

Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA.

VOL. XIX, No. 12. }

POONA—THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 1936.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	133
ARTICLES :—	
The Sanctions Bluff.	135
“ Democracy Out of Place in India.	137
The Kerr Bill in U. S. A. By P. Kodanda Rao.	139
REVIEWS :—	
America's Economic Capacity. By Prof. L. N. Welingkar, B. Sc. (Econ.) (London)... ..	140
Problem of Air-Mindedness. By S. G. Sastry.	141
The Meerut “Conspiracy”. By Prof. R. H. Kelkar, M. A.	141
SHORT NOTICES.	142
MISCELLANEOUS :—	
The Late Mr. G. K. Devadhar—Prof. P. R. Damle's Tribute.	143
BOOKS RECEIVED.	143

Topics of the Week.

Refusal of Supplies.

BY refusing supplies for the Executive Council the Assembly has once more made it clear to all concerned that the present Government has forfeited the confidence of the country. The Assembly's vote cannot be brushed aside as that of irresponsible and irreconcilable Congress agitators to which no value need be attached. For even a tyro in politics knows that Congressmen by themselves would have been unable to carry such a motion had it not been for the co-operation they received from other parties in the Assembly. The Assembly doubtless deserves the congratulations of all progressives upon successfully vindicating public opinion.

WHAT, it may be asked, are the sins of the Government which earned for them this censure at its hands? The mover, Mr. Satyamurti, gave a long list. Indeed it would not be difficult even for a political novice to compose such a list. But it is really not such a list, but the unsympathetic spirit and the irresponsible manner in which the administration is conducted which is the subject of complaint and against which Mr. Jinnah raised his powerful voice in the present debate.

A GOVERNMENT which was really in touch with public opinion would not have turned a blind eye to the pressing problem of unemployment among the educated classes as this one is doing. Whenever the subject is referred to by the Government's spokesmen, it is only to shift the responsibility for its solution from the shoulders of the Government of India

to those of the provincial Governments. That is perhaps constitutionally correct. But does not such an attitude argue want of imagination and culpable aloofness on the part of the Central Government? Even if the task of finding a solution of the unemployment problem may fall within the sphere of local Governments, does it not behoove the authorities at the Centre to keep themselves closely in touch with the unemployment situation with a view to grappling with it on a country-wide basis? We trust the passage of the motion will at least awaken them to a realisation of the measure of the unpopularity engendered by their inaction in this respect.

Indian Military Policy.

THE constitutional device of withholding supplies as a means of expressing the legislature's disapproval of the policy of the executive was put into force by the Assembly this year in connection with the Army Department. The principle of Indian defence being increasingly the concern of the people of this country has found acceptance at the hands of Government, but cannot be said to be anything better than the expression of a pious hope, little being done to translate it into action. It may be recalled that the recommendations of the Defence Sub-Committee of the first R.T.C. which enunciated the above principle raised high expectations in India at the time; but when the time came for giving effect to them, cruel disappointment was in store for Indians. The capacity of the Indian Sandhurst, brought into being in response to the insistent public demand for army Indianisation and in satisfaction of the Sub-Committee's recommendations, was restricted to 60; and the reduction of British troops, which was strongly emphasised by the Sub-Committee, was declared to be an impossible dream for some time to come. As for the public outcry against the unbearable load of military expenditure, the Commander-in-Chief has recently replied to it by foreshadowing the possibility of its increase in the not distant future!

LEAVING aside these big questions, is the Government's record in matters of comparatively minor importance less unsatisfactory? The reply, we are afraid, has to be an emphatic negative. The legislature has been recently crying itself hoarse over the establishment of an advisory committee on Defence. Be it noted that all that it asks for is only the right to be consulted on military matters and not a right to dictate to Government. Yet the Government has consistently turned down even such a modest demand.

BUT the most galling part consists in the Commander-in-Chief twitting non-official members on their dense ignorance about army affairs. It was with a view to securing for themselves opportunities of studying these problems at close quarters that the establish-

ment of the Standing Committee on the Army was demanded by them, and it is the stubbornness of the Army Department that has always stood in the way of their obtaining the necessary knowledge of military questions.

IN this connection he is reported to have referred in a complaining spirit to the failure of non-official members to study even such an important document as the report of the Capitulation Tribunal, though access was provided to some of its connected papers by placing a few copies in the Assembly library. We have no means of testing the truth about this accusation. And in any case Sir Robert Cassels cannot have been speaking on the point from firsthand knowledge. Nor do we know that even if his complaint was true he is well advised in basing his general statement on this solitary instance.

Protest Against Repressive Policy.

FAITHFUL expression to public dissatisfaction with the repressive policy of the Government was given by the Assembly by carrying a motion for a token cut in the demand for the grant for the Home Department. The policy is apparent in the continued detention of a large number of young Bengalees—their number is about 14,00—on the pretext of their being suspected terrorists. They have suffered harassing restrictions on their liberty for years; but the agony does not yet seem to be nearing its end. How long is it to go on? This question has been asked many times before this and was asked in the present debate without eliciting a satisfactory reply from the Government.

THE attitude of the Government towards the public demand for the release of persons who are detained without an open judicial trial is, to say the least, enigmatical. An improvement in the terrorist situation is even officially admitted, and attributed to the pursuit of a policy of coercion. Public opinion has never been convinced of the soundness of the latter contention and will never be. It expects the alleged improvement in the terrorist situation to be reflected in a total withdrawal of the restrictions on the liberty of the detenus. But the Home Member's reply holds out little hope of this expectation being realised.

SIR HENRY CRAIK made much capital out of the passage by the Bengal Legislative Council of the anti-terrorist legislation, which instead of being renewed for a term of years is now given a perpetual lease. Far from establishing the need of such legislation or its success in dealing with the terrorists, it only serves to show how completely out of touch that legislature is with public opinion in the country. It is a matter of doubt whether, if in response to the public demand a freshly elected Legislative Council had been in being in Bengal, the Government would have been in a position to make the boast that it does.

Quetta.

THE Finance Member's proposal to finance the reconstruction of Quetta out of current revenue instead of loans has evoked generally adverse comments. It was stongly animadverted upon by several non-official members of the Legislative Assembly in the course of the general debate on the Budget. And as if to leave no loophole for any misunderstanding on the point, the Assembly carried by 73 votes to 52 a cut motion intended to express its dissatisfaction with the proposed plan. Sir Cowasji Jehangir

who moved the out mainly relied on the Japanese precedent for support to his demand. When Japan found itself faced with a similar problem, funds for reconstruction were raised by means of loans and not from current revenues, as in the present case. The reason for that course is obvious. The expenditure was of a character which would benefit future generations as well; and it was manifestly unfair to saddle the present generation with the whole burden of the cost of reconstruction. It cannot be doubted that Sir Cowasji's criticism had considerable force in it.

