

Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA 4.

VOL. XXI, No. 13. }

POONA—THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1938.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	153
ARTICLES:	
Federation by Consent ...	156
Dyerism in Trinidad ...	159
Rebuilding of Rural Economy. By Prof. P. G. Thomas.	162
Welcome Turn in Bombay Finances. By Principal D. G. Karve ...	164
REVIEW:	
Economic Inquiry in the Punjab, By N. S. S.	166
SHORT NOTICES ...	166
CORRESPONDENCE:	
An Agent for East Africa. By Dr. S. D. Karve ...	168

Topics of the Week.

The "Chronicle's" Silver Jubilee.

THE *Bombay Chronicle* has completed its twenty-five years of active national service on the 3rd inst. in commemoration of which it has issued an attractive souvenir containing felicitations and greetings from people like Mahatma Gandhi and others. The souvenir also contains accounts of the genesis, growth and the present position of the *Chronicle* by those who were or are connected with the paper. There are, besides, informing articles on many of the burning problems of the day written by people who know their subjects well.

THE idea of a nationalistic daily for Bombay was first inspired by the late Mr. G. K. Gokhale. Sir P. M. Mehta who was opposed by the Anglo-Indian press and the Harrison caucus started the *Bombay Chronicle* to voice forth the views of the people, as there was no other English paper in Bombay to take up the people's cause at that time.

THE career of the *Chronicle* was not a smooth one. What with the press law and the anti-national forces ranged against it, it had every now and then in its career to face many troubles, because the *Chronicle* has always been frank, independent and nationalistic in its outlook.

PUBLIC life in Western India, it may not be an exaggeration to say, owes a great deal to the vigilance and zeal of the *Chronicle* to safeguard and protect the political rights of the people. We are happy to associate ourselves with its jublations and wish it many more years of national service.

Bombay Medical Practitioners' Bill.

THE Government of Bombay have decided to give statutory recognition to the Ayurvedic and Unani systems of medicine and have introduced a bill to provide for the registration of such of the indigenous medical practitioners as have had a full scientific training in the Ayurvedic and Unani systems of medicine and to protect the public from the activities of uneducated and half-educated quacks practising all systems. This measure was long overdue and the Government deserves to be congratulated on introducing it. The reaction to the bill has been on the whole favourable. A section of the Ayurvedic practitioners has raised a protest against the provisions of the bill and wants the old orthodox method of teaching indigenous systems to continue. The bill gives full and adequate protection to the existing practitioners and those under training; but it stops any further training under the old methods. If the Indian systems of medicine are to be improved and brought in line with modern scientific systems, this provision is not only desirable but necessary. Equally necessary and desirable is the presence, which the bill provides and to which some of the orthodox *vaidyas* are opposed, of the representatives of European medicine and surgery on the Board to be established for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the bill. Out of the thirteen members of the Board, at least eight will be representatives of Indian systems of medicine; and only four or five, if the President is included, will represent non-Indian systems. The presence of the latter should help the Indian systems to develop on modern and scientific lines—which is no small gain to the Indian systems.

THE Board shall prescribe a course of training and qualifying examinations in medicine, surgery and midwifery, including training and examinations in pre-clinical subjects. Two years after Part II of the bill which deals with the establishment of the Board, appointment of the Registrar, registration of practitioners, qualifying examinations, granting of diplomas, etc., comes into operation, no person other than those provided for in the bill, shall practise in any system of medicine, surgery or midwifery. This is a sound provision. A meeting of the Poona *vaidyas* has demanded the deletion of all the penalty clauses in the bill. If this were done, it is as well that the bill is withdrawn. We are confident that Government will not entertain any such proposals. The provisions of the bill are on the whole satisfactory and we hope the legislature will pass them with such minor modifications as might be necessary to make the bill more perfect.

A Paper Killed in Travancore.

IT appears that the Travancore Government has forfeited the security and cancelled the licence of

"Kanmadi," a Malayalam daily of Travancore, for the sin of reproducing a message that the late Mr. George Joseph sent to the Travancore papers some days prior to his death. It is said that the message was published at that time in almost all the papers in Travancore State and no action was taken by the State at that time. The message itself is altogether unexceptionable. It says, "I stand for a stable government and you can have a stable government only by constitutional responsibility. In other words, power must pass from the Palace to the Legislature."

* * *

WHAT surprises us most is that the security of "Kanmadi" should have been forfeited without even a warning and without informing the Editor what its offence was. If the security was forfeited for the offence of publishing the message of the late George Joseph, we would like to know why the other papers which committed the same offence some time prior to "Kanmadi" have not been proceeded with. We would also like to know why the Government did not prosecute the Editor of the paper in an ordinary court of law for any offence that he and the paper might have committed.

* * *

THE action of the Travancore government ill becomes an ordered government. It is high-handed, and it amounts to the suppression of civil liberty and of freedom of the press in the State.

* * *

Welcome Measures.

