

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XVII, NO. 22. }

POONA—THURSDAY, MAY 31, 1934.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	253
ARTICLES :—	
Congress and Communal Award	255
Bikaner's Coercion Law. By A. V. Patvardhan	256
Implications of Rejection	257
OUR LONDON LETTER	258
REVIEWS :—	
Sir Rajendra Nath Mukerjee. By M. N. Subba Rao	260
Indian Child Labour. By V. V. Giri	261
Causes of World Depression. By C. V. Hanumantha Rau	261
Indian Money Market. By D. G. K.	262
Worldly View of Morality. By V. M. Bhat	263
Human Factor in Production of Wealth. By S. Gopalswamy	263
Short Notices	264
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
The Mahatma and the Princes. A. V. Patvardhan	264
BOOKS RECEIVED	264

Topics of the Week.

Cannot the Safeguards be Stiffened ?

THE *Sheffield Telegraph*, an organ of moderate Conservative opinion in Great Britain, has the following in a recent dispatch of its Political Correspondent:—

"When the India Constitution Bill appears it will prove to be strengthened by more safeguards than in the White Paper. All the Indian Police will not be put under the Provincial Legislatures, and the setting up of an All-India Parliament with full powers will probably be delayed. With these safeguards the Government means to make the Bill law before the next General Election in the United Kingdom, and to transfer powers in India before a left-wing Socialist or right-wing Diehard majority secures power at Westminster.

"The aim, in brief, is to get India out of the control of the House of Commons before we are afflicted with a reckless House which would pass something far more dangerous than the Bill now in preparation. A Cabinet of Maharajas, their Diwans, and Indian Liberals, under a strong Viceroy, would safeguard India against the pranks of a Crippsite Cabinet here."

Assured such a Cabinet will safeguard India in the Central Government, but what about the provinces? Are they to be left to the tender mercies of popularly elected Ministers? Cannot the Baldwin-MacDonald Government oblige India by setting up hereditary second chambers in the provinces where, for want of the counterweight of Indian Princes, which is calculated to preserve the balance so beautifully at the centre, democracy is apt to run riot?

The Princes' Chamber.

THAT the Princes' Chamber needs to be reorganised cannot be gainsaid. Some of the largest States, accounting among themselves for the greater portion of the area and the population in all the States together, are outside, viz. Hyderabad, Kashmir, Mysore, Baroda. It is obvious that the Chamber cannot pretend to a representative character unless these States are included. Schemes for the overhauling of its constitution have therefore been under consideration for a long time, but it would appear, from the scheme that was proposed by Sir Akbar Hyderi at an informal meeting held in Bombay last week, that the bigger States cannot be brought in unless the smaller States are driven out. For the scheme amounts to this, that the rulers in the Princes' Chamber or Narendra Mandal, as constituted at present, are to be concerned hereafter only with those questions that relate to dynastic matters or matters personal to Their Highnesses and questions concerning the exercise of paramountcy, but all other questions relating to policy or administration are to be remitted for consideration to a body to be formed for the purpose composed solely of Ministers. It is to consist of 15 members, ten drawn from the ten biggest States entitled to a salute of 21 and 19 guns, and five members drawn from all the other smaller States (a hundred odd in number). This means, in effect, winding up the Chamber as it is and creating in its place, so far as we can make out, a Council dominated by the bigger States. It would be more than human if the smaller States remained within the organization if the Hyderi plan were to be carried out. These States found a very powerful advocate in the Maharaja of Bikaner, who, in spite of his distinguished position in the councils of the Empire, has a fewer number of guns to his credit than 19. The scheme will be considered by a committee of twelve Ministers, but the result of accepting it will be to make it still more unrepresentative than before. The Chamber is after all a consultative body, whose decisions have no binding force. Why then should it not be thrown open to every ruler, we wonder?

C. D.—Mandatory or Discretionary ?

CIVIL disobedience has been stopped for all, but it has been kept alive for Mahatma Gandhi. Is it mandatory in his case, or merely discretionary? Is it incumbent upon him, after the expiry of the period for which he has secured a dispensation, that is, in the beginning of August, to break some law or other and go to gaol, or is it open to him to adapt his conduct to the circumstances that he may find existing at the time when a decision will have to be taken? The Mahatma himself has given no inkling of his mind on the subject, but those who were in intimate touch with him at Ranchi and

Patna and shared his thoughts fully and unreservedly give us an assurance (in order that we may not take retention of civil disobedience as the Congress policy too tragically) that Mahatma Gandhi is under no inexorable necessity to offer civil disobedience and may in fact find it possible to be at peace with Government, even without a substantial change in its attitude. Babu Rajendra Prasad tells us so, and it must be remembered that he is not a pro-Council-entry Congressman whose opinion on this subject must be taken at some discount. For such Congressmen would find it very embarrassing, when their leader is in gaol, to contest elections on any programme except that of indiscriminate opposition, which they do not wish to adopt at present, and it is to their interest, therefore, to make it appear that Mahatma Gandhi can still be dissuaded from pursuing the path which he has reserved for himself. Rajendra Babu's opinion is therefore entitled to special consideration and one would like to know what it is based upon. We too would naturally wish the Mahatma to lay aside the weapon of satyagraha in his own case as he has done in the case of his followers, but we must confess, without claiming to know his mind, either directly or indirectly, to a feeling that he would himself take a different view of the matter. Suspension of civil disobedience for all other Congressmen but reservation of it for himself means, in our judgment, nothing more than a limitation of the field of actual fight for strategic reasons, but it also means that the fight is still on. If Mahatma Gandhi too were to abstain from civil disobedience on the appointed day, it would clearly mean that the fight is over. We believe that Mahatmaji considers himself pledged to carry on the fight, and that he does not think that he is at liberty to recall civil disobedience till the objective, in view of which the fight was commenced, is attained.

* * *

Objective of C. D.—

AND that objective is surely not the withdrawal of repressive measures. Civil disobedience was not launched by the Congress in order to counter measures of coercion which Government had wantonly introduced. The passive resistance movement that was initiated when the Rowlatt Act was passed was of this nature. That movement could be legitimately liquidated after the repeal of the Act, for civil resisters had gained their end, and there was no reason for the movement to be continued any longer. But the repressive measures that were applied by Government during the last three or four years were called into play by the inauguration of the civil disobedience movement instead of civil disobedience being entered upon for the purpose of fighting repression. The movement has been suspended for all but one individual, and therefore it may be that Government will withdraw or at least not enforce the coercive measures with which it has armed itself. But all that will be secured thereby is the re-establishment of the *status quo ante bellum*, and this will afford no justification for the Congress to bring the fight to a close. The causes which prompted the Congress to enter on a fight will remain as before, and the Congress will be unable to lay down its arms without owning defeat. We have no desire to remind Mahatma Gandhi of this line of thought if he would rather like to forget it for the moment and seize upon some pretext for calling off the movement altogether. But we are so convinced that this special pleading will fail of effect with him that we feel we must undeceive all those Congressmen who hope to persuade him by this means to desist from practising civil disobedience.

* * *

—Not Release of Prisoners.

WE are surprised to find that Mr. Bhulabhai Desai who is destined to be the leader of the Congress party in the Assembly advances so ridiculously untenable an argument. "Questioned whether he expected Gandhiji to resort to civil disobedience in the near future and thus give effect to (the Working Committee's resolution) of July last Mr. Desai replied :

That is more than I can say. In my opinion, it depends on Government. So far as Gandhiji is concerned, he is, as he stated in his interview to the *Hindu*, straining every nerve to prevent Civil Resistance from becoming a necessity. While I have not had the advantage of a talk with Mahatmaji on this subject and cannot therefore speak authoritatively on his behalf, it strikes me, after listening to his speech in reply to the debate on the Civil Disobedience resolution at the All-India Congress Committee, that Mahatma Gandhi is naturally much worried over the continued imprisonment of Congressmen even after he had withdrawn Civil Disobedience for which alone they had been cast into prison. If I were the British Government, I would straightaway release all the Congress prisoners. That, to my mind, is the one sure method of making this resolution a dead letter."

