

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XVI, No. 34.

POONA—THURSDAY, AUGUST 31, 1933.

{ INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6
FOREIGN 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	397
ARTICLES :—	
The Release And After.	400
Lord Rothermere and India. By C. F. Andrews. ...	401
India's Monetary Policy. By Prof. B. P. Adarkar.	402
Germany and Austria. By Madame L. Morin. ...	404
OUR LONDON LETTER.	405
REVIEWS :—	
Realistic Interpretation of World Facts. By K. Venugopal Rao.	406
History of Buddhist Literature. By Prof. Pratapgiri Ramamurti.	407
Dr. Cannan's Economics. By Prof. S. V. Ayyar. ...	408

Topics of the Week.

Unworthy.

GOVERNMENT had stooped to questioning the sincerity of the Mahatma when he said that Harijan service was the breath of his life and accused him of having during his few days of liberty given more time to politics than to Harijan work. They might have resisted the temptation. It is difficult to estimate how many hours of his waking time the Mahatma gave to Harijan work and to politics. It must however be noted that his political work received, and for obvious reasons, greater publicity than his Harijan work which apparently gave the impression that he was devoting most of his time to politics. Secondly, it was to some extent inevitable that he should, if he did, give more time to politics than to Harijan work. Civil disobedience was suspended only for six weeks and before the expiry of the time, some decision had to be taken as to the future policy of the Congress. Harijan work was less exciting, less controversial and had no time-limit; but not so a decision on the political policy of the Congress. Even if the Mahatma was minded to devote himself wholly to Harijan work, his Congress colleagues, who had foregathered in Poona, had hemmed him on all sides and urgently pressed for a decision on the future of civil disobedience. If in the circumstances he had put aside Harijan work and concentrated on politics, he could not decently be charged with insincerity for Harijan work. As to his sincerity in the Harijan cause, even the Government of India should by now be above doubt. It is a cruel injustice to question it.

Joint Report.

SIR PHEROZE SETNA did well to emphasise the vital necessity of as many Indian Delegates as find it at all possible proceeding to London for the resumption of the work of the Joint Select Committee in October next and in particular, of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru being prevailed upon to be at his post again. Wearisome and taxing as has been the work during these unending years of collaboration, and unpromising and even disappointing as are the prospects of such collaboration, it would be a grievous mistake to give way to despondency at this, the last, stage and keep away from London. It is clear that nobody entertains any the least hope of improving on the White Paper proposals. The danger of whittling them down is still very real and must be resisted to the utmost and to the last. Even so, it is another matter if the proposals as they will finally emerge will satisfy any large sections of Indian public opinion. But the time is not yet to decide whether the proposals should be accepted or rejected. That will be when the constitution bill is passed. For the moment all attention should be concentrated on improving the proposals, hoping against hope.

In this connection, it is of the utmost importance that the Indian Delegates should be invited by the British Government to participate in the discussions subsequent to the taking of evidence and sign the report of the Joint Select Committee. The laudable object that the Government had in inviting the co-operation of Indian Delegates will thereby be the better achieved. It is not enough that they should have been present during the examination of witnesses. The Indian Delegates could be of much greater assistance than that; and it should be the object of the Government to secure the maximum benefit from their cooperation. After all, the final decision will rest with His Majesty's Government and Parliament. Very few members of Parliament, or even of the Government, will be able to go through the whole of the evidence tendered before the Committee and it is as well that they should have the considered views of all those who sat through the evidence, followed it closely from day to day and gave their earnest thought to it.

Such a procedure will certainly be a departure from existing constitutional practice. But that cannot be and need not be an insuperable bar to its adoption. Many departures from precedent have already been, and more will be, made in the history of the British Constitution. The calling in of Indian Delegates to the Joint Select Committee with the right to examine witnesses is an instance in point. The whole conception of the new Indian constitution is a wide departure from precedents, and the highest constituted authorities have justified such departure. Strict adherence to precedent will mean stagnation. As long as a departure is justified on its merits, it is desirable to make it.

South African Indians.

THE schism in the ranks of the South African Indians over the Colonisation enquiry is deeply to be deplored. Those who from the highest motives advocated the boycott of the enquiry have based it on the ground, among others, that participation in it amounted to subscribing to the principle that Indians were "undesirables" in South Africa, who should therefore be sent out of that country. No such implication is tenable. Indians both in South Africa and India have never subscribed to it and have unequivocally repudiated it. If they co-operate with the Commission, it is only with a view to show conclusively and from a vantage point that there were no countries to which Indians could profitably migrate from South Africa and that the better solution for the Indian concentration in Natal was the lifting of the provincial barriers in the Union itself. Is it to be understood that of the members of the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Indian reform now sitting in London Lord Salisbury has subscribed to Indian Swaraj as the Labour representatives have or to the White Paper as Sir Samuel Hoare has? The Colonisation Enquiry Committee is free to report that colonisation is unworkable and that no considerable number of Indians were prepared to accept it. It all depends on the evidence, though personal prepossessions are bound to influence the decisions to some extent. This applies as much to Mr. S. R. Naidoo as to Mr. Heaton Nichols. The Committee is a fact-finding one and not a select committee already committed to a certain principle.

Another ground for opposition to participation in the Committee is that Indians were opposed on principle to the emigration of Union Indians. Whatever be the merits of the case, it is perhaps a little too late to ground objection on principle. At any rate, Mahatma Gandhi himself did not do so. The Indian Relief Act of 1914 made provision for repatriation and the Mahatma asked the Indians to accept the Act and treat the settlement as the Magna Charta of South African Indians. Just before leaving South Africa the Mahatma issued through the press a letter to the Indian and European public of South Africa. In it he said:

"The presence of a large indentured and ex-indentured Indian population in Natal is a grave problem. Compulsory repatriation is a physical and political impossibility; voluntary repatriation by way of granting free passages and other inducements will not, as my experience teaches me, be availed of to any appreciable extent."

Here he did not raise an objection on principle to voluntary repatriation; only he anticipated it would not be large. Though he knew that the motive of the Government and the whites was no other than their feeling that Indians were "undesirables", his acceptance of voluntary repatriation did not commit him to the same opinion. The whole trouble from the beginning in South Africa was the feeling of the whites that Indians were "undesirables." The Mahatma himself was prevented from landing for the same reason. The Mahatma knew of the "deeming order" of the Union Government that Indians were "undesirables". But it would be a grave injustice to him to accuse him of having concurred in that opinion.

Repatriation, or assisted emigration or colonisation, all have the same purpose, the reduction of the Indian population in the Union. They are variants of the same fundamental objective. The present dissentients had themselves, after much debate, agreed to the investigation of the kind now set on foot by the Union Government. If a principle was sacrificed, it was sacrificed then and by the protesters themselves.

In participating in the preliminary enquiry nothing is being done which has not been sanctioned by Mahatma Gandhi and no commitment made by the Indians that they were "undesirables" in South Africa. There is everything to gain and nothing to lose by participation. The unreasoning attitude of certain leaders will alienate much goodwill of the whites which successive Indian Agents have generated. It is noteworthy that not only the *Natal Mercury* but also the *Natal Advertiser* has advocated the lifting of the provincial barriers. It may be that the preliminary colonisation enquiry committee will be, if properly handled, the instrument to secure this much-needed reform.

* * *

An Astounding Decision.

