

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XVI, No. 20.

POONA—THURSDAY, MAY 18, 1933.

INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	229
ARTICLES :—	
Safeguards.	231
National Planning.	232
After the Washington Interviews. By Madame L. Morin.	233
The Leprosy Clinic. By Dr. Isaac Santra.	234
OUR LONDON LETTER.	235
REVIEWS :—	
Sidelights on Simon Commission. By D. V. A.	237
"Project Method" in Education. By B. D. Karve.	239
Life of Shivaji. By D. V. Apte.	240
SHORT NOTICE.	240
BOOKS RECEIVED.	240

Topics of the Week.

Peace or Victory.

Sir Samuel Hoare has ignobly surrendered to the Government of India; he would not order the release of political prisoners in India notwithstanding that the Congress President on the advice of Mahatma Gandhi, has "suspended" the civil disobedience campaign. He had nothing to add to the communique of the Government of India. It may be remembered that Sir Samuel Hoare, as quoted by Sir Harry Haig in his statement in the Legislative Assembly on the 1st April last, was content to say: "We must have convincing reasons to believe that their release would not be followed by a revival of civil disobedience." He suggested no definite action on the part of the Congress; it was enough if he was convinced that there would be no revival of civil disobedience. It was Sir Harry Haig who insisted on the Congress guaranteeing that they had no intention of reviving civil disobedience—a positive declaration on the part of the Congress promising good behaviour. While Sir Samuel left the door open to securing peace without humiliating the Congress, Sir Harry was bent more on humiliating the Congress than on securing a cessation of civil disobedience. Plenty of reasons can be marshalled to convince any dispassionate person that if the political prisoners are released there is no prospect of civil disobedience being revived. Anybody who followed the events of the last few months and has the slightest acquaintance with the attitude of prominent Congress leaders will have no difficulty in convincing himself of it, without asking for guarantees from the Congress leaders. No less a constitutionalist than Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru has warned Government against asking guarantees of the Congress. But Sir Harry does not want peace; he

is bent on revenge and utter humiliation. And now Sir Samuel has succumbed to him. But his victory will not bring peace with it.

Joint Select Committee's Doings.

SYNCHRONISING as they did with Mahatma Gandhi's fast, the doings of the Joint Select Committee, both public and private, have attracted little notice in this country. All that seems so far to have taken place is some consultation between the British and Indian wings of the Committee on questions relating to procedure. We are not yet told how these points were disposed of. The important question whether the Indian delegates can cross-examine witnesses seems still to remain undecided. It is to be hoped the right will be conceded. Obviously they cannot write their own report which, like that of the British wing, will go before Parliament. This by itself is a formidable handicap; but if on the top of this they are not allowed to cross-examine witnesses, their usefulness will be still further reduced.

The question of publicity of the work of the Committee was debated in both Houses of Parliament last week and the Committee was allowed to exclude both the Press and the public from its sittings. It was, however, desired to make available to the press a full report of its proceedings daily. It is feared that this may fail to secure for the Committee's work that measure of publicity which it would have received had the press been admitted to its sittings. Parliamentary approval of this middle course had to be obtained, because such committees are empowered to have either public sittings or to go on with their work behind closed doors. Whatever that be, we are unable to congratulate Parliament on its decision. The exclusion of the public was officially justified on the ground that if the proceedings of the Committee were thrown open to the public there would be such a rush that the Committee's work might be seriously interfered with. Indian affairs are known to excite so little public attention in England that the official strikes us as very largely groundless. Even supposing that the British public took it into its head on this occasion to belie past experience, it may be asked whether admission could not have been restricted by the issue of tickets? Instead of shutting out the public altogether, this would have been, in the opinion of many, a far better course. But whatever justification there may be for not allowing the general public to attend the Committee's meetings, there appears to be none whatever for refusing admission to the press. The number of British newspapers interested in India is disappointingly small, perhaps a dozen in the whole of the United Kingdom. Could they not have been accommodated in the Committee room without any inconvenience or embarrassment to the Committee? We cannot believe this was impossible.

Mysore People's Demands.

MR. SATYANARARYANA SETTY'S presidential address to the Mysore People's Congress last week shows that the misgivings of British Indians about the proposed Indian Federation materialising in the near future are fully shared by the subjects of Indian States. The condition about half the Indian States joining the Federation before it comes into being was itself difficult of fulfilment; but to that has recently been added another about the establishment of the Reserve Bank which is even more impossible, its satisfaction depending largely upon world economic forces. In these circumstances can anybody be blamed if he despairs, as does Mr. Setty, about the Federation coming into existence in a short time? But granting for argument's sake that it did, what about the safeguards and special responsibilities of the Governor-General and Governors? The president of the Mysore Congress had no difficulty in proving to the satisfaction of all responsible people that they are dangerously wide in scope and are calculated to reduce such self-government as is offered to a farce. And can the Federation that will come into existence be regarded as a genuine article or a spurious one? Mr. Setty's view is that the mere fact that the Princes are brought in is no reason why it must be looked upon as real Federation. They have been allowed to come in for the simple reason that they would act as a brake on the progressive elements in British India; and he has serious doubts whether a combination of the democratic British Indian units with the autocratic rulers of Indian States will entitle it to be called a genuine Federation. Mr. Setty doubtless speaks for a very large volume of opinion when he says that unless the people of Indian States who have so far been left in the cold of neglect are brought into the constitutional picture by allowing them the right of electing their representatives on the Federal Assembly, the proposed Federation will be a Federation only in name. He also entered a demurer to the proposed separation of the office of the Viceroy from that of the Governor-General which is bound to result in a bifurcation of Indian polity.

Though Mr. Setty devoted a large part of his address to the consideration of India's constitutional future he did not forget to deal with local problems. In dealing with them he naturally gave the foremost place to the public agitation going on in Mysore now for nearly fifteen years for securing from the State authorities a declaration to confer responsible government on the people. Nobody can question the fact that the State is on the whole a well-governed State. It may also be conceded at once that its administration is more responsive to public opinion than that of many other states. At the same time it cannot be doubted that this is but a poor substitute for self-government. No more proof of its need is required than the almost virtual denial of such elementary rights of citizenship as the freedom of press and of public meeting to the subjects of even such a progressive state as Mysore. Its Press law is hopelessly stringent and is a veritable Damocles's sword on independent journalism. If the subjects of Indian States are to be conceded the rights of federal citizenship, as they should be, it is necessary they should be in the enjoyment of well-known fundamental rights within the more restricted area of their own State. May we hope that the demands of the people of Mysore as embodied in the resolutions passed by the Congress will not fall on deaf ears?

Conference of Exploiters.

THE JAPANESE cotton industrialists have been stirred to anxiety by the notice of the denunciation

of the Anglo-Japanese Agreement. Prior to this they were busily engaged raking in profits from their expanding export trade with India to the displacement of Lancashire and Indian manufacture. They took full advantage of the lower standards of life, of wages and higher efficiency of the Japanese workers and of the phenomenal depreciation of the yen and dumped goods on the Indian market. All this merry time they gave no thought to the languishing industry of Bombay or Lancashire. Now that adequate action is being seriously proposed to shut out effectively the dumping of their goods, they have suddenly developed great consideration for India and are desirous for opening negotiations with Indian cotton industrialists to solve their difficulties. In the meanwhile, Lancashire has been agitating and putting pressure on the British Government to take steps to preserve to it its rapidly diminishing Empire trade, due to the competition of Japan. Mr. Walter Runciman, the President of the Board of Trade in England, advised the British and Japanese industrialists to meet and discuss their problems. Lancashire has been busily engaged in preparing for such a conference.

