

The Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VALE.

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA 4.

Vol. XX. No. 45. } POONA—THURSDAY NOVEMBER 18, 1937. { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6
FOREIGN SUBSN. 15s. .

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	529
ARTICLES :	
Gandhiji and the States ...	532
Bombay Government and Labour.—II. By R. R. Bakhale ...	534
Current Comment ...	535
REVIEW :	
Two Ideologies. By Prof. S. G. Puranik ...	538
SHORT NOTICES ...	539
CORRESPONDENCE :	
Return of Forfeited Lands. By T. ...	539

Topics of the Week.

The Batliwala Case.

THE famous case of Mr. Batliwala, a Congress Socialist, which created such a stir in the A.L.C.C. in Calcutta, has been decided, the Judge having sentenced Mr. Batliwala to six months' simple imprisonment. An appeal against the judgment has been filed, and it would not therefore be appropriate to comment on the merits of the judgment. But the political aspect of the case may be briefly considered. In the first place it appears strange that the Ministry, formed by a party which considers itself wedded to the creation of disaffection against the Government established by law, should start a prosecution under section 124 A. Incitement to violence is a different matter, which is not in question in this case; and even if it were, it would be agreed that unless incitement was of such a character as to lead to an outbreak of violence, it would not be right policy for any Government to launch a prosecution. In the present instance it cannot be said that there was any ground to fear such a result. This particular prosecution would appear from this point of view to have been uncalled for. More we may not say at this stage.

DR. PATTABHI SITARAMAYYA suggests that the conviction of Mr. Batliwala is an argument in favour of the separation of the judiciary and the executive.

The very institution of a prosecution by a Local Government in which the judiciary and the executive are combined, says Dr. Pattabhi, makes conviction the most natural issue. Not that there is any pressure brought by the Ministry on the Judge. Nor that the Judge is incapable of independent judgment, but that the Judge, not an automaton but a human being endowed with ordinary susceptibilities, cannot, in the nature of things, resist a conclusion which is

the most natural issue in respect of a prosecution instituted by the Governor either by himself, or acting with his Minister. We do not know what the truth is. Obviously the Judge was reluctant to convict. Else, he would not have given six months. This only illustrates the supreme necessity for separating the judiciary from the executive.

Cr. Law Amendment Act in Ahmedabad.

THE situation in Ahmedabad where workers in 34 mills have gone out on strike is causing grave anxiety to the Congress Ministry, which believes that workers willing to work are being intimidated and terrorised. And in order to put a stop to such intimidation the Ministry has issued a notification under the Criminal Law Amendment Act declaring the offence of criminal intimidation committed within the municipal limits of Ahmedabad City to be cognisable and non-bailable and has directed that additional police should be dispatched immediately.

THE *Bombay Chronicle's* comment on this order so correctly voices our own sentiments that we cannot do better than quote it here :

But resort to an odious repressive legislative measure is a serious matter in its implications. It means that the Congress Government want the law to stand on the statute book for use in emergencies. That view is inconsistent with the declared policy of the Congress to repeal all repressive laws. Moreover, if Congress Government help to retain a repressive law, there is no hope of other Governments repealing it. They will point at the offending Congress Government, who will thus be a help in perpetuating an obnoxious law.

It will perhaps be argued that a Congress Government will make only a most judicious use of the objectionable Act and that, too, in a grave emergency. But that plea is untenable. Other Governments will put forward the same excuse and thereby justify the retention of all repressive laws and even the making of new ones. A vicious weapon, it is well said, may tempt even a saint; and a Congress Government, under the influence of a panic, may unwittingly make an improper use of a dangerous law like the one in question. This is essentially a matter of principle and admits of no compromise. The Bombay Cabinet has often assured the public that the repressive legislation will either be repealed or remain a dead letter. The present resort to it is contrary to that assurance. Moreover, we do not think that the use of it is indispensable.

Communal G. O.

THE Province of Orissa has received from Madras, in the districts detached from the Madras Presidency, the *damnoea hereditas* of a system of communal representation in the services. But the Congress Ministry has done away with it, though the Congress Ministry

in Madras has retained it. The Cuttack correspondent of the *Hindustan Times* says :

One of the boldest acts of the local Congress Ministry has been to abolish what, in the language of Madras politics, is popularly known as the communal G. O. That is, recruitment to posts under Government is made from the different communities, according to a fixed and definite proportion. This G. O. was in force in the ex-Madras area when it came over to the new province of Orissa but the Congress Ministry has abolished it. During the last session of the Orissa Assembly, Mr. Latif-ur-Rahman, the ex-Minister, who has now constituted himself the champion of all the minority interests in this province, raised this question of communal recruitment and Mr. Biswa Nath Das, the Premier, blandly replied to him that the Government had decided that in the best interests of the province, appointments to Government posts should be based on qualifications only and not on any other consideration. But a recent 'communique' has made an exception in favour of members of the backward tribes living in the Agency areas and in the Khondmals. It is considered, says the 'communique,' that members of the backward tribes should be recruited for such posts as they are fit for, on more than one ground. In the first place, those who have homes in the Agency are not eligible to draw Special Agency pay, and are, therefore, cheaper for Government. Secondly, recruitment from amongst them would demonstrate to the tribes generally the advantages of education, and reconcile them also to the ordinary systems of administration. Thus, save and except in this case, the Orissa Government has done away with communal preferences and exclusions in the matter of appointments.

Repression in Mysore.

MYSORE has not added to its reputation by the heavy sentences, viz., eighteen months with labour plus a fine of thousand rupees, awarded to Messrs. K. T. Bhashyam and N. C. Thimma for their part in the agitation, a side-issue of which was the recent Bangalore incidents. The State's executive authorities are not of course responsible for the sentence which is brutal, but they are responsible for the prosecution. It is clear that the Government of the State took a serious view of the activities of these two leaders. If the State believes that prosecution of such respected citizens will work as a deterrent to other leaders and stop political agitation, it has sadly failed to learn from events in British India. Trying to curb the agitation of public leaders only adds fuel to the fire.

It is tragic that a progressive State like Mysore should be associated with tyranny of this type. We may remind Sir Mirza of his speech to the Dussarah session of the Mysore Assembly, where he expressed his opinion that no objection would be taken to legitimate political movements of the State citizens. As far as we have been able to ascertain, there was at least no question of either of the accused in the case being associated with any violence. Heavy securities have been asked from other workers also and it seems almost as if Mysore has decided to line up with other autocratic States in the country. It is a fine prelude to federation!

A Madras Lead.

THE Madras Government deserves commendation for a recent communique in connection with the purchase of stores. The Indian stores purchase has been a hardy annual of attack from the Opposition in the Central Assembly, but hardly anything is known about its repercussions on the provincial stores purchase. The Madras Government enjoins its officers

in charge of this department to put on record their reasons for purchasing their requirements abroad as to why they did so. If they could get their requirements in India without impairing efficiency and economy, they are to do so without exception. The communique draws attention to the excellent service given to their clients by the agencies of foreign manufacturing firms by way of technical advice, delivery, installation, repairs and supply of parts of articles. In the case of Indian manufacturers these attractive attributes of salesmanship combined with a concern for the convenience of clients do not exist, at least to the same degree of perfection. The Madras communique, however, will result in drawing their attention to these defects and as Government shows greater solicitude for Indian goods, these defects may be remedied. The lead of the Madras Government will, we hope, be followed in other provinces without loss of time.