IT is not clear from summarised reports whether opportunity was taken to register a protest against the procedure adopted by Government in getting the Assembly committed to the whole scheme. As Sir James Grigg pointed out in his Budget speech, the work of reconstruction will spread over seven or eight years and the total expenditure will be over Rs. 7 crores. To a scheme involving an outlay of the tax-payer's money on this scale, the sanction of the Legislature should really have been sought by means of a resolution to that effect officially brought forward. But for reasons best known to the Government this straightforward course was not resorted to. Instead, the Assembly's sanction was in a way anticipated by the inclusion of the Quetta expenditure in the Budget. The Legislature was thus deprived not only of its privilege of closely scrutinising the Government scheme but of judging for itself about such connected questions as, e. g., the wisdom or otherwise of reconstructing Quetta on its old site and of the necessity or otherwise of bringing out a British engineer for the purpose. This may not be an attempt to confront the Legislature with a *fait accompli*, but it deprives it of an opportunity to express itself on a new scheme of heavy expenditure in a straight and direct fashion.

Excise in Madras.

THE excise administration of the Madras Government was subjected to strong criticism by non-official members in the course of the consideration of the Budget. That Government in common with other local Governments stands committed to the goal of prohibition but is acting in a manner which makes many people doubt whether its allegiance to that goal was at all genuine. As a matter of fact it was loudly complained that not only was it doing nothing to bring the goal nearer, but some of its acts were calculated to delay its advent as much as possible. An instance in point was the reduction in the price of country liquor. This was officially defended on the ground of the necessity to check the evil of illicit distillation which, it was stated, was fearfully on the increase. Whether the step has actually led to the desired result is more than can be asserted with any amount of certainty.

A GOVERNMENT desirous of promoting temperance, as the Madras Government claims to be, would not go out of its way to increase the facilities for drinking by adding to the number of shops. But this is exactly what that Government is guilty of doing, an offence for which it was severely censured by several speakers. Great concern was noticeable at the alarming rise in the consumption of foreign liquor. This was so much the case that the sentiment was given expression to by more than one member that if drink is to be allowed it had better be swadeshi. General dissatisfaction was expressed at the lack of sympathetic consideration shown to the recommendations of excise advisory committees and

of any provision in the budget for temperance propaganda. It was obvious from the Minister's reply that the question of the constitution and functions of these bodies had at last succeeded in engaging the attention of the Government. Will it be too much to hope that the consideration of the question by the Government will result in their status being definitely improved?

I. C. S. Recruitment.

ON 24th February Sir Reginald Craddock asked the Under-Secretary of State in the House of Commons whether, in view of the unsatisfactory state of recruitment of British candidates for the Indian Civil Service in 1935, as reported by the Civil Service Commission, he proposes to take any action to restore the proportion of British to Indian recruits to the

50:50 ratio fixed in 1924. The "unsatisfactory state of recruitment of British candidates" was stated by Sir Henry Craik in the Legislative Assembly on 16th March to be as follows: "During the last five years 175 Europeans and 175 Indians should have been recruited. Actually the recruitment was Europeans 96 and Indians 162, the total shortage being 92, of which 79 were Europeans." Mr. Butler replied to Sir Reginald Craddock's question: "My Noble Friend (Most Hon. The Marquess of Zetland) hopes to be in a position very shortly to make an announcement of the measures to be taken to restore the 50:50 ratio as soon as Part III of the Government of India Act, 1935 (concerning provincial autonomy), comes into force. If present expectations are fulfilled, it should be possible to make a beginning in 1937."

THE SANCTIONS BLUFF.

NO OIL, NO WAR.

UPON the dismissal of Sir Samuel Hoare from the Foreign Office and his replacement by "that terrible young man who wants peace so badly", viz. Captain Anthony Eden who had declared that "we cannot afford to dally," and that "action must be swift, and action must be effective, if the League is to achieve the end for which it is set up," it was hoped that the British Government would press vigorously forward with an oil embargo and would proceed to every extremity in order to stop Mussolini's war. Mr. Eden's speech in the debate in the House of Commons on 24th February has shown, however, that he, too, like Sir Samuel Hoare, is willing to wound but afraid to strike, that in fact he is a dualist, meaning by dualism (as stated by Professor Lees-Smith) "the process of laying down a doctrine and then always being in two minds as to whether you are going to carry it out." The disillusionment which all the progressive elements in Parliament felt at this speech was best expressed by Major Attlee who said, "I seem to see the old Adam in Eden."

It may be that the sanctions already being enforced are working well, and that an embargo on Italy's exports to the League Powers, which amount to 70 per cent. of her export trade, will by reducing Italy's purchasing power eventually cause her economic strangulation and put an end to the war. But these sanctions are indirect and necessarily slow in producing the desired effect. "Oil is the only sanction," as Mr. Lees-Smith who opened the debate reminded us, "which is going to have a direct effect on the military operations." It will also have an almost immediate effect. The Expert Committee of the League has calculated that Mussolini will not be able to continue the war for more than three months and a half if the ban on oil and tankers is joined in by all the exporting countries. The World War showed what a tremendously important part oil plays in modern wars. "At the end of 1917, Clemenceau, faced with insufficient oil reserves, wrote to President Wilson: 'Every drop of oil is worth a drop of blood.' In 1918 it was the lack of oil which prevented the Germans from driving quickly enough

through the French front, which they had already penetrated twice. On the eve of the Armistice, Lord Curzon exclaimed: 'The Allies are borne to victory on torrents of petroleum.'"

With the increased mechanisation of armies the importance of oil has grown still more. "Without gasoline (motor spirit) it is possible to set in motion neither automobiles, lorries for the transportation of the infantry, motor-cycles for the 'motorised' cavalry, tractors, nor airplanes. Without fuel oil, battleships, cruisers, torpedo-boats, and submarines are condemned to immobility. Without lubricants, the axle-trees of railroad-cars and the wheels of the motors become overheated and get out of commission. And without benzine and toluene, the by-products obtained through the distillation of naphtha, it would be impossible to make any of those asphyxiating gases which are so reassuring to civilian populations. An army deprived of petroleum would be stopped as suddenly as an electric tramway by a short circuit." Italy thus depends completely upon a sufficient supply of oil for the continuance of the war. Her internal supply is very limited. She has only one oil field in Sicily, which yielded in 1934 only 2,000 tons. She has also constructed refining industries to crack imported petroleum. These plants produced in 1934 125,000 tons of oil, which is 26 per cent. of her total consumption of gasoline, the imports of gasoline in 1934 being 348,000 tons. Italy's total imports of oil in 1934, as officially reported, were 1,826,575 tons (crude oil 143,000 tons; petroleum 150,400 tons; gasoline 348,000 tons; lubricants 65,675 tons; end-products 1,122,500 tons). Of gasoline as much as 34 per cent. comes from the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, of which the British Admiralty is the principal shareholder, and the great magnitude of Britain's share in this vile trade can therefore be understood.

BRITAIN'S VACILLATION.