THE Calcutta Port Trust has by a majority decided against any preference being shown to goods of Indian manufacture in its own purchases. The decision will, we are sure, be universally received with dismay if not disgust. At a time when the Government themselves lose no opportunity of enjoining upon its purchasing officers their duty to go in for Indian-made goods in preference to foreign ones, it is most surprising that a body subordinate to them should thus dare to go against their declared policy. But even more astounding are the Port Trustees' reasons in support of their anti-national decision. They argue that as most of their revenue is derived from foreign trade they must not do anything which will discourage foreign imports. Even if this involves some unfairness and even injustice to Indian trade, we suppose that must be tolerated in the interest of the Calcutta Port Trust. If their object is to encourage foreign trade, it is difficult to see why they have restricted their attention only to their own requirements. Why do they not take courage in both their hands and inaugurate a "Buy Foreign" campaign in opposition to the "Buy Indian" campaign which is now blessed even by the Government! That would be a thoroughly practical way of not only retaining their revenue at its present level but also of adding to it. The Calcutta Port Trustees must indeed be living in a world of their own if even at this time of the day they are so utterly ignorant of the universally popular sentiment in favour of swadeshi. It is time they realised that revenue cannot be the only consideration in deciding the stores purchase policy of the Government or of semi-Government bodies like themselves. It is now a generally accepted maxim that this must be so shaped that by promoting the enlarged use of genuine swadeshi goods it will encourage Indian trade. The Calcutta Trust's decision is a clear departure from this principle and must not be allowed to operate.

* * *

Equal Status for Federal Chambers.

ANYBODY with any acquaintance with the course of contemporary events knows what importance the Princes attach to the need of investing both Houses of the Federal legislature with equal powers in all matters, not excluding even financial. They seem to have reconciled themselves to the inferior status impliedly assigned to the Upper Chamber by the requirement that money bills must be introduced in none but the more popular house. But their protagonists on the Joint Select Committee seem to have made up their mind not to allow any further detraction from its status. Can it deal with Demands for grants just the same as the Assembly which, according to the White Paper, "will be empowered to assent or refuse assent to any Demand or to reduce the amount specified therein, whether by way of a general reduction

of the total amount of the Demand or of the reduction or omission of any specific item or items included in it"? Proposal No. 48 which defines the powers of the Upper House in this respect empowers it "to require, if a motion to that effect is moved on behalf of the Government and accepted, that any Demand which has been reduced or rejected by the Assembly shall be brought before a joint session of both Chambers for final determination". This, it was contended, was anything but making its powers coextensive with those of the Lower House. Lord Salisbury pointed out that while the Assembly will have the power of rejecting a demand, the Senate will enjoy no such power, its assistance being invoked only in cases in which the demands have been rejected or reduced by the Assembly. He went on to remark that even if the Council of State wanted to check manifest extravagance by rejecting or reducing a Demand it would, under the proposal as worded, be powerless to act. It however appeared from some of Sir Samuel Hoare's replies that he was under the impression that a demand which is reduced or rejected by the Assembly could be taken to the Upper House, as under the present Constitution. But after some discussion he too unhesitatingly accepted Lord Salisbury's interpretation of the relevant proposal in the White Paper, that "although the Council of State will have complete co-ordinate authority in respect of the Finance Bill, it will have a very much lower authority than the Assembly in respect of what you call demands, or what we should call estimates." When subsequently Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru also drew Sir Samuel Hoare's attention to the defective wording of the White Paper from the point of view of clearly bringing out the idea of co-equal power for both Chambers, which he took care to make clear that he did not favour, the Secretary of State promised to remedy the flaw when the Reform Bill came to be drafted.

* * *

List of Central Subjects.

STATES' representatives on the Joint Select Committee made no secret of their strong dislike of the proposed classification of Governmental functions into only three categories: Federal, Provincial and Concurrent. Their contention was that subjects which were really Central were included in the first list and they therefore pressed that a fourth list of those subjects should figure in the Constitution Act. In resisting the demand Sir Samuel Hoare said:

"... It is not so much a question of principle as a question of constitutional convenience. We have been informed by our expert advisers that judging by the experience of other Constitutions the fewer lists you have the better. The more lists you have, the more opportunity there is for litigation, and for a "No Man's Land" between the various lists. On that account, we have been very anxious to keep the lists as few as possible, and as simple as possible. It was upon that ground, chiefly, that we included all these Central Services, whether they are Federal or whether they are British-Indian Central Services, in one list; drawing, however, a gap between the two, as Members of the Committee will see upon page 115, and realising the whole time that the Princes are, speaking generally, only contemplating coming in upon the first 48 subjects. That is why we put these two chapters into one list."

Lord Salisbury, endorsing the Princes' demand, pointed to the impossibility of the gap being reproduced in the Act; but could hardly induce the Secretary of State to make any substantial modification in his previous answer.

* * *

Nominated Federal Ministers?

SOME useful information was elicited in the course of Sir Samuel Hoare's examination before the

Joint Select Committee about the ten seats in the Upper Federal Chamber left open to nomination, by the Governor-General. It is on the cards that to four out of the ten, States' representatives would be nominated and the balance would, it was made clear by the witness, be distributed among the different communities in British India in such a manner that the communal balance established by the Communal Award would not be disturbed. However much one may object to the principle of nomination itself, there is very little in the manner in which the seats are to be apportioned between the two parts of India with which any fault can be found. But the real point is whether the nominated members will be considered eligible for Ministerships. Sir Samuel Hoare's affirmative reply to this question, joined to his comparison of a nominated Minister to the inclusion of a Peer in the British ministry, will be generally regarded as very unsatisfactory and betokens a deplorable lack of appreciation on his part of the difference between the political conditions in the two countries. In replying to Mr. Joshi's question, "whether a man who is appointed Minister and fails to secure election could be made a nominated member," the Secretary of State went so far as to prophesy the occurrence of such instances, in the same way "as it has happened here that a man fails to be elected a member of the House of Commons and he is subsequently made a Peer." It would have been well if the point had been pursued further with a view to finding out how many of such Peers, if any, had so far found their way into the Ministry. As can be easily understood, it is one thing to make Peer of a man who is defeated at an election; but it is quite another to defy public opinion to the extent of making him a Minister. Of the latter variety, it is more than doubtful if Sir Samuel Hoare could have produced many instances. The nominated Minister or Ministers, it was pointed out to him, would help to blur the sense of responsibility of the executive to the legislature. But the Secretary of State merely contented himself with differing from that view without assigning any reason. May we hope that Indian delegates will leave no stone unturned to prevent nominated members being considered in connection with Ministerships?

* * *

Arrangements for Transitory Period.

ARRANGEMENTS for the transitory period between the introduction of provincial autonomy and the setting up of the Federal Centre contemplate the continuance of the present Indian Legislature, the removal of the limit on the number of Counsellors to be appointed by the Governor-General, the vesting of administrative control of Central Departments in the Governor-General and the suspension of the operation of provisions relating to the Council of Ministers. This provision was interpreted in some quarters as an attempt to endow the Governor-General with virtually dictatorial powers in regard to the Centre. The apprehensions aroused in the public mind by the relevant clause of the White Paper were represented to the Secretary of State by Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar in a specially prepared memorandum. The contents of this memorandum need not be referred to in detail, for before replying to Mr. Iyengar's points, they were succinctly summarised by Sir Samuel Hoare without any challenge by the former. The Secretary of State thus described the state of mind of Mr. Iyengar and those whom he represented:

"He is nervous of the autonomous Provinces being set up, of the Federation not coming into being, and as a result of the setting up of the Autonomous Provinces the existing Central Government becoming something in the

nature of Crown Colony Government. He assumes that the Viceroy's Council would come to an end, and that, therefore, the Central Government would become a much more personal kind of Government than it is at the present time."