Separation of Functions.

WHEN the Madras Education Minister, Dr. P. Subbaroyan, paid a visit to the Bar Association of Tinnevely on the 8th inst, the President of the Association, Mr. Sadhu Ganapati Pantulu, took exception to the views ventilated by the Premier, Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar, on the separation of the judicial and executive functions. The Association, he said, had considered the matter carefully and was of opinion that such separation was necessary, and the views of the Madras Premier on this matter were unacceptable. In replying, Dr. Subbaroyan revealed the fact that the Congress Ministry was sharply divided on the subject, and that while he and the Premier were opposed to separation, others were in favour. He said :

He himself as well as his leader, felt that the time had not come for such a separation and in this they were in a minority in the Cabinet. They believed that under the present Constitution Act, such separation would not be desirable because it would whittle down the power of the executive to an extent undesirable at present. He was aware, he said, that in other provinces a different view had been taken and added that he had conversations on this matter with two distinguished lawyers, Mr. K. M. Munshi and Dr. Katju, who were Ministers in the Congress Governments of Bombay and the U. P., and they were inclined to agree with the Madras Premier, though their leaders Mr. Kher and Pandit Pant took a different view. The Government of Madras had not taken any decision on the matter and the view against separation was only a personal view of the Premier and himself and that if circumstances made a satisfactory solution of this question possible, it would be considered.

WHY the revenue officials should be armed at present (i. e. while the Congress party is in office) with powers which it is found necessary in every country for the administration of justice and for the preservation of civil liberty to take away from them, it is not possible to understand. But we need not labour a point on which Mr. Rajagopalachariar and Mr. Katju have got a rap on the knuckles from every quarter. What interests us, however, is that Mr. Kanhayalal Munshi is with these fallen angles. It would appear that we were too optimistic when we expressed relief in a recent issue that the Bombay Minister for Home and Law had taken a bold line in a favour of separating judicial from executive functions. We were misled by his recent speech in Poona and forgot for the moment that, equally subtle in intellect with Messrs. Cnari and Katju, Mr. Munshi too would give a go-bye to a dearly cherished principle. Mr. Munshi says one thing in public and another in private, and while the possibility must be conceded that what he has in mind may be quite different from what he says either in public

or in private, the people of the Presidency must at least take his public utterance with tons of salt when they are known to differ from his confidences told to his brother Ministers in the seclusion of his private chamber.

State Support of Education.

THE *Hindu*, as our readers are aware, has already expressed its disapproval of the Wardha scheme which makes primary and secondary education independent of the support of the State in so far as current expenses of such education are concerned. Now on account of certain Ministerial utterances which have caused misgivings in the public mind that State support will be withdrawn from university education too, it has deemed it necessary to comment as follows :

The idea that higher education should involve no expenditure of money on the part of the State, the suggestion apparently being that the whole cost should be met from tuition fees and the income from private munificence, is grotesque in the extreme. In no country has this been possible. The State owes a duty to its citizens in regard to the promotion of higher education. As we have pointed out above, it is obvious that education must be made less literary than now by the provision of facilities for training in technical and industrial subjects. Reforms are urgently called for in the co-ordination of the activities of the various universities so as to secure greater economy and efficiency. There is overwhelming necessity for correlating the courses of studies in colleges and universities to the life of the people around. While these and other improvements are urgently called for, it is quite unsound to seek deliberately to withdraw State support from higher education. There should be no need to stress these obvious principles but for the grave misgivings which have been created by the utterances of some of those in authority.

Education in Bombay.

ALTHOUGH Premier Kher expressed his complete accord with the Education Conference scheme at Wardha, his mind still appears to be a little afflicted by doubts. For it is reported in the *Bombay Chronicle* that the Ministry intends this year to start 500 new primary schools in selected villages out of the 16,000 villages that are still without any facilities for primary education. The Government, it appears, will ask private agencies to start the schools and will give a subsidy to them. The report says further : "As regards the Wardha scheme of education, there is no question of its introduction. The scheme itself is not ready, and even when it is ready, it will have to be gone through by educationists to see that it is fool-proof. If and when approved, the scheme will be introduced in the Presidency in selected rural areas."

THE *Bombay Chronicle* in its editorial comments suggests that the areas to be selected for the introduction of the scheme, if and when approved, should not be too many, and that in any case the principle of self-support should be dropped. It remarks, after reiterating its approval of the scheme of imparting education through a vocation :

It is only when the resolution "expects" that this system "will be gradually able to cover remuneration of teachers" that many educationists will begin to doubt and fear. However, it is something that the self-supporting aspect of the scheme is not made its essential feature in the resolution as finally adopted by the Wardha Conference. The essential feature is such manual and productive (we would have preferred the word "creative") work as can be made the pivot of general education, its remunerative capacity being only incidental and absolutely subsidiary. Understood in the sense that manual productive work is only to be one of the principal means of importing bodily,

intellectual and aesthetic training, the Wardha scheme deserves a fair trial. Indeed by imparting a reality and purposefulness and intellectual training the scheme will be a great educational reform. Its value will be great even if it fails, during the limited time of the primary course, to fit a child fully for a vocation. Its value will be greater if the child is so fitted without prejudice to the general training. The scheme will then be a great blessing. If, however, the remunerative principle, as distinguished from the educative, is unduly emphasized, then the general training of the mind and the emotions will be but a name if not a mockery. It is all a question of emphasis. In any case, the scheme must first be given a trial in small selected areas, as has wisely been decided by the Government of Bombay, and no hasty attempt should be made to introduce it on a wider scale. We shall wait for the details of the scheme that are being worked out by the Committee of the Conference. We earnestly hope the Committee will not make a fetish of the remunerative or self-supporting feature.

"Cannot be Self-Supporting."

PRESIDING over the Karachi Students' Conference on the 13th inst., Mr. Satyamurti observed in his inaugural address :

I am personally in favour of giving a manual orientation to our schools. I am also in favour of the extension of the period of compulsory free education to seven years. I also believe that, in our schools, at least in the higher classes, we may so conduct our activities as to earn something for the schools; but I am convinced that it is neither possible nor desirable to make our elementary schools self-supporting. Children are a legitimate charge on their parents and on the State, and I think the State ought to find the money for the elementary education, for five or seven years, of its children. It is being done by every modern civilised State. I hope this aspect of the problem will receive careful consideration. I am undoubtedly in favour of reducing the expenditure on our elementary schools. I feel that we are spending too much on them. I feel we do not need elaborate buildings or elaborate furniture. I think we ought to use more and more the buildings in our temples, mosques and churches for these schools, and cool fresh sand ought to be enough, in the place of furniture. I am afraid we are spending too much on text books. If we must have text books, I am entirely in favour of the provincialisation or the nationalisation of the text-book industry. The Provincial Governments must engage good writers to write good text books, print them themselves, sell them at a little more than the cost price and use all the net profits for the spread of elementary education. This will eliminate frequent charges of text books and corruption, and will help the spread of education to some extent financially.