THE latest orders of the Bombay Government in securing enforcement of the fundamental civic rights of the depressed classes have once again demonstrated the deep rooted prejudices of the caste Hindus and the limits within which measures of persuasion can go. Since the establishment of the Backward Class Board eight years ago, efforts of persuasion were repeatedly made by the Government and the Backward Class Officer to induce local bodies to throw open, without distinction, wells, tanks and other watering places, *dharamshalas*, etc., financed or maintained out of public funds, to the members of the depressed classes. But they had no effect on many of the local bodies. The past Government did not countenance methods of coercion, either legislative or executive or both, to compel local bodies to realise their legitimate responsibility in this respect. We are delighted to learn that the Congress Government have decided to use such methods, whenever necessary, and have issued instructions to their officers to report cases of recalcitrant local bodies to their notice. The prosecuting authorities are asked to press the courts to award deterrent punishment for the offence of fouling drinking water of the scheduled classes; District Magistrates are required to report such cases to Government; local officers are enjoined not to hesitate to recommend to Government curtailment or stoppage of voluntary grants to any local body failing to give effect to the Government policy in this respect; deliberate and persistent disregard by a local body of the Government orders in this respect and failure to carry out its obligatory duty of throwing open public wells and tanks to all including the depressed classes will cause its supersession or dissolution and Government will have the obligatory duty carried out through their agency and at the expense of the local authority. The threat of financial loss in these orders may go a long way in producing the desired effect on local bodies; otherwise it will have to be more acute and drastic.

* * *

Wage Legislation Necessary.

While the millowners of Bombay, Ahmedabad and Sholapur have decided, though not without protest, to give effect to the recommendations of the Bombay Textile Enquiry Committee and increase the wages, the mills in the up-country centres such as Dhulia, Jalgaon, Chalisgaon, etc., have declared their inability to give a wage rise. If they are allowed to continue their old wage level, the Bombay, Ahmedabad and Sholapur millowners have a legitimate ground for complaint. In competition they may suffer a disadvantage which it is only fair to remove. The workers at these centres may not be able to maintain their rise, if their brothers at the other centres continue to work under the old level of wages. Industrial peace is likely to be disturbed, and one of the main objects for which the Committee was appointed, will be defeated. It is, therefore, the duty of the Government to take legislative measures to secure for the textile workers of the up-country centres the recommended wage rise. It is necessary to pass such legislation as promptly as possible if the situation is not to be allowed to deteriorate.

* * *

C. P. Government on Trial.

RAPID developments took place in C. P. since we wrote last week on the premature release of Zaffer Hussain by Mr. Sharif, the C. P. Minister for Law and Justice. A huge demonstration of over five thousand men and women made a march on the Assembly with a demand for Mr. Sharif's resignation. The Congress Party in the Assembly after hearing Mr. Sharif passed a vote of confidence in him. The members of the Government attempted to address a public meeting to explain the conduct of the Minister, but it ended in a great fiasco. The facts that have come to light through these developments are briefly these: one, Mr. Sharif admitted his error of judgment in releasing Zaffer Hussain; two, he failed to gauge the extent of public reaction to his releasing the criminal; three, he expressed his regret for what he did and tendered an apology to the Congress Party; and four, his resignation is in the hands of the Prime Minister. These facts which have been officially admitted, conclusively support the public demand for the Minister's dismissal. It gets added strength when it is remembered that the rumour that Zaffer Hussain got an appointment in an adjoining Indian State on the morrow of his release, which rumour leads the public to think, and in our opinion not incorrectly, that it was a premeditated and pre-arranged plot which could not be without the knowledge of the Minister, has not yet been contradicted in any quarter. And yet the Prime Minister, Dr. Khare, asks the public to rest content with the apology and close the chapter. His present attitude is really amazing and is in sharp contrast with his first reaction to the release.

* * *

THE C. P. Cabinet has not only not dismissed Mr. Sharif but has not even got the courage to accept the resignation that he has tendered. The Congress would have moved heaven and earth if such an act had been done under any other Government. But its Government in the C. P. is mortally afraid of even raising its little finger. It is difficult to find a more glaring instance of cowardice and nepotism. The C. P. Cabinet has obviously shirked its constitutional responsibility. Perhaps it wants the Congress Working Committee to shoulder it. We trust that it will shoulder it in the only way in which the moral prestige of the Congress will not be allowed to go down still further. But there cannot be two opinions that the C. P. Cabinet has stultified itself in the eyes of the public.

Specific Guarantees Needed.

LORD LOTHIAN in his *Times* articles on federation virtually asks British Indians to trust the British Government not to make use of the special powers vested by the Constitution Act in the Governor-General and to trust the Princes to adopt the method of popular election in choosing their representatives in the federal legislature. Commenting on these articles, *Indian Affairs* of Calcutta says that British India can perhaps trust the British Government but not the Princes. In regard to the latter an amendment of the Act is necessary. It says:

It is not inconceivable that the spirit which has animated the relations between Governors and Ministers should also be in evidence in the relations between the Governor-General and the Federal Cabinet. One might even go so far as to believe that in the actual working of the new constitution at the Centre the Governor-General would consult the Federal Ministers and even defer to their opinions in matters connected with defence and external relations and that the exclusion of these subjects from popular control would not amount to much in practice.