The Indian market is by far the largest market for which Indian, British and Japanese manufacturers compete. Each would like to have a monopoly of the market. Japan has seriously displaced both the Indian and British manufacturers. Japan is the common competitor of both India and England. But since Indian textile manufacturers desire to have a monopoly by promoting tariffs and anti-dumping measures, Japan and England have reason to combine against India. Common action between India and England against Japan is rather at a discount on account of the political quarrel between them. A conference between the three parties is not particularly conducive to the evolution of a common policy for the exploitation of the Indian consumer.

If however a conference should be held, it should be held in India. And at the conference the Indian consumer as well as the Indian worker should be adequately represented.

* * *

Wife Beating.

ACCORDING to Sam Weller, the gentleman as defended the man as beat his wife whenever he got jolly was content to plead that it was after all an amiable weakness. But the Subordinate Judge of Dacca went on further and laid down that under Muhammadan law the chastisement and even occasional beating of the wife by the husband were permissible and that these correctives were necessary for the proper conduct of families of the class from which the parties to the suit under consideration were drawn. He accordingly reversed the judgment of the court of the first instance. But his own judgment was happily reversed by Justice Mukerjee and the reversal was confirmed by the Chief Justice and Justice S. K. Ghose in a Letters Patent appeal. Muslim wives may now feel secure that the British secular courts, at any rate in Bengal, will not sustain the right of Muslim husbands to beat them.

But the action of the High Court must cause grave concern to the Muslim Sanatanists who believe that the Muhammadan law enjoined on Muslim husbands the duty of beating their wives occasionally. They have hitherto concentrated on the provision of safeguards in the constitution against such interference by the legislatures. But against judicial legislation of the kind they have made no provision. They have their work out out devising more safeguards.

Articles.

SAFEGUARDS.

SPEAKING as "a determined democrat and a determined believer in self-government for India," Lord Lothian, in his address to the last annual meeting of the Indian Students' Union and Hostel in London, remarked that "the future of the world depended more and more upon the character of its men and women. They might have the best institutions in the world, but unless they had the right men and women to work them they would fail; whilst institutions faulty in themselves, would be successful if they had men and women of the right type to work them." While this may generally be true, there is no reason why when a new constitution is being fashioned, it should be made faulty in the first instance and then its success made dependent on the availability of good men and women to work it. It is far better that the constitution itself should be fashioned well and then entrusted to good men and women. With reference to the White Paper constitution, Lord Lothian said, "If adequate leaders were forthcoming, there would be nothing in the new constitution which would prevent the attainment of full self-government as it had developed in Canada, in Australia and in South Africa." The implied antithesis is that the constitution would be faulty, though good leadership might rescue it and make a success of it. The noble Lord urged India not to dwell too much on the constitution itself but to find good men and women to work it and make it a success in spite of its defective character. Apparently, he does not realise that the constitution may be so bad as to render it practically impossible for good leadership to handle it to good purpose. The composition of the legislatures contemplated in the White Paper is such as to deny opportunities for good leadership. If it was the deliberate purpose of the constitution to prevent the emergence and play of good leadership, the White Paper constitution cannot easily be improved upon. The legislatures will be filled not by nationalists who take into consideration the needs of the whole country, but of a disproportionate number of the nominees of mediaeval autocrats, the Princes, who are bent on safeguarding autocracy against the march of democracy, and the representatives of numerous narrow communal interests and of foreign exploiters. Lord Irwin put it more diplomatically but not less unmistakably when in reply to the debate on the White Paper in the House of Lords he asked their Lordships to remember that "the Central legislature was such as to ensure that all the *stable* elements in India should make their views *effectively* heard." (Italics ours.) Such a constitution must stink in the nostrils of "a determined democrat and a determined believer in self-government for India."

The composition of the legislatures is enough in all conscience to render the constitution undemocratic

and incapable, without a bloody revolution, of ever evolving the way of the constitutions of Canada and Australia. To make it doubly safe against self-governing democracy, the constitution provides for safeguards to be controlled by Great Britain and her agents. It is true that Prof. Berriedale Keith has on the analogy of the constitutional history of the Dominions taken the view that those external safeguards would in practice be inoperative. But that was not the view taken by Sir Samuel Hoare, who assured his constituents that the safeguards were meant to be effective. Was it not provided that not only should the army be under the control of Great Britain but also the civil and police services for some indefinite time? The assurance was respected most unequivocally during the debate in the House of Lords on the White Paper by Lord Irwin who said, "Unless one contemplated a general strike of all civil servants, British and Indian, which was as likely to happen in India as it was here, he had not the smallest misgiving on the ground of the safeguards proving inoperative."

This only means, it may be said, that, granting that England meant to enforce the safeguards, ready and efficient instruments for so doing have been provided. But will England be disposed to enforce them? The *New Statesman* some time ago averred that England would be far too preoccupied with her own immediate problems to have the time or the inclination to interfere in Indian affairs if only Indians acted boldly. If the parties were only the "responsible" Government of India and the British Cabinet, it is conceivable that the latter might relax its day to day control of Indian administration. But the unique status and powers given to the Viceroy and Governor-General, the retention of the Secretary of State for India and of the India Council in a modified form, and the powers given to them make for continuous and detailed supervision of Britain over India. The key position is that of the Governor-General. Enormous overriding powers have been entrusted to this officer. So enormous indeed that Lord Zetland apprehended that they were far too heavy for any person to bear. Lord Irwin, while admitting that under present circumstances the burden on the Viceroy was heavy, assured Lord Zetland that inasmuch as the Governor-General under the new constitution would have "responsible" ministers to advise him as contrasted with "irresponsible" ministers under the present constitution, the burden would not be unduly heavy for him to bear. This would be the case if the Governor-General was under the obligation to act on the advice of his "responsible ministers," but he is under no such obligation. The centre of gravity is the Governor-General and not his "responsible" ministers. As long as the ministers obey the Governor-General they can have their way and naturally there will be no need to invoke the safeguards vested in him: but if the ministers responsible to India differ from the Governor-General responsible to England, safeguards come into operation and England over-rules India! Lord Irwin agreed with Lord Reading in the hope that the Gover-

nor General was not at all likely to find it necessary to exercise his constitutional powers in regard to safeguards. Why? Because, ministers would not like to "quarrel with the Governor General and lose their jobs"? So Lord Irwin contemplated that the "responsible" ministers of the Central Government of India would be job-hunters, who for fear of losing their jobs would kowtow to the wishes of the Governor General. If, unexpectedly, the Ministers be of sterner stuff and declined to be wage-slaves of the Governor General and resigned their high offices, he could—Lord Irwin blandly assured his compeers in the House of Lords—take over the Government and appoint, as now, "irresponsible" ministers to do his behests! Lord Irwin did not believe that "Indians would desire to see any of the circumstances happen in respect to which the safeguards were to be provided." The net result of this is that responsibility of ministers is a myth. Surprisingly enough, Lord Irwin went on to assert that safeguards did not impair responsibility of ministers. He summed up the position by stating that "either the safeguards would not be required, in which case responsibility was not limited, or they would be required, in which case all reasonable opinion here and in India would think it right that there should be safeguards." The essence of responsibility, according to Lord Irwin, lies in the cheerful submission of ministers to the pleasure of the Governor General. And to remember that it was no other than this noble Lord who as Viceroy of India under a Labour Government spoke of Dominion Status for India! The bitter irony of it!!!

Lord Irwin would have us believe that the safeguards were not actuated by England's distrust of India. The Muslims and other minorities in India who wanted safeguards for themselves were more honest in that they frankly based their claim on their distrust of the other communities. But England must pretend that her insistence on safeguards was not due to distrust of India but to her paternal concern for the right conduct of India. This Pecksnifian hypocrisy is most sickening.