The problem of secondary education presents some difficulties. It is not possible to carry out the facile suggestion that we must divide students into two classes : one going to the University, and the other ending at the school course. This experiment has been made in Madras, and has so far been a failure. We can and ought to give a vocational bias to our schools, but I am not in favour of turning them into whole-time or part-time factories. If the boys require that training, they must go to the workshops. Secondary schools must be literary, while encouraging and teaching the boys to use their hands, their eyes and their feet.

AT a discussion held in Madras on the Wardha scheme of education, the Rev. J. D. Boer said that, while agreeing with the scheme wholeheartedly in many of its fundamental features, he could not approve of the self-supporting idea. The State should come forward and put through such a scheme, whether it was self-supporting or not. He also believed that the self-supporting idea, if made an inseparable part of the scheme, would hurt the scheme itself. The Minister of Information, Mr. S. Ramanathan, in reply,

said that this was the attitude taken up by most of those present at the Wardha Conference and the resolution which was finally drafted clearly indicated this, for it only stated that an attempt should be made to meet the recurring charges, while the former proposal was to make the entire scheme self-supporting. This does not indicate any overweening confidence in the ability to make primary and secondary education self-supporting.

Recognition to Women's University.

THE authorities of the S.N.D.T. Indian Women's University are trying to persuade the Bombay Government for a statutory recognition of its degrees. The work of this University, popularly known as Karve University, is known not only in India but outside it. It tries to supply that distinguishing feature to the education of the girls which the other educational courses, designed more with an eye to the needs of the male students, lack. The number of its students and its sphere of action have gradually grown to considerable proportions in spite of the handicap of a lack of recognition by other Universities. This handicap operates most harshly when the students of this University desire to go in for higher vocational education. That the popularity of the Uni-

versity among the public has not suffered in spite of this rather severe handicap is proof of its need to the country. With the removal of this handicap, the future growth of the institution will be assured, and we hope the Bombay Government, whose Premier, Mr. Kher, has shown a deep interest in the University, will not hesitate to accord it the required sanction.

Return of Forfeited Lands.

IF the satyagrahis who took part in the no-tax campaign in Gujarat and Karnatak are to have the lands which they lost in the campaign to be restored to them, why should not this relief be carried further in the case of other sufferers from bureaucratic oppression? The *Indian Express* says:

The return of forfeited lands to the peasants of Karnatak and Gujarat is a step in the right direction. But it is not enough. It should be followed by return of forfeited securities to newspapers. In our own presidency, it should be a matter of honour for the Congress Ministry to deal sympathetically with persons economically crippled on account of their devotion to Congress, such as village officials and other employees of Government dismissed from service, authors of proscribed books and non-co-operators subjected to the payment of unconscionable and ruinous fines.

GANDHIJI AND THE STATES.

MAHATMA GANDHI has delivered sledge-hammer blows against the All-India Congress Committee for having condemned the Mysore State authorities for their policy of thorough-going repression and for promising Congress support to the people of Mysore in their fight against this policy. The resolution adopted by the A.I.C.C. enters in its earlier part "an emphatic protest against the policy of repression as indicated by the inauguration of restrictive and prohibitory orders and political prosecutions launched in the Mysore State and also against the suppression of civil rights and liberties by denying the elementary rights of speech, assembly and association." The second part is as follows: "This meeting extends its fraternal greetings to the people of Mysore and wishes them all success in their legitimate and non-violent struggle and appeals to the people of India and Indian States to give all possible support and encouragement to the people of Mysore in their struggle for self-determination." Mahatma Gandhi both objects to the policy of giving support to the States' people that is embodied in the resolution and denies the correctness of the facts about repression on which the A.I.C.C. bases its protest; and he takes as strong exception to the speeches made in commending the resolution as to the substance and wording of the resolution itself. Mahatmaji censures everybody and condemns everything connected with it.

So far as facts are concerned, we agree, as everybody must, that no political organisation and no politician should make statements which are not scrupulously fair. But we fail to see what statements about the repressive policy of the Mysore State are made in the resolution to which one can possibly demur. As says the *Tribune*, not given to flights of imagination, "The authorities in Mysore are resisting with all their might the peaceful advance of the pro-

gressive forces in the State. The press has been gagged and several Congress leaders have been imprisoned. The President of the Mysore Congress Board, Mr. Siddalingiah, and the Chief of the Council of Action, Mr. K. T. Bhashyam, have been sentenced to long terms of imprisonment." Can any of these statements be challenged, and can anyone say that the condemnatory part of the resolution based upon them is couched in too strong terms? And yet Mahatma Gandhi makes the assertion that "the resolution did not set forth the correct state of affairs." He does not say himself either what the correct state of affairs is; he merely casts aspersions on the A.I.C.C. His chief complaint appears to be that the Working Committee should first have expressed its opinion on it. He says: "The A.I.C.C. should have appointed, if it was so minded, a committee, even of one person, to ascertain the facts before proceeding to pronounce judgment. The least it can do in such matters, if it has any regard for Truth and Non-violence is first to let the Working Committee to pronounce its judgment on them and then, if necessary, review them in a judicial manner."

There was surely no need of a preliminary inquiry either by an independent committee or by the Congress Cabinet. Assuming that some of the incidents in the Mysore State's coercive policy are involved in obscurity or doubt, the weight of evidence afforded by incidents which are proved and incontrovertible is such that the A.I.C.C., with the fullest regard for truth and non-violence (even with capital *t* and capital *n*) could take upon itself the responsibility of passing the kind of resolution it did. If Mahatmaji's regret is that the initiative in this matter was taken by a larger body whereas by following the normal procedure all political power might have been gathered in the hands of the Congress

junta, one can understand it; but looking at the matter from the objective point of view, we cannot but feel that the A.I.C.C. resolution was perfectly justified. He objects to the speeches made in support of the resolution too. Only brief reports of the speeches have been published in the papers, and we cannot say, both on account of the inadequacy of the reports and on account of our unfamiliarity with the recent developments in Mysore, whether all that was said at Calcutta was true in every particular. Assuming, however, without conceding, that some of the criticism in which the speakers indulged was not strictly fair, we should like to ask why Gandhiji should be so squeamish and finical in this particular matter. He was not always so easily affected by speeches or was so over-nice and fastidious before. Not that he compromised with truth at past meetings of the Congress; but he made, we suppose, as every reasonable person does, some allowance for an overstatement here and there under the sway of passion. He could tolerate these minor deviations from truth—and they were habitual—when the British Government was under the lash. Now that a State comes under scrutiny, he becomes over-scrupulous as to the propriety not only of the words to be used in a resolution, but also of the words to be uttered by individual speakers in support thereof. In criticising the British Government the Mahatma himself is not always so punctilious, though the contrary may safely be asserted when he has occasion to speak of the States' Governments. Only a few months ago the Governor's refusal to give him certain assurances convinced him that the British Government had made up its mind to rule the country with the sword. The refusal persists, but now he seems to have persuaded himself that the British Government is going to make no difficulties about provincial autonomy. If a Mahatma can commit such exaggerations, lesser persons may be pardoned for occasionally letting their reason run away with their feelings, although they do so while criticising our own Indian rulers.