* * * *

Sir Samuel Hoare then assured the Committee that that was not the Government's intention. He added :

"Our intention is to make only such changes in the Central Government during the transitory period as will enable the autonomous provinces to be set up, and as will ensure the autonomous provinces having full opportunity for developing their autonomy. We, therefore, propose that within those conditions the Viceroy's Council would continue. Obviously, it would be subjected to alteration, both in its duties and also in its personnel, but always remembering the change that the setting up of autonomous provinces has made in the constitutional picture, we should go on with the Central Government as nearly what it is now as it could be, assuming the conditions that I have just defined. Again, as to the legislature we should propose to make no changes in this transitory period in the methods under which the legislature is constituted. We should either continue the existence of the present legislature, or if it looks as if the time of the transitory period was longer than some might expect, then we should have to make arrangements for the re-election of a Central Legislature but we should do it upon the present basis."

He justified this course of action in the following words :

"We have definitely come to the view, after a great deal of thought, that it is much wiser to deal with the transitory period on those lines than it is to adopt any alternative method for making substantial transitory changes in the Central Government. We think upon every ground that that would be a mistake. In the first place, it would make many people think that the period was not going to be a transitory period at all, but that it was a permanent period that we were contemplating. Secondly, I think that, short of the larger changes that we are contemplating under our constitutional procedure, the fewer smaller changes that are made, the better, from every point of view, and particularly from the point of view of stability. . . . the more you make arrangements that would make it appear to be a permanent period, the more likely is that period to go on for an indefinite length."

Articles.

THE RELEASE AND AFTER.

IT is a matter of intense relief and satisfaction that Mahatma Gandhi was, under section 401 (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code, unconditionally released on the 23rd inst. after a fast of just a week, and a terrible tragedy which seemed imminent and inevitable was averted. But the relief is not un-mixed with anxiety for the future. The release of the Mahatma does not seem to indicate any change of policy on the part of the authorities, according to inspired messages from Simla. If the Mahatma courted prison again, he would be allowed no greater privileges than those which provoked the last fast. Unconditional release, civil disobedience, jail, restricted freedom for Harijan work, fast,

hospital and release—these seem to be the inevitable arcs of the vicious circle. If this should unfortunately be the case, will it enable the Mahatma to undertake any work for the uplift of the Harijans on which he is so much bent? It often happens in life that for the sake of the chief objective, others have to be subordinated. If the Mahatma involves himself in this circle, he can have a personal duel with the Government as to the adequacy of the facilities for Harijan work but he will not be doing any good to the Harijan cause which he has so much at heart. Which is his chief objective, when he is not to have both—improving the morals of the Government or Harijan service? The parable is not without present application which refers to the claim of a mother and a stepmother to the possession of a child. When the shrewd judge proposed to cut up the baby and give each a half, the real mother immediately surrendered her claim in order that the child's life might be saved.

But this is not to justify the action of the Government in restricting the facilities. In the interview which the Mahatma gave soon after his release he published the letter of the Government of India, dated the 3rd Nov. last which is absolutely unequivocal in its acknowledgment of the special status and responsibility of the Mahatma to do Harijan service even from within the jail. The orders run as follows :—

"Government of India recognise, in view of considerations stated in Mr. Gandhi's letters of October 18th and October 24th, that if he is to carry out the programme that he has set before himself in regard to removal of untouchability, which they had not before fully appreciated, it is necessary that he should have freedom in regard to visitors and correspondence on matters strictly limited to removal of untouchability.

"They also recognise that if Mr. Gandhi's activities in this matter are to be fully effective, there can be no restriction on publicity.

"As they do not wish to interpose obstacles to Mr. Gandhi's efforts in connection with the problem of untouchability, they are removing all restrictions on visitors, correspondence and publicity, in regard to matters which, in Mr. Gandhi's own words, 'have no reference to Civil Disobedience and are strictly limited to removal of untouchability.'

"They note that Mr. Gandhi contemplates presence of officials at interviews and inspection then and there of correspondence, should Government at any time consider such procedure as desirable."

It is wholly irrelevant to the point at issue whether the Mahatma was a State prisoner or other. Only a pettifogging Secretariat underling will be capable of the most stupid blunder that the Government have made in going back on the understanding of November last on the technical ground that the Mahatma has not on this occasion a State prisoner. An instance of a more utter lack of imagination and commonsense is difficult to conceive. Whatever be the legal and moral considerations, Government stand committed, and rightly, to giving unrestricted facilities to the Mahatma in jail to carry on Harijan work and there was not the slightest justification for

going back on that commitment. It is also difficult to forgive the Government for not including in their recent *communiqué* the orders of the Government of India of the 3rd Nov. last on which the Mahatma had based his present claim. It was not to be supposed that the document would never see the light of day. In withholding it from the public, Government have been guilty of an unworthy act of hitting below the belt and misrepresenting the Mahatma.

It is to be hoped that, should circumstances again unfortunately bring the Mahatma to the jail, Government will not repeat their blunder. We repeat the suggestion we made last week that if the jail discipline is disturbed by giving the Mahatma these facilities, Government should intern him in a special bungalow and make him his own jailor, with freedom to carry on any and every kind of constructive social work, short of promoting civil disobedience.

Far more important than the present duel between the Mahatma and the Government is the future of the country and the part to be played by the Mahatma and the Congress. The official policy of the Congress since the Poona Conference is individual civil disobedience. Not many have come forward to offer it. The Congress has ceased to function. There is peace in the country—the peace of the cemetery!

We would implore the Mahatma to read the signs of the times aright. Whatever be his estimate of the character of the present Government, it is not shared by not inconsiderable sections of the people; not all of whom are unpatriotic. Not many of those who shared his opinion have joined the ranks of his non-violent army and gone to the front. Of those who did, the great majority have since retired from the field for one reason or another. Now he is left almost alone,—the general without the army. Not only have they dropped out but pleaded with him that they were tired, they had no desire to continue the civil disobedience movement any longer, and begged him

to cry a halt and change the route. May not the Mahatma listen to the advice of his own followers, who have been loyal to him and who, at his command, braved all repression and courted no end of suffering and sacrifice? Let him not surrender to the Government: that would be a humiliation. Let him not listen even to the advice of those who may compendiously be called the Constitutionalists, who all along opposed his programme of civil disobedience. But what of those who were his staunchest followers? If it is a surrender, it is a surrender to friends, not to foes; to love and not to force. No body doubts the courage of the Mahatma; he will face death itself cheerfully in the interest of the country. If he changes his policy, he will do it not because he is tired of sacrifice or lost faith in himself but because of his love for his faithful disciples, who ask for a change. If he would be a democrat, may he not listen to the voice of his chosen people and not set his own personal inclination above their considered opinion? We would beg the Mahatma, if we may, to call off civil disobedience altogether,—not as a surrender to the Government but as a concession to his own people. If there is any disgrace in it, it will be due to his people and not to himself. The greatest of reformers must work with the people as he finds them. And if they are unable to rise to his level, he must step down a bit and accommodate himself to their capacity if he would help them. Going to jail again by himself will be heroic, certainly; but it will not help the Harijans or the nation as a whole.