If Mahatma Gandhi had desired all Congressmen to escape repression and keep out of gaol, all that he need have done was not to start civil disobedience, but he started it for a specific purpose, and cannot wind it up merely if those who were deprived of individual liberty on account of their participation in the movement again become free men. We are acquainted to some little extent with the Mahatma's relentless logic, and we cannot hope (though we would heartily wish it) that mere release of prisoners will be regarded by him as a valid reason for bringing the civil resistance movement to a termination, if the object with which the movement was started is as far from being achieved as ever before. On the contrary, we are afraid, that he will regard it as his religious duty, on which there can be no going back, to keep up the fight, at least in his own person, till the objective is attained. The Swarajists will be in a terrific difficulty if this happens, it is true, but we do not suppose he will remain out of gaol in order to make their path easy.

* * *

Non-Congressmen and Anti-Congressmen.

To Mr. Bhulabhai they are all all the same. "Those who are not with us are against us," is his motto. It is in this spirit that the Congress is going to meet the so-called menace of the White Paper. With the heartiest co-operation of all other nationalist groups, the Congress will hardly be able to carry a resolution condemnatory of the White Paper in the Assembly, and if it assumes an attitude not merely of cold aloofness but of bitter antagonism to them, its defeat (i. e. the defeat of the Congress and not of the White Paper) is certain. It is an ominous sign that not only new converts like Mr. Bhulabhai, whose overzeal is perhaps excusable, but seasoned Congressmen like Mr. Rajagopalachari exhibit such a deplorably exclusive spirit. The White Paper is a result of "British determination" and must be defeated in order to prove and enforce India's right to self-determination. This is how the Congress leaders define the immediate issue before the country. In this issue they seem to assume that all those who are not in the Congress will necessarily vote against a proposition condemning the White Paper scheme. This assumption however is not true. While undoubtedly there will be some Liberals and Nationalists who will, in order to save the White Paper scheme, vote

for it, there will be others who will vote, along with the Congress, against the White Paper, hoping that thereby that the scheme will be put out of the way. Such Liberals and Nationalists it will be to the interest of the Congress to seek out and support at election, for in some constituencies they will be more successful than the Congress candidates. It bodes ill for the country that the leading politicians in the Congress should be so narrow and partisan in their outlook. Self-determination vs. other-determination, says Mr. Bhulabhai,

"was the simple issue. Those who backed the Congress candidates stood for India's right to self-determination. Those who opposed Congressmen and those who voted for non-Congressmen—he would not say anti-Congressmen—were people who were content to give a blank cheque to Sir Samuel Hoare not only to pursue his dubious dual policy in this country, but also to deny India her natural and inalienable rights."

Articles.

CONGRESS AND COMMUNAL AWARD.

THE A.I.C.C. at Patna, like the Swarajist Conference at Ranchi, shelved the communal award and has thus made itself the target of general criticism, not only in the non-Congress camps but in the Congress camp as well. Only Dr. Ansari among the prominent Congressmen seems disposed to defend the Committee's action, but it is a very unconvincing defence that he is able to put up. The defence briefly is this. The Congress wants to confine itself for the present only to matters on which there is universal agreement among all the political parties in India. The communal award is not such a matter. Some sections of Indian opinion favour it while others condemn it. This therefore is a question that the Congress must agree to put on one side for some time. Eliminating all controversial questions in this way, there remains only the White Paper on which, says Dr. Ansari, there is no difference of opinion among politicians in India, for all schools of thought are agreed that the White Paper scheme is unsatisfactory. And, therefore, this is the one question on which the Congress will concentrate at present. Dr. Ansari must be extraordinarily simple-minded and naïf if he thinks that because each party grumbles about one feature or another of the White Paper, they all desire to put an end to it, as the Swaraj party wishes to do, by bringing forward in the Assembly and carrying a resolution condemning the Hoare scheme. Not to speak of Moslems and other minority communities, even all nationalists are not at one with the Congress in wishing the White Paper proposals dropped or defeated. Will the Congress then give up its policy of rejection because unanimity cannot be reached on it? The Congress will surely not do so, but will proceed with its own policy, whether it be accepted or not by other groups. So must the Congress stand fast on its own principles on the communal question, in spite of the opposition of extreme communalists. The Congress can either aim at sinking all internal differences, in which case it must renounce the ambition it entertains of dealing a death-blow to the White Paper, or it

may decide to draw to itself all progressive elements, in which case it must cease to play fast and loose with the communal award as it is doing, but take its stand on principle and reject the award along with the White Paper, without minding what reactionaries will think of it.

The parliamentary section of the Congress has announced its intention to stand by the National Demand as propounded by Mahatma Gandhi at the Round Table Conference. This demand contains several items which are not agreed to even by the most radical members of the Liberal Party. One such item is the demand that the Army be immediately transferred for control to the federal legislature. The Mahatma had no sooner put forward the demand than the Liberal representatives opposed it as wholly impracticable. If, as Dr. Ansari says, "the Congressmen want to find the greatest common measure of agreement on non-controversial questions," then they ought to scrap this part of the National Demand, because it meets with the support of none but the Congress. However, they want to retain it in spite of the active opposition of all other parties, while they want to maintain an attitude of neutrality towards the communal award though all sections of nationalists like the Liberal Party are united in condemning it. Only one inference can be drawn from this, viz. that the Congress adopts a wavering policy on the communal problem not in deference to external differences, but in deference to internal ones. All sections of the Congress do not agree that no communal settlement will be accepted that is based on separate electorates. That is the real reason why the Congress is unwilling or unable to reject the communal award. For the same reason it is pursuing a reactionary policy on the States question. The Liberal Party insists upon election of the States' representatives, but the Congress agrees to nomination, because Mahatma Gandhi agreed to it at the Round Table Conference. So it amounts to this, that the Congress neither represents the most progressive mind in India, nor does it represent the greatest common measure of agreement. It is radical in certain matters, though it receives support from no one else; it is reactionary in certain other matters, because several of its own leaders hold reactionary views. It settles its own policy without reference to the views of other sections and in accordance with the views of its own leaders. This is the only explanation one can think of of the very curious fact that the Congress is at once too conservative and too advanced in its general outlook—conservative when dealing with different phases of the internal problem and advanced when dealing with the British Government.

We have already expressed our own opinion on this subject in no uncertain terms. In the existing circumstances we must give up insisting either on general electorates or on election in the States. To press for them at the present time is not merely unprofitable but suicidal, because it would hold up all reform. Moslems will not support any step in constitutional reforms in British India unless separate electorates are conceded and the Princes will not come

into the federation unless nomination is accepted. The part of true patriotism therefore consists in supporting both communal election and nomination. But the Congress cannot do so consistently with its avowed policy of rejection. If it does not mind the whole scheme of reforms being withdrawn, why need it support separate electorates and nomination, which are wrong in principle? Whom does it try to conciliate

by making this concession and how is it necessary? We on the contrary want to secure as much constitutional advance as is possible here and now, and we therefore naturally have to make concessions. But the Congress is under no such necessity, and its attitude on these two questions is therefore open to serious objection.

BIKANER'S COERCION LAW.