But the terms on which the States and the Provinces will come together in a single federation stand on quite a different footing. It would be far from wise for Congress to put their trust in Princes' words and bring the federation into being without taking care that the fundamentals of a federal constitution are ensured by the Act. India cannot run the momentous risk of establishing a legislature in which a substantial voting power will vest in a few hundred Princes who stand for none but themselves. It must be laid down beyond the least fear of revocation that the representatives of the States must be elected by the people. And who can say that this attitude is unreasonable? And if the change can be accomplished only by statute, why should not the opportunity be availed of to meet, even if it be half-way, some of the other objections of the Congress?

Indore.

THE difficulty of forming a correct estimate of the personal expenses of the ruler of any State and his family by a study of the administration report of the State has been emphasised in these columns time and again. For one thing the manner of presentation of figures is frequently modified, which makes a comparative study very difficult. And for another what are really the ruler's expenses are in many cases debited to different departments, which prevents one from forming a precise idea as to how much was spent in a given year on the ruler and his family.

THE difficulty may as well be exemplified by a reference to the contents of the administration report of Holkar State for 1936 which has recently reached us. A look at the expenditure figures for that year will show that, roughly speaking, the Palace consumed Rs. 21 lakhs, an increase of about Rs. 5½ lakhs since 1929-30, while the Household and Karkhanas swallowed a little over Rs. 2½ lakhs. We also find that an expenditure of Rs. 90,000 was incurred on Gardens and a sum in excess of Rs. 50,000 was spent on a motor cars and repairs shop. It may be incidentally noted that the introduction of these two new heads of expenditure is a recent innovation. These heads are not to be found in the reports either for 1933 or 1930, which could conveniently be referred to. It is needless to go into the why and wherefore of the change. What is necessary is to note the modified mode of presenting accounts, which makes the figures useless for purposes of comparison.

NOW it is difficult to believe that no part of the expenditure shown under these two heads had anything to do with the Palace. At the same time it cannot be said with certainty how much of it was for maintaining the palace gardens neat and trim or what part of it was spent on keeping the palace cars in repairs or purchasing new ones for the use of the ruler and his family. But we do not believe it would be overshooting the mark to say that about Rs. 40,000 had some connection with the Maharaja and his family. The total of the palace expenses thus comes to Rs. 24 lakhs out of a total revenue of Rs. 122 lakhs or 20 per cent. of the State income! Even if these last two items are left out, the proportion will be found to be 19 per cent. instead of 20 per cent. The people of Indore have a right to expect that the palace expenses should be considerably reduced so that larger funds would be available for the nation-building services.

FOUR societies, we read, were recognised for the purpose of holding non-political and non-communal meetings. The obvious inference to be drawn from this statement in the report is that not only can no political meetings be held within the confines of the Holkar State territory but that even for arranging non-political meetings the organising body must hold the necessary passport from the powers that be. This constitutes a measure of civil liberty—or the absence of it?—enjoyed by His Highness's subjects.

THE panchayat movement in the State dates back to 1920 when the village panchayat law was passed. The year under report witnessed a rise of 14 in the number of these village bodies, which at the end of the year stood at 125. Of the total number of nearly 1,300 members of these bodies, more than 1,000 were literate. The membership of these bodies varies between 6 and 15, including the Sarpanch. Generally speaking, there is a panch for every 75 persons subject to a maximum membership of 15. There is an element of nomination in the constitution of panchayats, but it is stated to be smaller than the elective one. We wish the respective proportions of these two elements had been specified in the report. The Sarpanch again is nominated, all which points to the undemocratic character of these bodies. It is high time these bodies were made completely elective.

THE number of educational institutions increased by 49 to 552 and that of scholars by over 2,000 to 41,560. Primary education is free everywhere but compulsory only in Indore City. However imposing the figure might appear, it represents about a fifth of the total number to be brought under instruction if there is to be universalisation of primary education. It is not clear from the report what, if any, is the policy of the State in regard to education as well as to abkari. We can only hope that the educational policy is to make literacy universal by resorting to compulsion and that its introduction in the State capital. It is only a precursor of its early advent in other parts. So far as abkari goes, it is unthinkable that Indore can have any other but prohibition as the goal of its policy to be attained in about ten years. If this is not already clearly stated, we would suggest that an authoritative declaration to this effect be made as soon as possible.

FEDERATION BY CONSENT.

I.