In an article on the White Paper in the *Contemporary Review*, Lord Meston is said to have stated that "if the better mind of India will accept such a constitution and will consent to our cooperation in working it, its difficulties and rigidity will vanish in time. If, on the contrary, mistrust and obstruction prevail, no ingenuity in drafting, no safeguards or reservations, will protect the world from having a second China on its hands." The implications of Lord Meston's statement are that safeguards are unnecessary if trust and confidence prevail; safeguards are futile if distrust forms the background. The choice is between 'cooperation and no safeguards' and 'safeguards and chaos.'

NATIONAL PLANNING.

A very important transformation is at present going on in the views of responsible British thinkers on the subject of state policy. We in India are only too well aware of the fact that throughout the nineteenth century the watchword of

the British Government in all matters concerning the welfare of individuals and classes was, 'Let Alone.' The Government of India had no independent policy in these respects. While on the one hand it took active steps to develop the great railway industry and claimed the ownership of all land to itself, it on the other hand proclaimed its utter unconcern at the social disintegration and industrial decay that was set on foot as a result of India's contact with the Western world. Backwardness of agriculture, ruin of indigenous industries, widespread illiteracy, appalling insanitation, and most of the other social and economic ills of our times are directly traceable to this attitude of indifference adopted by the Government. Ranade, Dadabhai, Dutt, Gokhale and several other Indian statesmen urged that the conception of the Government of India regarding its responsibility about the nation's fortunes was wrong in theory and disastrous in practice. They pointed to the policies of national conservation and development actively followed by continental governments and demanded that a similar policy should be followed in India. The Government spokesmen only repeated the jargon of the automatic working of natural laws and used the obvious prosperity of Great Britain as practical proof of the success of 'Let Alone.'

So long as England owing to its initial economic advantages and her political and colonial preeminence was free from any effective competition from other countries Laissez-faire served her well enough. But with the close of the last century she began to lose her leadership which was steadily challenged by Germany, France, Belgium and Austria-Hungary. The Great War and the post-War monetary tangles have definitely deprived England of her special advantages and importance. Japan and U. S. A. are now powerful rivals of England both in the political and the economic field. England is faced with grave problems like unemployment, financial dislocation, industrial stagnation and social unrest. An attitude of indifference which under similar circumstances was and is adopted in India could no longer be followed by a responsible British Government. Organised effort to reach a definite national goal with which the nation had become familiar during the War was needed for the solution of the internal and international difficulties of the times. The technical success of organised action in communist Russia and fascist Italy has not been without its effect on the British mind. What many other countries had discovered fifty years ago the English statesmen are discovering to-day. As Sir Basil Blackett, a former Finance Member of the Government of India and a Director of the Bank of England, says in his newly published book on "Planned Money":

"In this country the idea of planning has passed rapidly beyond the stage of being suspect for its communist connotations and has become perfectly respectable... it stands for a political philosophy which is the antithesis of Laissez-faire. The nineteenth century believed that in Laissez-faire it had discovered an automatic and self-governing economic system, which nothing but unwise governmental interference could prevent from promoting public well-being..... The twentieth century is now painfully discovering that this automatic self-regulating

system was a myth, and that the marvellous material prosperity which the world enjoyed in the seventy-five years before 1914 was not due to the supposed merits of this system, but to a fortuitous combination of circumstances, essentially precarious and ephemeral, which has now passed away."

This statement is strictly correct for Great Britain alone, because all other nations had long ago discovered the hollowness of the British' worship of Laissez-faire. Now that Great Britain has seen the wisdom of purposeful national regulation of economic and social life it might be hoped that a similar policy will before long be adopted by the Government of India and the several provincial Governments. It is necessary, however, to draw attention to those aspects of a planned order which are most likely to be missed in India. In the first place we must be on our guard against any attempt to press India into a rigid Empire-system. We are free to admit that in the present state of the world the objective of each nation must principally be the development of its own interests and that we must not delude ourselves into a false belief that internationalism is an accomplished fact. We might incidentally mention that nobody has done more to create an unwarranted hallow round the name of internationalism than British writers who talked about internationalism while their politicians garnered the fruits of an intensely nationalistic policy. But granting that 'Planning must be national in having regard to the national economic life as a whole. It cannot be individualistic. Nor in existing circumstances can planning be international,' it does not follow that Empire planning is in any way justified. The countries that form the British Empire have in common none of the necessary bonds of an abiding nationhood. Race, language, religion, history, economic interests, geographical unity,—all these are counts which emphasise the heterogeneous character of the political entity now known as the British Commonwealth of Nations. The Empire is based neither on the idea of nationality nor on that of internationalism. In any scheme of economic planning that is suitable for India the Empire idea must not be allowed to detract either from the freedom or from the comprehensiveness of her policy. International planning has some value at least as a goal, but Imperial planning stands condemned both as a principle and as policy.

Planning to be theoretically justifiable and practically beneficent must be wisely undertaken and must aim at promoting the interests of the nation as a whole. If these two conditions are to be satisfied in India far-reaching political and administrative reforms are immediately called for. As mentioned above, the Indian Government must have the completest freedom from Imperial interference. But as no one class can be trusted to do full justice to the interests of all it is necessary that the legislatures in India should be representative of all sections of the population. The maximum of popular representation must be secured to warrant an expectation that state action in pursuit of planning will be in the interest of the nation as a whole and not of a section. Second-

ly, means must be found to collect and interpret all the data necessary to build and execute a wise plan. Any kind of reliable data on social and economic questions is absolutely lacking in India. Unless legislation is undertaken with a view to the maintenance and collection of suitable statistical information no useful and sound planning will be possible. Provincial, state and central governments must maintain competent agencies for the co-ordination and interpretation of information collected from official and non-official sources. The co-operation of universities and organised trade bodies must be secured by state initiative. The function of formulating policies must be handed over to provincial and central economic councils representing all the interests as also trained experts and practical administrators. In the near future considerable constitutional alterations are going to take place in India. People will be justified in expecting that the new authorities should do more for the positive betterment of the nation than the old. Fortunately the prevailing opinion among British administrators is favourable to the adoption of constructive policies. But if the actions of the new Government are to be wisely chosen and efficiently executed it is necessary to set up additional administrative machinery of the proper type. It is also essential that perfect freedom from outside interference either from the executive heads or from the home authorities must be vouchsafed.

AFTER THE WASHINGTON INTERVIEWS.

MR. MacDonald has returned, and M. Herriot is expected here to-night. The London Conference is being actively prepared for. In all the newspapers here, several columns are devoted every day to comments upon the Washington interviews and to conjectures about their bearing on the solution of all the urgent problems of the day.

The fluctuations of both dollar and pound are creating a good deal of anxiety. And, coming at the present juncture, the news that President Herriot is supposed to have consented, in principle, to a provisional truce as regards customs-duties, has aroused very critical comments in many circles. The *Figaro* says: "This is exactly like putting hand-cuffs on a wrestler's wrists just when the match is about to begin". "To have an idea of the danger of this concession", writes M. Kerilis in the *Echo de Paris*, "it is enough to recollect that while the franc retains its stability, the pound and dollar are racing downwards, thereby gaining on the French market a considerable advantage, a positive premium to exportation". This customs-truce proposal has hardly met with a better welcome in England; and when it was introduced a few days ago before the Committee which is preparing for the coming International Conference, Mr. Von Hoesch, the German ambassador in London, was the first to protest.