THE Foreigners Bill of Bikaner State is a sharp reminder to British Indians, if they needed it, that under the proposed federation there will be no such thing as common citizenship. It is an essential feature of all federal unions, that the States entering such a union accord, to the citizens of all the other States, which are constituent members of the union, all the civil rights which they accord to their own citizens. So far as political rights are concerned the States may discriminate. In the matter of franchise or of employment in the public service, for instance, one State may give to its citizens more rights and privileges than to those of other States, but in regard to civil rights every State must treat the citizens of other States just as it treats its own. This is the basis upon which all federations are founded. There can be no alienage, under federation, between the citizens of one State and of another. There is a specific provision in the constitution of the United States which says that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." The full significance of it was well brought out in a memorable judgment of the Federal Supreme Court in the following passage:—

"It has been justly said that no provision of the Constitution has tended so strongly to constitute the citizens of the United States one people as this. Indeed, without some provision of this kind, removing from the citizens of each State the disabilities of alienage in others, giving them equality of privilege with citizens of those States, the Republic would have constituted little more than a league of States; it would not have constituted the Union which now exists."

There is no federation in which this principle of interstate comity does not prevail. There is no federation in which a State can impose upon the citizens of other States restrictions in such matters as establishing residence, holding property, entering into contracts, etc., which it does not impose upon its own citizens; nor can it restrict rights of the freedom of speech, the press and public assembly of the citizens of other States in any other way than it restricts those of its own citizens. When a federation is brought about, a citizen of no State can be a foreigner to one of other States. The Indian federation, however, is *sui generis*. Lest we forget this important fact, which differentiates our federation from others, the Maharaja of Bikaner, to whom more than to any other statesman, either from British India or Indian States, our federation is due, has a Bill prepared which places

drastic restrictions upon the entry of Indian foreigners (1) from outside his State. From a Bill to an Act is but a short step in Indian States, and we shall soon be informed that the Bill has passed the Legislative Assembly of Bikaner without any opposition and with perfect unanimity. But what I wish to impress on the readers is that such laws will not be invalidated by the establishment of the federation, but that they will remain in force, as if Indian States were not brought into any organic relation with British India. Each of the 600 odd States, can treat the people from other States and from British India as aliens, even after federation, as they could do at present.

The most important clauses of the Bill are given below:—

His Highness's Government or any Minister so authorised to act, on their behalf, may, by writing, order any foreigner to remove himself forthwith or within a prescribed period from the Bikaner State, or to remove himself therefrom by a particular route to be specified in the order.

Every foreigner on arriving in any part of the Bikaner State, in which the provisions of this Part are, for the time being in force, under an order issued as provided in Section 9, from any part or place not within the Bikaner State, shall within 48 hours report himself to the Magistrate of the district or to such other officer as shall be appointed by His Highness's Government to receive such reports.

No foreigner shall travel in or pass through any part of the Bikaner State, in which the provisions of this Part are for the time being in force without a permit.

If any foreigner travels in or attempts to pass through any part of the Bikaner State, without such permit as aforesaid, or beyond the districts or limits mentioned therein, or after such permit shall have been revoked, or shall violate any of the conditions therein specified, he may be apprehended without warrant by any officer exercising any of the powers of a Magistrate or by any commissioned officer in the service of His Highness the Maharaja or by any police officer not below the rank of a Sub-Inspector.

If any foreigner be apprehended by a person not exercising any of the powers of a Magistrate and not being a police officer, he shall be delivered over as soon as possible to a police officer and forthwith carried before the Commissioner of the Division or the Magistrate or Additional Magistrate of the district. Whenever any person shall be apprehended by or taken before the Commissioner of the Division, or Magistrate or Additional Magistrate of the district, such Commissioner or Magistrate shall immediately report the case to His Highness's Government and shall cause the person brought before him to be discharged, or pending the orders of His Highness's Government to be detained in custody.

It is superfluous to comment upon the Bill. We are assured that "law-abiding or peaceful foreigners" have

nothing to fear from its provisions. But we know who are regarded as "law-abiding and peaceful" by the Bikaner Durbar or by the Durbars of other States. The chief thing to note is that the people from British India or other States will be looked upon as foreigners and that their freedom of movement will be restricted even after federation comes about.

I am not surprised that the rulers of Indian States desire to keep agitators from outside their States' borders at arm's length or that the British Government desires to keep agitators from Indian States out of British India. Both Indian and British rulers used their powers in this behalf extensively in the last few years in suppressing agitation within their territory and naturally they are not anxious to give up those powers under the new regime. What surprises me is that our own leaders should accept without question provisions which are admitted universally to be destructive of the basic principles of federation. Some of these leaders are renowned constitutional lawyers, but apparently they think that all their knowledge of constitutional law is intended for the purpose of bringing into being a constitution opposed to all known prescriptions of constitutional morality.

A. V. PATVARDHAN.

IMPLICATIONS OF REJECTION.

IT is time the Indian public made up its mind what answer to give to the question that will be submitted to its judgment by the Swarajists (i. e. the Congress) at the ensuing Assembly election. The answer is not quite so easy to frame, for there are risks involved both in Rejection of the White Paper scheme which the Swarajists advocate and in its Acceptance, and the answer that the voter will give to the question will depend upon which kind of risks he will prefer to run. But before we try to draw out the implications of either course of action, we must make clear the meaning which the Swarajists attach to Rejection. It does not necessarily involve non-co-operation. The Swarajists will work in the first instance for the withdrawal and then, if necessary, for the defeat of the White Paper. If in spite of their opposition the Hoare constitution becomes effective, then the question will arise whether to work it for what it is worth or to give it a wide berth. That question has been deliberately left open, and at least some of the prominent Swarajists will then urge upon the Congress the working of the constitution, whatever it be. Even if the constitution be worse than that outlined in the White Paper, they will exert all their influence on the side of working it. It will not do, therefore, to turn down the rejection policy on the ground that it will lead inevitably to Council boycott. The Swarajists themselves do not understand Rejection in that sense. It may be that they are wrongly using the word Rejection; perhaps Disapproval would be the correct expression. But the point is whether we object to the policy itself, apart from the name.

Some people try to avoid expressing their opinion on the desirability of Rejection by saying that it is im-

practicable. Why consider it at all when we know that rejection will never be successful? They prognosticate a certain failure of the policy for these reasons: 1. the Swarajists will not obtain a majority for a resolution condemnatory of the White Paper; 2. even if they do, the British Government will not drop their reform proposals on that account, but proceed with them, in spite of the adverse vote in the Assembly; 3. Government will not only proceed with the Bill but get it passed in Parliament, the united forces of British diehards and Indian extremists notwithstanding. None of these three events however can be predicted with certainty; there is an element of doubt attaching to each one of them. But even assuming that rejection is impracticable, it does not obviate the necessity of considering whether it would be desirable if it were practicable. For if desirable, we may make an attempt in that direction, however unpromising the direction may be. We all know that, humanly speaking, any substantial improvement of the White Paper scheme is impossible. We still cast about for ways in which some attempt at improvement may be made. If an All-Party Conference is suggested, we welcome it. We say to ourselves, "Nothing very much is going to come of it. But still let us do our duty. At any rate it will do no harm." And we set about the task with as much enthusiasm as we can muster. Similarly, if once we concede that rejection is desirable, it becomes our duty to line up with the Swarajists who want to make a serious effort at rejection, though we may be inwardly convinced that it is bound to fail.