But Mahatma Gandhi's strictures on the A.I.C.C. on the ground that it has departed in its resolution from the fundamental policy of the Congress of "hands off the States" are wholly undeserved. "In my opinion," he says, "the Mysore resolution was ultra vires of the resolution of non-interference. This, so far as I am aware, has never been repealed." What is there in the resolution on Mysore which appears to him to violate the earlier resolutions of the Congress? The A.I.C.C. sent fraternal greetings to workers in Mysore State. Surely even the Mahatma cannot quarrel with this. Then it makes an appeal to the people of India to give support and encouragement to the people of Mysore. The support here contemplated is only moral support, as Mr. N. V. Gadgil, who seconded the resolution, was at pains to prove. Mr. Gadgil asked: "With what face can we offer our sympathies and help to the people of China or Abyssinia and send them fraternal greetings if we do not do the same thing with regard to struggling people nearer home?" The Mahatma's contention all along has been that the States' people are foreigners to British India and therefore must be treated as

such. The resolution does not treat them any better or makes any closer approaches to them than to the people of Abyssinia, Palestine, Republican Spain or China. What then does Gandhiji grumble about? What is the resolution to which the A.I.C.C. resolution runs counter? The 1928 Congress at Calcutta gave an assurance to the people of the Indian States "of its sympathy and support in their legitimate and peaceful struggle for the attainment of full responsible government in the States." In 1935 the Working Committee of the Congress passed the following resolution:

The Indian National Congress recognises that the people in the Indian States have an inherent right to swaraj no less than the people of British India. It has accordingly declared itself in favour of establishment of representative responsible government in the States and has in that behalf not only appealed to the Princes to establish such responsible government in the States and to guarantee fundamental rights of citizenship, like freedom of person, speech, association and the press, to their people but has also pledged to the States' people its sympathy and support in their legitimate and peaceful struggle for the attainment of full responsible government. By that declaration and by that pledge the Congress stands. The Congress feels that even in their own interests the Princes will be well advised to establish at the earliest possible moment full responsible government within their States, carrying a guarantee of full rights of citizenship to their people....

With regard to the impending constitutional changes it has been suggested that the Congress should insist upon certain amendments of that Act which deals with the relation of the Indian States to the Indian federation. The Congress has more than once categorically rejected the entire scheme of constitutional reforms on the broad ground of its not being an expression of the will of the people of India and has insisted on a constitution to be framed by a Constituent Assembly. It may not now ask for an amendment of the scheme in any particular part. To do so would amount to a reversal of the Congress policy.

At the same time, it is hardly necessary to assure the people of the States that the Congress will never be guilty of sacrificing their interests in order to buy the support of the Princes. From its inception the Congress has stood unequivocally for the rights of the masses of India as against any vested rights in conflict with their true interests.

It is true that in some quarters the A.I.C.C. resolution is regarded as having made some change in Congress policy. For instance, the *Tribune* says:

The attitude of the Congress towards the States' people, which was originally one of passive sympathy, has now become one of active support. During the progress of the Round Table Conference Mahatma Gandhi merely requested the Princes "to allow the States' representatives in the Federal Assembly to be chosen by election and to embody the fundamental rights of their subjects in the Federal Constitution and place them under the jurisdiction of the Federal Court." He did not say that unless these conditions were satisfied, the Congress would reject the federal scheme. Though this resolution, passed (by the Working Committee) two years ago, left no room for doubt as regards the deep sympathy of the Congress with the States' people in their aspirations, it did not indicate that the Congress would assist them in their struggle. But now under the bold leadership of Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru the Congress has declared itself to be an active ally of the States' people.

We think that the *Tribune* is over-interpreting the resolution.

But, in view of federation, the attitude of the Congress and all other political bodies must change from passive sympathy to active support. Of course,

the States' people are under no illusion that this active support can be very great. They know that they must fight their own battles. But British Indians must recognise that it is their moral duty, not merely to sympathise with, but to give active support to their brethren in the States in all their legitimate activities. The States' people even now, i. e. apart from federation, have a claim on the active support of Congressmen. As Mr. Gadgil said: "The States' people have always stood by the Congress and helped them in the election campaign and during the civil disobedience movement. It is up to the Congress to extend their helping hand to the States' people in their struggle, not so much as a matter of reciprocity, but out of consideration of righteousness and justice." Congressmen should make some return to the States' people for all the help that they have received from them. But anyhow federation ought to make all political parties change their attitude towards the States' people. In any federation worthy of the name inter-state comity between the various federal units must be secured. It is provided in the United States constitution that no State "shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws," and that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." The federal government possesses the right to require that the citizens of each State of the Union shall be accorded in all the other States all the civil rights—e. g., residence, ownership, freedom of the press, freedom of speech, etc.—which those States accord to their own citizens. The federal

government makes it possible for the citizen of any State even to acquire political rights of any other State by obtaining its citizenship. That is to say, in a federal union no one, from whichever State he may hail, is an alien to any other, to whichever other State he may belong. Our federation, even when it comes about, will maintain the existing alienage between British India and the Indian States. Are the people going to respect it?

Mysore claims that how it protects or invades civil liberty within its borders is its own affair; it is not the concern of any other State or British India. These are foreign territories and Mysore will exercise the right of keeping out the inhabitants thereof when it likes. This conception of State rights, however correct it may have been in pre-federation days, cannot survive federation. Under the federal scheme of course those, who are now foreigners, will stay foreigners. But if the people will do nothing else, they will at least refuse to be treated as foreigners as at present; they will assert the elementary right which every federation confers upon all the citizens of each federating unit. Has not time come for Mahatma Gandhi to make a change in his legal doctrines required by the new constitution? But, as we have shown above, the resolution does not contemplate the change that the altered conditions demand. It keeps true to the old policy of sympathy and moral support such as any people may, without impropriety, extend to any other. Does the Mahatma want British India not to interest itself at all in the States, though it may interest itself in far-off Spain and China?

BOMBAY GOVERNMENT AND LABOUR.

II

IN the last article published last week an attempt was made to examine the material on the labour policy of the Bombay Government; and the examination disclosed that, however satisfactory and well-meaning the policy might be, the methods adopted and the steps taken to implement it are so vague and dilatory that there is no prospect of even a few of the major grievances of the workers being redressed within the quickest and definite period of time. In this and in subsequent articles it is proposed to consider what, in my opinion, would be a right approach to the removal of the present acute discontent among the workers and the adoption of remedial measures for meeting the ills which are associated with the industrial life of the workers and, what, with these ends in view, the Government of Bombay can do within the four and half years of office which are still available to them.

