenchman, in his conduct as the Director of the Organisation he never gave room for the suspicion that he allowed his national bent to influence his actions. One of the essentials for the successful working of an international organisation is to secure for its service men who will take a real international view, and Albert Thomas proved by his personal example that men can develop a real international spirit and could win confidence and faith for the ideal of internationalism. He believed in the cause of social justice and his enthusiasm for his work was remarkable. Nothing daunted him and depressed his spirits. He fought hard for the adoption of his policy and programmes, and generally he won. What is more, he imparted his enthusiasm to his whole staff and to all his colleagues. Though an idealist, he was tactful and practical; an enthusiastic and persistent fighter, he could when necessity arose, readily accept a temporary compromise; but in the end he would always carry his point. He was a master of superb and fiery eloquence which always stood him in good stead and enabled him to capture the hearts of his audience. He had a genuine sympathy for backward and oppressed nations and peoples irrespective of race, nationality or colour. He was not only interested in improving the labour conditions in these countries, but within his limited sphere he fearlessly expressed his sympathy with the movements for political freedom and deliverance from foreign domination. Referring India in his speech in 1932, he said "We should like to give our friends from India, even in the midst of their political difficulties, an assurance that we are closely following their industrial and social problem. We express the hope that the spirit of conciliation, which is characteristic of Geneva, may be of great assistance to them in the present difficult circumstances." It is a great pity he was not able to fulfil his long cherished desire to come to India. He keenly followed and kept himself in touch with the political movement in India and recently specially went to London to see Mahatma Gandhi to hear from him personally his gospel and policy and also to explain to the Mahatma the ideal of social justice for which his own Organisation stood. In spite of the difficulty of his official position, he presided over Mr. Sastri's lecture on India's struggle *Swaraj* in Paris last year and expressed his sympathy with our political aspirations. In him India has lost a great friend, the working classes of all countries their staunchest champion and the international world its most distinguished and devoted servant.

Reviews.

CO-OPERATION IN BOMBAY.

CO-OPERATION IN BOMBAY: SHORT STUDIES. Ed. by H. L. KAJI. (Taraporewalla, Bombay.) 1930, 25cm. 373p. Rs. 10. THE present work is to be welcomed as a valu-

able addition to the co-operative literature of our country. It is an exposition of the movement as practiced in the Bombay Presidency in the different branches. It is a collection of essays written by prominent co-operators of the Presidency edited by Prof. Kaji.

Bombay has been an enlightened province in co-operative work. She has been the pioneer in several respects. Her Provincial Bank and her Institute—in spite of the accusation of the editor that the latter neglects the undeveloped aspects of the movement—have initiated many a useful and beneficial activity. She has been again the first province to avail herself of the opportunity under the Montford Reforms to have her own Co-operative Act, thus putting into practice the principle of self-determination. In the organisation of labour societies she has some valuable lessons to teach. This splendid record of co-operative activity demands the attention of the workers in other parts of the country and makes the Bombay experience an invaluable guide. For as the editor has justly remarked, "After all, the lines of general advance in the co-operative field have been much the same and the experience of one province is no less a valuable guide to other provinces than experience gained within the provinces themselves."

Besides the Introduction dealing with the general principles, the book has been divided into eleven chapters each dealing with a particular aspect of co-operation, such as rural credit, finance; agricultural supply and marketing, People's Banks, consumers movement, and co-operative law. The chapters on secondary occupations for agriculturists and co-operation among the working classes deserve special attention. The organisation and working of the Provincial Bank and the Institute have been dealt with separately. The editor is responsible for the Introduction as also the chapter on consumer's co-operation. Nine others contribute the remaining chapters. Among these are to be found officials of the Co-operative and allied departments as well as non-officials—all of them tried co-operators of the Province. The Foreword has been contributed by that veteran co-operator, Henry W. Wolff. The Bombay Co-operative Act of 1925 and the Rules framed thereunder have been added as appendices. The inclusion of a number of charts and statistical statements greatly enhances the value of the book.

The subjects dealt with are such as to deserve treatment each in a separate book. A work of this kind necessarily imposes limitations on the comprehensive treatment of the questions involved and the authors have to content themselves sometimes by merely suggesting them. Besides, success or failure of an experiment mostly depends upon local circumstances and conclusions drawn from such experience have to be adopted after due scrutiny. Thus Prof. Kaji's caution to leave the cloth store alone for the present unless it could be started on a large scale and with efficient management should be taken as applicable only to Bombay. Otherwise it would suggest the possibility of this branch remaining closed for co-operative exploitation at least for some time more to come. Moreover experience elsewhere has shown that a moderate measure of success is possible of achievement though not satisfying the conditions laid down as essential for success.