The question therefore must be faced: Is Rejection desirable or undesirable, apart from its practicability or impracticability? Rejection surely entails some risks, which must be measured against the risks involved in Acceptance. The risk we run by following the policy of rejection evidently is that we stand to lose the White Paper constitution. That this constitution, however meagre and inadequate, marks an advance in some respects on the existing position no one can possibly deny. Some people detect an advance in one part of the constitution; some in others. Mr. Satyamurti welcomes provincial autonomy as an advance, though not as great as he would like it to be, but he sees nothing but retrogression in federation. Mr. Sastri, on the other hand, sets little store by provincial autonomy, but welcomes federation, though he would have welcomed it still more if the federation were of another kind. And in this way different persons place a different value upon different parts of the scheme. But this much is clear, that something will have to be sacrificed if the White Paper scheme disappears. Just what the amount of sacrifice will be will have to be determined by each one according to his light.

If there is some sacrifice, large or small, involved in rejection, why not accept the White Paper scheme for the time being, reserving to ourselves full freedom to fight for a better constitution at the earliest available opportunity? In following this course there cannot be any risk. A superficial observer may argue like this. But

Acceptance too has its own risks, as Rejection has. Only one instance need be given to prove this. When at the second Round Table Conference the British Government, being somewhat in doubt about the future of federation, offered to establish provincial autonomy immediately as only a first step, several British Indian leaders objected, saying: "Our eyes are fixed on central responsibility; if that takes time let provincial autonomy too take time. By accepting the latter now we may be postponing the former indefinitely. We shall therefore wait for both, however long a wait it may be. For we don't like being cheated out of central responsibility by means of the sop of provincial autonomy being thrown at us." They risked losing something in order to avoid the loss of something else that they considered bigger. Similarly, Acceptance of the White Paper scheme too is attended with risk. It is not every day that we can make constitutional reforms a live issue. When once reforms of some kind or other are passed, it takes long to bring up the question of further reforms before the authorities as a matter that demands their attention, and consequently it pays sometimes to refuse smaller reforms in the attempt to get larger ones. That obviously was the reason why Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Sastri refused to accept provincial autonomy when it was offered.

But there is another reason that will be advanced by some people for rejecting the White Paper scheme. They will say that the constitutional advance contained in the White Paper is of such a nature as to estop further advance for a very long time or perhaps for all time in certain vital respects. If nomination by the Princes is allowed now and the substitution of election in its place is left to the discretion of individual rulers, the establishment of democracy will be put off for an indefinite time. Similarly if the Princes are not bound to accept constitutional amendments, adopted by the federal legislature by however large a majority, the growth of the White Paper constitution into a self-governing constitution will become almost impossible. Again, if the Viceroy alone is to exercise rights of paramountcy over the States, Dominion Status in its full significance, not to speak of Independence, is clearly an impossibility, not only politically, but constitutionally. To those who think that these arguments are sound acceptance of the reform scheme will appear to be more dangerous than rejection, inasmuch as *ex hypothesi* a small reform will block the way for a bigger reform. They will consider it of greater importance to keep open the road to our final destination than to worry about the immediate possible advance. On the other hand, there are those who think that, however long we wait, our political progress can hereafter be only along the lines of federation and federation will be possible not only now, but at any time in future, by agreeing to what may be thought to be unreasonable conditions of the Princes; and these men ask, if the difficulties have to be faced one day why not face them now ourselves rather than leave them to be faced by posterity? Let us be done with it for once and for all, say they. This, however, being but

a forecast of the turn that events will take in the future, rests on the belief of the individual and is not capable of any proof. Besides, however ardent may be one's desire for federation, there is yet quite a large amount of scope for constitutional development in British India alone, and till that is exhausted the inevitability of immediate federation will not be universally acknowledged.

There may be many who will be unable to make up their minds definitely when asked to choose between Acceptance and Rejection. They will find that there is much to be said on both sides, and their choice will lie midway between acceptance and rejection. But this of course will not be admissible. They must return a categorical *aye* or *no* to the question: Do you want the White Paper scheme or not? If they want it, they must be prepared to defend it against all the attacks that will be delivered on it. If they do not want it, they must be prepared, if necessary, to go on with the present constitution for an indefinite time. They will have very strange bedfellows either way. If they are for Acceptance, their friends and co-workers will be communalists and reactionaries in India; if they are for Rejection, their allies will be reactionaries in England like Churchills and Lloyds. They will be uncomfortable in either company. But each one amongst us must resolve for himself his doubts and must be ready to answer to which side on the whole his mind inclines. It is a cruel fate that assigns to us the task of making a choice between such alternatives, but the task must be performed—not only by the few persons who will seek election to the Assembly, but the many who form the electorate. And therefore political education of the electorate on this intricate but vital question must be undertaken at once. The Swarajists may be relied upon to marshal their forces. It is equally necessary for those who are for Acceptance to carry on an energetic propaganda on their side. They cannot afford to be indifferent to the fortunes of the White Paper. In the result lack of enthusiasm for acceptance may prove as harmful (in their view) as support of rejection. Time has arrived when the protagonists on each side should go about the country preparing the minds of the people to grasp the implications of either course of action and finally to decide which of these they will follow.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, May 19.

THE REFORMS PROCEEDINGS.

AFTER all it has not been possible for the Committee of Privileges to present its Report to the House of Commons before the Whitsun recess. Indeed, although it has been considering its Report upon a review of the evidence for some time since it ceased to hear witnesses, it is understood that it will require at least two more sittings before the Report

is ready. Parliament, therefore, will not be able to consider the matter until some time after the 29th, when the House resumes its sittings. It is supposed that, after the publication of the Report, either with or without a record of the proceedings attached, the Government will invite a debate. As Mr. Churchill and his friends have already denounced the Committee of Privileges as biased in favour of the Government, he and they are entirely free to oppose whatever the Committee may have done, should the Report, on the whole, fail to support Mr. Churchill's charges. The Government, on the other hand, will naturally want to expedite the whole matter, first because the enquiry is taking up a great deal of time in the case of those Ministers who are members of the Committee and secondly because the rules require promptitude and despatch.

So far as the Joint Committee is concerned, it is understood that it has now completed its review of the White Paper proposals and of the evidence produced before it. When next the Committee meets on the day that Parliament reassembles after the Whitsun recess, it is understood that it will begin consideration of the draft Report, prepared, it is supposed, by the Lord Chairman himself, who, in some quarters, is spoken of as the probable Viceroy of India. As however, Lord Linlithgow will probably not be the sole competitor for the high and onerous office to be held by the King-Emperor's representative under the new Constitution, it is premature to speculate upon the accuracy of the forecast. It suffices for the moment that all indications seem to show that it will be virtually impossible to produce the report until the end of July at the earliest, and very possibly some time in August. I presume that such technical difficulties as may arise from the possible necessity of publishing the Report when Parliament is not actually sitting will have been anticipated and overcome. It is still not believed that the unexpected delay in presenting the Report will interfere with Mr. Baldwin's forecast that the Government will produce its Bill in the early winter, i. e. about December next. But, as I have already pointed out, the delay will make it difficult for the Government to overtake hostile propaganda in the country, though thoughtful people may take advantage of the comparative leisure of the recess to study the Report carefully, and bring a more reasoned consideration of it to bear when Mr. Baldwin consults the Tory Party next October. In the meanwhile we may note that the *Times* has given the necessity of passing and implementing a new constitution for India as a reason of major importance for a National Government to go to the country at the next General Election.

"MORNING POST" JOKES.