It is hoped that M. Herriot and the experts who shared his task will give the necessary explanations to justify their decisions. Nobody will deny the necessity of discussing the present tariffs and finding a remedy for their excesses. But it is equally evident that no revision of this kind can be fruitfully undertaken so long as currencies remain in the present state of instability. A firm basis is required as a first condition of any lasting agreement and useful action. Any other course is bound to lead to disillusion,

speculation, further misunderstanding and the so-called "legitimate reprisals."

To form an impartial view of this question, says Lucien Romier in *Paris-Midi*, it is enough to remember that the programme of the World Economic Conference has prepared in Geneva last January by a commission of experts (including American experts). This document drafted a list of the problems to be examined. The first and foremost task is stated to be the stabilisation of the various currencies; next comes the adjustment of debts, etc. . . Progressive decrease in tariffs, quotas, and the various prohibitions which hinder international trade, only comes fourth on the list, exactly because "customs-duties are effects rather than causes." A premature tariff-truce would rather postpone the cure of the present economic disorder.

After a few months, continues Mr. Romier, America will realise, just as England has done, that the commercial advantage realised by unstable money is extremely small compared with the risk entailed. Many experienced economists here are expecting that both England and America will be compelled to stabilise their currency in the near future, and tributary countries, financially speaking, would naturally follow the same course. If by that time France has succeeded in maintaining her financial and monetary prestige she may have an important part to play in the economic pacification of the world.

In any case, nothing much can be done in that line until the United States acknowledge the necessity of a fair balance of commercial exchanges between the old and the new continent. There are many reasons to believe that this is not impossible to realise. Mr. Roosevelt's personal desire to put an end to America's isolation is certainly most genuine. It remains to be seen how far he will be followed by the Congress. Let us be confident rather than sceptical.

M. Herriot, questioned by a correspondent of *Paris-Soir* who joined the "Ile-de-France" at Plymouth, said that he was very happy and very satisfied with his journey. "I am certain," said he, "that Mr. Roosevelt and I have done some good work during our long conversations. I have enabled the American President to realise the true position of our country in relation with world difficulties, and I particularly wish to emphasise the friendliness of America's welcome."

M. Herriot also pointed to the fact that he had collected a very complete documentation on certain important questions, such as debts, tariffs, and armaments. This declaration has been especially noticed and appreciated here, for it is more and more consciously understood that these various points are intimately connected with one another and with the recent aggravation of the monetary crisis. Up to now, there has been a regrettable tendency to examine each one of these subjects separately. And even (if not especially!) in international conferences one or another of these questions at least was purposely excluded from the deliberations. The result was an unending game of hide-and-seek, a perpetual shifting of the difficulty from one aspect to the other. If only the representatives who are going to meet in London next month do not limit themselves to analysing separately each one of those problems, but have the courage and power to face them as a whole and realise their mutual implications, they may perhaps find a more comprehensive and more stable solution to the present international unrest.

L. MORIN.

Paris, May 6.

THE LEPROSY CLINIC.

THE Leprosy clinic aims at making the N1 and N2 cases free from all active signs, sterilising the 'C' cases, becoming a feeder of cases needing special treatment to the nearest leprosy hospital and relieving it of its non-infectious cases. It treats the lepers and teaches them how to live to their own advantage without spreading infection to their dear ones. If the doctor in charge has time, he can examine contacts and tell the villagers what to do and what not to do to avoid leprosy. From its working the State can get an idea how long it will take to control leprosy in a given area.

The chief advantages of a leprosy clinic are its cheapness, and the voluntary exercise that it imposes on the patients. This exercise is essential to counteract overdosing that may happen in the absence of technical tests for which the general dispensary man may have no time. The annual expenditure per patient per year is about Rs. 2 in a clinic attached to a dispensary. The patient by attending the leprosy clinic avoids becoming a burden on the State. He supports his family and pays his tax. There are certain villages in India where the incidence is 10 to 20 per cent. It is impossible and unnecessary to take away all these men to an asylum. The only way to deal with them is to treat them at a clinic. Where shall we have our clinics? Will they be separate establishments or adjuncts to dispensaries?

If we examine the monthly statement of diseases treated in the dispensaries of India, we find a separate column for leprosy which proves that leprosy treatment is a recognised part of routine medical work. If lepers are not treated, it is due to the fact that either they do not know that the treatment is available or the doctor does not know how to treat. At present the propaganda done in villages and the training arranged for doctors are removing the above two obstacles to treatment. Therefore let us now make arrangements to treat lepers near their homes. Let leprosy clinics be attached to every dispensary situated in endemic areas, with provision for treating the cases during certain fixed hours on a certain day or days in a week.

It may be necessary to have a central clinic where the propaganda, treatment and survey work may be carried out, but I think it is a mistake to detach leprosy work from the general medical work. A clinic with a separate staff has the following disadvantages:—

1. Separate finance—In case of retrenchment this is liable to be affected as it has been now in Bihar and Orissa.

2. It creates the general impression in the mind of doctors, patients and the public that the treatment of leprosy is a special department needing the establishment of special men.

3. It will create a feeling in the public that leprosy is so vile a disease that its treatment has to be separated from the general work. Once such belief is entertained, it will be difficult to introduce leprosy treatment into the ordinary dispensaries.

I fully realise the efficacy of a special clinic working under a district leprosy board or district leprosy committee. But what I want to impress is this that unless every dispensary shares in the work we cannot control leprosy. During my second visits to clinics attached to the dispensaries, I found many of them had been closed down. Doctors told me that patients stopped coming. But when I went to the villages patients told me: "Doctor said the party who came to treat leprosy is gone." Let every doctor be made to understand that under the terms of his service he is expected to treat leprosy just as he would treat cases

of cholera or smallpox. In a certain province when I requested the I. G. to give an allowance to the dispensary doctors for doing leprosy work, he said "No allowance should be given because it is their duty." I think that it is the right attitude. Recently in a certain district I found that the leprosy work had been dropped because the District Board had not been able to continue the allowance it gave to the medical officers for leprosy work. Therefore the first step to take is to tell every medical man that treatment of leprosy is part of his duty. Once this is achieved the foundation of the leprosy clinic is laid on rock.

We will suppose that after a survey of the surrounding villages, a leprosy clinic has been attached to the dispensary. The clinic should have a map showing the villages with the number of lepers marked in each. A register has to be maintained containing all the details of cases detected. At the end of every year this register should be revised showing how many cases have been arrested, how many sterilised and how many new cases detected by the health department, number dead, number left and new immigrants. Thus the leprosy clinic will practically be worked by the medical and health department, the treatment side being under the former and the preventive side being under the latter. With such an arrangement we can have an idea whether leprosy can be controlled in a certain area and if so, how many years it will take to control it.

It is wise to remember that the leprosy clinic has its limitations. It is not practicable to have clinics in hill-areas as in Kulu and the Chin Hills. Lepers in certain parts of Bombay Presidency are so widely distributed and so far away from any communication that it has been said that even in the dry season travelling dispensaries will hardly reach them. Therefore increasing the number of clinics will always call for the extension of leprosy hospitals.

I shall close this article by answering a few questions that might be asked about leprosy clinics.

Can leprosy be properly treated in a clinic attached to a dispensary with no facilities for laboratory work? I believe it can. Clinical judgment is the main requirement for successful treatment, but necessary laboratory tests can usually be arranged for at the nearest Government laboratory. Are not the patients in a leprosy clinic very irregular in attendance and will not many of them stop coming after a few months or a year? Even at the best clinics with the best doctors regular attendance is very difficult to maintain. Patients have their own way of determining a cure. On the disappearance of visible lesions they think that the disease is cured and therefore stop coming. Villagers have to look after their fields during rains and the harvest season. Therefore it may be advisable to substitute the injections with Chaulmoogra pills during the period the patients cannot come.