IN two articles contributed by him to the *Times*, the Marquess of Lothian gives a keenly sympathetic survey of the existing political conditions in India and makes constructive suggestions about the method by which they can, in his view, be ameliorated. His suggestions are halting and inadequate to the requirements of the situation as we shall show presently, but his survey is accurate and masterly. Even in making suggestions as to the way out, though they do not go far enough, he shows a breadth of outlook which marks out a real statesman from a mere politician. Above all, he is free from what the late Lord Salisbury once described as "the commonest error in politics, viz., sticking to the carcass of dead policies." And if the actual solution that he proposes is not sufficiently radical, one may hope that once British statesmen realise the need for a new orientation in India, they will be driven by the logic of facts to wider and more extensive changes than they are willing to contemplate at the moment.

The first indication of a possibility of change in British policy was afforded by the *Times* article of the 10th inst., founded no doubt upon Lord Lothian's analysis, counselling postponement of the establishment of an all-India federation till after the ruling Princes of India, no doubt of their own accord, had taken some concrete steps on the path towards democratising their administrations. It was widely felt in India that, in recommending this fundamental change, the *Times*, which was so close to the British Government, was an unofficial spokesman of those sections in the Cabinet which are not definitely die-hard; it was felt that if the Cabinet had not decided upon postponement it was at any rate afflicted by serious doubts and misgivings as to the wisdom and expediency of imposing upon British India a federation against which the latter had vowed undying vengeance with a unanimity unparalleled in contemporary history. The feeling of satisfaction which this article aroused in the breasts of British Indians was damped by the answer that was given in the Central Assembly on behalf of the Government of India the same day that "the early achievement of federation represents the considered policy both of His Majesty's Government of India and the Government of India." While it is not open, in face of this answer, to hope that British India's objections to the federal scheme are yet appreciated in official quarters, whether in India or England, it may still be hoped that they are coming to be appreciated by forward-looking statesmen in Great Britain, though there has been a considerable decay in the influence they can exert on the Tory Government now sitting in Downing Street. If this hope be realised, it will be due almost entirely to the unbiased but large-visioned examination given by Lord Lothian to the factors in the present political situation in India.

II.

Lord Lothian says bluntly: "There is no use in disguising the fact that to-day almost nobody likes

the federal part of the Act." This of course was admitted by all, but Britishers always added: "If nevertheless the Act be put in force everyone including Congressmen will settle down to work it quietly. Therefore, the speeches and writings of excited denunciation signify nothing. Heedless of them, the Government should go forward with its plan of giving effect to the federal part as soon as possible after enforcing the provincial part of the Act." It is here that Lord Lothian's illuminating articles should cause the scales to fall from the eyes of British politicians. He takes a most serious view of the political effect of forcibly imposing the federal constitution upon India in defiance of its vehement opposition. "Any attempt," he says, "to impose the federal part of the Act would, I believe, lead to a renewal of civil disobedience. . . . I have no doubt that, rather than work the federal part of the Act, if it is imposed without some form of prior consent, Congress (representing the most considerable section of Indian opinion) would not only refuse to co-operate in the federation but would compel its Ministries to resign in the seven Provinces which it controls. Thereby the Governors would be forced to govern autocratically, because they would get no other Ministry which could command a majority in the legislature and the electorate. Civil disobedience, non-violent and perhaps violent, would in the end follow." The Haripura Congress made this clear, but many people chose to poohpoo it. The Congress called upon all to prevent the inauguration of federation and declared: "In the event of an attempt being made to impose it, despite the declared will of the people, such an attempt must be combated in every way, and the Provincial Governments and Ministries must refuse to co-operate with it." Lord Lothian is thoroughly satisfied that this is not mere bluff but represents a grim determination on the part of an organisation which does not shrink from but rather welcomes opportunities for direct action to embark on civil disobedience. Such an extra-constitutional movement, Lord Lothian concedes, the Government can put down with a high hand, but he is convinced that "there is no longer any way forward along the line of repression." Reconciliation must take place, and "the first step to that reconciliation is by a clear recognition by Great Britain that the Federation Act should, if humanly possible, only be brought into operation by consent."

At this point we would like to dispel a misconception of Lord Lothian. He asserts that the resolution on federation adopted by the Congress at its Haripura session "is far less intransigent than some passed in the past" sessions. This is a wholly unwarranted statement. The reasons for such a wrong impression are possibly two. First, the resolution affirms that "the Congress is not opposed to the idea of federation." A declaration to this effect is often regarded as a great come-down on the part of a body sworn to defeat the Act. When Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, in cursing the Act with bell, book and candle, prefaced his objurgations with a simple explanatory