The British Government, while Sir Samuel Hoare was in control of foreign affairs, had shown the utmost weakness in regard to oil embargo. The proposal for an oil embargo was put forward by Canada—not by Great Britain. Nor was it heartily supported—

* Francis Delaisi in *Marianne*.

by Great Britain. "With the sole exception of Chile, Britain showed the least eagerness in the subsequent discussion to press the matter forward. . . . The representatives of Russia, Rumania and Holland, which countries are all large producers of oil, gave their support. The British representative did not oppose the embargo. But when he joined in the discussion it was to advise second thoughts."† When the proposal came up for discussion before the Committee of Eighteen from its Sub-Committee on Economic Measures, once more the British representative, this time Earl Stanhope, Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, did not take the lead. He was anxious rather to prevent "a too-wide embargo." Earl Stanhope's opposition was again responsible for omitting from the resolution embargo on toluol, which is very important in the manufactures of explosives. Thus the Committee did not accept even in principle an embargo on products obtained from the hydrogenation of coal. Ultimately, the oil embargo was torpedoed by the Hoare-Laval Surrender Plan.

Such being the history of oil discussions, and the British Government never having given the lead but always having put spokes in the wheel, Mr. Lees-Smith very rightly said: "This oil embargo has become the symbol and the test of the sincerity of this country and the League, and the reason why we say, 'You must now impose it,' is that, so long as you delay it, you cannot avoid the fact that you are part of the Italian military operations. We therefore demand that you shall now state that you are going to cease to assist Italy any longer." When the League condemned Italy as an aggressor the Soviet Government forthwith declared itself ready to suspend all its sales to Italy—on condition that Rumania would declare likewise. The Bukharest Government hastened to pledge its adherence, but on condition that the other sanctionist States buy from it the petroleum which it would no longer be able to sell to Italy, since the export of naphtha is the only means it has of paying for its imports, and deprived of this means, the country would find itself under an economic blockade. In Holland the Royal Dutch and the Shell Transport Companies declared themselves ready for all sacrifices provided that the American trusts did likewise. The Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, controlled by the British Government, simply continued shipping oil to Italy. Sir Samuel Hoare stated in the House of Commons on 5th December, 1935, that its shipments had decreased in 1935, but it was reported in the *New York Times* on 8th December, 1935, that this Company shipped 42,000 barrels of fuel from Port Said to the Italian Navy on November 19, 1935, in addition to its regular contract. §

Would therefore Mr. Eden go to Geneva (asked Mr. Lees-Smith) and himself propose the imposition of the oil embargo, leaving it to any nation which objects to take its responsibility in the face of the world? Mr. Eden's reply was as unsatisfactory as

possible. "Oil is a sanction like any other and must be judged by its efficacy. There is no symbolic quality attaching to it," he said. And he carefully avoided committing himself to a declaration that he would take the initiative in proposing it. The British Government would give a lead in taking defensive measures against a possible attack by Italy in the Mediterranean but not in taking measures of constraint against Italy in defence of Abyssinia. Sir Samuel Hoare, in his speech after resignation, said that the burden of strengthening the defences in the Mediterranean fell entirely upon Great Britain, and that not a man nor a gun had been moved by any other Power. Sir Archibald Sinclair brought out the important fact that "these other countries had never been asked to collaborate with us until the day before that speech was made, or, at any rate, a few days before, but as soon as they were invited to join in resisting interference with sanctions they promptly agreed."

REVULSION IN AMERICA.

Mr. Eden hinted that if an oil embargo did not come to be put on it would be because of U.S.A.'s attitude, for, he said, oil is "a commodity the supply of which is to a great extent in the hands of a non-member of the League." It was rather clever of Mr. Eden to have brought in U.S.A. at this stage, for just now the American Congress has refused to invest the Administration with power either to ban oil exports altogether or to restrict them to the normal amount of peace-time trade. But there is no doubt that this decision was due in the main to the weakness of the sanctions policy of the League Powers. U.S., while desiring to avoid official contact with the League, was anxious to co-operate with it in restoring peace, and with that end in view not only adopted all the measures which the League had sanctioned (though it made them applicable to both the belligerents), but went even further—till 24th November, 1935, when France and Britain decided to ask the League to postpone action on the proposed oil embargo. After this and after the meeting of the Hoare-Laval proposals the tide of opinion in U.S. turned, as is shown by the facts mentioned below:

Oct. 30.—President Roosevelt declared: "In the course of war tempting trade opportunities may be offered to our people to supply materials which would prolong the war. I do not believe that the American people will wish for abnormally increased profits that temporarily might be secured by greatly extending our trade in such materials. Accordingly the American Government is keeping informed as to all shipments consigned for export to both belligerents." The President told newspaper men that he had advised manufacturers not to fill orders from Italy.

Nov. 15.—Secretary of State Cordell Hull declared: "The American people are entitled to know that there are certain commodities such as oil, copper, trucks, tractors, scrap iron and scrap steel which are essential war materials, though not actually 'arms, ammunition or implements of war,' and that, according to recent Government trade reports, a considerably increased amount of these is being exported for war purposes. This class of trade is directly contrary to the policy of this Government, as announced in official statements of the President and Secretary of State, as it is also contrary to the general spirit of the recent Neutrality Act."

† *Abyssinia*, 29th January.

§ *Foreign Policy Reports*, 15th January.

Nov. 21.—Secretary Ickes, acting as Petroleum Administrator, stated that domestic producers should "keep the spirit and letter" of the Neutrality Act by refusing to sell "oil and war materials to Italy."

Nov. 23.—The Shipping Board Bureau of the Department of Commerce sent a letter to all the commercial ship lines indebted to the Federal Government (on nearly all American ships the Government holds a mortgage) declaring that "the carrying of essential war materials, such as those mentioned in the statement of the Secretary of State on November 15, destined to either of the belligerents, is distinctly contrary to the policy of the Government."

After 24th November U.S. policy underwent a change. Secretary Ickes on 3rd December unsaid what he had said on 21st November. He declared that his earlier statement concerning an embargo did not refer to "oil" but rather to "munitions"! This reversal of the attitude of the American Government is attributed by all dispassionate observers to the vacillation of the League States in imposing an oil embargo. The Washington correspondent of the *Times* wrote at about this time:

Frankness demands the statement that little is left here of the earlier mood of hopefulness. Italy takes from the United States only 6 per cent. of her oil requirements in times of peace. If there were a genuine attempt to prevent her access to the remaining 94 per cent. by other nations, the position of the American Government, which desires to honour the spirit as well as the letter of its neutral duties, would be strengthened.

And although Congress has not given the Government legal power to impose a quota on oil exports, still the Government can do a great deal by the use of "moral pressure," as it actually did before, and it is impossible to believe that if only the League acts resolutely the American Government will not yet co-operate with League Powers, though indirectly. The supplies of oil from U.S. must come for the most part from the Standard Oil Company, and Mr. Rockefeller, who is a strong supporter of the League, announced on behalf of the Company that it was making no shipments which "might be called war business," and that it was continuing merely normal trade. There is no doubt that Mr. Rockefeller will discourage shipments of oil in future. Thus passing the buck back to U.S. will not help Mr. Eden.

PEACE PROPOSALS AGAIN!