Can satisfactory treatment for severe reaction be carried out in clinics? This is often a difficulty but provision ought to be made at each clinic for hospitalizing at least two patients.

Let us not despair. Higher education has been introduced in India for the last hundred years. Yet 91 per cent. of the population are illiterate. Reformers have been working since the days of Ramanand from the fourteenth century but what reforms have we in India? Have the reformers and educationalists ceased to work? Let us have faith and press forward with the noble work to make India free from leprosy.

- ISAAC SANTRA.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, May 5.

THE MAHATMA'S FAST.

THE news of Mahatmaji's fast, announced to begin on Monday next, unless certain inspired intervention or conviction to the contrary should, in the meanwhile, take place, has spread throughout this country, and has produced various reactions. Most English people are totally bewildered at the Mahatma's decision. To them the spiritual purpose and technique of a fast of this kind are quite incomprehensible. Whilst they are accustomed theoretically to believe that faith can remove mountains, practical experience assures them that there are other methods employed in the scheme of nature, and even in worldly affairs, for the removal of mountains, and no historic instance can be produced of a single mountain, let alone a great range, having been removed by faith alone. The difficulty felt by most people here is in knowing what it is all about. The existence of untouchability in India was comparatively little known here until quite recent times. Miss Mayo and Mr. Gandhi between them have helped to give it an importance in the eyes of English people which, great though it is, is largely out of proportion to its place in the Indian scheme of things. Having attained that importance, the average Britisher will say that a system as deep-rooted, as ancient, and with as many ramifications as this, cannot in the ordinary nature of things be expected to disappear, so to speak, overnight. It may well be that the walls of Jericho fell down at the blast of a trumpet. If so slight a vibration as that was sufficient to cause their fall, they must already have been very badly undermined. This process of undermining from the British point of view would have to proceed very much further than it is supposed to have done if the whole edifice is expected to fall at the first assault of enthusiasm and devotion. The more sympathetic and understanding among people here would say that the Mahatma has dealt the grim and hideous edifice a shrewd blow that may well have riven it to its foundations, but the results can only be known and usefully taken advantage of by a long process of assault and excavation, and the exploiting of every known resource, spiritual and secular.

The less pig-headed folk are asking other questions. Mr. Glorney Bolton points to some of them. Is there not some occult political motive behind this display of eagerness for the immediate purification of those ostensibly engaged in promoting the removal of untouchability? Why should Mr. Gandhi have chosen a moment that happens to coincide with the arrival here of those who will be shortly engaged in attending the sessions of the Joint Select Committee? Why should he act in such a way as to produce the maximum of embarrassment to them, and that has already caused two of their number, who have been closely associated with him, to decide in the circumstances not to come here, and take part in the task to which, by their acceptances of the invitations extended to them, they had agreed to set their hands? There are quite a lot of people here who, if they do not entirely doubt the Mahatma's sincerity and good-faith, are not unwilling to attribute to him motives in which a political element is a large ingredient. At the same time many people point to the

apparent futility of the whole matter, whilst they are thoroughly convinced of the Mahatma's sincerity, since no one is willing to put his life in jeopardy at so much cost and suffering to himself and to those closely attached to or dependent upon him, except he is entirely sincere, even though from the worldly point of view he is misguided and ill-advised in the method of his sacrifice.

In the circumstances, there is a general wish among people of liberal disposition that Mr. Gandhi should be released before the fast has begun. It is held that the Government need have no hesitation in deciding to release him, since neither in form nor in substance is the fast conceived as an attack upon, or a challenge to Government, in which it differs from the fast undertaken some months ago, resulting in the Poona Pact. Moreover it is held that, in the first place, Government cannot afford the odium that would fall upon it if fatal results with the Mahatma occurred whilst in jail, and Government need have the less hesitation in that, in any event, the consequences of the fast, should he survive it, are likely to be such as to absorb his entire activities for an indefinite period. Strong representations have to the present writer's knowledge been made in that sense to various members of the Government by prominent friends of Mr. Gandhi now here, and also by the Indian Conciliation Group through its Chairman. We shall know within the next few days whether these representations, aided as they have been by those of Mr. George Lansbury in his own capacity and as representing the Parliamentary Labour Party, have borne fruit.

In the meanwhile, the element of romance has been introduced into this tragic affair by the intervention of General Smuts, who bases his appeal to Mr. Gandhi to abstain from the fast upon the old friendship between them dating from South African days. Few people remembering Smuts, the grim jailor of Gandhi, would have suspected this element of romance and chivalry in him. Yet it is within the writer's knowledge that at one period of Mr. Gandhi's imprisonment in South Africa, the Boer Minister sent him books to read, and he was himself one of two persons charged by Mr. Gandhi, upon his departure from South Africa in 1914, with the pleasant task of presenting to General Smuts a pair of hand-made sandals, the product of Indian handicraft among passive resisters at Tolstoy Farm. Lord Willingdon might reasonably be expected to take at least one leaf out of General Smuts' book of chivalry.

STATUS OF INDIAN DELEGATES.

The delegates who have arrived in the midst of a vast attempt on the part of the diehards to divert the Government from their purpose—an effort that obliged Mr. Baldwin to devote the greater part of a speech in his constituency to a formidable attack upon them—are not yet certain as to the exact powers that they will enjoy "sitting in" (to use an American expression) with the Joint Select Committee. It is still uncertain, and they are making enquiries on the subject, whether they will enjoy the right to examine or cross-examine witnesses who may appear before the Committee. The language so far used is that they would be entitled to be present at the examination of witnesses, hear them, and discuss with their colleagues. This, however, does not carry the matter far enough, and I understand that the further power that I have above referred to is to be insisted upon. The delegates have already received an invitation from Lord Linlithgow, the Chairman, (who yesterday was castigated in the House of Lords by Lord Halsbury for his alleged indiscretion as Chairman in having allowed

an article over his signature to appear in a party magazine, subscribing generally to the policy enunciated in the White Paper) to meet him in informal conference next Thursday.

Meanwhile, whilst our old friend Sir Evan Cotton (his late father would have turned in his grave) is deriding the proposed reforms as being too progressive and too extensive, Mr. Baldwin will have some difficulty, I imagine, in satisfying Indian opinion as to the exact meaning of the following phrase with which he ended his speech last Saturday in his constituency:—

"I believe from the bottom of my heart that by going forward boldly with India to-day you may keep India within the Empire, and as generations go by and further advances are made you will find in her as loyal a part of the British Empire, co-operating with us and we with her as any other part of the Empire to-day. And I believe equally that if we do not advance to her the right hand of fellowship and a generous right hand, within the lifetime of many in this room, we shall lose that great part of the Empire and lose it for ever."

It would be difficult to expect young India to wait for one generation for the fulfilment of its aspirations, not to speak of many generations.

A PROGRAMME FOR THE CONSTITUTION.