remark: "I am not opposed to federation in principle", all Anglo-Indian papers affected to detect in it a complete volte face on the part of the then Congress President. It is however not too abstruse a proposition for even the meanest intelligence if one were to say: Federation of the right type is acceptable; but the particular scheme of federation embodied in the constitution would be utterly unacceptable, and that the people would resist it with their backs to the wall. The union of Austria with Germany as such would be welcomed by many Austrians; but which Austrians except the Nazis would welcome Her Hitler's bludgeoning Austria into a union with his totalitarian state? Second, the Haripura resolution defines Congress objections to federation with particularity as no past resolution did. This, however, does not make Congress opposition weaker, but immensely stronger. At first, the Congress based its objection mainly on the fact that the constitution was not drawn by Indians but by foreigners. This invocation of the principle of self-determination did not make much impression on practical-minded people, and a reference to the constituent assembly was dismissed by them as a cliché and a shibboleth. Then, the Congress reinforced this somewhat doctrinaire objection by the practical one that the constitution was too restricted, that it conferred too little power. The Haripura resolution reiterates both these objections, the latter by saying: "This scheme of federation excludes from the sphere of responsibility vital functions of government." But it also states another objection, a more vital objection, which it had so far fought shy of, viz., marriage, to use Lord Lothian's expressive phrase, "of feudal India to democratic British India." The Congress had till recently thought it expedient to make out as if, in fighting against federation, it had only to fight the British Government, but not the States. This was the old Gandhi line of attack. Pandit Jawaharlal, however, who drafted the Haripura resolution, has not only included among the objections the association of a democratic British India with an autocratic Indian India, but has put it into the foreground. The Congress now attaches far greater weight to this objection than to the almost utter absence of responsibility at the centre, though this is a weighty enough objection in itself. The Congress and the country owe a great deal to Pandit Jawaharlal for placing the question in its true light. The resolution only helps to show that the people's opposition to federation is far more uncompromising than might otherwise be thought.

III

If a forced federation is to be ruled out and if general consent is to be a precondition of its establishment, can such consent be obtained? Lord Lothian addresses himself to this question and gives an affirmative answer to it. A formal amendment of the Act he considers utterly impracticable at the present moment, but he believes that without such amendment objections arising both from the British Government's retention of power and from the Indian rulers' autocracy can be met and that British Indians can be persuaded to accept the federal scheme as it is. He

is much too optimistic here, but the consolation is that he is convinced that those Britishers are entirely mistaken who think that with the passing of the Act the Indian question can be dismissed from their minds for quite a good while and that there would be no further trouble in India. He is emphatic on the other hand "that the Federal Act as it stands will never be accepted as the solution for India's constitutional problem and that at some time in the not too distant future, but not now, it will have to be amended to meet Indian objections." So far as the objection on the score of exiguity of responsibility is concerned, Lord Lothian would simply ask Indians to trust to constitutional usages and conventions on the one hand and to the inevitability of partial responsibility leading to full responsibility on the other. It is useless to waste any words on refuting this facile assumption: "The Viceroy has legal power to do this, that or the other; but he will not bring it into play, he will take his Ministry's advice and abide by it. Parliament can sit still while there is a loud cry for a revision of the constitution in India; but it will not do so, it will amend the constitution as British India wishes and also override the veto power which the Act confers upon the Princes." All this sounds like a fairy tale to Indians. A constitutional struggle would on this hypothesis be a mere child's play in any country where a beginning is made with a semblance of responsibility. We do not think it worth while to proceed any further with an examination of the pleasant fancies and imaginings of Lord Lothian on this point.

In regard to Indian objection on the score of despotism of the Princes, Lord Lothian is equally sanguine that it can easily be removed. The objection itself is, according to him, thoroughly justified. He says, it has real weight. "Too wide a divergence in governmental systems between the federating units might produce tensions which would lead to a breakdown of the federation after it had been established." "In a majority of States there are no statutory civil liberties such as habeas corpus or any other effective right of political association or meeting. Little more than 20 can claim to have proper administrative machinery. In few has there been anything like a representative system or adequate expenditure on education or social reform." Such States British India has every right to reject as its spouses. Here Lord Lothian only endorses what the Haripura Congress resolution on federation says:

A real federation must, even apart from the question of responsibility, consist of free units, enjoying more or less the same measure of freedom and civil liberty, and representation by the democratic process of election. The Indian States participating in the federation should approximate to the Provinces in the establishment of representative institutions and responsible government, civil liberties and method of election to the federal houses. Otherwise, the federation as it is now contemplated will, instead of building up Indian unity, encourage separatist tendencies and involve the States in internal and external conflicts.

The Congress resolution on the States says:

The only kind of federation that can be acceptable to the Congress is: one in which the States participate as free units, enjoying the same measure of democratic freedom as the rest of India.