The grievances of the industrial workers are so many and so deep-rooted that it is idle to expect their full redress within a measureable distance of time. Indeed the very structure of our industrial organisation is such that a complete and lasting solution of the labour problem is well-nigh impossible. It is not, however, difficult to adopt a well-thought-out scheme by which many of the day-to-day grievances which,

allowed to accumulate, as now, become a hot-bed of discontent, might be substantially redressed, the hardships and distress arising from some others might be to a large extent mitigated and for such grievances as are inherent in the capitalist system, remedial measures on the lines of those adopted in the industrialised countries of the West could be adopted. The test of the sincerity and earnestness of the Bombay Government lies mostly in the promptness with which they will take effective steps to adopt those remedial measures. I may at once concede that they require thorough and necessary data; and I shall deal with them a little later. But for the redress of day-to-day grievances, meditation, contemplation, consideration, exploration, exhaustive enquiries or other evasive and indefinite expressions used in the Government's press note are, in my opinion, unnecessary. The Royal Commission on Labour in India has dealt with almost every aspect of the life of the industrial worker and its report contains recommendations which even a most reactionary employer has not to my knowledge pronounced as radical or impracticable or which the fire-eaters among the workers have condemned as reactionary. They are highly balanced and calculated to remove the discontent of the people arising from their day-to-day grievances and to pave the way for the adoption of measures dealing with grievances inherent in the present

Industrial structure. No provincial Government has so far treated the report with the respect it deserves and given serious thought to its recommendations. The Bombay Government will find scores and scores of the Commission's recommendations which can be given effect to without much difficulty. There are several recommendations which the Government can carry out either under executive action or by the extension or amendment of the existing laws or by enacting small pieces of new legislation. There will be found again many recommendations which Government can, by persuasion, influence or pressure, ask the employers to carry out. If only Government will set up a departmental committee or appoint a special officer assigning to it or him the full responsibility of examining the recommendations of the Royal Commission, selecting such of them as lie within the competence of the local Government to carry out or cause to be carried out and requiring the Government department concerned to give effect to them. The committee or the officer should be given the authority to make such enquiries as may be incidental to its or his work and should issue quarterly reports of the progress made. It should be obligatory on the committee or the officer to complete its or his work within a period of twelve months and Government should announce that within a period of not more than two to three years all of the recommendations of the Commission within their competence will be carried into effect. I feel confident that such definite action and the announcement thereof will not only help to remove the present atmosphere of suspicion and despair but will also go a great way to remove the present accumulated discontent among the workers.

This, if done promptly and satisfactorily, will mean that Government have touched only the fringe of the problem. The main and immediate part of the problem on which, as I said already, the *bona fides*, sincerity and earnestness of the Congress can be tested is the adoption of remedial measures for meeting the ills which are associated with or inherent in the present industrial structure. Such ills also are many; but I shall personally be satisfied if Government tackle forthwith four of them and cure them, within a period of three to five years. I shall state them, not in the form of ills, but in the form of problems to be tackled:—(1) Stability and security of employment; (2) housing; (3) minimum wage; and (4) social insurance. Industrial workers are perpetually under a dread of loss of employment. Even in normal times of the industry, the workers are dismissed or in other ways thrown out of employment. There are again industrial establishments where employment is fairly steady, but in which the worker is considered as temporary even though he may have put in five, ten or even fifteen years' service. It is unnecessary to dilate on the evil consequences of such a state of affairs, one of the most important of which is that it draws to the industrial centres an unnecessary and unwanted floating population which not only depresses the labour market but also creates many a social problem. It should not be difficult for Government to pass legislation by which the workers will be

assured of security and stability of their employment. Such laws are not unknown in some of the advanced countries in the West.

Bad housing and slums are not only a social evil entailing serious consequences on the community but also constitute a serious handicap to the industry in the form of low vitality and efficiency of the workers. Our industrial housing is both a disgrace and a scandal. In the European countries and the U. S. A. enormous sums of money are spent annually for slum clearance and the construction and maintenance of decent houses. In India little attention is paid to this important aspect of the social life of the people. With the rapid growth of industrialisation and with its attendant evil of over-crowding it has become necessary for the State to undertake a bold housing programme. It is, therefore, the duty of Bombay Government to chalk out a large scale programme for industrial housing. It is recognised that such a programme cannot be wholly financed from the ordinary revenues. Loans will have to be floated for that purpose. In the meantime I suggest that provision for adequate housing accommodation for the workers and other poor sections of the population should be made an obligatory duty on the public authorities such as municipalities and local boards and also such semi-government bodies like the port trusts. At present the municipal, local boards and port trust laws do not recognise housing as one of their obligatory duties. These laws should be amended so as to require the local and other bodies to undertake legal responsibility, as one of their obligatory duties, for the construction and maintenance of dwelling houses for the working classes and to set apart for this purpose a certain percentage of their annual revenues. The money so set apart will not be able to finance a large scale housing programme. But it will surely enable the local bodies to undertake small schemes for improving the housing conditions, or to pay subsidies for constructing new houses or to pay interest charges on the loans which may be floated for carrying out a large scale housing programme. The Government of Bombay can immediately take steps to amend the municipal and other laws for this purpose; and I may inform them that in countries where social legislation has sufficiently advanced, such provision generally finds a place in their statutes.

With minimum wage, social insurance and other problems I shall deal in the next article.

R. R. BAKHALE.

CURRENT COMMENT.

TEMPLE ENTRY.

WHAT a hiatus there is between what one asks of others and what one does when one comes to occupy the position of the giver! The Malabar Temple Entry Conference held at Guruvayur passed a resolution calling upon the Ministry to enact legislation permitting temples to be thrown open to Harijans. The resolution backed up this request with a warning that if such permissive legislation were not passed within six months, Mr. Kalappan would be

justified in resuming the satyagraha that he suspended in 1933 at the instance of Mahatma Gandhi.

Anyone who remembers the previous history of the question would think that this is a reasonable resolution. Six months is not too short a period for the Rajagopalachariar Government to pass into law a Temple Entry Bill of the kind that Mr. Rajagopalachariar, pledged even though he then was to non-co-operation, went to Delhi as Mahatma Gandhi's agent to plead for. Mahatma Gandhi insisted at the time that the Bill be taken into consideration and passed by the Central Assembly even without going through the procedure of circulation. His contention was that for enabling legislation such as the Bill purported to be there was enough public support, and that eliciting public opinion through normal channels would be a dilatory procedure not required by the provisions of the measure that the legislature was called upon to adopt. Mr. Rajagopalachariar was greatly chagrined when on the first day the way was not made clear for this Bill by giving precedence to it over other non-official Bills.

One would think that a Government at the head of which was Mr. Rajagopalachariar himself would make no complaint if it was given six months within which to pass a Bill for which he carried on such vigorous propaganda four years ago. But now that responsibility for taking action has fallen upon Mr. Rajagopalachariar himself and his colleagues, they seem to be greatly annoyed with Mr. Kalappan, whom Mahatma Gandhi persuaded to break his fast by promising a speedy measure of relief. The Ministry is now counselling patience to Mr. Kalappan and his collaborators. "Don't threaten us," it says, "with measures which were good enough to threaten a bureaucratic government with." But, being conscious that this appeal to mercy may fail, it reinforces the appeal by other arguments. The Hon'ble Dr. Rajan put forward the excuse that public opinion in other parts of the Province was not so favourable to temple entry by Harijans as opinion in Malabar, and that it would have to be educated before the Ministry could embark upon a measure applicable to the whole Province.

Dr. Subbaroyan at Alwartirunagari said the same thing. He said:

He was just returning from Travancore where the Maharaja had taken a very big step and had allowed the Harijans to worship in all public temples. The thought was naturally uppermost in his mind as to why they in Madras should not follow suit and why all classes of Hindus should not be allowed to enter the famous temple at Alwartirunagari. He had no doubt that before the Congress Government laid down office temple-entry would be an accomplished fact. It was the feeling of the Premier, as well as that of the speaker and his other colleagues in the Government, that unless this was brought about at an early date they would not have done much in the work of the abolition of untouchability, which was an important item in the Congress programme. At the same time, the Government felt that a great reform of this type must be carried out with the willing co-operation of the people.

The speaker asked those among the audience, who were in favour of allowing Harijans into the great temple in front of which they had met that day, to raise their hands. A large number of people raised their hands.