But even more than this weakness in applying the oil sanction Mr. Eden's talk of the necessity of bringing about a peaceful settlement of the dispute causes serious misgivings. Just a repetition of what Sir Samuel Hoare did. Mr. Eden says that the settlement should be on the lines of the report of the League's Committee of Five, lines "which might be considered acceptable to all members of the League." Sir Samuel too claimed that his Surrender Plan was in conformity with the underlying principles of this Committee's report, and quite rightly too, for this

report is essentially faulty. It is true that the Committee did not propose any surrender of territory, but England and France in a note appended thereto "recognised a special Italian interest in the economic development of Abyssinia." We are glad to see that both Liberal and Labour leaders attacked the report of the Committee of Five. Sir Archibald Sinclair said: "Frankly, I do not much like the report of the Committee of Five." Major Attlee said, after describing in detail the recommendations of the report: "This whole business is undertaken with the idea that Abyssinia is to be controlled and Italy is to have a full share in it. It does not amount to much more than going back to the old treaties and the dividing up between imperialist Powers. We are really returning to the old idea of buying off the aggressor."

The upshot of all this was well described by Mr. Amery. Though his point of view is just the contrary to ours, his remarks about the British Government's shuffling evasiveness will be thoroughly acceptable to all. He said:

I daresay there are many hon. Members who know how to sail a boat. They know what a gybe is. It is a manoeuvre that in a strong wind requires no little nerve and determination. Incompetent or irresolute handling of the tiller may easily lead to that most unpleasant of all experiences—a double gybe—when the boom swings right over one way and back again. I have seen such a proceeding result in an important member of the crew being sent flying overboard. I have known it strain the whole fabric of a vessel from main mast to keel. (From peace talks the Government gybed to sanctions and from sanctions to peace talks. Once again they gybed back to sanctions. The wind is still strong on the sanctions side of their sail) and sooner or later they will be forced to gybe over once more.

The British Government has in fact almost gybed over—unless British public opinion again asserts itself, which however is doubtful.

THE MORAL ASPECT.

An oil embargo is not a sanction just like any other. While it is more destructive of the aggressor's power to make war than any other, it is merciful inasmuch it will not affect the civilian population, but its weight will fall only on the army. Besides, whether an oil embargo is effective or not, it would be wrong for any country which has voted Italy an aggressor country to provide it with means to continue the aggression. It is not a question of practicability alone, but a question of right and wrong, in spite of what Mr. Eden says to the contrary. Thus the Executive Committee of the League of Nations Union passed the following resolution in February:

That the population of a member State should be bombed by aeroplanes supplied with oil fuel purchased from other States members of the League is itself a breach of Article 16 and constitutes a deplorable travesty of the Covenant.

"DEMOCRACY OUT OF PLACE IN INDIA!"

WHILE the inner motive of the British Government in hastening a federal union of the democratically-minded British Indian provinces with the autocratic rulers of Indian States is obvious, one can only speculate as to the motives

which led the leaders of British India to agree to such federation without making a serious effort to require the rulers, either immediately or at a future time, to adopt democratic practices in so far as federal matters are concerned. Although the Reforms

Act is now passed and will come into force within a year in the provinces and in 1941 (this is the date that is now mentioned) at the centre, the speculation will go on for a considerable period, and in fact the question whatever made our leaders hail such federation with joy will not cease to haunt Indian minds till the new constitution comes to be scrapped and a different one, based on entirely different principles, takes its place. An answer to this nightmarish question was suggested by Mr. N. D. Varadachar at the close of his three lectures to the Madras University on the subject of "Indian States under the Federal constitution."

The lecturer had no doubt as to what prompted the British Government to this unholy marriage of autocracy and democracy in India. He declared that

So far as the Parliamentary statesmen were concerned, the association of Princes in a scheme of federation seemed to offer the best solution to the difficulties that they had in relaxing control over British Indian affairs. A considerable section of Englishmen were opposed to the extension of institutions of parliamentary democracy to India. Except a few radical politicians mostly of the Labour party, public opinion in England was anxious to provide for a scheme of safeguards which would keep the constitution from being swayed by extremist Indians. To all these the inclusion of Princes or their representatives in the federal legislatures suggested the best guarantee of stability and conservatism in the new constitution. Besides, the agents of Paramountcy would also be able to influence the federal machinery in many ways, particularly through the minority administrations of the States. And finally, if the States were joined to the system, democratic forces in British India would be restrained.

Mr. Varadachar then enumerated the various anomalies that the federation contains and gave first place in this list to an inequality in the area on which the federal government will operate in different units of the federation, there being inequality, first, as between British India and the States, and, secondly, as between State and State. "This difference in respect of the authority of the federation among the component members", said the lecturer, "made the Indian constitution unique, as in all other federations the power of the federation was equal over all the units." In pointing out this grave anomaly, however, Mr. Varadachar gives more credit to British Indian leaders for trying to remove it than they really deserve. He says: "Apart from demands for the exemption of individual States from federal jurisdiction in matters of common interest which could not but be federalised, there was a class of subjects which it would be to the advantage of the country to be federal. The British Indian provinces particularly wished to retain the advantages of the uniformity of laws effected by the great codes of the Indian legislature. There were also subjects like Labour welfare which would gain by being treated as all-India subjects. The rulers did not agree to the inclusion of these matters in the federal list applying to them." If the leaders of British India "particularly" wished the States to make civil and criminal law a federal subject, applicable as well to the States as to British India they admirably succeeded in concealing this ardent desire of theirs

from the Princes, from the British Government and from the Indian public too. For only Sir Mahomed Shafi made a half-hearted attempt to induce the Princes to part with this power to the federation.

Mr. Varadachar then refers to the demand of the Princes that the federal laws shall not apply *proprio vigore* in the States, but that they shall have operation only after they are re-issued by the respective rulers under their own authority, and to the further demand of the Princes that they should have the right to administer federal laws and that the officers of the federation should not exercise direct authority within the States. In this way the lecturer went on pointing out the numerous anomalies of the constitution. We would mention here only one, for it is most important. He said: "On the question of amending the Act, it was laid down that certain sections could be amended without affecting the validity of the Instruments of Accession. The idea of this was to render impossible amendments relating to the States without their consent. It would be easily seen that this requirement would make amendment of other provisions practically impossible, inasmuch as the previous consent of *all* the States would be required." "All the States" in this quotation is of the utmost importance. We have been crying ourselves hoarse over this question, without however our voice reaching any appreciable section of the people. We are, therefore, particularly glad to receive endorsement at the hands of a student of constitutional law. Mr. Varadachar, at the close, summed up his conclusions and tried to answer the question, "What then could be the reason which made the British Indian leaders acclaim this kind of federation with such a ballyboo?" He remarked:

The federal constitution has many disadvantages. It makes privileged members of the State units with special quasi-constitutional rights, and leaves the future development of the constitution much in their hands. The growth of democratic institutions and responsible government must, to a large extent, be delayed in consequence. But Parliament has shown its unwillingness to deal with the British Indian problem apart from the Indian States. Indian statesmen like Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru considered any price not too high to bring the States into constitutional relations with British India, leaving the rest to the future.

The cream of the lectures, however, came at the end when Mr. Varadachar quoted from a letter dated July 26, 1934 (when the Reforms Bill had passed both Houses of Parliament) which was addressed to him by that great constitutional expert, Professor Berriedale Keith.