If once civil disobedience is called off, the road will be clear for constitutional action, which is badly wanted. A combination, for instance, of the Mahatma and Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru would create such a tremendous constitutional force in India as will tell on the British. Our divisions are our worst enemy; and no two persons can attempt to minimise the evil with greater chances of success than the Mahatma and Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru.

LORD ROTHERMERE AND INDIA.

DURING the past six months I have been watching very carefully the campaign which is being ruthlessly conducted by the London *Daily Mail* against Indian aspirations. It has consistently supported Mr. Winston Churchill, Lord Lloyd and other Diehard Conservatives in the Houses of Parliament. It has flooded the country with propaganda of a very unscrupulous character against Mr. Stanley Baldwin. It has opened its columns almost daily to the 'India Empire League' which is the most reactionary of all the organisations now engaged in anti-Indian publicity work. This League might almost today be called the organ of anti-Indian propaganda.

The *Daily Mail* proprietor, Lord Rothermere, has become the passionate champion of this Die-hard anti-Indian campaign. Money has flowed into the League chest and it appears to be able to finance and send out speakers wherever there is an opening and

also to obtain a very prominent place in the innumerable provincial papers of Great Britain. The *Daily Mail* press itself is syndicated, and a whole series of evening newspapers is allied to it. But in addition to these allies, which are statellites of the *Daily Mail*, there are very many others of great importance that have been carried over by the increasing popularity of the cry of 'The Empire in Danger' which the *Daily Mail* has raised.

The *Daily Express*, for instance, with its two million circulation, is not going to be outdone by the *Daily Mail*. Lord Beaverbrook will never be behindhand, when Lord Rothermere leads the way. He will try to 'go one better' and he is doing this with regard to India. The *Evening Standard* is now by far the most powerful and influential London evening newspaper. Its circulation has at last exceeded 2,000,000, while the *Evening News*, which is allied to the *Daily Mail*, is still under 1,000,000.

Both these evening papers run one another very hard in their cry of the "Empire in Danger." Between them, they practically control the evening press of the Metropolis, with its ten million population; for the *Star*, which is the only Liberal paper, has a comparatively small circulation compared with these two big evening 'Dailies.'

Lord Rothermere himself has become a protagonist in this gigantic battle. He has obtained someone to "brief" for him and to furbish up his arguments. He poses always as an authority, though he is nothing of the kind. Besides admitting, at carefully chosen intervals, articles by Mr. Winston Churchill and Lord Lloyd into his leading columns he also occupies this space himself and fills the middle with articles of the crudest character, calling India "Great Britain's possession" which has been won by the sword of our forefathers and must be maintained by the sword. The Rudyard Kipling type of Englishman is set forward as the ideal to be aimed at—the man who will shoulder the "white man's burden" while the "silent sullen people" of the East watch him at work. Nothing can be more repulsive than the pattern he thus sets up before the youth of England of the superior white man, and as long as that idea continues to be held there is nothing to be done except to resist it with all one's might. Quite recently this strong man's policy has had a most unfortunate boom from the Nazi propaganda in Germany. We are told by Herr Hitler in his book "Mein Kampf" that it is this strong-willed Englishman whom he admires, especially in India.

Lord Rothermere goes further still in his argument. His second line of attack is on the side of cupidity and greed. Great Britain, he says, has grown rich on her Indian trade. This Indian market provides one-fifth of the income of every British household. No family in Great Britain will be unaffected, if, by our own folly and stupidity, we lose that market! Therefore there must be no relaxing at all of the British hold on India! Lord Irwin did this very thing and at once all went to pieces, (so Lord Rothermere explains what happened) but Lord Willingdon has applied just in the nick of time the strong hand again and all is quiet. The British Government has only to keep that strong hand on India and all will go well. But once relax and go back to Lord Irwin's policy and all will go to pieces. Every day this propaganda of the "strong hand" goes on and the younger generation in England, in so far as it admires Herr Hitler and Mustafa Kemal and Mussolini, gives ear to this Rothermere doctrine. Even if the "strong hand" would not succeed in England it is absolutely essential (so they are taught at school) for those "lesser breeds without the law" about whom Kipling writes to be governed in this manner. The mischief that is thus done is almost incredible, and it has become very hard indeed in this time of post-war disillusionment to counteract this definite Fascist spirit, as applied to the East. It is strongly capturing Central and Southern Europe and its repercussion is being felt in England.

The last argument of Lord Rothermere is based on population. He points to Japan with its increase of 1,000,000 in a single year, and declares that the vast excess of population in Great Britain was due to the same cause as that of Japan, namely 'Empire-building.' The British found all the food for this over-population out of her Indian market. Therefore, if we once lose this Indian trade, our surplus millions will starve: our unemployed will be double the number which we see to-day.

How far there is any truth in this argument it is difficult to say: but Lord Rothermere never considers the Indian side of the same picture. What about Indians starving to give food to Great Britain? He never faces this directly. But indirectly he turns the argument round by picturing the 'chamber of horrors' that India would become if Great Britain left India to its own devices. He luridly pictures, in that case, another China and turns away from the grossly selfish argument to the sentimentally romantic. "We could never forgive ourselves," he cries, "if we saw Indian poor people massacred and looted by bandits as they are in China. To contemplate this is to understand what a 'base betrayal' it would be, if England left India."

C. F. ANDREWS.

INDIA'S MONETARY POLICY.

SEVERAL important events have taken place during the last few weeks which are of great significance to the monetary and economic future of this country. Whatever else the World Economic Conference achieved or failed to achieve, it has led at least to two developments which, from the Indian standpoint, it must be admitted, bid fair to dominate our future economic wellbeing to a greater or less degree. In the first place, the Silver Agreement, signed by the silver-producing and silver-using countries, has made it feasible for this country to unload its unwanted silver on the world market without let or hindrance and without any heart-burning. For some time past the currency authorities of this country have been disposing of their silver stock and consolidating their gold position. Whether or not this is a wise move on their part we shall discuss in a moment. But one fact is certain, and it is that this Silver Agreement is a definite step in the otherwise faltering progress of monetary affairs in this and other countries for some long time past. Secondly, as an offshoot of the World Economic Conference deliberations, the various delegations of the Empire countries have met and have entered into a pact of co-operation for evolving a common monetary policy for the Empire as a whole. No doubt this pact is just a reaffirmation of a similar agreement arrived at at Ottawa, but the fact that until now practical action in regard to that agreement was allowed to be postponed in the hope that some sort of world consensus might be achieved at the World Economic Conference and that this hope has been now dashed to the ground, makes the new pact all the more significant and full of potentialities. Thirdly, the Reserve Bank Committee have concluded

their deliberations and signed their Report, and it is only a matter of time for the pros and cons of the Reserve Bank to be again debated and the old battles fought all over again. In view of these outstanding events, it becomes necessary to examine once again the question of India's monetary and exchange policy with a view to chalking out a path for its future course, for we are now on the threshold of developments in this direction which are capable of making or marring our destinies as a nation.