Dr. Subbaroyan said that he believed that all of them were sincere and hoped that from to-morrow they would carry on propaganda in favour of temple-entry and prepare the public mind for the reform.

This same Minister as a non-official member sponsored a Temple Entry Bill for Madras Presidency on the lines of Mr. Ranga Iyer's Bill for the whole of India. Evidently, Mr. Subbaroyan felt in 1933 that opinion was quite favourable to the introduction of the measure; but in 1937, when it is the Congress Ministry which is to make itself responsible for the law, he suddenly finds that opinion is still not favourable and that the reform cannot be effectuated till the public mind has been prepared. Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Rajagopalachariar thought in 1933 that not only Madras Presidency but all the Provinces were ripe for the measure so much so that they would not let any time elapse in consulting public opinion. The Rajagopalachariar Government is now having second thoughts on the subject.

Being reduced to a condition in which he could plead no valid excuse, Dr. Subbaroyan ultimately fell back on the last refuge of all politicians who find themselves in a compromising situation. "Why worry," he said in effect, "either with this or with any other plan of the Ministry? How long after all are we going to remain in office? We are engaged in a fight with the bureaucracy, and the bureaucracy is sure to drive us out soon. And even if it does not in the provincial field, we are bound to lay down reins of office when federation gets going in a few months." And here we give Dr. Subbaroyan's actual words in the press. "After all, the present Constitution Act does not give us independence, and unless the question of the Centre is satisfactorily solved and we have an acceptable federation, we all shall have to come out." May we take then that if the present federal scheme is enforced all the Congress Ministries will resign?

THE D. S. PARTY AND FEDERATION.

To our statement in the last issue that the Democratic Swaraj Party has now veered round to acceptance of the federal scheme, the Party's Marathi organ, the *Trikal*, edited by Mr. S. L. Karandikar, M.L.A., takes exception and it refers us to the Conferences of the Party held at Chalisgaon and Nasik which, it says, not only did not accept federal but did not even resolve to work the federation constitution if, in spite of general opposition, it was brought into force. The resolutions of these Conferences, the *Trikal* says, ought to be given greater weight than the utterances of individual members, however exalted their position. The leaders of the Party have recently been speaking so often in favour of acceptance of federation that we thought that the Party itself had changed its view. But we accept the explanation of the *Trikal* and are glad to know that it opposes federation as much as other parties.

Our contemporary, however, suggests that as it is impossible, on the showing of Messrs. Bhulabhai Desai and Vallabhbhai Patel, to prevent the enforcement of federation, there is not much difference between those who would work the federal constitution when it is put in force in spite of the opposition of the people (there being general agreement about inadvisability of boycotting federal elections) and accepting federation. The *Tribal's* interpretation about the Desai-Patel report is not, we fear, quite accurate, but we leave this point alone. Even otherwise there is a very great difference between the two attitudes. We can illustrate it best by referring to the Democratic Swaraj Party's attack on the Congress position in the matter of the communal award.

It will, we think, be admitted that the communal award, however objectionable, cannot be put aside except by mutual agreement among the communities; the whole Act must be repealed for the purpose, and that is not a matter of immediate practical politics. Will it, therefore, be right for any political party which is opposed to the award to abandon its attitude of opposition? In fact, is it not the Democratic Swaraj Party's main criticism against the Congress that the Congress, seeing the futility of maintaining opposition, has now virtually ranged itself on the side of the award? The Congress at least does not accept the award in terms. It says that it neither accepts nor rejects the award, which of course is illogical; but anyhow it does not accept the award. And yet does not the Democratic Swaraj Party level bitter attacks against the Congress on the ground that its attitude amounts to that of acceptance, and that it ought to have maintained its attitude of opposition, although opposition cannot be made immediately effective?

The Democratic Swaraj Party would lay itself open to the same criticism, and more, if it were now to say: "After all it comes to about the same thing in actual practice, whether you are opposed to the scheme or not, provided you are prepared to work it as if you had accepted it." The Party would lay itself open to the criticism still more; first, because federation is not yet operative and the question of working or wrecking has not been raised and, secondly, because while the Congress at least professes not to accept the communal award, the Democratic Swaraj Party leaders—though not the Party itself—in their speeches proclaim themselves to be supporters of the federal scheme.

REFORMS IN BIKANER:

For some two weeks the Golden Jubilee of the present Maharaja of Bikaner, Sir Ganga Singhji, was celebrated with great pomp and ceremony. The Maharaja announced on the occasion a step forward in constitutional reforms, as a result of which the elected members of the State Legislative Assembly will be in a majority. This Assembly was first established in 1913, i. e. 34 years ago. Till

1929 it was composed of 27 nominated members (7 members of the Executive Council and 20 representatives of various interests, some of whom, it would appear, could be officials) and 18 elected members (all of them being returned by indirect election and none by direct). Eleven of the 15 municipalities then existing were given the right of electing 12 members (and we are told that the elective system had by then been "introduced in several municipalities"), and Tazimi Sardars (we suppose they are feudatories) and the Zamindars' Board (which was constituted in 1921 and consists of 60 leading Chaudaris) were each given the right to elect 3 representatives. In the year 1929, in view of the coming Round Table Conference, His Highness increased the elective element by 2 members, and this was perhaps done by reducing the nominative element to the same extent.

The advance now announced consists of an addition of 6 members to be returned by direct election, which would make the future composition of the Legislative Assembly as follows: 25 nominated members and 26 elected members (20 obtained by indirect and 6 by direct election). The powers of the Assembly do not appear to have undergone any expansion. The position in 1930 in this regard was as follows: "The Legislative Assembly is at liberty to discuss the budget and offer such suggestions as it thinks fit for the consideration of H. H.'s Government. The Assembly has the power of interpellation. Supplementary questions by the member who asked the original question are allowed." The only change that will now be made is, to quote the *Leader*, that "though under the law of the State (as of British India) legislation can be enacted without reference to the Assembly, His Highness has announced that laws will not henceforth be so enacted." All that we interpret this to mean is that no non-emergency legislation will be adopted without first consulting the Assembly, but it will be seen that there is not one single matter in regard to which the Assembly will have vested in it the power of control. It will remain a purely advisory body of a lower status than the legislatures we had in British India during the Morley-Minto period of 1909 to 1919.

One would have thought that, in commenting on this "boon" of reforms which establishes, after 34 years' evolution, a legislature wielding no political powers of any kind and consisting of an elected majority of one in a house of 51 members, less than a quarter of whom are chosen by direct election on a franchise which is not yet determined but will surely be exceedingly restricted, the British Indian newspapers which are severely critical of the British Indian administration would find it possible to utter a soft word of criticism expressing some mild dissatisfaction at the slowness of the pace of reforms or would at least be able to restrain somewhat their enthusiasm in singing paeans of praise of the Maharaja. But, no. The *Hindu* says: "By undertaking this reform, the veteran ruler has set an example worthy of emulation by other members of the Princely Order." The *Leader*,

fixing its gaze on the remote future, says: "Doubtless, as time goes on the Assembly will continue to grow and gain further powers for itself." All cleavages of opinion on British Indian politics that divide our great journals of unimpeachable independence and integrity are extinguished when they come to discuss Indian State affairs. Their common function is to sing hallelujahs to the Princes. Only the *Tribune* speaks bluntly about it and says that the reformed Legislative Assembly is a debating society instead of the independent legislative body that alone would satisfy popular aspirations. But this exception proves the rule.