It is good to realise that the *Morning Post* possesses a humourist on its staff. For some reason its Bombay Correspondent affects to regard Pundit Jawaharlal as the Leader of the Congress right wing, which appears to suspect, according to the Correspondent, that the leaders of the newly-formed Swaraj Party have entered into "a subtle understanding" with the Viceroy, in order to support him and the Government of India against the Conservative Opposition in England, in support of the White Paper. This is described by the *Morning Post* in striking headlines as "forcing the hand of Whitehall," and the reason given for the dissolution of the Assembly is that Simla has entered into some kind of crafty understanding with Congress, by which the latter's opposition to the White Paper proposals will be used by Lord Willingdon as a strong argument to go beyond the White Paper proposals. Another subtle

method that Simla is reported to have adopted, in order to push forward its constitutional propaganda, is to recommend the appointment of Ministers from Indian States to high appointments in British India. As an instance of this the name of Sir V. T. Krishnamachari, Dewan of Baroda, is said to have been submitted to His Majesty for the Commerce Membership of the Government of India. Even supposing that that were true the Bombay Correspondent of the *Post* conveniently forgets Sir Krishnamachari's long period of service as a distinguished official in British India, before he went to Baroda.

Perhaps, however, the cream of the *Morning Post* joke is to be found in yesterday's issue, where the same Special Correspondent, who has apparently been paying a flying visit to Madras, quotes the *Hindu* as saying that Lord Willingdon will, during his visit to England, "see that they make the reform proposals approximate as nearly to the Nationalist-Liberal demands as is possible, and in any event Lord Willingdon is determined to persuade His Majesty's Government to concede at least what is known as the Sapru Memorandum," which, the *Post* Correspondent declares, in its essence contrives to secure the practical abolition of the Viceroyalty and the substitution of a constitutional Governor-General as in Canada. Consequently, continues the Correspondent, Lord Willingdon is determined to see that His Majesty's Government accept and inaugurate Federation. He then goes on to state that under the pretext of paying a visit to England for reasons of health and holiday, the Nabob of Bhopal, Dr. Ansari, Sir K. N. Haksar, and Sir V. T. Krishnamachari are coming here to assist Lord Willingdon. Really, really! It takes the *Morning Post* and its readers to swallow all this. In the meanwhile the Correspondent asks his readers to believe that the Government of India during Lord Willingdon's absence are taking the greatest precautions to see that no political section should attack the scheme of Federation and that they have solicited, in this behalf, the good offices of the President of the Assembly. Some of the Princes and unofficial political sections, too, are said to expect Lord Willingdon to succeed "as his policy is to ignore Parliament and to get matters fixed directly with the Cabinet." So that's that!

FURTHER NOTES.

Mr. Butler had to tell Sir Alfred Knox this week that the occasion for definite decisions by individual Princes to enter the Federation cannot arise until after the passage of legislation providing for a Federation. He added that the question of weightage to be given to the representation of acceding States in respect of States which do not accede to the Federation is one that falls within the terms of reference of the Joint Select Committee.

A similar telegram to the *Times* records proposals for improving the central organisation of the Indian States under two main proposals: (1) the classification of the States into regional or possibly economic groups, each with its own organisation for collective discussion of policy and matters of common interest to the States forming the group, and (2) the nomination by these regional organisations of delegates to a Central Council of States' Ministers. It is added that the largest States would act independently of geographical affiliations. The *Times* Correspondent adds that some of the States interested in the scheme apparently regard it as a potential instrument of making their representation in the Federal Legislature the more effective by preconcerting policy there, but they prefer to suspend discussion of the larger issues till the Joint Select Committee has

reported. Hence, he says, the comment in the *Statesman* on the activities of British opponents of the White Paper who have been visiting India and "pursuing certain Princes with blandishments intended to cajole them out of support for the Federal scheme."

Mr. P. B. Haigh, attending the Conservative India Committee at the House of Commons this week, denied that the Indian masses were as contented or as helpless as was frequently alleged, and that the minority were entirely composed of self-seeking politicians. He said that the discontent of the educated classes was founded mainly on a scheme of wounded self-respect, and a feeling that the legitimate aspirations were being ignored and misrepresented. He believed that in many matters, and particularly in social legislation, Indian Ministers responsible to an elected Legislature would be in a far stronger position than nominated councillors, British or Indian. He supported an indirect system of election to the Provincial Legislatures, and said that the masses would be the first to suffer by the disorder that was bound to result from a refusal to satisfy a demand that the British had created. He advocated election to the Central Legislature from the provincial legislative bodies.

In his remarks from the chair on Tuesday, when Sir Frederick Sykes addressed the East India Association on "Some Aspects of the Situation in India," Mr. L. S. Amery said that there was no one in this country who, whether he criticised or approved the proposals now before the Joint Select Committee, would deny at the right time and under the right conditions that the pledges we have made should be honoured. Had we given no pledges, the very essence of our own Government and its traditions would have compelled us to face the problem of Indian self-government.

Reviews.

SIR R. N. MOOKERJEE.

RAJENDRA NATH MOOKERJEE. By K. C. MAHINDRA. (Art Press, Calcutta.) 22cm. 249p.

THE life of Sir Rajendra Nath Mookerji is presented in this neat volume in a simple yet effective manner. Mr. Mahindra has done distinct service by putting on record the various incidents in the life of a man who carved out for himself a career set with hazards and apparently insurmountable difficulties and has gloriously lived to enjoy the fruits of his dogged work of many years. The life of this great man will cheer many a depressed youth in these troubled days, and bring home the lesson that only through severe trials and tests does a man show his true mettle. As the author says in his foreword, "This is not a story of heroic actions, nor a sketch embellished with spectacular designs; it is the story of a great business man, equally great of heart as of head, generous of instinct and charitable of soul, who has brought glory to everything he touched and, what appears to me as his greatest achievement, remained amidst the lustre of his surroundings—(undoubtedly his own creation)—a simple and great-hearted gentleman."

Sir Rajendra's life has been in short a triumph of character. In this respect he owes much of his greatness to his mother, under whose loving care he was brought up. We know that he lost his father when he was six or seven years old and the entire responsibility of bringing him up lay upon his mother. Rajendra's

well-being and his future welfare were the dominant thoughts that were uppermost in her mind. We wonder if Sir Rajendra would have been what he is to-day had not his mother displayed rare courage, imagination and forethought in deciding to give her son proper education. Living in a joint family with very moderate means she boldly took the step of sending her son to distant Agra for the sake of his health and education. Gifted with a "strong will and soft heart" she left her distinctive imprint on the character of her son. Sir Rajendra fully justified the confidence and hope of his mother and proved a worthy son of a worthy mother.

The unique position that Sir Rajendra occupies to-day in the business world is a tribute to his dogged determination, sustained industry, shrewd commonsense and unbounded optimism. He was born to be a civil engineer and has lived an engineer. Having developed a passion for the science of engineering in his younger days he assiduously worked to master the scientific details of the subject. Having realised the value of honest work and the dignity of patient labour, he spared nothing in his power to achieve the ambition of his life. Where technical efficiency was involved, only rigid scientific conclusions dictated his action. Commencing his independent career as a builder he has crowned his achievements with the completion of the beautiful marble structure, the Victoria Memorial. Behind all Sir Rajendra's achievement lies his constructive mind, ready to grasp the realities of the situation. Many a time in his long business career when a crisis seemed imminent he evolved new lines in business policy through concentrated thinking and bold imagination, and successfully tided over the difficulties.

Sir Rajendra's greatness as a man surpasses his greatness as a business man, simple living and high thinking seem to have been the principles of his life. Being religiously minded, he has lived the life of a true and devout Hindu. He inherited the traditional Hindu instinct of conservatism and while having sympathy with social reform movements, he never became a convert and has remained loyal to the Hindu creed. But he is outspoken in his criticisms of some of our obnoxious and meaningless customs and other social drawbacks such as child marriage and purdah and set an example by practising his precepts himself.