I have to-day been discussing with an old Parliamentary hand a sort of time-table to which possibly the Government are working in connection with their scheme of reform, and upon the assumption that they are in earnest in the matter and wish to get a Bill through without delay. It seems now likely that the number of witnesses will be limited, as it is understood that, for a variety of reasons, few will be expected from India. If that be so it ought not to be difficult, or at any rate beyond the scope of probability, to finish the work of examination by the Committee of the White Paper proposals by the end of July. August and September are holiday months, and it is improbable that any sittings of the Committee will be held until October, by which time the Chairman may produce the draft report, which would then, if the Select Committee is allowed to sit under the rules of the House during the Parliamentary vacation, be subject to criticism and discussion by November. With luck the Report might be passed and be in the hands of Government and presented to Parliament early in November. The Government would then have to test feeling in both Houses by a debate on the Report, and if, as may be supposed, Parliament adopts the Report in substance, the Government would then proceed to introduce its Bill, which presumably by that time would have been virtually ready, and if all went well it might be expected that the Bill would receive its second reading before Christmas and referred to a Committee of the whole House. It is understood, of course, that the Government would introduce the Bill in the House of Commons. All the other stages of the measure, having regard to limitations of time available for Government business up to Easter of next year and budget requirements thereafter, might be expected to be completed in both Houses by mid-June. So far as I have been able to discover, even with the best will in the world, it would be difficult in any material respect to expedite this procedure taking into account the fact that at every stage the diehard faction would be challenging progress in the hope of delaying the passage of the Bill, if they could not in fact procure its defeat, until such time as circumstances more favourable to Tory obscurantism had occurred. There is, of course, a certain school of thought, though not at present an influential one, that views with a certain amount of satisfaction the failure of democracy to hold its own in substantial

parts of Europe, and who might rely upon this apparent failure to convince their countrymen of the extreme undesirability of extending even the forms of democracy, let alone the substance, to India. The next few years in Europe, as well as in Asia, will be testing-times, and if, indeed, liberalism is not on trial, or even on the run, and the principle if not the forms of dictatorship installed in its place, in large areas claiming an advance civilisation, it will be a miracle. The very economic distress that has become all but universal may well be a compelling element in the situation.

Reviews.

SIDELIGHTS ON SIMON COMMISSION.

THE INDIA WE SAW. By EDWARD CADOGAN. (John Murray, London.) 1933. 19cm. 304p. 7/6.

THE author's membership of the Simon Commission invests his book with special importance. It is not a mere travel-diary or a chronicle of his impressions of the persons he met or the places he saw during the Commission's two visits to this country. These are no doubt found interspersed in its pages; but the value of the book lies more, in our opinion, in the insight it affords us into the working of the Commission behind the scenes and its reactions to some of the difficult problems that presented themselves for its consideration. This is no small gain, seeing that everything connected with the Commission, from its appointment to its recommendations, was the subject of keen controversy and for this reason the book will be welcomed by the Indian public.

Why was it considered necessary to include none but Britishers in the Commission's personnel? On this point Mr. Cadogan has hardly anything new to say. The ambiguous wording of the relevant section of the present Government of India Act does not make it clear whether membership of the Commission must be restricted to Parliament. Those who were responsible for its appointment had therefore nothing to go upon except the views of the authors of the 1919 reforms. One of these, Mr. Montagu, had died some time before the question cropped up; while Lord Cnelmsford was in no doubt that "an exclusively Parliamentary Commission had been intended,"—an opinion which, according to him, was shared also by Mr. Montagu.

The exclusion of Indians from its personnel led to the Commission being boycotted almost by the whole of political India with consequences still too fresh in the public mind. Were the authorities taken aback by these happenings? According to the author, the then Secretary of State, Lord Birkenhead, could not at any rate be said to have been quite unprepared for the strong opposition which the Commission's inquiry encountered in India. Only he expected that the storm would be short-lived and would blow over. Mr. Cadogan however did not share Lord Birkenhead's optimism. Events have amply proved that the Government wofully miscalculated the strength of Indian feeling on the subject. Even the author himself cannot, however, be said to be absolutely free from this failing. But this is in a way excusable in his case, having regard to the fact that he derived his information mostly from official sources. His writing makes it clear beyond doubt that the hostile demonstrations that greeted the Commission throughout its itinerary greatly upset it, which need not cause any surprise. But he is entirely wrong in thinking that these were got up with the help of hirelings. Speaking about the Poona demonstration e. g., he says that the participants "were not inhabitants of Poona

at all, but had been sent up from Bombay by a train previous to ours in order to compose a stage crowd." (p. 119) We can say from personal experience that this is a sheer travesty of facts and it may well be that the author was equally misinformed about similar happenings elsewhere. Moreover if anti-Commission demonstrations could be easily arranged, receptions and other social functions in its honour which may have misled the author about the state of public feeling are not more difficult to get up. Indeed the latter can be far more easily engineered than the former by officials who have extensive powers of patronage in their hands. But the point need not be laboured any further. Suffice it to say that the Government's initial mistake in keeping out Indians from the Commission's personnel greatly added to its difficulties by depriving it of the co-operation and advice of almost all political parties in this country.

Mr. Cadogan's view about the boycott of the Commission by Indians of importance is difficult to follow. It would be unfair to him to assume that he welcomed this non-co-operation and yet he plainly says that even if leaders like Pandit Malaviya, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Mr. Jayakar and other had appeared before the Commission, it would hardly have modified the Commission's report in any essentials (p. 34). Does he wish us to suppose that the leading of evidence before the Commission by non-officials, whose value was stressed officially at the time, was more or less a formality? Indian co-operation with the Commission was either useful or useless. If the former, its absence was unquestionably a great loss to the Commission. In the latter case, the author and others like him who regret India's decision to have nothing to do with the Commission are clearly guilty of asking Indians to engage themselves in a perfectly futile undertaking. Surely he cannot have it both ways. It may be noted here that he is inclined to look upon the Central and Provincial Simon Committees as more or less so many *impedimenta*.

While the withdrawal of co-operation with the Statutory Commission by political parties worth their salt was as complete as it could be, it is stated on p. 103, we do not know with what truth, that during the Commission's stay in Delhi "Mr. Jayakar and others were soliciting interviews with Sir John Simon". We have no means of judging who the "others" are; but Mr. Jayakar certainly owes it to himself to explain the circumstances in which, if at all, he thought it necessary to seek opportunities of meeting the Chairman of the Commission. Such a statement by one in the position of the author is too important to be allowed to go unchallenged.

A section of opinion which was bent upon putting the most charitable construction upon the Commission's doings took the view that its omission to use the expression "Dominion Status" anywhere in its report was accidental. There is enough evidence in the pages of this book which goes to show that this was very far from the truth. The Commission had in fact been all along opposed to the idea of holding out to India even a distant hope of achieving Dominion Status, a matter which was then under discussion between Whitehall and Simla. "Originally", the author informs us, "a suggestion was made to include the phrase in our correspondence, 'the grant of Dominion status as soon as may be', as far as I recollect were the words proposed to be used. Sir John asked that the words might be deleted, a request that was acceded to." (p. 290.) It is unnecessary to inquire for the reasons which led the Commission thus to avoid the use of the phrase like the very poison. It is enough for our purpose to remember

that when the Labour Government fell in with Lord Irwin's wishes to hold up before Indians the goal of Dominion status, the author combined with his colleagues on the Commission in regarding it as an "egregious mistake" (p. 292). Mr. Cadogan blames Indians that they should attach so much importance to a mere phrase. If the Indian demand is so unsubstantial and if India's satisfaction can be secured at so little cost, it is wholly inexplicable that Britishers like Mr. Cadogan should so fearfully boggle at it.

As is to be expected, the author stands up for the Commission's failure to make the Indian Central Government responsible. To him a fully responsible government at Delhi is inconceivable "at any future time or under any set of circumstances" "even if the populations of India were to become as advanced in education politically and socially as ourselves" (p. 170). He adds by way of justification: "The conditions for responsibility as we understand the expression, namely an executive drawn from a single party which depends for its existence from day to day on the votes of members directly elected by an electorate, may never exist in India" (p. 171). Indian politicians have all along taken pretty good care to leave nobody under the misapprehension that mere provincial autonomy would meet the requirements of the situation. Yet the Commission fondly hugged the delusion that if they only succeeded in placating the provinces by their peculiar pattern of provincial autonomy "there was nothing much to be feared." In this connection it should be borne in mind that the official world as a whole was opposed to the transfer of Law and Order to the control of popular ministers in the new regime. To disarm their opposition the Chairman of the Commission, the author tells us, was at one time thinking of providing for the conferment of power on the Governor of transferring this subject from one Minister to another of course "in the event of a crisis." This would more often than not have meant its administration by the official ministers contemplated under the Simon scheme. It is a mercy that this reactionary idea proved to be still born.