The *Tribune* also refers to the speech made by His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner about the desire of the States not only not to obstruct progress, but to help the lame dog of British India over a stile by joining the federation in spite of the heavy sacrifices that would be entailed on them. On this point our contemporary observes:

"There need be no fear in anyone's mind," says the Maharaja of Bikaner, "that the activities of our representatives in the federal sphere would on account of our peculiar traditions and forms of government be any the less inspired by the urge for the further progress and advancement of our common motherland than those of the other federating units." The assurance is meaningless. An ill-assorted marriage can never be a happy marriage. They live in a fool's paradise who imagine that an everlasting harmonious relationship can be established between Autocracy and Democracy. Unless the States are converted into self-governing units with their rulers reduced to the position of figure-heads, they cannot be connected with the autonomous provinces of British India without making "the further progress and advancement of our common motherland" impossible. Are the Princes prepared to democratise their administration and abandon the "rights and privileges" which are a negation of the universally respected democratic principles?

ECONOMIC SANCTIONS

Commenting on the proposal to apply economic sanctions against Japan, *America* in its issue of 23rd October says:

At first sight, the boycott-plan appears easy and inviting. Like Great Britain, Japan is an island kingdom dependent upon trade. The Government appears to have solved the problem, but even more than Great Britain Japan must rely upon imports for the sinews of war. According to figures cited by Burton Crane, writing in the *New York Times*, "Japan imports all its wool, all its cotton, ninety per cent. of its petroleum, seventy-three per cent. of its pig-iron," and about eighty per cent. of the materials used in the manufacture of automobiles.

That is a fairly formidable list, but in addition, Japan imports large quantities of rubber, forty per cent. of its copper, forty-six per cent. of its aluminum, half of its pulp for paper and rayon, sixty per cent. of its zinc, ninety-five per cent. of its lead, and all of its tin, mercury and antimony. In all, Japan is obliged to import slightly more than a third of its raw materials. Clearly, then, a boycott, even if conducted only by the United States and Great Britain, would work serious hardship, for about sixty-five per cent. of all its imports are from these two countries.

It is also clear from the above list that Japan is poorly supplied with war materials. As a British Labour leader recently said, and with much truth, without oil there can be no navy, no tanks, no transportation and no air fleet. Since 1934, Japan has been storing oil, and probably has enough on hand to last a year, but after that a primary war

essential has been lost. In less than a year, the stores of materials used directly for munitions, such as cotton, mercury and lead, would be exhausted.

"As a theory, then," says *America*, "the boycott seems admirably adapted for use as an extinguisher for Japan's war-like fervour. The difficulty arises from the tremendous cost of reducing theory to practice." What is the difficulty? Not, as one would think, that Japan, reduced to extremities, would start a war against the boycotting countries, and that U. S., which would like first of all to avoid involvement in war even indirectly, could not impose an embargo without being prepared to use armed force in the last resort. The difficulty apprehended here is the pecuniary loss that U. S. would incur. "Japan has materials that we need... Last year our purchases of raw silk cost us about \$100,000,000. More to the point in these hard times, we have materials for which Japan is willing to pay war-prices. A boycott would mean that we could ship no more machinery to Japan, no more oil, or lumber, or cotton, or automobiles. To apply this pressure to Japan would cost us about \$300,000,000 for the first year."

As a matter of fact, boycott of Japanese exports would be more effective for the purpose of restraining Japan than a ban on exports to Japan. As Mr. Vyvyan Adams said in the House of Commons on 21st October, restraint of Japan "would be possible through a widely concerted refusal to accept imports of goods exported from Japan. That would deprive her of the exchange which she needs to purchase essential war materials from abroad. Such a form of concerted action need be neither 'world-wide' nor 'universal.' (Boycott by Great Britain and U. S. would be enough.) It would be preferable to a refusal to export goods to Japan." But that U. S. should hesitate to place an embargo upon exports to Japan for no other reason than that she would be unable in that case to reap a harvest from war, and that a country which is gorged with money would lose some of her trade which is going to fall off anyway on account of disturbed conditions, always destructive of commerce, is a bad argument for a journal which takes its stand upon Christian principles. To be fair to *America*, we must say that its mind is not made up. It says: "We do not conclude that a boycott is impossible, but it does seem to us that it is improbable. It might be cheaper in the end, but Governments more commonly consider only the immediate costs. Our sole suggestion is that into all this talk about the boycott we weave some thought of the price that will be asked." We are glad that *America* has not endorsed a definitive view against boycott. If it had, we should have thought that the Biblical quotation would be pat to its reasoning: "Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also."

Review.

TWO IDEOLOGIES.

CONFLICTING TENDENCIES IN INDIAN ECONOMIC THOUGHT. By SHIB, CHANDRA DUTT. (N. H. Ray Chowdhury & Co., Calcutta.) 1934. 24cm. 225p. Rs. 5.

THE title of the volume suggests an ambitious scheme—a broad and analytical survey of the conflicting tendencies in Indian economic thought as gleaned from the writings of the various Indian

economists, journalists, Government reports, surveys &c. A period of thirty-five years, beginning with 1898, the year of the first publication of the late Mr. Justice Ranade's *Essays in Indian Economics*, is selected for bibliographical survey. It is further divided for convenience into five parts, each being characterised by some noteworthy trend. But instead of analysing and grouping the thoughts of various writers with a view to trace the growth of certain marked tendencies, the author is content with giving us only in chronological order a long catalogue of books, journals, &c. The treatment of the main theme is also not topical but confined only to the conflicting views of two great persons, as representing two different schools of thought, namely, Mahatma Gandhi and Prof. Benoy Kumar Sarkar. "The survey presented here," we are told by the author, "is exhaustive neither in regard to authors nor in regard to topics." The ambitious programme is thus set aside and the author argues that the foremost problem for India to solve is her visible grinding poverty and there are two alternative solutions for it. She may either develop her economic life after that of Europe or America or she might cling fast to a slightly modernised edition of her primitive economy that prevails at present in almost all villages. Which of the two alternative paths to follow, is the main crux of the problem. We find herein two main conflicting currents of thought being developed. There is on the one hand a fervent plea raised in favour of rapid industrialisation and modernisation of the country side, while on the other hand there is a good deal of intellectual thought and speculation concentrated and idolisation of the primitive structure of mediæval village life with stray patches of modernism here and there. The foremost representative of the former type of thought is, according to the author, Professor Benoy Kumar Sarkar, while the latter is ably sponsored by Mahatma Gandhi. It is needless for purposes of a review to cull together all the conflicting views of these two great persons. They stand almost poles asunder. The learned Professor, drawing upon his vast studies and personal experiences of his continental tours, believes that if India is to survive and to deserve a right place in the stern competitive system of world economy, she must imbibe the best of the Western civilisation, however non-spiritual, non-ethical it may be, and infuse a spirit activism and hope in her vast masses; she must acquire her manpower and adopt freely all advanced methods of the present-day technocracy with a view to satisfy her growing need and welfare. This, he asserts, spells her true progress. The great personality of the mystic Mahatma, however, stands diametrically opposed. Though not an economist, his influence today both in the economic and political fields is certainly very great. He stands as a great apostle of the spiritual culture and glory of the Orient and as one who perceives an under-current of violence and exploitation in the non-ethical, machinised civilisation of the west. He advocates a philosophy of voluntary poverty and the new cult of non-violence and denounces everything else that smacks of violence. The volume thus makes very interesting reading as most of us are now interested in watching how the Mahmatic precepts would be interpreted in practice by the Congress Ministers. The author's leanings, however, are in favour of Prof. Sarkar, whom he almost worships. We do not think that the so-called heresies of Sarkar, as given in the last chapter, are in any sense novel or revolting but represent largely the views of a number of economists, freely expressed even when these problems were being discussed. There is nothing heretic in it, but only a difference of opinion.