As the position presents itself to me, the Government of this country is satisfied that it would be dangerous to accord responsible government to British India and is only prepared, therefore, to accord such government, with large exceptions, to a Government whose conservative character will be ensured by the measure of representation accorded to the Indian States. It declines to impose any obligation on the part of the State to move towards representative or responsible government, since such a movement might destroy the conservative character of the State representation. The conservative character of the central powers under the constitution is dictated by the desire to secure that the conservative forces in the country shall be in a position to counteract any undue democratic tendencies in any province.

The skill of the proposal is obvious, for to grant responsible government to the provinces while retaining the central government under British control would have created serious difficulties, which are diminished by substituting for British control of the centre that of conservative Indian elements which are opposed to the advance of democracy on principle. I fear that the Indian leaders who accepted the federal ideal acted unwisely so far as the extension of democracy is concerned; but, of course, they may have felt that democracy is out of place in India and that an Indian oligarchical regime is preferable to one mainly British. The decline of democratic institutions in Europe has no doubt filled many minds with great doubts as to the possibility of the success of this system in India. Personally, I should have preferred immediate responsible government in the provinces, without vital change at the centre, as the first step, leaving the States over until a federation could be achieved on the basis of responsible government as an objective for the States.

Was Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru led into acceptance of federation by his willingness to pay too high a price in democracy to get some sort of autonomy or was he, as Professor Keith suggests, genuinely fearful of unadulterated democracy? The former hypothesis is the one generally accepted, but the latter can also be put forward, it must be admitted, with some show of reason. It will be remembered that in the Federal Structure Committee he at one stage proposed that a vote of non-confidence in a Ministry should be passed by a two-thirds majority in both chambers of the legislature in order that it should take effect. This provision that Sir Tej suggested had no reference whatever to any claim for sovereignty on the part of the States. He suggested it because he thought that, in a country unused to democracy like India, stable government would be difficult to maintain unless some such safeguard was devised, and probably he borrowed this safeguard from the constitution which Egypt adopted in 1930, just about the time when Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru was thinking of these and other constitutional problems. One of the most reactionary provisions of the Egyptian constitution of 1930 was this one, and Sir Tej Bahadur may well have drawn his inspiration for this suggestion from the universally hated consti-

tution of Egypt. But it is also possible that he might have been guided by the consideration which undoubtedly weighed with many other British Indian leaders: "Let us relieve the Britishers of some of their power. If this power falls at first into the lap of an oligarchy, well, a democracy might arise out of it, and in any case a native oligarchy is better than a foreign bureaucracy."

But the point we wish to stress here is that, in the opinion of so eminent an authority on constitutional law as Professor Berriedale Keith, no constitutional objection could validly be urged against the grant of full responsible government to the provinces without establishing federation at the centre. The British Government proceeded on the basis that not only was central responsibility impossible without federation, but even full provincial autonomy was equally impossible without federation. Whether politically right or wrong, constitutionally speaking, this policy is, according to Professor Keith, faultless. Constitutional theories are developed as political exigencies may require, and when the British Government saw the powerful help federation would render in clipping the wings of a rising democracy in British India, they at once placed federation on a high pedestal and began burning incense to it. "No advance even in British India except when the autocratic elements in Indian society were given the whip-hand in everything, was the new doctrine that came to light, and the British Government could all the more easily accept it because they knew that the Indian autocrats would be under their own heel. This much, however, must be said. One cannot charge the British Government with having manoeuvred British Indian politicians into the federation. Rather it is these politicians who by their persistence made the British Government accept it with a show of reluctance. If the federation turns out ill, let the blame for it be placed on right shoulders!

THE KERR BILL IN U.S.A.

THE current session of the U.S. Congress is likely to consider a bill, introduced by Mr. Kerr in the House of Representatives, which is not without interest to Indians, or "Hindus" or "East Indians" as they are called in U.S.A. The bill, H.R. 8163, is sponsored by the Roosevelt Administration. It is meant to "authorise the deportation of criminals, to guard against separation from their families of aliens of the non-criminal classes, to provide for legalizing the residence in the United States of certain classes of aliens, and for other purposes." All the ameliorative provisions of the Bill are applicable only to those aliens who are "not ineligible to citizenship." And "Hindus", Japanese and Chinese are "ineligible to citizenship." There is, however, one section, Sec. 3 (a), which applies to all aliens, irrespective of eligibility to citizenship, and, therefore, to Indians as well as Japanese and Chinese.

This section provides that, at its discretion, an Inter-Departmental Committee, consisting of representatives of the Departments of Labour, State and Justice, "may permit to remain in the United States any alien found subject to deportation" who is not, however, a criminal provided that he has lived continuously in the United States for ten years, or that he has been living in the United States a parent, spouse, or child, if the latter was admitted to the country legally or is a citizen. This is meant to prevent the disruption of families of those who have been good persons but whose stay in the country is illegal, maybe for purely technical reasons.

There is a case, for instance, of a father who is not liable to deportation, of a mother who is liable to deportation but whose child, born in U.S.A., is a citizen. Under the existing law, the Immigration authorities have no option but to deport the mother.

notwithstanding that the child is but a baby in arms.

It should be noted, however, that though the provision is applicable to all aliens irrespective of eligibility to citizenship, it is essentially a matter of discretion for an Inter-Departmental Committee.

Secondly, the provision authorises the Committee to permit, of course at its discretion, such an alien to "remain" in U.S.A. It does not give power to legalise the residence of the alien. Another section, Sec. 3 (b), permits of the legalization of the residence of those permitted by the previous section "to remain" in the country by a record being made to that effect. But the right to "record of admission" is permitted only to those aliens who are "not ineligible to citizenship." A Hindu, or an Oriental, may be permitted to remain, but is not entitled to a record of admission, which would legalize his residence.

One disability attaching to this rather anomalous status is that the alien who is merely permitted to remain may not re-enter the country, if once he leaves it even temporarily.

The Kerr Bill, if enacted as it stands, cannot in any way worsen the status of the resident Orientals in U.S.A. If anything, it confers on them a possible benefit, however limited it be.

P. KODANDA RAO.

New York,
1st February.

[The Kerr Bill has, we understand, been turned down by the House of Representatives.—Ed., S. O. I.]

Reviews.

AMERICA'S ECONOMIC CAPACITY.

AMERICA'S CAPACITY TO PRODUCE. By EDWIN G. NOURSE and others.

AMERICA'S CAPACITY TO CONSUME. By MAURICE SEVAN and others. (Brookings Institution, Washington.) 1934. 21cm. 608 and 272 pp. \$3.50 and \$3.00.