It is very gratifying indeed that our financial straits of Delhi have after all come to the conclusion that the continuous process of headlong deflation through which this country was put during the last decade or so, both as a result of indigenous and of world forces, needs now to be reversed. It was the one glaring fact on which all the disagreeing delegates of the World Economic Conference heartily agreed—this need for reversing the course of falling world prices, although the remedies proposed by them towards that end showed marked divergencies as to character and content. Some proposed a purely monetary reflation brought about by the pumping of purchasing power into the body economic; others proposed public works schemes to make the reflation more real and of permanent value. This is not the place to reiterate facts or arguments as to why the World Economic Conference failed to achieve even seeming unity on these highly essential matters. As some economic thinkers put it, perhaps the greatest merit of the World Economic Conference lay in that it helped to clarify issues and the theoretical bases of the methodology of controlling the depression. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that one important consequence of the disillusion created by the failure of the Conference has been that the nations of the world are more and more adhering to the doctrines of self-sufficiency, of economic isolation and of advance planning. "Each one for himself and the devil take the hindmost" has now come to be the motto of these jaded enthusiasts of international cooperation and fellowship.

So long as this country was on the gold exchange standard or gold exchange-*cum*-bullion standard, it was impossible for it to escape the consequences of falling gold prices. For several well-known reasons the monetary authorities in India have for long preferred the sterling-rupee nexus to any alternative scheme of management, irrespective of its merits or demerits. Their unwillingness to sever that connection virtually meant the dragging of the economy of this country down the slippery slope of deflation. The precious metals have for generations past exercised a magical influence on the minds of statesmen of all nations and it was no wonder that frantic efforts were made till September 1931 to keep sterling on gold, although it was becoming daily clearer and clearer that adherence to gold meant simply aggravation of those financial difficulties of England and the sterling block, such as adverse balances of trade and so forth, which it was the concern of these statesmen to surmount all the time. It was one of the best things that could happen to the world in general, and

to the sterling group and this country in particular that sterling made its departure from gold in September 1931.

In the altered circumstances the sterling-rupee nexus, instead of becoming a load round the neck of Indian trade, has now become a source of great security in a whirl of world-wide uncertainty. There are indeed those who rightly assert that the sterling-rupee nexus was not a *sine qua non* for the new freedom that we now share with England in monetary matters. Even if independently we had been on the gold standard, our departure from gold could have given the same relief to trade which has now resulted from easier price-levels at home and abroad in terms of the rupee. Nevertheless we must grant that in the present world situation, so long as sterling has not bound itself through a pegged exchange to either dollar or franc but maintains an independent career of its own, adherence to the sterling exchange standard has many advantages to commend itself. As English economists like Cannan and Keynes have been complaining, however, Conservative opinion has not crystallised in this connection and it is still vacillating between a *pukka* gold standard and an exchange standard of some kind. Therefore, the agreement entered into by the Empire delegations to maintain parity with sterling and to form what Sir Basil Blackett characteristically describes as a *sterlingaria* must be admitted to be only a half-measure, in so far as it leaves Great Britain free to make its own choice as to the standard, regardless of the needs of the other parts of the Empire. It would be utterly imprudent for us to give ourselves up to the tender mercies of London High Finance, which will apparently give prime consideration to its own convenience and profit in the management of sterling. It must be understood that inter-imperial co-operation and control are an essential prerequisite to the formation of a sterling area—a fact which unfortunately has, it seems, escaped the attention of the Empire delegations.

The present monetary policy of the Government of India has this in common with that of the British Government, that both the governments seem to be singularly hazy as to the future course of action. In this regard Simla perhaps is a little better, because it has at least done its religious duty of pegging the rupee exchange at 18d., and has agreed to follow the lead of London. Both the Indian and the British authorities however seem to be nursing a hope of some kind of return to the gold standard, sooner or later. Luckily public opinion in Great Britain has enjoyed the fruits of monetary freedom too long to be anxious to effect a premature return to gold. Public opinion in this country, however, has since the days of the Fowler Commission insistently clamoured for an orthodox gold currency standard of the real old kind and in its recent preoccupation with the ratio controversy has not had the opportunity to taste the bitter-sweet of the gold standard. Its childish fondness for gold will indeed die hard. But on what plausible ground except perhaps that of financial conservatism can the monetary authorities in this coun-

try commit themselves and the future of economic India to the old, long-exploded fetish of gold? Yet apparently that is what they appear to have in mind, what with their silver sales and gold accumulations and bullion backings for the proposed Reserve Bank. Gold is an international standard; adherence to it might at the most give us a stability of exchanges and foreign trade; it cannot by any stretch of imagination secure *internal* stability of trade for this country. To sacrifice the needs of internal trade, which is several times more voluminous than our external trade, for the interests of a minority of the nation is to spoil the ship for a ha' pennyworth of tar. It is to be hoped that the Indian Government will take all these points into consideration before finally wedding itself to a gold standard. At the moment the sterling-rupee connection is right enough and its judicious use will certainly benefit India, but blind adherence either to sterling or gold or to both must deprive this country once more of that freedom of action as regards internal management of prices which is a matter of paramount importance to its economic life and structure.

B. P. ADARKAR.

GERMANY AND AUSTRIA.

THE attitude adopted by France and England regarding the Austro-German incidents, their common official protest at the German Foreign Ministry, and the negative reply from Germany, are too significant for the present state of international relations to remain unnoticed. Even before the French and English "démarches," Italy had made unofficial and friendly representations to Germany on the same ground.

The reply to France and England has come as a painful surprise. The Germans pretend that throwing hostile documents against the Dollfuss Government on Austrian territory, from German aeroplanes, and addressing anti-Governmental propaganda by wireless to the Austrian people, is not inconsistent with existing treaty obligations, nor with the promise made by Germany to respect Austria's independence. This sounds a little bit like when Mr. Goebbels says: "Christ cannot have been a Jew. There is no need to prove it scientifically. It is so."

But Germany's interference in the home affairs of the Viennese Government is considered by France and England as contrary to the spirit of the Four Power Pact. On the other hand, the Germans consider the interference of France and England in the German-Austrian dispute as "inadmissible."

And the Hitlerians continue to please themselves. While the ambassadors of France and England were politely voicing their remonstrances, an Austrian patrol was being shot on the Bavarian frontier by German volunteers lying in ambush by the roadside, and similar incidents have occurred again since then. The propaganda against the Austrian Government is still being carried on, after several days have elapsed. The speech by Herr Heibicht, broadcasted from Munich, has created a sensation in that way. From one end to the other it is an attack diverted against the present Government and an appeal to overthrow it at elections. Herr Heibicht is a German member of the Nazi Party, personally appointed by Hitler last year with the task of organising the Nazi campaign in Austria, from which country he has lately been expelled. Other

speeches must in the same tone have been broadcasted during the following days.

Germany knows only too well that she has not much to fear from France, England and Italy, beyond verbal indignations, and that she can safely go on applying to Austria the tactics which have proved so successful in establishing Hitlerian control over Germany.

An important centre for propaganda and espionage has been discovered in Vienna. The plans of the Nazis are to organise agitation for general elections, which would be "managed" so as to return a large Nazi majority; spying, effectively conducted, especially among civil servants; recruitment of an adequate legionary force, composed of Austrians but kept in reserve in Germany to be used inside Austria at the given moment; an energetic sabotage of the economic plans of the present Austrian Government, this sabotage being meant to increase unemployment; and to foment discontent and despair among the population.

The documents seized also prove that the German minister to Austria has been actively supporting the anti-Austrian movement by all kinds of means, making liberal use of the special facilities enjoyed by him owing to his official and diplomatic position. The whole scheme was perfectly organised on the German side as well as in various Austrian centres ready to receive orders.