Sir Rajendra never forgot the debt he owed to his 'pataasala' in his native village of Bhabla. When he was better placed in life, one of the first things he did was to finance and maintain the school in good condition and by stages gradually raised it to a high school. He built up a new building, provided with extensive playgrounds, and made a handsome donation towards its maintenance. Nor did he forget his co-villagers. He provided the village with all comforts and amenities of life and the people were enabled to live happily. Sir Rajendra's munificent donations and help to various other social, cultural, religious, scientific and sporting bodies were given in a most unostentatious manner shunning publicity. His love of sport is remarkable and the spread of the physical culture movement in Bengal is due entirely to his efforts.

Sir Rajendra had occasions to cross swords with his opponents but he never hit below the belt. The Fenwick episode and later the incidents relating to the treachery of his assistants are typical instances wherein he magnanimously overlooked his enemies' shortcomings, and acted in a manner befitting a gentleman. His work as chairman and member of various Committees and Commissions bear testimony to his greatness as a practical businessman.

The book is replete with various interesting and absorbing incidents occurring in the life of a great man. The author opens the book with the scene laid in a Bengal village and it is refreshing to read the vivid description of rural life that it contains. But now and then he indulges in certain irrelevant topics, having no bearing on Sir Rajendra's life, airing his own views on them.

M. N. SUBBA RAO.

INDIAN CHILD LABOUR.

CHILD LABOUR IN INDIA. By RAJANI KANTA DAS. (International Labour Office, Geneva.) 1934. 1/6.

FROM the statistical material available, Mr. Rajani Kanta Das has written a very useful book on child labour in India. This is the first of its kind. In dealing with the question of child labour in India, Mr. Das points out that out of a total population of 353,000,000 in India, the number of children under 15 years of age is 141,000,000. In comparison with England and Wales, the proportion of children to total population is higher by nearly 16.6 per cent. On this basis in spite of the fact that there is a very high death rate and low expectation of life, there is in India, according to him, a surplus of 56.5 million children, which affects adversely their material welfare. There are no statistics to show the number of gainfully employed children. From a perusal of the periodical returns sent from factories, certain tea plantations and mines, Mr. Das attempts to find out the possible number of children gainfully employed.

He describes the provision embodied in the present legislation regulating the minimum age and working hours of children that can be engaged in an industry. He has also made reference to the recent legislative attempts in Madras in the shape of the Artisan Bill and Beedi Factories Bill regulating medical examination, minimum age, working hours and corporal punishment of child labour. The contemplated abolition of underground employment of women including girls of 13 years of age and over by 1939, the working of Maternity Benefit Act in Bombay and Central Provinces, the introduction of legislation invalidating pledging of the labour of children, the proposed Factories Bill and the Bill regulating deduction from wages of children, are referred to as an earnest of the efforts of the Government to protect child labour. However, it should be pointed out that in the absence of proper statistics of child labour and detailed knowledge of their working conditions, no effective action is possible to ameliorate them. There is no reference to child labour employed in theatres, restaurants, public places, commercial concerns and as domestic servants in dealing with the question. While emphasis has been placed on the necessity of elementary education on a universal scale, the question of affording facilities for employed children during working hours to improve their knowledge and vocational training has not received adequate attention.

Mr. Das admits that existing labour legislation still leaves unregulated a large number of occupations, both industrial and non-industrial. This ought to result in a strong public opinion urging upon the Government to remedy the defect. As a compendium of various protective measures now in force regulating child labour in this country, this book will serve a useful purpose, but what is required is a detailed survey of the working conditions of child labourers in various occupations in this country,

and this can only be done when the Government takes an initiative in the matter.

V. V. GIRI.

CAUSES OF WORLD DEPRESSION.

WORLD DEPRESSION. By K. T. SHAH. (National Literature Publishing Co., Madras.) 1933. 20cm. 272p. Rs. 1/8.

MR. SHAH has won a reputation for himself as an economist whose views are imbued with a widely sympathetic outlook which is rather deficient in the writings of many another dry-as-dust economist. In this book on world depression, which is a reprint of a series of lectures delivered by the author under the auspices of the Madan Memorial Fund, Bombay, he ably sustains his reputation.

Mr. Shah not only traces the general causes of the present economic depression and the general remedies applicable to it, but points out the manner in which the depression has affected India. It is an unparalleled economic situation that we have got to-day and it must be considered to be due to some deep-seated causes in the economic system. It is not therefore enough merely to tinker with the problem but devise drastic measures which go to the root of the problem. There may be several local causes for the depression but considered collectively and in their essence, they all lead to the same inescapable conclusion—viz. the absolute unworkability of our existing socio-economic institutions. The productive system is not in any way impaired nor has productive efficiency decreased to any substantial extent, but the demand for these articles has enormously fallen owing to lack of purchasing power. That is the problem that now faces the world and Prof. Shah is perfectly correct, in the present writer's opinion, in his diagnosis.

In devising remedies therefore the primary place must indeed be accorded to the setting right of this disequilibrium between production and consumption. Mr. Shah considers remedies under two groups, viz. remedies intended to have a local application to remove a local cause, and remedies going to the very root of the matter and affecting the very foundations of our present socio-economic system. Among the former he includes (a) Revision of the entire problem of international indebtedness, (b) the removal of impediments to international trade, (c) the overhauling of the banking and credit organisation of the world so as to have a more rational, smooth, better co-ordinated system, and (d) the removal of the evils incidental to private indebtedness in agricultural countries like India. Among the latter Prof. Shah includes (i) the planning, as of a single unit, of the entire socio-economic mechanism of the world, (2) the redistribution of world production and world population, (3) the reconstruction of the fundamental institutions of the modern commercial society and the revision of its governing motives of private profit, (4) the adoption of the principle of conscription of labour and the consequent abolition of the parasite class, and (5) the regulation of exchange on the principle of a cooperative and collectivist enterprise. In connection with the latter kind of remedies, Prof. Shah has many good things to say of the Russian Soviet system, especially its planned economy and the subordinate place given in that country to the problem of exchange. Prof. Shah at the end of every chapter makes a reference to the conditions in our own country and suggests ways and means of improving them.

In chapter V, Prof. Shah discusses the work of the World Economic Conference and the Report of

the Commission of International Experts which was appointed to prepare an agenda for the Conference. The World Economic Conference was however a sorry failure in every respect and the author arrives at the conclusion "that the situation thus remains still one of unrelieved gloom, except perhaps in the United States where the local measures for recovery seem to be taking effect."

C. V. HANUMANTHA RAO.

INDIAN MONEY MARKET.

BANKS AND THE MONEY MARKET. By B. RAMACHANDRA RAU. (Lalchand & Sons, 76, Lower Circular Road, Calcutta.) 1933. 20cm. 257p. Rs. 2.

PROF. B. R. RAU of the Calcutta University is already well-known as a careful and competent exponent of Indian banking problems. In this book Prof. Rau has published four lectures on the Indian Money Market which he delivered to the Calcutta Centre of the Institute of Bankers in 1930-31. Lecture First deals with the Ideal Money Market and its Organisation. While describing the features of a developed money market Mr. Rau has not been unmindful of the imperfections of the Indian situation. In his second lecture the author gives a very lucid account of the process of expansion and contraction of currency and its effects on the money market. This is a very important aspect of India's monetary and banking structure and we would recommend to all students of Indian finance a perusal of this part of Mr. Rau's book.

The third and the concluding lectures deal respectively with other Monetary Markets, and an Ideal Monetary and Banking Standard. The suggestions of Prof. Rau regarding the best means to bring the indigenous bankers within the organised money market and to develop a brisk bill market in India deserve careful consideration. It is gratifying to note that, unlike several facile writers, Prof. Rau is conscious of the fact that the great disparity between the bank rate and the market rate in important centres will not be removed except by a co-ordinated movement in all fields of economic activity. Too much emphasis is often placed on the extent of this disparity and the peculiar features of the Indian economic situation which underlie the practices of indigenous bankers are too little appreciated.