Thus, not only uniformity as to the method of representation in the federal legislature, but also uniformity in the systems of internal government—in constitutional freedom and individual freedom—between British and Indian India is required by the Congress, and this demand is endorsed by Lord Lothian as just and necessary. He says, the solution of this difficulty about federation “depends mainly, therefore, on the degree and the speed with which the Princes meet the British Indian demand that they should establish the basic civil liberties and the beginning of electoral institutions, so that the divergence between the States and British India will not be so wide as to imperil the federation after it comes into being.” Curiously enough, Lord Lothian considers this to be so simple an affair that in his opinion federation need not be long delayed on that account. Apparently, what he has in mind is not a thorough revision of the States’ constitutions so as to transform the existing autocracies into democracies but just a gesture on the part of the Princes. The States are, according to his plan, to sign the Instruments of Accession, and British India is to judge of their suitability for a partnership in federation when they are to announce how their representatives in the federal legislature are to be selected. In order that this announcement may be satisfactory he seems to think that the paramount power’s intervention will be necessary. “The question will arise,” he says, “when the ruler is to be advised when appointing the representatives of his State to the federal legislature.” Advised by whom? We think he means “advised by the paramount power.” Thus it comes to this, that British India should walk blindfold into federation, relying upon the Imperial Government to cause the whole forest of reservations and safeguards to fall into desuetude, to compel the Princes to appoint such representatives to the federal legislature as will be favourable to democracy and to insert “in the not too distant future” far-reaching amendments in the constitution without giving an opportunity to the Princes to lay their veto on them.

What is required is neither a gesture, nor some patchwork, but real progress in democratisation of the States and a definite guarantee (even if by a gentlemen’s agreement) that the representatives will be popularly elected. British India will not make extravagant demands in this respect; it will be ready to accommodate the Princes to a certain extent and for a certain time if they are genuinely intent upon overhauling, either of their own motion or under the inspiration of the paramount power, their systems of administration, but the danger in this respect is that a mere intention may be regarded as an actual accomplishment, and British India may be caught into a trap. The accomplishment may be again too small, without an obligation on the States to carry it to full fruition within a specified amount of time in future. Lord Lothian realises the danger in another connection. He says: “The temptation to some of the larger States ... to weaken paramountcy by introducing a modicum of representative government in their own States ... might become irresistible.” There is a corresponding danger of British India being

deflected from its objective by the States introducing only a modicum of representative government if it does not obtain express stipulations that responsible government will be introduced within a stated period, which must be reasonably short. The democratisation of the States, if it is to be real and not a mere eye-wash, will take long; it cannot certainly be accomplished within the few months that will elapse between now and the establishment of federation, as Lord Lothian envisages the situation. The *Statesman* is quite right that even if federation were postponed for three years the essential conditions which British India would stipulate will not be wholly fulfilled. It says: “Nor is it to be expected that within that period progress towards the creation of representative institutions and the recognition of basic civil liberties in the majority of the States would be sufficiently rapid to bring about a complete reversal in the attitude of the Congress towards the scheme of federation proposed.” If, however, Lord Lothian thinks that progress along these lines is a matter of months rather than years, what conceivable objection can he have to “a federation of British India alone with the right of the Princes to adhere after they have established responsible government in the States”? They will not, on this hypothesis, have to wait long outside the federation door, and in any case it will rest with no others but themselves to cut short the waiting period. Neither the difficulty on the side of the British Government nor that on the side of the States is, in our opinion, at all so easy to remove as Lord Lothian imagines, but the merit of his contribution consists in a full acknowledgment that the difficulties on both sides are real, and his admission that the autocracy of the States constitutes a formidable obstacle to federation is of particular value. Again, his insistence that federation, whenever it is to come, must come by the consent of British India as well as of the Indian States is of paramount importance.

IV.

Lord Lothian by insisting on the renunciation by the Princes of their autocracy in order that they may become worthy of a federal union with the democracy of British India puts to shame the British Indian leaders who at the Round Table Conference took such a complacent view about Princely autocracy that they never raised the question at all. They seemed to think that a federal union was like an alliance between two States such as England and Italy, whose different ideologies or different systems of government need not be considered a barrier to the conclusion of a commercial or political understanding. Mr. Neville Chamberlain is now pleading that England can well enter into friendly relations with Italy; the latter’s authoritarian system of administration is not a relevant factor in the talks looking towards the cementing of friendship, the only relevant factor being the mutual interests of the two countries. Our leaders who exercised a decisive influence at the Round Table Conference were equally loud that a federal union between autocracies and democracies was constitutionally quite sound and that for British

India to require the States to mitigate any features of their internal administration would be not only politically inexpedient but constitutionally improper. Now comes Lord Lothian who says that a federation between British India and the Indian States would break down unless the States begin to democratise their constitution, and that for this reason British India is within its rights in objecting to a federation with autocratic States and indeed it is its duty to object. Not only would the Round Tablers say nothing about the system of administration in the States; they would not even insist upon the States sending elected representatives to the federal legislature. They did not insist at the Round Table Conference, nor did they insist later when they thought that federation was about to be established. They did not insist publicly; nor did they insist privately. Is it not a matter of disgrace that it should have been left to a Britisher to open a question which they thought had best be closed once and for all?