Regarding the future development, stress is laid on the importance of non-credit development. "The ultimate success or failure of the co-operative movement will be determined by the progress in this direction"—not the kind of progress indicated merely by figures and statistics in terms of interest saved, profits realised, savings effected or the prior debts discharged but the advance marked by the inculcation of

the co-operative spirit. The path of the realisation of this noble ideal is not smooth. This sphere of social activity being incapable of affording scope for any spectacular work appeals to but a limited few. But in the case of Bombay Presidency which has done such useful work in the past it is to be confidently hoped that Prof. Kaji's appeal for greater concentration of non-official activity in this direction shall not be in vain.

The grateful thanks of all co-operators are due to Prof. Kaji and his coadjutors for this valuable addition to the co-operative literature of the country.

S. GOPALSWAMY.

THE EVE OF THE WAR.

GERMANY'S ROAD TO RUIN: THE MIDDLE YEARS OF THE REIGN OF THE EMPEROR WILLIAM II. By KARL FRIEDRICH NOWAK. Trs. By E. W. DICKES. (Putnam, London.) 1932. 25cm. 382p. 21/-.

THE learned author's wide reading, his access to documents, and his acquaintance with the ex-Kaiser have enabled him to publish an authoritative account of the middle years of Emperor Wilhelm II. It is no disparagement to this scholarly production to say that for the right understanding of its contents it is necessary to possess some intimate knowledge of the early years of Kaiser Wilhelm II's reign. The author himself has provided it in his earlier volume "Kaiser and Chancellor" which is a brilliant resume of the opening years of the reign of Kaiser Wilhelm II.

The book covers the period 1890-1905, from the Chancellorship of Caprivi to that of Bulow. The story opens with the rejection of the Russian secret treaty. Bismarck had concluded a secret treaty with Russia in 1897, but Caprivi, who succeeded him as Chancellor, discovered that the treaty was advantageous to Russia and not to Germany. The Kaiser agreed with Caprivi and the secret treaty was not renewed. If Bismarck was temperamentally inclined to Tsarism, von Caprivi, his successor, was attracted towards Britain. The Kaiser too, who was "half an Englishman", favoured an alliance with Britain. Kaiser and Chancellor wooed Britain. Conditions were favourable for an understanding with Britain. Queen Victoria loved her grandson. Her Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, heaved a sigh of relief when the news came of Bismarck's downfall and Caprivi's appointment. Taking advantage of these favourable conditions, Kaiser and Chancellor attempted to bring Britain into a Quadruple Alliance with Germany, Austria and Italy. But Britain was not willing to enter into a formal alliance. Germany failed to appreciate Britain's reluctance and attributed to her every sort of sharp practice. The misunderstanding was increased by differences between the two countries in the matter of colonies. The author seems to be of opinion that Germany need not have insisted on a formal treaty, for the situation in the early nineties and considerations of balance of power would have drawn Britain to the Triple Alliance without a treaty.

In spite of the failure to draw Britain into a Quadruple Alliance, the Kaiser was well disposed towards Britain. He did not give up his attempts for an Anglo-German understanding. In 1901 he continued his negotiations for an alliance with Britain. But at this time he was served by a Chancellor who, according to the author, was mainly responsible for all the ills that befell Germany. The foreign policy of Germany was at this time directed by Prince von Bulow, the Chancellor, and "the mysterious

figure of the juggler-calculator, Holstein." The Kaiser was keen on an alliance with Britain, but Bulow and Holstein threw obstacles in the way. Bulow demanded that Germany's partners in the Triple Alliance must be included in the agreement and that the treaty with Britain must be ratified by the British Parliament. Lord Lansdowne was willing to conclude an alliance with Germany and not with Austria-Hungary and Italy. He also refused to allow the treaty to be ratified by Parliament. Instructed by Bulow, the Kaiser insisted on Parliament ratifying the treaty, though he should have known that in England the Cabinet of the morrow was always associated with and committed to the actions of the Cabinet in office and that therefore Parliamentary ratification was unnecessary.

The learned author rightly throws the blame for the break up of the negotiations on Prince von Bulow, the Chancellor and Holstein, the power behind the screen. As he himself says at p. 265, "Much of the whole course of events was mysterious to him, as the Chancellor had kept from him all the connecting links in the negotiations and almost every crucial detail. He did not yet know that a German Chancellor and his adviser, working with an unscrupulousness beyond all measure and an arrogance to match it, with a falsity beyond plumbing, with methods of pretended craftiness and real lying, and above all, with a narrowness without parallel in all history, had destroyed the good relations of two great nations and the peace of the world."