THESE are the first two of a series of four studies devoted to what the authors describe as "an analysis of the Relation of the Distribution of National Wealth and Income to Economic Progress." The question which the authors claim to have raised and answered in the first volume is: "Did actual production even in our most prosperous years utilise our full productive capacity, and if not, how much latent capacity was there which might have been drawn upon for the satisfaction of people's wants through some better method of handling our economic affairs?" In the second volume, the problem of the fundamental relationship between production and consumption is approached from the side of the consuming capacity and the question is discussed whether in the United States either actual production or productive capacity has exceeded what the "American people as a whole would like to consume." It is clear, thus, that the authors are here at grips with some of the most difficult problems of the modern social economy with its familiar "poverty amidst plenty," its craze for economic plannings of diverse and mutually inconsistent implications, its restric-

tionism, its technocracy, its dependence upon a growing international trade and its equally urgent insistence upon national self-sufficiency, its inflationism and deflationism, its essential selfishness and, above all, its inglorious failure to tackle any of these problems. The authors have faced their task with an intellectual heroism which merits our praise. This heroism is well rewarded by the fact that their task has been facilitated by the fulness of the statistical wealth of America which is the envy of the world.

The theory and the statistics of the problems are very elegantly welded into a complete whole. The statistics must obviously be beyond dispute and beyond cavil to a foreign reader. It is to their ideology and, therefore, methodology that the judicious critic might turn his attention. It is satisfactory to note that the authors recognise that "the sort of questions which we are asking cannot be conclusively answered by the marshalling of mere figures," that "they involve sequences of cause and effect in an organic economic society." Even supposing, however, that we could apply the statistical detail to the solution of economic problems with an uncanny precision (which itself is a sufficiently impracticable proposition), the theoretical structure needs to be safeguarded against jerry-building. It appears to us that, although the general conclusion of the authors of both the volumes that productive capacity in the United States has not outrun the consuming capacity is perfectly sound, they have followed very arbitrary methods in assessing both producing as well as consuming capacities. They have unduly circumscribed their meditations by the very conditioning factors of the modern social economy from which one would expect them to set free their logic and method. For example, they consider only the present "practically attainable capacity" of production, i. e., one which is conditioned by the present price factor, the present distribution of income and the present flow of demand. It is clear that if the inequality of distribution is materially altered, either by the course of events or by political *bouleversement*, the potential demand factor would also alter the potential capacity. It is in this dynamic aspect that the question of productive capacity should have been considered. Of course, thus presented, the whole issue nullifies the utility of existing statistics either of production or of practical capacity or of theoretical (in the engineering sense) capacity. The trouble, moreover, with the authors of the first volume is that they have not been able to keep separate the two distinguishable aspects of the matter, viz, the long-run or permanent problem of the adequacy of capacity to produce and the essentially short-run and cyclical problem of "idle" capacity. Starting with the ambitious project of considering the former, they have unconsciously landed in the latter region, with the result that we find them telling us that normally there is bound to be some unutilised capacity, while in the depression it has been as low as 50% of the whole. In our view, they cannot consider the issue with proper clarity with these circumscriptions.

In the second volume, again, in order to show the extent of possible consuming capacity the authors have followed the wholly unjustifiable procedure of assuming the possibility that the entire range of family incomes was raised on a sort of sliding scale. "Let us ask the question," they say, "what would be the result upon consumer demand if, by some means, poverty could be completely eliminated and if there were very moderate increases of income among the families in the middle classes? In order to analyse the problem in specific terms, let us assume that the incomes of families were to be

increased in accordance with the following scale," etc. They are thus brought to the question of what is "poverty" and what would be a "reasonable standard of living." The answer, as may be expected, is inexcusably arbitrary, especially in a series of volumes which ostensibly deal with the question of a better alignment between consumption and production with a view to economic progress. They tell us that "the trouble is clearly not lack of desire but lack of purchasing power," which would indeed be a platitude, if it were not for the damaging admission which accompanies it that "vast potential demands alike for basic commodities and for conventional necessities exist in the unfulfilled wants of the masses of the people, both rural and urban," damaging, because it makes the arbitrary raising of incomes to a certain level itself questionable. And, now, we must close here, for the remaining two volumes, viz., *The Formation of Capital and Income and Economic Progress* will have to be gone through before we are in a position to pass a final opinion on the success or failure of this series of volumes. All that can be said so far is that the authors have very creditably accomplished a difficult theoretical and statistical task within the limits which they have imposed on themselves.

L. N. WELINGKAR.

PROBLEM OF AIR-MINDEDNESS.

A MILLION MILES IN THE AIR. By GORDON P. OLLEY. (Hodder & Stoughton.) 1934. 22cm. 320p. 7/6.

THIS book gives in a non-technical manner an account of the development of aviation, especially civil aviation. Realising the important part that aviation is going to play both in times of war and peace, the author tries to create an intelligent interest in the subject amongst the general public. In fact his idea seems to be to make the man in the street "air-minded." Without attempting to write an autobiography but merely describing his own experiences, the author cunningly insinuates himself into the confidence of the reader who unconsciously develops an ultimate friendship with Captain Olley as he goes on graphically describing the onward progress of aviation and the part he has himself played in it by flying more than a million miles during a course of about twenty years.

"Romance is not dead. Far from it. Adventure is still with us. The only difference is that adventurers who used to achieve their exploits by land and sea now find their scope for their ambitions along the highways of the air." With these crisp and hopeful words the author fixes the attention and interest of the reader from the commencement. While chronicling the exploits of others, the author depends mainly on his own experiences. He never exaggerates, but one often suspects that he is needlessly modest where his own exploits are concerned. But all the same, when one lays down the book after going through its vivid descriptions, Captain Olley is sure to be added to the list of heroes kept and maintained—at least in one's mind—by every reader.

Since the book is meant for the lay reader, and since it is written by a practical pilot, everything described in it belongs to the spectacular side of progress in aviation. The part that has been played by the scientist and the engineer does not find a prominent place in any part of the book. When it is remembered that it looks as though it were yesterday that we heard the flights of the brothers, Wilber and Orville Wright (less than 30 years ago), the progress in aviation during the intervening period has been

nothing short of a miracle. This miracle would not have been possible but for the work of the physicist, the mathematician and the mechanical engineer. It is really the work of these "scientists" that is at the back of all the progress and that enables "pilots" like Captain Olley possess a machine that is capable of a speed of 400-500 miles an hour at the present day. It is by no means with the idea of belittling the magnificent contribution made by "pilots"—who man the machines—that these lines have been written about the "silent" men who work at their desks and laboratories.

The book is divided into five sections and all developments of aviation from the time of the balloonists to the present day are chronologically and graphically mentioned. Captain Olley has successfully shown to his readers that, if there be any amongst them that are still doubtful about the safety of travelling in air, it is as safe to travel in one of the modern air-liners as it is in an express train or in an up-to-date steamship. In fact he mentions that insurance rates are now-a-days quoted at a lower figure for air-journeys.

The services rendered by the aeroplane in these days by annihilating space and time are narrated by a number of examples and it were not right to enumerate them here. It may be stated confidently that there is not a single dull page in the whole book. It makes fascinating reading.

S. G. SASTRY.

THE MEERUT "CONSPIRACY."