Let it be remembered that the proposal for a federation was first made by British Indian leaders. They went cap in hand to the Princes asking whether they would be pleased to come in—of course on their own terms. Mr. Eden, in explaining his difference with the Prime Minister in the matter of opening negotiations with Il Duce, said in the House of Commons: "Of late the conviction has steadily grown upon me that there has been too keen a desire on our part to make terms with others rather than that others should make terms with us." The Round Table knights always showed too keen a desire to make terms with the Princes rather than that the Princes should make terms with them. And there are no such hard bargainers as the Princes. They at first agreed only to consider British India's offer. Then they ensured that their internal autonomy shall never be called in question; that their representatives in the federal legislature shall be appointed by them by whatever method they pleased; that the list of federal subjects shall contain only such subjects as had already passed out of their control; that they shall not be touched in their pockets; and that they shall enjoy a liberum veto on constitutional amendments. With all this they still show a great deal of reluctance as if in such misalliance they have anything to lose and nothing to gain. The other day a Conservative member, Mr. Harold Nicolson, described in the House of Commons the Italian method of negotiation as that of the corkscrew. He said:

The tip of the corkscrew is placed gently, charmingly, sweetly upon the top of the cork. Nothing happens. The bottle is placed in the right position. That manoeuvre is called "good relations;" it is called "ending a vendetta." Suddenly the corkscrew is given a twist and the cork begins to squeak. That is the method. It goes further. They have a perfect system of inventing something that they do not want, of clamouring for the thing they do not want, of saying they will die if they do not get it, and then when they get it, of asking for something else. They have a perfect system which they have used consistently, under which they pretend that you are menacing them, or that something which you want is of vital importance to them. They then surrender it with a tremendous gesture and say, "What do we get in return?" They have the standing method which is called in Italian a "combinazione," under

which they never let you know the maximum of their demand. They let you suppose that their demand is something quite modest, but the corkscrew goes in a little further all the time until you find that the cork has no means of egress except in close conjunction with the corkscrew.

The Princes are adepts in using this corkscrew method, and the British Indian Round Tablers fell a prey to their guiles. "Agree with thine adversary quickly whiles thou art in the way with him," was their method in dealing with the Princes. They could take a firm stand with the British Government, but in so far as the Princes were concerned, they followed a give and take policy, themselves always giving and the Princes always taking. The negotiations conducted by them are the worst instance of surrender to blackmail, of the bending of the knee to those who should have been left severely alone for the present. The result is that the Princes have laid British India in thrall to the extent that they are not themselves in thrall to the British Government. Let the public take a cool view of the matter at this distance of some six or seven years. The Round Tablers treated the question of internal reform in the States as an utterly irrelevant issue. Now it has become the supreme issue of the moment though it was reserved for a Britisher to raise it prominently. All their labour has been in vain, and, what is more, it brings discredit on them. We take no pleasure in saying this of those for whom we have great respect, but "to the public good private respects must yield."

DYERISM IN TRINIDAD.

THE debate in the House of Commons on the 28th February last on the Colonial Office Vote was confined to the consideration of the Report of the Commission on the Trinidad and Tobago Disturbances of 1937. It will be recalled that in June 1937 there were disturbances, first, in the oilfields and, later, on sugar estates in Trinidad which ended in 14 persons, including 2 policemen, being killed and 59, persons, including 9 policemen, being wounded. Soon after the Secretary of State for the Colonies appointed a Commission, consisting of Mr. John Forster, the then Acting Chairman of the Industrial Court in England; Sir Arthur Pugh, a nominee of the Trade Union Congress in England; Mr. T. Fitzgerald, who had previously been Chief of Posts and Telegraphs in East Africa; Mr. Justice Vincent Brown, a coloured West Indian Judge in Trinidad; and Mr. G. Jones, a former Commissioner of Agriculture in Trinidad. The terms of reference of the Commission included not only the nature of the disturbances and the action taken by the authorities to meet them, but also the underlying causes of the disturbances. The Report of the Commission was unanimous, though it has been challenged by the late Governor of Trinidad, Sir Murchison Fletcher, during whose regime the disturbances occurred and whose conduct was adversely criticised by the Commission, and by Lord Olivier, whose knowledge of the West Indies generally is extensive and who as recently as 1929-30 presided over the Commission on the West Indian Sugar industry. Nearly two-thirds of the Report is devoted to

a survey of the economic and social conditions in the Colony, with special reference to sugar, cocoa and other export crops, to oil and asphalt industries and to medical and health services, education, housing, land settlement, labour conditions and labour legislation, etc. A chapter is devoted to the discussion of the disturbances. Then follow the recommendations.

At this hour it is not helpful to dwell at length on the disturbances themselves and the action taken by the authorities to deal with them. There are, however, a few matters which call for notice.