Comments in the French Press have a different character according to their origin. The Radical press supports the view, which is also expressed by many English papers, that the German answer was really a bluff meant to save Hitlerian prestige inside Germany, and that the representations made by France, England and Italy will bear their fruit. It is fair, they say, to wait for some time before forming a final opinion upon the Germans' real intentions. Germany must be judged by her acts, not by her words.

But the Press of the Right is certainly not so conciliatory. Several papers consider that the present attitude of Germany proves the inefficiency of the Four Power Pact and will deal one more fatal blow to the authority of the League of Nations. Others deplore that the provisions of the Four Power Pact are lacking in precision and that no sanctions have been foreseen against those who do not respect their engagements. These omissions are considered by some to be one of the chief causes of the present incidents.

M. Pierre Bernus, in the *Journal des Débats* accuses the French Press of trying to hide the failure of the Franco-British "démarche", encouraging thereby ignorance in public opinion, with a view to legitimate official inaction in the matter.

As a matter of fact, the Germans have not fulfilled the promises given privately to the Italian Government of stopping the aggressive propaganda which had given rise to international anxiety.

The argument put forward that Hitler is obliged to reckon with German public opinion and save appearances by an open negative answer, while secretly giving assurances of future good behaviour, hardly holds good in the present case. "Distinction between inner and outer policy is rarely justified in our time", says M. Bernus, "it certainly cannot be applied to Hitlerian Germany, who professes a perfectly unified policy of absolute pan-Germanism inside as well as outside the country."

The assurances given to Italy have no lasting value since the Reich does not give up considering Austria as his domain and goes on preparing a Nazi revolution there.

Yet, Hitler has proved that he can act diplomatically. It is not impossible that an order will be given to carry on milder propaganda and stop aeroplane incursions on Austrian territory for a time. International opinion, reassured, may then safely go to sleep again.

The Editor of the American Review *Foreign Affairs*, Mr. Hamilton Fish Armstrong, gives a fair idea of that kind of tactics in a little book called "Hitler's Reich", which he has just published on his return from Germany. He happened to be in Danzig just after the Nazis had come into power, and was surprised to see that they treated the Poles more kindly than might have been expected. He questioned one of the Nazi chief who replied: "We are simply holding Danzig for Hitler, so that it can be incorporated into the Reich as soon as the order will be given". In the meanwhile, diplomacy must be used. And Mr. Armstrong concludes: "In other words, here as well as in Austria, Hitler's plan is ultimately to be the master, to excite or to calm the population according to circumstances, to irritate or to appease his foreign opponents according to political necessities, until he manages to assimilate the country to the German Reich."

Old traditional formulas, amicable representations, recourse to the mechanism of the League of Nations—all these are of no avail when one has to face a people trained to the daily use of the most brutal means, and who reckons upon the ignorance, the weakness, and even in certain cases upon the cowardice of other nations, to establish its domination. "But", says the *Journal des Débats* "the German people would listen to energetic language. If they are not made to understand that right will be served by might, in the present European circumstances catastrophes will happen...and peace will be lost."

Certain papers advocate confidential steps on the ground that German opinion should not be unduly excited or exalted, while on the contrary a public warning might prove much more efficient, on the condition that it should express a firm will and leave no scope for doubt.

The open provocations of Germany against the Austrian Government do not concern Germany and Austria only. These incidents raise a most serious and vital question of principle in international relations. Deliberate blindness to facts can lead to the worst consequences. Those who are in power at present can no longer cultivate irresponsibility without gravely endangering world peace and respect for any international agreements.

L. MORIN.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, August 18.

MAHATMAJI'S LATEST.

WITH the news that, faithful to his leader, Mr. Aney has sought and found imprisonment once more, comes the still more important news that the Government of Bombay have capitulated to Mahatma Gandhi, and have allowed him, subject to certain restrictions and limitations, to carry on his Harijan work, despite the fact that he is now a convicted prisoner, and no longer a "State" detenu. Common sense should have dictated so reasonable an

accommodation long before the position became acute. It would appear, from the new facts that have so far reached here, that the prison authorities did, last week, permit him the desired facilities, and then, for some unknown reason, withheld them again this week, with the result that might have been easily anticipated. Why this foolish step was taken or upon whose instructions requires some explanation. Apart altogether from the particular act of folly on the part of the authorities concerned, it is beyond ordinary understanding, why they rode for a fall like this. They must have known of the possibility of some such thing occurring, if they had at all thought out the implications of the Mahatma's determination to return to prison. They had made all arrangements, this time, for his prosecution and his confinement as an "A" class prisoner. What had happened between his release from detention until his new imprisonment to alter the character of the distinguished rebel, his interest in the untouchability problem, and the manner in which, it might be supposed, he would deal with it, is a matter upon which it is unnecessary to speculate. Either the situation was, essentially, notwithstanding a change of status as a prisoner, exactly what it had been on the point of the Mahatma's continuing his social reform propaganda in this respect, or it had fundamentally altered. If the former, it should have been made clear to all concerned that he was to be allowed facilities for it. If the latter, not even a threatened fast should have moved the authorities, unless they have realised that foolish prison rules ought to be permitted to override the common sense of providing non-labour prisoners with useful methods of occupying leisure, and preferably such as they themselves would choose. Even criminal convicts should be allowed to work "with the grain" and not "against it". However that may be, at this distance it looks as though the Bombay Government had been as little prescient as possible or else having taken their stand upon one line of action or inaction, they have, under the compulsion of a stronger will than their own or fear of consequences upon public opinion if, as a result of persistence in their intended course, the Mahatma perished on their hands, withdrawn from that attitude. Had Mr. Sen-Gupta died as a free man he would have been revered as a genuine patriot who had made great sacrifices for the country's welfare. The fact that he died as a State prisoner will be imputed to the Government for an offence against the nation. How much worse, then, had the authorities proved inflexible and Mr. Gandhi had pursued his intention to commit suicide in protest against a callous official refusal to exercise a general tolerance towards a distinguished, if eccentric and unique, prisoner held in wide esteem as the most eminent Indian of his day and one of the great religious and social reformers of our time? They could not have put the position lower than that, however strongly they might differ from his political views or even his social reform methods. Even the Bombay Government, amply as it recognises the good done by the Salvation Army in human uplift, does not necessarily adopt its brass band and big drum methods of propaganda! As it is, the Mahatma has again won, the fast is called off almost as soon as begun, and the prestige of official authority has received another check. From six thousand miles away, it does not look as if the dispute was worth it. Nobody, of course, will be punished for this fresh occasion of fatuity. But why cannot it, even under a bureaucratic system, be penalised, so that the people can know, not only that someone has blundered, but that he has suffered for it, too?

Since the above lines were written we are informed that Mr. Gandhi has changed his mind and that,

being dissatisfied with the conditions laid down for him by the Government, and which it was supposed that he had accepted, for the continuation of his work on behalf of the untouchables, he has resumed his fast. A further telegram from the *Times*' Simla correspondent states that "from past experience it was obvious that Mr. Gandhi would insist on the whole of his demand, whether part was conceded or not. Attention is drawn here to his omission to try to do anything for the Harijans during his recent activities when he was out of prison." The message adds that "resentment against Mr. Gandhi's methods has already found expression among the orthodox Hindus of Bombay."