Surprise is expressed in Indian political circles at the extremely reactionary nature of the Services safeguards proposed in the White Paper. If Mr. Cadogan is to be taken as a typical representative of the British Conservatives who constitute the main strength of the present "National" Government in England—and there is no reason why he should not be—it must be admitted we had really no ground to expect that the safeguards would not be as bad as they are actually found to be. Though it has been made clear on countless occasions that India is prepared for obvious reasons for the continuance of the European element in the Services for some time to come it is not enough to satisfy Britishers of Mr. Cadogan's mentality. They attach so exaggerated an importance to this question that they would not hesitate to hold up the constitutional scheme "until the whole question of the Services was quite clearly defined." The points to be insisted on in this connection are, in Mr. Cadogan's view, "that for many years to come there must be a considerable leavening of Englishmen amongst the Governors, in the Central Government, in the Secretariat, in the All-India Services in the Provinces; and that all these Europeans must be of the right type." Such a type will not be forthcoming unless he enjoys a statutory guarantee that "there is still the chance of a continuous career for them once they have joined the Service." The problem before the Commission in short was how to secure the continuance "for a considerable time to come" of a strong European element in the provincialised services in the event of provincial autonomy material-

ising as a result of the present constitutional discussions. This was necessary not merely in order to provide comfortable berths for young Britishers though even that aspect could not have been altogether absent from the minds of the Commissioners but for the purpose of preventing a breakdown of the provincial administration—a calamity which "God's own Englishmen" alone can avert. The safeguards which the author had in mind were thus intended to be more preventive than curative. To this end he thought it was no good relying upon the general powers of superintendence and control exercised by the Secretary of State or to trust to the good sense of Indian Ministers to see to it that the provincial services had an adequate sprinkling of the European element. The author recognises full well that to insist upon such definite safeguards would be to take away with one hand what is given with the other, which would naturally displease even the more sober sections of Indian opinion; but it is a danger from which he would not run away. "It is a grave risk, but it is not so grave a risk as handing over the services to the unlimited control of Indians under existing conditions" (p. 248). The author goes further and blames Mr. Montagu for beginning the reform of the Indian constitution at the wrong end. He should have, in the author's opinion, first Indianised the bureaucracy and then thought of starting responsible government.

The author's opinion about the constructive ability of the Governments in India and their officers is anything but complimentary to them. On p. 178 he says:

"It was very noteworthy that but few of those whose position and experience entitled them to speak with any degree of authority were either willing or able to supply us with original suggestions, although they were all ready enough to deprecate and expose the fallacies of any suggestions that we ourselves were at pains to submit to them for examination and comment. With hardly an exception they imparted advice with great reserve and with no very strong convictions."

The same complaint is repeated on p. 37.

"Although we were regaled with much hospitality, when it came to business discussions with the Central Government we became aware of a certain aloofness and detachment which is traditionally characteristic and which rendered the chances of our deriving any substantial assistance from that quarter remote.

We should have liked to refer to Mr. Cadogan's views on some other aspects of the Indian constitutional problem; but have left ourselves little space for the purpose. We cannot however bring this review to a close without referring to one or two matters covered in the book. It is well known that before the Simon Commission set out on its arduous task, a private meeting took place in London between some of its members including its Chairman and the late Pandit Motilal Nehru. He and Sir John Simon were engaged in a case before the Privy Council—a circumstance which really led up to the meeting. The Commissioners were apprehensive lest their invitation to the Pandit to meet them for an exchange of views might be rejected and, therefore its acceptance by the Pandit was to them an agreeable surprise. As to what happened at this meeting we had better allow the author to speak for himself.

"On the occasion of his meeting with us he made little enough concealment of his asperity against the British raj and he spared our feelings in no respect. We were studiously polite in return. Curious that he should have shown himself so occidental, we so oriental in demeanour, especially as, on this occasion, he was the recipient and the Englishman the dispenser of hospitality... We asked him in so many words why he thought the failure of the

Royal Commission was a foregone conclusion. He replied that, in virtue of the fact that the question of defence and the question of the Indian States had been excluded from our terms of reference, our recommendations could be of no value . . ." (p. 11).

From this it is clear that Pandit Nehru foresaw what Sir John Simon and his colleagues took two years to find out.

Who wrote the Simon Report? Sir John Simon himself or the Secretary to the Commission or somebody else? A good deal of curiosity is sometimes noticeable on the point. This was how it was done:—

"Sir John Simon was in the habit of preparing a memorandum upon whatever subject we were discussing, but he almost invariably invited one or other of his colleagues to do likewise. These memoranda were thoroughly and exhaustively discussed line by line, and by the time the Commission had finished with them they were hardly recognisable by their authors, but the result belied the proverb that too many cooks spoil the broth" (p. 287).

Mr. Cadogan's estimates of the personalities he came across are interesting and show a remarkable insight into the working of human nature. We can refer here only to two of them—Lord Irwin and Mr. Jinnah whom the author wrongly calls "Mr. Jinner" on p. 31. A similar slip occurs on p. 95, where he describes Sir Shadi Lal, the Punjab Chief Justice, as Sir Chandra Lal. Lord Irwin's one fault seemed to Mr. Cadogan to be that "he took it too much for granted that others conformed to as high a standard of honour as he had set himself." Mr. Jinnah he characterises as "the inscrutable unknown quantity" in the eyes of his countrymen.

D. V. A.

"PROJECT METHOD" IN EDUCATION.

DEVELOPING A PROJECT CURRICULUM FOR VILLAGE SCHOOLS IN INDIA.

By WILLIAM J. MACKEE. (Association Press, Calcutta.) 22cm. 435p. Rs. 2-8-0.

It is not possible to write an adequate review of this volume in a column or two, because in it the author has tried to deal in detail with one of the most vital problems facing India to-day, viz., that of providing "a basic education for its teeming millions of people." Dr. William J. Mackee has had actual experience of village teacher-training in India, when he was the Principal of the Training School at Moga in the Punjab from 1920 to 1924. And he writes from minute study and experience in this book which gives an account of his search for a suitable curriculum for the village schools in India.

The author states in the preface:

"The purpose of this study is to work out a suggestive and practical method of procedure for developing a curriculum which will help towards an effective rural elementary education in the Punjab. By "effective" is meant such an education as will function for the fullest development of the rural child and for the improvement of his home and community.

"To accomplish this purpose four distinct investigations have been undertaken, the first dealing with the history of education in India, the second dealing with the educational system of the present, the third dealing with environmental conditions as they affect education, and the fourth dealing with modern social and educational ideals and theories in their relation to India's educational problems.

"While the criteria and principles deduced from these investigations may have a general application, the conditions in various parts of India differ so widely that it would be impossible to develop a single curriculum fully

adapted to the needs of all sections. This study, therefore, has been confined to a single province, the Punjab. It has also been limited to the rural elementary schools, not because the educational goals for rural schools are different from those of urban schools, but because social conditions vary so widely that the pedagogical method of approach cannot be the same."