S. G. PURANIK.

SHORT NOTICES.

AN EIGHT-HUNDRED YEAR OLD BOOK OF INDIAN MEDICINE AND FORMULAS.
By ELIZABETH SHARPE, (Luzac.) 1937. 22cm. 135p. Rs. 6/-

WHY an English lady and especially "a complete lay-woman" was selected for translating the age-old Hindi manuscript of these formulas passes our understanding. The translator says, "the Latin and English names owe their origin to the Court Physician" and yet the Court Physician translates "Bhagna Netra" (it should be "Bhugna" and not "Bhagna") "Sannipat" and "Tridosha" as all delirium! This is more than Ayurvedists can understand. Another glaring mistake is the word "Antargal" for hydrocele! Several formulas are given in the book, yet the translator is much enamoured of "ointments" as she says they with "modern antiseptics" are worth a trial. Why this partiality for ointments? Possibly she has not tried, or had no opportunity to try, the prescription. But she should have said so. We should have much preferred to have the book translated by an Ayurvedist who knows allopathy also, and several such could have been found. They alone would have properly evaluated the intrinsic worth of the formulas as many of them are common-places in Ayurvedic medicine.

V. M. BHAT.

MEENAKSHI'S MEMOIRS. BY H. KAVERI BAL.
(Natesan.) 19cm. 572p. Rs. 3.

THE book will be of some value to social workers, though there is a thinly veiled Christian propaganda behind it. The narrative is written with feeling and depth of thought, which can only come from one who has suffered a lot in life. The problems presented come to notice quite often in daily walks of life and so the "Memoirs" become interesting as showing how they were tackled in Meenakshi's life.

Meenakshi is not the author's name, but is assumed for the sake of convenience as mentioned in the Preface.

W. M. V.

Correspondence.

RETURN OF FORFEITED LANDS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—I do not at all grudge the return of their forfeited lands to the 750 peasants (?) of Bardoli and Kanara. Nor have I any personal knowledge of the conditions in Kanara villages. But as to the villages all over Gujerat, wherever the Patidār or Anāwil or Rājput is in predominant occupation, I ask: How many of these are real peasant proprietors tilling their own fields themselves? To the best of my knowledge—though I cannot claim to have covered every inch of the vast ground—such genuine cultivators are a very small and dwindling percentage indeed: the great majority are really small zamindars and money-lenders who get their tillage done by the submerged *dublas, kotis, bhils, Thākardās, Kaliparaj, &c.* So much so that the Patidār, Anāwil, or Rājput, who still does any tillage personally is looked down upon, loses status in the marriage market and the caste hierarchy to the extent, in extreme cases, of disgracing the name Patidar, Anawil or Rajput and being known instead as Kunbi or Patel, Bhāthelā and Thākardā respectively.

This, in sober and tragic fact, is the rock-bottom problem of Gujerat agriculture and Gujerat prosperity. Few of the Khatedars or numberdars are cultivators

themselves. They dominate, they crush, they exploit the less intelligent masses of the locality. This movement of intelligence away from the realities, hardships and uplifting experiences of land and labour and raw nature, has been going on—one knows not for how many centuries. One cannot put his finger on a particular century in the past and assert: this downward slide began here; we know so extremely little of the past. The difference between the Marathā and the Gujarati has one of its main roots here. Perhaps Gandhiji, shrewdness personified that he is, when desirous of devoting himself to the problems of village uplift, deserted Gujarat, deeming the conditions here hopeless because of this particular feature, and migrated to Wardha as to a field not so unpromising. Be that as it may, it is the biggest and the most fundamental drawback of Gujarat and one of our hardest problems—how to get intelligence and muscle to grow up harmoniously together by co-operation and mutual help in the daily occupations of life; how to get intelligence back more and more to land and labour; how to make real men and women of the exploited and submerged—and it cannot be solved in a day, nor can it be solved as we amble and muddle along, trusting to phrases instead of seeking for root-remedies.

What is really expected of the Bombay Congress Ministry is that they should lay down a policy with this as the principal aim and start work with this as the goal to be attained, and such work should be so well planned that it could continue steadily for years and decades, in spite of changes in ministers, ministries, parties, legislatures, and even constitutions.

Take only one of the many side issues. Sentimental people grow unreasonable over the mere mass of the indebtedness of the numberdars. As to this, let me ask a few pertinent questions. Is it not merely book indebtedness in which the interest and compound interest is many times the principal? And whose fault is it? Should not the numberdar have kept his own account books and got the accounts examined and checked and settled annually? Have not the numberdars union enough even to engage one accountant to keep account books for them? Where there are petty parties, or religious groups such as Hindus and

Muslims, could not each group keep an accountant for itself? Secondly, suppose a clean slate is somehow secured to-day, by immediate measures necessarily violent, unfair, rough and ready, and enforced by mere brute force, creating a lot of bad blood in their summary operation. What will be the condition of these numberdars making a fresh start, in the short space of a decade or two? Will they not again be under an equally heavy burden of indebtedness, against which the outcry of the sentimentalists will be far shriller than to-day? The fact is, there are some screws altogether loose in the village social life which must be renovated. The greed and unscrupulousness of the sowcar is not the only or even the main evil.

And meanwhile, what about the heavier and utterly crushing loads under which the pitiable, submerged, voiceless and exploited, who really are our masses, are condemned from birth to drag on an existence ending—luckily, I must say—in an early death; an existence punctuated by malaria and other debilitating dirt, squalor and starvation diseases; an existence not merely sub-human but sub-brutal; an existence at which any European who gets a glimpse of it stands horrified? In Gujarat the only leaders the submerged have so far obtained are very quiet *sāttvic* personalities like Amritlal Thakkar and the late Ravishanker. Vallabhbhai is in no sense whatever either their leader or their spokesman. Every drop of blood in him proclaims him the hectoring Patidar, the exploiting, money-lending landowner, posing as the *kunbi*, but being only the *kunbi*-exploiter *par excellence*.

What I urge is: Tackle this central problem. Lay down a simple, firm and comprehensive policy about it, which the most ignorant villager and his wife could comprehend and co-operate with. Leave slogans and gestures, pyrotechnics and demagogic legerdemain severely alone. Winning power as party-men, let our Ministers rise to be statesmen and far-seeing patriots, recreating the commonwealth from its natural base on sound, solid, *sanātana* foundations.—Yours, etc.

Bombay, 12th Nov.

T.

**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 ingredient to make.

"It's good through and through
to the thinnest water."

Available Everywhere.

**GOVERNMENT SOAP FACTORY,
BANGALORE.**