In addition to the 105 pages of boldly printed matter which comprise the main body, the book consists of eight closely printed appendices covering 156 pages. These are reprints of articles contributed by the author to several journals and deal with such problems as the remonetisation and stabilisation of silver, the Gold Standard and the Crisis, Lessons of Foreign Banking for India, the Co-operative Movement, the Future of Indian Joint Stock Banks, the Foreign Exchange Banks and the Imperial Bank of India. The appendices consist of useful material and are full of interesting comments. But inasmuch as this material is easily available elsewhere to all who are interested in a more than cursory study of the subject its incorporation in this book is not easily justified. Some years have elapsed after both the lectures and the appendices were originally composed and in many respects such as the ratio controversy and the foreign exchange banks a new situation has been created. All the same this publication of Prof. Rau will be of immense interest and assistance to all students of India's monetary and banking problems.

D. G. K.

WORLDLY VIEW OF MORALITY.

THE EVOLUTION OF MORALITY. By GEORGE WHITEHEAD. (John Bale.) 1933. 22cm. 340p. 10/6.

THIS is a very interesting and instructive book admirably written in a clear and forceful style. The author has dealt with this subject from a purely worldly point of view. He says, "Morality has to do with any kind of conduct affecting social life" and its aim to-day is "the increase of social enjoyment and decrease of unnecessary pain." This is entirely different from the spiritual aim of our Indian ethics. Our moral philosophy teaches us to merge ourselves into the cosmic soul of which we ourselves are parts, and to look upon all others as reflexes of ourselves, susceptible to the same environments of pleasure and pain. From the worldly point of view both Aryan and Western ethics agree on the objects and purposes, but the Aryan pedestal is undoubtedly higher to look from and gives better explanation as to why we should do and be good.

The author traces the roots of morality in "beastiality" but he says it aspires "to grow into the air of spirituality" "Hunger, sex and fear" आहारिन्द्रियवेद्युक्तानि form the main substratum upon which the superstructure of morality is based and he has given from zoology interesting phenomena very much akin to human conduct in many spheres as far as the intellectual growth of the subhuman species allowed. If we take sexual relations alone, the author says that "in almost every aspect of their manifestations can resemblances between the human and subhuman world be traced." So also he has shown "that sympathy, social feeling, and even chivalry and pity are displayed by subhuman forms" (p. 12). "Association and mutual aid are the rule with mammals." "Protection of mate, parental care, the social instinct and manifestation of sympathy... have been factors making for the development of morality in prehuman forms," "and they are also agents of progressive survival" (p. 19). The author has taken considerable pains to prove this in various chapters, quoting many authenticated examples from well-known authors. For instance, he has quoted Spencer to show that "the races that have become most sympathetic are those in which monogamy has been long established." These qualities however have not always led mankind to higher stages. As Galton says: "The slavish spirit is a direct outcome of gregarious instinct" but gregarious instinct was the basis of sympathy and love also, which form a cement to bind the species. And even this stage of servitude, he has shown, "must of necessity precede the age of freedom" (p. 66).

As moral ideas go on developing, a stage is reached when "external conceptions of morality are made subjective and called conscience; and the internal conceptions of ideal perfection are made objective and called God." The author is not however willing to probe this subject further and is content to stand merely on this worldly plane. "Ethereal impersonalities carrying on the evolution of life as supermen providing spirit plasma for Gods as subjects for thought are interesting, but too abstract for profitable discussion." Indian philosophers reach this stage and realise it also.

Some interesting resemblances between the thoughts of ancient and modern philosophers provide pleasant reading. For instance, in his chapter on "Adolescence and Morality," the author quotes Stanley Hall to show that adolescence is a transfer of mind which "swings over from an autocentric to heterocentric basis." And with it comes "the glorious dawn of imagination which supplements individual

limitations and expands the soul towards the dimensions of the race." "All are thus born twice (द्विज) once as individuals and once as representative of species."

As wars were frequent, and as the vanquished were made slaves, they were not subject to the same laws even in Christendom, as they were not in ancient India. "Slaves were mutilated for trivial offences. In the Roman republic slaves only could be tortured." This is exactly parallel with the treatment of the so-called untouchables in ancient times in India showing that human nature runs in similar grooves in similar conditions.

There in Europe, as in India, "the clergy and the nobility were subject to lighter tortures than others". In England also the death penalty was subject to exceptions based upon "benefit of clergy." "Clergyable" offenders were let off with branding and imprisonment for a year, as a maximum except in larceny which was punished with transportation for seven years." The treatment accorded to Brahman offenders in Manu Smriti is not much different from this.

The author has tried to show that man is progressing towards moral perfection, but the process is fearfully and disappointingly slow, and sometimes the progress is not continuous. In his evolution man has dethroned religion, but what has been the result? Rank anarchy. And he along with other thinkers exclaims that "some binding sanctions to morality are needed... many feel the need for some conception which will personify the idealism of the best minds of to-day." That is, the author concludes, "something comparable to a religion is needed." One may then legitimately ask, who is to do it? We have pulled down ancient religions, but religion is still needed! A modern Avatar, prophet or Issiah can do it.

The author sometimes has committed himself to contradictions. For instance, in his chapter on "Truth" he says that Orientals have an unenviable reputation for falsehood! But the chapter itself is a dissertation on the lying of Occidentals! And even giants like Huxley, Darwin and Spencer were not free from such blemishes! (p. 295)

The book is, on the whole, worth perusal and will be a good guide to the student of moral philosophy.

V. M. BHAT.

HUMAN FACTOR IN PRODUCTION OF WEALTH.

WORK AND WEALTH OF HUMAN VALUATION. By J. A. HOBSON. (Allen & Unwin.) 1933. 22cm. 340p. 10/6.

UNTIL recently the economic science and discussion have dealt with a sort of standard and unalterable man ignoring both biology and psychology. The human factor in the production and evaluation of wealth has remained in the background. A new outlook in the study and appreciation of economic problems was presented when the first edition of the book under review was published in 1914. In earlier studies the distinction between real and 'nominal' indicated vaguely the ultimate consideration. But definitely as a factor of prime importance it is only now that such examination and study have been pursued, with a view to seek 'some intelligent and consistent method of human valuation of economic goods and processes'. The study of economics, besides computing the wealth or the income in terms of money, has been extended further to determine how far these measurements of concrete wealth can furnish reliable information regarding vital values, the human welfare which all economic processes are

designed to yield. In other words the problem has been to what extent material wealth contributes to the happiness or welfare of the people

Is it possible to devise an intelligent and consistent method of human valuation for economic goods and processes and if so, how far? Let the author answer:

"To find a standard of human welfare as stable and as generally acceptable as the monetary standard is manifestly impossible. Indeed, the difficulties attending any sort of calculus of vital values might appear insuperable, were it not for one reflection. Every statesman, social reformer, philanthropist, every public-spirited citizen does possess and apply to the conduct of affairs some such standard or criterion as we are seeking. Some notion or idea, more or less clear and explicit of the general welfare. Crossed and blurred no doubt by other interests and passions is an operative and directive influence in his policy. Moreover, though idiosyncracies will everywhere affect this operative ideal, there will be found among persons of widely different minds and dispositions a substantial body of agreement in their meaning of human welfare. The common social environment partly evokes and partly imposes this agreement. In fact, all such cooperative work for social progress implies the existence of some such standard as we are seeking. The complex image of human values which it contains is always slowly changing and varies somewhat among different sorts and conditions of men. But for the interpretation of economic goods and processes it has at any time a real validity. For it is anchored to certain solid foundations of human nature, the needs and functions to which, alike in the individual and in the society we give the term organic."