CONSPIRACY AT MEERUT. By LESTER HUTCHINSON. (Allen & Unwin) 1935. 20cm. 190p. 5/-

THE Meerut conspiracy case had in its days earned a bad name for the wearisome length of its proceedings and the cruel severity of the sentences after most of the accused had spent long years in prison as 'under-trials.' Most of them were young men who could have come out of the ordeal with nothing but a bitter hatred of the system of government under which such a scandalous state of affairs was possible. The general sympathy for the accused in the hearts of their countrymen, including even those who hated the communists and their ways, was an indication that the Government of India had committed a political blunder of 'Himalayan' proportions, even though they may be allowed to have been actuated by honest motives.

An account of the trial by one of the accused has therefore a special attraction for students of Indian affairs and the attraction is particularly heightened by the fact that no less a person than the great Professor Harold J. Laski has written a foreword, in which he has to pass some very bitter comments on the Government of India.

The author, in spite of his terrible experiences during the most impressionable years of his youth, has unexpectedly retained a lively sense of humour. He embellishes the account with his own observations on persons and things he saw in India, both inside and outside of the prison-walls. The narrative runs smoothly and attractively, with constant twists and turns that make its perusal an amusing pastime.

If we turn, however, to the substance of the book we must confess to a sense of disappointment. His comments on Government servants and their ways pick out the black spots in the administrative machinery with an almost malicious joy and his rare references to the brighter side appear to deepen the shady aspects of the picture. His critical thrusts at Indian

customs and manners are similarly aimed and though it would be unfair to the author to compare them to the devilish efforts of the authoress of 'Mother India', they are an indication of an irresponsibility of outlook and an unrefined taste, coupled with a constitutional inability for a sympathetic understanding of a foreign people and their sentiments. Two illustrations will suffice. His detailed description of the physical beauty of Indian maidens as 'a revelation to the tired Europeans' does not deserve quotation. His references to Mr. Gandhi are equally annoying in their own way:

His ugliness alone convinces them of his holiness.... He is the master of the divine art of converting the obvious into the incomprehensible.... He is adopted as the political instrument of those interested in exploitation.... His material and political craft was apparent.... With him went the odour of sanctity.

The sins of omission are even more pronounced. Nowhere in the book do we find the names of all the accused or the mention of the prosecution's charges against the accused, or a hint as to why the Allahabad High Court judges, who drastically reduced the sentences, still thought it incumbent on them to retain the remaining ones. He fails to explain the mutual sympathy between the 'merely trade unionists' and the terrorists who threatened the life of the convicting judge. Nor are we given any reasons whatever to explain why a foreigner like him rose within a few months of his arrival in India from an obscure journalist of 23 to the vice-presidency of two of the largest trade unions in India. The reader does not again know why he left India, 'probably for ever', without more than a momentary touch of regret. It would be too much to ask him to find out the reasons which prompted the author to persist in employing as his cook a person whom he had found to be "closely connected both with a dangerous gang of dacoits and the police... the adviser of all the notorious characters of the district, ... who made no secret that he regarded me as a master criminal, etc."

Altogether, the thoughtful reader likes to lay down the book with the unpleasant feeling that the author does succeed in impressing him not as the protagonist or even as a clever propagandist of a great humanitarian cause and a martyr to his deep convictions but rather as the type of an intelligent, hard-working but irresponsible young man using his considerable capacities in the pursuit of reckless adventures, romantic and otherwise as a noisy part-time before he settles down to something more serious.

We cannot help thinking that if what we see in this book really represents the typical mentality of the communist workers, the outlook is dark and difficult indeed for his fellow-workers and their cause, and for the Government that persecuted him and his likes into a sort of 'famousness' and also for those who allow themselves to extend even their discriminating sympathy towards their sufferings.

R. H. KELKAR.

SHORT NOTICES.

RELIGION AND THE MODERN STATE.

By CHRISTOPHER DAWSON. (Sheed and Ward.)

1935. 22cm. 154p. 6/-

MY sensations while reading this book were similar to those I experienced while being hustled through a three days' tour in France by a terrifyingly expert guide, who maintained a remarkable indifference to the things he displayed to us. In the space of 152

pages of not very large type, Dr. Hecker presents to us—Religion. He does it with a magnificent gesture and, like my guide in France, he left me at the end gasping for breath and longing for freedom.

In the first two chapters he presents Religion, as it is for the believer and the theologian. These, as far as they go, are reasonable; but they are inadequate and do not go far enough. Then follows a chapter in which the author is concerned to show how religion has failed to solve social problems, and another, which explains that the four antagonists of religion are secularisation, mechanisation, modern society and communism. By way of appearing to balance the harm which these chapters seem to bring to the cause of Religion, the next is devoted to 'What is aiding Religion', and people like Jeans, Eddington, Millikan and Thompson are brought to our notice. The conclusion from all this seems to be that 'Religion is definitely on the defensive', which is a perfectly true statement and, as *Punch* would put it, 'another glimpse of the obvious'. For if A takes a stick to B, and B starts to defend himself and his interests, it is unnecessary for A to point out B's act of self-defence, and unreasonable for him to conclude from it that B is already knocked out nor even that he is likely to collapse. Yet that is what the author concludes in the last chapter.

Dr. Hecker writes as a Communist, and therefore has no use for Religion, as such. That is a pity, because he could have written so much more shortly: "I dislike Religion as she is practised." That would have been far more honest. But it would not have taken our breath away. Hence this book.

OUTRAM WALSH.

PARENTHOOD: DESIGN OR ACCIDENT?

By MICHAEL FIELDING. (Williams & Norgate.)

1935. 18cm. 208p. 2/-

MR. H. G. WELLS assures the reader in the preface that the book is written by a well-qualified medical practitioner, but that medical etiquette forbids him to put his name to it, also that it is the 'most exact, plain and unexciting handbook' on the subject. The third edition is a great improvement on the first, which in my opinion, did not quite deserve this praise, but I am inclined to agree with Mr. Wells now. A specially important section of the book is "What to Avoid", in which the author includes such methods as the 'Safe Period', 'Coitus interruptus', stems, studs etc., introduced into the womb, continuing breast-feeding longer than is good for the child, and what is known as 'holding back', in which the woman deliberately tries not to reach her organism, all these being definitely harmful. The book not only gives a summary of the methods recommended, but also a chapter of methods of the future, which are still in an experimental stage. It gives a glossary of technical terms which may be unknown to the ordinary reader and a list of books for further reading, which makes the book as complete as any ordinary reader could wish. It is necessary to point out, however, that the sizes mentioned as most common in English clinics (p. 73), viz., between 70 and 80, with 75 as the most common size, are not the most common sizes required by Indian ladies, in these parts at any rate. My experience is that the most common sizes are between 60 and 70 and rarely 72½ or 75 as a maximum. Fig. 6 on page 72, showing the Dutch Cap in position is not very satisfactory. On the whole, however, there is no doubt that this is one of the best books on the subject.

R. D. KARVE.

RURAL INDIA: PEASANTS POVERTY, ITS CAUSES AND CURE. By CHOWDHRY MUKHTAR SINGH. (Leader Press, Allahabad.) 25cm. 175p. Re. 1-8-0.