To those, like ourselves in this country, it seems equally obvious that, if Mr. Gandhi was certain to demand the whole and not be satisfied with the part, it would have been not merely wisdom, but ordinary plain common sense, as a result of past experience, once it had been decided not to withhold facilities from Mr. Gandhi on the score of his change of status, to have conceded the whole. The authorities at Yeravda had managed very well on the previous occasion, notwithstanding certain inconveniences to those concerned, and there was no reason to suppose that they could not cope with the situation again. Moreover, Mr. Gandhi, though not a State prisoner, in the technical sense of the term, is so in a general sense, his sole offence having been the technical refusal to obey an order issued to him under a special law that now forms part of the ordinary law of the country. And in the eyes of his countrymen and of foreigners, he is the most eminent captive in India today.

Whether or not he did anything for the untouchables after his release, Mr. Gandhi is entitled to say that he was not a free man and that his Congress colleagues looked to him for leadership and advice on the major issues of its own methods and policy. Circumstances prevented him devoting himself to the cause to which, whilst still in jail, he had committed himself, without, however, renouncing the claims of other imperative matters. All this may have been disconcerting to friends and opponents alike; but it would be unfair to make too much of it.

As to the objections of Bombay orthodox Hindus, the message is vague, and it is strange that the Bombay correspondent has not referred to them in any of his messages, nor do they appear in any other dispatch from Bombay. Apart from that, surely such matters are irrelevant. The orthodox will always protest against Mr. Gandhi's methods, mainly because they object to his aims. There is nothing new in that.

WHAT NEXT FROM THE CONGRESS?

If Mr. Aney rendered little service to the nation in following the Mahatma's injunction to resort to individual disobedience and in ordering the dissolution of all Congress organizations—including, presumably, the very fabric of the Congress itself—he rendered a very real and useful service to his countrymen when he allowed Mr. Kanitkar's bold and devastating speeches at the Poona Conference to be published for all the world to read. Not Maharashtra alone, but all India may be pardonably proud of Mr. Kanitkar's independence of judgment, courageous attitude, and constructive suggestion. He undoubtedly possesses many of these qualities of leadership for which the country—and many outside India—must be earnestly looking, if effective guidance is to be found for the national forces in the difficult days ahead. The next ten years are going to be vital to India's welfare, and unless the country can throw up leaders, comparable with and even excelling the great men of the past, her progress will be

slow, uncertain, and irresolute to a degree involving calamity. Hard as is the way of the nation-builder in normal times, it becomes arduous almost beyond endurance in times of crisis. And yet it is just such times that often—though not invariably—throw up just the kind of leadership that a new age and new circumstances most require. Hence it is that many friends of Indian political progress, looking at the dark clouds about the work ahead, are anxiously hoping and eagerly expecting that India will once again, from her great resources of mind, spirit and action, produce the gallant and intelligent leadership that will adapt itself with sufficient flexibility to the nation's and the world's needs, so that India's ore-fifth of all humanity may not drag the rest of the race back from its goal of noble achievement, but may contribute a force and an impulse that will lead it more rapidly and more securely to its great objective.

Reviews.

REALISTIC INTERPRETATION OF WORLD FACTS.

THE GEOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND OF
MODERN PROBLEMS. By H. J. FLEURE.
(Longmans.) 1932. 17cm. 85p. 1/-.

THE education of the worker in England is as well planned as it is comprehensive. There is no branch of human knowledge but is introduced into the mind of the worker in a manner intelligible and agreeable to him. In this book, Mr. Fleure like the consummate wizard of geography that he is, acquaints the worker with a view of world conditions as they are influenced by geographical factors. With a fascinating skill he traces the evolution of the world from its crude beginnings to its present state of aggressive economic nationalisms inspired by coal and iron. By reason of the mountainous nature of the country which abounded with the vine and the olive, Greece laid the cradle of later European institutions which assumed whimsical forms according as geographical conditions differed. Rome which was cut out for a wider economy was broadbased in political character and it became undemocratic as its rule extended beyond the city walls. As the Roman Empire became far-flung, the Roman civilisation also spread apace with its roads which helped to inspire commercial activity beyond its narrow confines. The development of this economic germ life in other countries of Europe proceeded along dissimilar lines and with the rise of Christianity, military and ecclesiastical autocracies came into being as in Spain sapping individual initiative so as almost to prevent "the growth of a middle class or of the power of trade," with the pathetic result that "modern Spain has seen a good many of her resources exploited by foreigners." In the non-romanized countries of Central Europe "initial difficulties were too great to permit the richer forms of expression that help to make a city."

On the whole the rigidity of settled rural economy of early Europe remained more or less intact and "though local might give place to regional self-sufficiency, and undoubtedly has done so, the fundamental social idea of a European peasantry has been that of production for home use rather than commercial farming in which profit is a main aim. At least this was largely true until the vast increase of the amenities of town life and the commercial-industrial fever began to penetrate the peasantries

late in the nineteenth century." Only gradually did this conservatism give way before the needs of geographical expansion based on linguistic affinities and thus it was that there came into vogue larger self-sufficiency systems.

A self-centred peasantry however persisted even in places where the torch of Roman civilisation was kept alive by Bishops. "Thus a European consciousness, of a kind, came into existence side by side with the local consciousness of the peasantry and it expressed itself in cities, especially in bishops' cities."

France alone obstinately sought advancement along the line of least resistance by forging bonds of a domestic commercial union between the peasant and the town. "It is only through a realisation of this development that we can hope to understand modern France with its anxiety to make internal production and exchange the main features of its commercial life, its intense patriotism, its desire for stability, its great road system, its legalism, its ideal of a moderate population, its fear of the overgrown industrial units, especially of the German one."

For lack of the French thoroughfares of internal commerce, the city in Germany grew in importance as it took advantage of the stream and the forest path. In the North, the seaport and its activity facilitated the emergence of the Hanseatic League. But as in Britain, the far-fetched commercial aspirations weakened the union between the town and the country. In Russia, the land of "Asiatic twilight" as Lord Acton so aptly put it, the extreme winter and summer discouraged the growth of individualism. In modern times the group consciousness of old, now rather attenuated, served as the foundation on which communism raised its edifice. The Scandinavian region, which was faced by the surplus population of Northmen, entered into the wide waters of international trade in a manner unknown to the rest of the then Europe.

Conclusively therefore, as Mr. Fleure observes, "the student of European life cannot but become increasingly conscious of diversities of social ideals related to diversities of experience. To many an Englishman, Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations" seems almost axiomatic in its opinions; to many a Frenchman, German and Pole, the publication of those doctrines appears in retrospect as a portent of the ensuing aggression of English industry upon the markets of other peoples. The reaction to the accumulation of capital in such unprecedented quantities in British hands has been a growing nationalism, which all admit is spreading a commercial paralysis throughout the continent and the rest of the world".

The growth of population and a high standard of its maintenance necessitated the political, colonial or economic expansion of the European peoples into other lands which came of use as the feeders of their industry and the consumers of finished products. The sharp variation in the climate of Australia and its physical features discouraged the growth of the real peasantry spirit, whereas in Argentina the national conditions fostered peasant farming, howsoever unremunerative. Such fluctuation in the fortunes of the colonies and markets "react with special intensity on England where there has been such a dangerous development of dependence on income from investments abroad, under many circumstances a precarious form of revenue. In the three years the total annually received by Great Britain is said to have diminished from 275 to 160 millions and it is highly unlikely that if a measure of prosperity

returns to the debtor countries, they will be able to allow vast sums to be set aside to continue indefinitely large interest payments."