Dr. Mackee has adapted what is known as the "Project Method" in the modern educational practice in order to achieve the object mentioned above. This method is tried at various places in foreign lands, particularly in the United States of America, and it has been found to be very successful. Although it may not be possible to generally accept the method in ordinary schools, modifications of it are well worth trying. In India the project method has not attracted much attention among educationists except those who are working in the missionary schools mentioned in this book. Moga has given a fair trial to this method and modified it to suit local conditions. Some other outstanding indigenous schools mentioned in Chapter IV have experimented in their own way and have gained for themselves the position of leaders and path-finders.

The main idea of the Project Method is to dispense with the formal curriculum as divided into different marked-out subjects; instead of which the subject-matter that is to be taught to a particular class is woven into or grouped round some purposed activity chosen by children themselves out of the every-day social occupations of the community such as making a village garden or farm, organizing a market or a co-operative store or a savings bank, etc. A number of such activities are mentioned in the appendix of this book. It seems almost incredible that most of the matter which is taught in the primary school as separate subjects, can be covered in a most practical and interesting way by such creative activities or projects. The curriculum grows, as it were, with the activity and grows out of it as a really living thing. While following this method the teacher should not thrust any knowledge or hastily constructed curriculum upon the children. He must enter into the spirit of the method and develop his curriculum in a natural way. But this is not the place to expound the "Project method."

Dr. Mackee's scheme seems to be very practical. There is a huge cry raised now-a-days for vocational education. But stray efforts made in this direction do not meet the problem adequately. In most cases vocational education forms merely an external addition to the usual course of study, with the result that it is mostly neglected. Very little purpose is served by such education. We find that even students studying agriculture prepare themselves merely to teach agriculture and not to equip themselves for actual farming. In India all education is so divorced from actual life that most of it is wasted and if it is successful it takes away the recipient of such education from his proper place in life.

The scheme contemplated in this book tries to 'unify head-hand-heart programme' so that intellectual, vocational and emotional education is interwoven into one homogeneous whole, correlated with actual life. It will be obvious that only the main principles of such a scheme can be accepted at other places and the details will have to be worked out according to the local conditions.

The least that can be said about this book is that it is worth-reading by every worker in the educational field: it should be read again and again and studied minutely by those who have to organize rural primary education.

Chapter XVII gives the gist of the whole book in a short summary stating the weaknesses of the

present-day education in India and the basic principles of curriculum-making. The suggestions made in this chapter for a graded method of procedure are most valuable to any teacher. The author recognising the difficulties in the way of adopting such a scheme, agrees that drastic changes cannot be made and one must begin where things are. He therefore makes definite suggestions for the gradual introduction of a curriculum made in accordance with the principles outlined in the book.

The book is illustrated with 17 photographs and Dr. William H. Kilpatrick, Ph. D. of the Columbia University, has written an appreciative foreword.

B. D. KARVE.

LIFE OF SHIVAJI.

SHIVAJI THE GREAT, VOL. I PART II. By BAL KRISHNA. (Taraporewala, Bombay.) 1932. 23cm. 589p. Rs. 6.

THIS is the second part of vol. I and it fully maintains the level of scholarship and fulfils the expectations raised by the earlier part. Instead of attempting the unscientific task of placing before the public a finished biography of Shivaji by adopting or bolstering up imaginary hypothesis in various places the author has rightly chosen the humbler duty of presenting the available material in a convenient form, suggesting new lines of comparative study and helping intelligent readers to form their own conclusions. The short but critically-worded paragraphs that introduce the original documents are not summaries but are meant to rouse the reader's curiosity and sustain his determination to study and ponder over every line of the documents. The first 48 pages, however, are of a different nature. They try to give the pros and cons of the controversies on various topics about Shivaji's early career up to 1658, i.e., the period for which material from European sources does not exist. The treatment in this section, on the whole, is satisfactory and does justice to Marathi and Sanskrit contemporary documents, but the paragraphs about Hindwi Swaraja, Torna (p. 22), the Beauty of Kalyan (p. 41) and the like, dispose of in a summary fashion topics of very puzzling and controversial nature. From the third chapter onwards we tread on smoother ground since the European documents supply the picture and the Indian histories the background of the romantic career of Shivaji.

But the distinct contribution made by the present volume will be found in the three appendices at the end, which are based on Dutch sources. A close perusal of these pages not only throws new light on the Agra and Mudhol incidents but it conclusively establishes the necessity of widening the range of operations for carrying on Indian historical research. These appendices prove that in spite of the series of European publication extending over several volumes like the Dagh Register and the English Factory Records edited by eminent scholars, the tedious operation of wading through the heaps of manuscripts in European archives over again, from the viewpoint of Indian history, cannot be dispensed with. It was the late Dr. Abbott of the American Mission who first drew the attention of Indian students to this point and since then every individual effort in this direction has not failed to bring to light some new and interesting information or other. The suggestion, therefore, of an Indian organized expedition, so to say, on the archives of the European continental capitals for ransacking historical material deserves consideration. Judging

from past experience European scholars will welcome the idea. On the Indian side also the intelligent interest taken by the present representative of the noble house of Shivaji and other princes in the publication of 'Shivaji the Great' gives indications of better times to come. We hope, therefore, that the coming volume of the present work will not fail to add substantially to our knowledge of facts of the last six years of Shivaji's eventful career.

D. V. APTE.

SHORT NOTICE.

INDIAN WOMEN AND THE ART IN LIFE. By K. H. VAKIL. (Taraporewala.) 1933. 26cm. 24p. Rs. 2.

CRITICISM of art in India, apart from what has issued from a few "revivalist" writers of Mr. Vakil's intense loathing is pompous, puerile and intemperate alike in admiration as in denunciation. To disinter the dead and derive sustenance from them for artistic endeavour is as unhealthy as not to be aware of the development of one's artistic soul in terms of the past. Abominating as Mr. Vakil does the atavism in Indian art and its promoters, it ill becomes him while blowing hot to sentimentalise deliriously about "our legacy of illimitable wealth in art." Throughout the book of curtain-lectures which is born of Mr. Vakil's artistic indignation there is much cry and little wool. The reviewer for once admires the Indian womanhood for giving a patient ear to its spoken words which overflow with obsessions and wild hectoring. Reading it in expensive print one discovers two or three ruling ideas and for the rest it is all refined billingsgate. It may be that Mr. Vakil has good reason to disapprove of the ancient idealists, those who blindly copy the old models; but for an art critic to the exalted manner born, it is more dignified to give adequate food for inspiration which will be productive of original and creative art. To take the offensive as Mr. Vakil does and that with the aid of the faulty English he employs, is to defeat the end he has in view.

The canons of sober art criticism require that the lecture be reprinted in a commendable form.

K. VENUGOPAL RAO.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE WORLD CRISIS AND THE PROBLEM OF PEACE.** By S. D. CHITALE. (International Book Service, Poona 4.) 20cm. 230p. Rs. 3/12.
- TWELVE STUDIES IN SOVIET RUSSIA.** Ed. By MARGARET I. COLE. (Victor Gollancz, London.) 1933. 20cm. 282p. 5.
- THE WORLD ECONOMIC DEPRESSION. A Flea for Co-operation.** By J. C. COYAJEE. (The Huxley Press, Madras.) 1932. 24cm. 96p. Re. 1.
- THE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT IN BENGAL.** By SACHIN SEN. (M. C. Sarkar & Sons, 15, College Square-Calcutta.) 1933. 23cm. 47p. Re. 1.
- THE CAUSES OF THE PRESENT DEPRESSION AND POSSIBLE REMEDIES.** By WINTHROP W. ALDRICH. (Chase National Bank of the City of New York.) 1933. 23cm. 35p.
- THE PROBLEM OF AGRICULTURAL INDEBTEDNESS.** By NALINI RANJAN SARKAR. (The Book Co., Calcutta.) 1933. 22cm. 47p. As. 12.