THIS is an exhaustive and realistic study of rural economics by one who combines in himself something of a peasant, a student of economic science, and a politician. This happy combination, while contributing to a realistic study, wards off the author from one-sided and biased view-points. The study itself is systematic and scientific, and the conclusions are logically worked out. The author, the optimist that he is, tries to take us out of this slough of despair to an era of happiness and prosperity.

The book is divided into four parts. The first part deals with the general allegations levelled against the Indian peasant, which are proved by the author as sheer perversions of truth. The second part gives the necessary historic background. Part third deals with the peculiarities of the industry of agriculture, and the facilities which the peasant and the industry should possess. 'The magic of property which turns sand into gold' should be well understood, and peasants should be made the owners of their farms. Recent European experience has volumes to speak in favour of this. The last part deals with indirect remedies such as better organisation, better planning, infusion of patriotism, and direct remedies such as collective farming, subsidiary industries, irrigation facilities and manure. Though ideas of collective farming and the like are directly traceable to Russian influence, the author seems to have some instinctive dislike for that system. He tries to prove that the Indian genius is not for it. The fundamental human instincts do not differ in the various countries, and if all the political genius of the foreign administrators of the country and their well-behaved boys could only create a situation not dissimilar to that of pre-revolutionary Russia, we cannot with the same confidence that the author possesses hope that India will shun the Russian model.

A close and an unbiased study like this reveals that the peasant is not the incorrigible wreck that he is made out to be by some, but one who has natural ambitions and one who is willing to improve and profit whenever possible. He is utterly poor, and that at times hardens him against everything. He has not shunned, and will not shun, the helping hand extended to him.

N. S. S.

MOTHERHOOD IN BONDAGE. By MARGARET SANGER. (Brentano's Ltd.) 21cm. 446p. 10/6.

MRS. MARGARET SANGER has now, by her campaign of birth-control, become a world figure. She is hailed everywhere as a harbinger of a new gospel by the suffering motherhood. She has suffered hardships, even jail, for her advocacy of birth control, but she has the good fortune of seeing her own efforts crowned with brilliant success, even in lands far off from her sphere of activities. The book before us, though old, is a well documented volume, showing in glowing colours how motherhood all over America was suffering from incessant anxiety, pain and even, in some cases, life-long invalidness. Mrs. Sanger held out a helping hand to such motherhood and her advice has not gone in vain. Women in America are, to great extent, rescued from the long travail of incessant pregnancies and confinements.

In the first chapter on girl mothers Indian readers will surely be surprised to read that right there in America "child marriages and child-

motherhood continue to exist." One girl mother there was who was only 13, and Mrs. Sanger says that there were no less than 250 who were between the ages of 14 and 15. Another example shows "six children at the age of 17," and one mother of 21 had 8 infants! In the fourth chapter Mrs. Sanger says: "Certain women ought to be totally exempt from the ordeal of maternity because of their physical, psychic and hereditary defects." This is a point worth noting by Indian parents who rush their daughters to the bridal altars only to satisfy their superstitious inclinations. In other chapters various other aspects of slavery of mothers are touched upon, and it is shown how "self-imposed continence and separation" ends in a tragedy of life. Evangelists and sentimentalists will do well to ponder over this sort of advice which certainly mars but does not mend matters. We pay our own tribute to Mrs. Sanger for issuing such a convincing book on the necessity of birth-control.

V. M. BHAT.

Miscellaneous.

THE LATE MR. G. K. DEVADHAR.

HERE was a Servant of India in the truest sense of the world. Service of the needy was the one motto of his life and he lived up to it as few men in India have done in modern times. The first of that band of selfless workers who joined Gokhale at the Servants of India Society he well-nigh excelled the master in at least one department of the Society's activities. Social service in all its aspects has lost in Devadhar an indefatigable worker, an inspiring leader and a wonderful organizer. One has only to bring to mind the Malabar riots or the Gujarat and Sind floods or the condition of Hindu widows a few years ago, to realize what Devadhar has done for his fellow-men.

Like all great men of action, Devadhar had the courage to choose his vocation in life and the patience to stick to it. In a country like India, politics of one shade or another is a natural attraction for every public worker. Realizing early in life that his temperament and abilities fitted him more for social than for political work, Mr. Devadhar never allowed himself to be lured away from his chosen field into the popular field of politics.

His one fault, as Mr. Sastri says in his tribute, was that he neglected himself in his anxiety to be ever helpful to others. But what a noble fault! How we wish that more in our country cultivated it and made the task of persons like Devadhar a little less exacting!—Professor P. R. Dasmle in the *Nowrosjee Wadia College Miscellany*.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE ROOSEVELT REVOLUTION. FIRST PHASE. By ERNEST K. LINDLEY. (Gollancz.) 1934. 20cm. 287p. 5/-.
- CONSPIRACY AT MEERUT. By LESTER HUTCHINSON. (Allen & Unwin) 1935. 20cm. 190p. 5/-.
- SEX AND REVOLUTION. By ALEC CRAIG. (Allen & Unwin.) 1934. 20cm. 144p. 4/6.
- THE GOLD STANDARD AND ITS FUTURE. By T. E. GREGORY. (3rd Edn.) (Methuen.) 1934. 20cm. 184p. 6/-.
- INQUEST ON PEACE. By "Vigilantes." (Gollancz.) 1935. 20cm. 366p. 3/6.
- ETHICS OF PEACE AND WAR. By H. GIGON. (Burns & Gates.) 1935. 20cm. 68p. 2/-.
- SUNLIGHT AND HEALTH. By O. W. SALSBY. (5th Edn.) (Nisbet.) 20cm. 178p. 5/-.

ESTABLISHED 1911.

The Bombay Provincial Co-operative Bank Ltd.

(Registered under the Co-operative Societies Act.)

Head Office: Apollo Street, Fort, BOMBAY. (Branches: 28)
Apex Bank of the Co-operative Movement in Bombay Presidency.

WORKING CAPITAL Exceeds Rs. 2,00,00,000

FIXED, CURRENT AND SAVINGS DEPOSITS ACCEPTED.

Terms on Application.

ADVANCES made only to registered Co-operative Societies.

COLLECTION WORK undertaken at almost all important towns in the Bombay Presidency.

Money deposited with this Bank directly benefits the agriculturists and persons of small means.

For further particulars write to Managing Director.

The Industrial and Prudential Assurance Co. Ltd.

The Premier Indian Life Office.

Estd. 1913.

Head Office — BOMBAY.

UP-TO-DATE BENEFITS.

LOW PREMIUMS.

BONUS:

Whole Life—Rs. 22-8-0 per Thousand per Year.

Endowment— „ 18-0-0 per — „ —

For Agency apply to—Secretaries and Managers,

Industrial and Prudential Assurance Coy. Ltd.,

Esplanade Road, Fort, BOMBAY.

SUPREME FOR YEARS SUPREME TO-DAY— QUALITY ALWAYS TELLS



Mysore Sandalwood Oil B. P. quality, the finest in the world, is perfectly blended and milled by a special process with the purest ingredients to make.

Mysore Sandal Soap

“It's good through and through
to the thinnest wafer”

Available Everywhere.

**GOVERNMENT SOAP FACTORY,
BANGALORE.**