The monsoon lands of Asia, in spite of their individual characteristics, have contributed enormously to the wealth of the world and "promise to continue into the future probably as richly, as it has maintained itself for well over 4000 years". India being the apple of the world's eye, possessing comparatively easy passage into it, became a prey to foreign incursions which bred in the people exclusive group instincts of the most inhospitable type, in sharp contrast with China, which "is conspicuous for the lack of effective stratification in its population; caste is unknown."

The world of to-day teaches bitter lessons to mankind by reason of the fact that the people of distant lands brush shoulders with one another like neighbours who counteract distance by speed and "at the same time the acceleration of scientific invention has made machinery go out of date so quickly that industry is an unstable condition. Countries, whether European or non-European, strive to produce as much as possible of what they need, and at the same time to make surpluses for export to shrinking markets."

To the Britisher in particular, Mr. Fleure has a special word of warning which needs to be taken to heart by him in a penitential spirit.

"It is probably the most important task of the coming generation in Britain to seek modifications of our present schemes which shall ease away the fear of other nations like our French neighbour lest the overgrown industrial populations overwhelm their social system, which works towards so different a goal and emphasises the value of stability, which shall so adjust our relations with men of other colour as to ease away their fear that the future will keep them as hewers of wood and drawers of water and which shall find some way to keep alive amongst us that freedom of thought and initiative for which our fathers have struggled so long. . . . Reliance on export trade is likely to be more precarious in the future even than it has been in the past. . . . The problem is a far deeper one of providing a measure of liberty, stability, security, differently interpreted by different peoples the world over because of their different experiences and diverse mental activities in the very diverse environments they are trying to adapt to their needs." (Reviewer's italics.)

The book is a geographical reading of world-facts in their most realistic perspective. If geographical education in India were imparted in the manner that Mr. Fleure has done here, economic advancement of the people will take care of itself.

K. VENUGOPAL RAO.

HISTORY OF BUDDHIST LITERATURE.

INDIAN LITERATURE IN CHINA AND THE FAR EAST. By PROBHA K. MUKERJI (Greater India Society, Calcutta.) 1931. 25cm. 334p.

THIS is a very scholarly work, being "the entire history of Buddhist Sanskrit literature as preserved in Chinese translation, whether the original is extant or extinct." We are actually given to understand that most of these books are unknown in India, because the originals are lost. At the end of the volume, Prof. Mukerji has given a list of about 350 Sanskrit books translated into Chinese. Prof. Mukerji, therefore, deserves our best thanks, for without his book it would not be possible to estimate adequately what a world force India was at the time

when Buddhism was triumphant. It tells us of the spread of Buddhist faith in China and other parts of Eastern Asia. Incidentally, the writer discusses whether Hinduism could be regarded as a religion, and whether Buddhist culture could not be regarded as Hindu culture. It tells us of the culture-contact between India and the rest of the Buddhist world so rich in its results. This contact was not for economic gain but for expression and expansion of spiritual affinities. It was witness of the power of common tenets and ideals as affecting the pilgrimage of the spirit.

A special feature of Prof. Mukerji's book is that it abounds in copious extracts that picture to us, in vivid colours, the life that people must have lived in those days. The many stories that are narrated, some of which, though improbable in themselves, indicate what people thought and felt. We are in a position to estimate what they thought of life and its activities, what value they set on things of the world, what hopes and aspirations in terms of the Hereafter influenced them.

From time to time Hindu monks went to China to spread the faith, and interesting facts of these missionary enterprises are to be had in this book. Ample material from these Chinese sources is evidently available and will enable us to know what faith, constancy and courage, these early devotees must have had. The various books laid under contribution by Prof. Mukerji, moreover, throw a flood of light on our biographical knowledge of great thinkers like Asvaghosha Nagarjuna, Aryadeva and Paramartha.

This book is, above all, a history of literature and because this literature is mainly religious, it is the story of the rise and growth of the Buddhist doctrine outside India. We have the fascinating story traced from the very early times to the end of the fourteenth century, in each geographical and political area.

It is very difficult to give an exact estimate of a production of this kind. It has its value as literature and as history; on the one hand, it adds a great deal to our knowledge of the scope and extent of Indian literature; on the other hand, we are enabled to trace the history of civilisation in the East from the earliest times to the eve of the Moghal conquests that border on modern times. Prof. Mukerji has, indeed, tapped a regular mine of information, historical, biographical and sociological, and students of oriental history will feel highly grateful to him. He has, indeed, opened up a new line of research and we believe that this book will be an invaluable guide for all future undertakings. We have great pleasure, therefore, in commending it to the scholarly world.

PRATAPGIRI RAMAMURTI.

Dr. CANNAN'S ECONOMICS.

ECONOMIC SCARES. BY EDWIN CANNAN.
(King). 1933. 20cm. 135p. 4/6.

THIS is an interesting collection of papers from the pen of Professor Cannan, the distinguished thinker and writer on economic questions. His standing in the economic world must make every reader of his writings alert in appreciation and criticism, for

Dr. Cannan himself is a terrible critic of many 'conventions' in economic studies.

The first essay on "An Adverse Balance of Trade" is immensely interesting and sometimes even provoking. He knocks on the head many outworn shibboleths about questions of 'balance in trade' and concludes his article with a striking paragraph:

"In common with the civilized world we have the great difficulty which arises from the stupid desire of central banks backed by legislatures and nationalist public opinion to hoard the standard of currency and thereby raise its value. We are the special prey of too ingenious bureaucrats who 'unnerved in Whitehall' devise schemes, which, at any rate are botched by the politicians at Westminster, sap the existing incentives to industry and good conduct without putting any substitute in their place. Whether we are off or on a gold standard we certainly shall not benefit by reviving the 300 year old and long ago exploded superstition that the balance of trade must be watched over and kept right by Parliament."

Cannan's second article "Not Enough Work for All" is again on a high level and is characteristic of the author. Prof. Cannan gives an able analysis of the causes of unemployment. "General unemployment appears," says Cannan, "when asking too much is a general phenomenon." Prof. Cannan indicates the difficulties in getting the co-operation of the people when variations in the purchasing power of money are taking place and has a fling at the monetary experts. "I am convinced," says he "that the present trouble is due to the reigning school of monetary experts having mixed up the rate of interest and the purchasing power of money in such confusion that they no longer know how to maintain or raise the price level." He maintains that the demand for labour is indefinitely extensible with the number of persons able and willing to work for a remuneration compatible with time and place. Prof. Cannan says that if the world is too stupid to prevent great declines of price level, it should learn to submit to declines of money income without squealing.

Dr. Cannan's paper on "Our Population" is also of great interest. He explains that there is not only no fear of over-population, but that the fear may be just the other way. "Birth control," says Prof. Cannan, "will doubtless in time affect the rest of the world, and there is no reason whatsoever for expecting the population of the world to 'tread on the heels of subsistence' in the future." Dr. Cannan's answer to the question whether cessation of the growth of population is to be regarded as a good or an evil turn in human history is characteristic of the author: "The limitations of economics, and perhaps of human nature, prevent any straight answers from being given. Nationalists in each nation want their own nation to increase in comparison with the other. If we try to avoid this obstacle and assume that somehow either the generally fittest will survive at the expense of the others, or that each as well as the whole will have stationary numbers, we still have to face the fact that our conception of the distinction between economic welfare and welfare of other kinds is nebulous in the extreme."

We commend this collection to every candid student of vital social problems and we have no doubt that the author's exposition will at least make us 'go on' thinking.

S. V. AYYAR.