Judged from this standpoint, economic costs of production and economic utilities of consumption have to be analysed into human cost and human utility—the debit and the credit side of welfare. This might open out a complete criticism of industry of today, in which there is a lot of ill adjustment and consequently a good lot of waste. A proper adjustment is possible only by a proper human valuation of both production and consumption. It is a problem left to the statesman and as the author says in the preface—

"The process of human valuation and judgment, whether applied to industry or to other activities and achievements, must ultimately belong to the art rather than to the science of society, the statesman and the citizen absorbing and assimilating the history of the past which science presents in its facts and laws, but using his free constructive faculty to make the history of the future."

There might be scope for difference of opinion in the examination of the problem, but the purpose of the book is fully justified in its exposure of the inhumanity and waste of modern industry, judged by the standards of human welfare. Such a study may be construed as alien to the accepted forms of economic thought but in its practical application, it is sure to present a reliable guide for the improvement of the relationship among apparently conflicting groups in economic society—both national and international. To statesmen, politicians and administrators, the work affords splendid scope for thoughtful study which, if only assimilated into their work in a practical manner, is bound to transform the world.

This line of enquiry has been strengthened by the war and the post-war changes in the economic sphere, which are responsible for the revision of the work in the present edition; but the original plan and purpose of the book remain unaffected.

S. GOPALASWAMY.

SHORT NOTICES.

THE GOLDEN BREATH. By MULK RAJ ANAND.
(Wisdom of the East Series.) (Murray.) 1933.
18cm. 136p. 3/6.

THE book is the outcome of a halucination that Modern India exemplifies a renaissance of the philosophical wisdom of the past. To the measure that Tagore, Iqbal, Puran Singh, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, and Harindranath Chattopadhyaya have unburdened their hearts of literary music, there is seen a mild flutter of the wings of the Muse, but their poetry, except in so far as it is full of mystic exuberance, has little to do with the extremely uninspiring level of Indian life. The modern India that we see presents too revolting a spectacle of insanitation, diseases, famines, religious riots, anti-social orthodoxies, degradation of life, and other petty tyrannies which are more truly renescent of the past of India than the inconsequential modern poetry is of the Vedic hymns. With uncritical rapture, our author bathes in the literary pond and seeks to trace its sparkling water (now become a little sluggish) to a non-existent source of his imagining. It may be a matter of indifference to the sentimentalist, but it is no credit to modern Indian poetry to be characterised as a mere relay from the ancient times. Howsoever admirable, the philosophical dead hand of the past has unmanned India enough. The Indian poetry of today is unwanted if it does not possess a distinctive idealism of its own that is unlethargic, unspulative and too progressive to become old. Mr. Mulk Raj Anand seems to be unaware of the fact that Iqbal, Mrs. Naidu and Harindranath have ceased to sing as they did in their days of immaturity. The average reader today finds Tagore wearisome; new Turkey has disturbed the equanimity of Iqbal; Mrs. Naidu feels less inclined to adore the past towards which Harindranath is positively irreverent. Other poets than these there are none or, being there, are of minor importance, which means that either the torch of poetry is not in favour or that there are none to bring new flames to its burning.

Valuable as an appreciative estimate of poetic merit, such of it as there is, it leads us nowhere.

K. VENUGOPAL RAO.

THE PRIVATE LETTER BOOKS OF JOSEPH COLLET. Ed. by H. H. DODWELL. (Longmans.) 1933. 22cm. 256p. 10/6.

THE private letter books of Joseph Collet throw interesting light not only on the life of an English merchant who rose to the position of Deputy Governor of Bencoolen and Governor of Madras, but also on the history of British India from 1711 to 1719, a period prior to Clive and about which not much is known. This English merchant was heavily involved in debts and was declared insolvent. He went to the East like every adventurer 'to shake the Pagoda tree' and to discharge the debts from which the law had set him free but which he felt bound in conscience to repay. The letters give us a glimpse into the religious beliefs of Collet, his views on matrimony and on the life of the English in the East in the first two decades of the 18th century.

M. V. SUBRAHMANYAM.

Correspondence.

THE MAHATMA AND THE PRINCES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—Mr. Satyamurti, in expressing his uncompromising opposition to federation, in his speech in Poona on Sunday last, tried to defend Mahatma Gandhi for the latter's acceptance of federation by saying that the Mahatma was prepared to support federation only if (1) all the States' representatives in the federal legislature were elected by the States' people, and (2) the elementary rights of citizenship of the States' people were guaranteed in the federal constitution. Since this is a matter of the utmost public importance, may I request Mr. Satyamurti to prove his statement by quoting chapter and verse? So far as I can make out, Mahatma Gandhi gave a *carte blanche* to the Princes, imposing on them no sort of conditions. As Mr. N. C. Kelkar pointed out in a telegram that he sent to the Ranohi Conference on 1st May, as President of the All-India States' People's Conference, the Mahatma "made no demands on the Princes, but was prepared to wait upon their pleasure in every respect." You will, I hope, give Mr. Satyamurti, as much space as he needs, in order to refute this statement proceeding from responsible quarters.—Yours, etc.

A. V. PATVARDHAN.

Poona, May 29.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE CAUSES OF WAR. By Various Authors. Ed. by ARTHUR PORRITT. (The Hogarth Press, Madras.) 1934. 20cm. 235p. Rs. 2.
- MODERN KNOWLEDGE AND OLD BELIEFS. By VIVIAN PHELIPS. (Watts.) 1934. 20cm. 138p. 2/6.
- DRIVING AXLE. By V. ILYENKOV. (International Publishers, New York.) 1933. 20cm. 455p. \$2.00.
- THE JEWS AND A CHANGING CIVILIZATION. By NORMAN BENTWICH. (The Twentieth Century Library Series.) (John Lane.) 1934. 20cm. 146p. 2/6.
- DEMOCRACY AND A CHANGING CIVILIZATION. By J. A. HOBSON. (The Twentieth Century Library Series.) (John Lane.) 1934. 20cm. 170p. 2/6.
- PAPERS ON CURRENCY AND THE RESERVE BANK OF INDIA. By S. K. SARMA. (S. Krishnaswami & Co., Trichinopoly.) 1934. 20cm. 67p. Re. 1/4.
- A BUSINESS MAN'S VIEW OF THE WORLD CRISIS. By L. POTTER. (Williams & Norgate.) 1933. 20cm. 151p. 3/6.
- ESCAPE FROM STAGNATION. By GIUSEPPE UGO PAFLI. (King.) 1933. 20cm. 165p. 6/-.
- HISTORY OF EDUCATION IN INDIA UNDER THE RULE OF THE EAST INDIA COMPANY. By B. D. BASU. (Modern Review Office, Calcutta.) 18cm. 208p. Rs. 2/8.
- THE INDIAN SUGAR INDUSTRY, ITS PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE. By M. P. GANDHI. (The Book Co., Calcutta.) 1934. 23cm. 286+IXXp. Rs. 5-8-0.
- STORY OF SATARA. By B. D. BASU. (The Modern Review Office, Calcutta.) 1922. 21cm. 542p. Rs. 10.
- COMMUNITY CIVICS. By E. CHANNA REDDY and R. E. ROBINSON. (P. T. I. Book Depot, Bangalore City.) 1934. 18cm. 121p. Re. 1/4.
- CLASSIFIED CATALOGUE CODE. By S. R. RANGANATHAN. (Madras Library Association.) 1934. 21cm. 292p. Rs. 4.