The result of the abortive negotiations was to increase the misunderstanding between England and Germany. Britain was now drawn towards France and the *entente cordiale* was the result. Thereupon the Kaiser planned a continental alliance with Russia and the members of the Triple Alliance but it fell through owing to Bulow's opposition.

Thus the foreign policy directed by Bulow and Holstein resulted in the setting up of two armed camps in Europe, namely, the Triple *Entente*—England, France and Russia—and the Triple Alliance—Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy. Only a pretext was wanting to throw Europe into the vortex of a war. The Serajevo tragedy was the pretext and the Great War began in which Germany was ruined.

The learned author's object is to make future historians speak less condemnatorily of Kaiser Wilhelm II when referring to his responsibility for Germany's downfall. The author points out that on occasions when the Kaiser acted independently of his Chancellors, he achieved great things for Germany. For instance, he acquired Heligoland, he secured Cecil Rhodes' pledge for the acquisition of Samoa, and he obtained for Germany the Bagdad Railway and her influence in Asia-Minor. But in the main lines of foreign policy he relied upon his advisers and it was his reliance on them that led Germany on the road to ruin. On account of their influence over the Reichstag, Chancellor Bulow and Holstein were able to dictate the foreign policy to the Kaiser who, in his loyalty to the constitution, sacrificed the best interests of his country. The learned author points out how the famous telegram to President Kruger after the Jameson Raid was despatched against his will. Baron von Marschal's declaration to Sir Valentine Chirol "that the sending of the telegram had been an act of state and had not represented the Monarch's feeling" clearly supports the author's view. The author also points out that the Kaiser's visit to Tangier was forced on him by Bulow.

The book, in spite of its many excellences, suffers from one defect. The author has, we think, given too much importance to Germany's foreign policy from 1890 to 1905. We wish the author had devoted more pages to the Social Democratic movement in Germany, the cult of militarism, the increase of her naval strength, and many other features which with the mishandling of her foreign policy led Germany on the road to ruin. In spite of these omissions, the book is a valuable addition to the historical literature on Germany. Written with the aid of all available documents and in close co-operation with the ex-Kaiser himself, the book is an authoritative publication on a chapter of Germany's foreign policy. The value of the book has been further enhanced by well-chosen illustrations, and a list of authorities which have formed the basis of this valuable book.

M. V. SUBRAHMANYAM.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE RUIN OF INDIAN TRADE AND INDUSTRIES. (2nd Edn.) By B. D. BASU. (R. Chatterjee, Calcutta.) 20cm. 406p. Rs. 3/6.
- MEDIEVAL INDIA: SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS. By A. YUSUF ALI. (Oxford: University Press, Bombay.) 1932. 20cm. 55p. 5/-
- HINDU FAMILIES IN GUJARAT. Being an Account of their Domestic, Social and Economic Life, By GOVIND-BHAI H. DESAI, (The Baroda State Press, Baroda.) 1932. 20cm. 472p. Rs. 1/13.
- A SHORT HISTORY OF THE WORLD. By H. G. WELLS. (Watts & Co., London.) 1930. 17cm. 31cp. 1/-
- AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF CHARLES DARWIN. By FRANCOIS DARWIN. (Watts & Co., London.) 1929. 17cm. 154p. 1/-
- HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION IN ENGLAND. Vol. 1.—By HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE. (Watts & Co., London.) 17cm. 242p. 1/-
- HISTORICAL TRIALS. (A Selection.) By JOHN MACDONNELL. (Watts & Co., London.) 1931. 17cm. 142p. 1/-

SASTRI SPEAKS.

A record of the writings and speeches of the Right Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P. C., C. H., during his eighteen months' tenure of office as the first Agent of the Government of India in South Africa. A store-house of information on the position of Indians South Africa—political, social, economic, and educational: and as such indispensable to everybody who wishes to understand the South African Indian problem.

Mr. Jan H. Hofmeyr, who contributes a foreword, describes the speeches as

"A real enrichment of our South-African life."

Besides Mr. Sastri's speeches, the Cape Town Agreement, Mr. Sastri's Memorandum and evidence on Indian education in Natal and his reports for 1927 and 1928 are among the valuable documents printed as appendices which highly facilitate an understanding of the Indian position in the Union.

Over 300 pp.

Price: eight shillings net.

The Natal Press,
Pietermaritzburg, South Africa.