Granting that it is always easier to be wise after the event and from a safe distance, there is yet reason to think that the Government, rather the police authorities, in Trinidad gave way to panic. There can be no doubt that the oilfields in Trinidad, which account for some 63 per cent of oil produced in the Empire and are, therefore, of vital imperial interest, were very vulnerable to sabotage, and the authorities were wise to be prepared for the worst rather than be surprised. Nevertheless it is significant that the managers of the oilfields were not apprehensive as the police officials were. There was a threat of a strike, but not of violence or sabotage. But the police took alarm. Say the Commission :

Inspector Power's report was so seriously regarded by the Inspector General of Constabulary that on the 18th June he himself paid a visit to certain oilfields, and there saw the managers who, though conscious of the possibility of trouble, did not appear to have been apprehensive. This feeling on the part of the managers interviewed was not shared by the Inspector General who, on his return to Port-of-Spain, and after reporting to the Governor, made such police dispositions as he thought proper to meet any outbreak that might occur. (Para. 194.)

When the strike did eventuate, it was a sit-down strike and, as the Commission observe, "there was no attempt at disorder and by 4 p. m. the police, who had been notified by the Management, had induced the strikers to leave the field." (Para. 196.) Even the firing of two wells on the morning of the 19th June was not, according to the Commission, due to sabotage.

It appears, however, that these wells were not fired in a deliberate attempt at sabotage but rather as a pre-arranged signal to oilworkers in general that the strike was on. (Para. 197.)

The report of the Apex Oilfields, Ltd., which was quoted from by Mr. Wedgwood Benn in the Commons debate, said :

Labour disturbances in Trinidad during last July interrupted operations in the oilfields for about a fortnight, beyond which no material loss was sustained by the company.

It would thus appear that the discontented workers had not intended any violence, though admittedly the oilfields offered an easy and inviting target for violence. The police took a more alarmist view than was justified.

The whole trouble seems to have been due to the action of the police in attempting to effect a spectacular arrest of Mr. Uriah Butler, the Negro leader of the workers. Apprehending trouble, without sufficient

warrant as was shown above, the police took out warrants to arrest Mr. Butler on "charges of using violent language which might lead to breach of the peace and of counselling and inciting the commission of breaches of the peace and acts of violence", as the Commission put it. (Para. 198.) The Commission do not say if the charges were justified, nor give the evidence on which such charges were preferred. Apparently they accepted the police charges as conclusive evidence. Earlier they had stated of Mr. Butler that :

His speeches and the literature issued by his party became conspicuous for their violent character and as his following included—as subsequent events confirmed—many who were prepared to adopt violent methods, Butler's activities came to be regarded as dangerous. At the same time Butler appealed to the workpeople from the standpoint of wages; and as threatening and abusive letters addressed to oilfield employers brought no response, he advocated a sit-down strike. (Para. 191.)

The Commission adduce no evidence that Mr. Butler's speeches and writing advocated violence; on the other hand, they themselves admit that he had advocated only a sit-down strike, which is certainly not violent. Nor do the Commission tell to whom Mr. Butler addressed his appeal for violence if, as the Commission admit, he appealed to workpeople only from the standpoint of wages. Nor does the Commission make clear by whom Mr. Butler's activities were considered dangerous. Nor do the Commission explain why the employers did not proceed against Mr. Butler for his abusive and threatening letters. Nor do the Commission say as to why warrants, instead of summons, were issued against Mr. Butler. The Commission note that at the time the warrants were issued for his arrest, Mr. Butler was on bail on a charge of obstruction. It was extremely unfair of the Commission to conclude from subsequent events that Mr. Butler's following included many who were prepared to adopt violent methods. On the Commission's own showing, the meeting of some 200 persons whom Mr. Butler was addressing when the police approached to arrest him was peaceful. The Commission thus describe the sequence of events:

Inspector Power approached Butler and informed him that he held warrants for his arrest and that he was sure that he would come along quietly. The crowd does not appear at the time to have displayed any hostility toward the police but Butler asked for the warrants to be read. Lance-Corporal Price commenced to read one of them but for some reason found difficulty in doing so and it was passed to Superintendent-Sergeant Belfon. During the period of delay caused by Lance-Corporal Price's inability to read the warrant the temper of the crowd suddenly changed. Butler asked whether they were going to allow the police to take him and the crowd cried, "No, they can't take you" and made a rush at the officers, hurling missiles of all descriptions. (Para. 201.)

It is apparent that the crowd was suddenly provoked by the police action and by the appeal of their leader. The Commission conclude from this and the subsequent violence displayed by the workers that Mr. Butler's party consisted largely of people who were advocates of violence. The Commission might as well conclude that the police were advocates of violence because, according to their own finding, the police had continued firing at Rio Claro even after the necessity for it had passed. (Para. 225.)

In passing, it may be noted that Lance-Corporal Price had difficulty in reading the warrant, and it was during the delay caused by his inability that the temper of the crowd changed. The Commission do not explain what was Lance-Corporal Price's difficulty.

The prejudice of the Commission is brought out again to their reflections on the inhabitants of Fyzabad regarding the killing and subsequent burning of Corporal King. According to the Commission, Corporal King was at the meeting but in plain clothes, unknown to the other police officers who had come to arrest Mr. Butler. When these officers failed to arrest him and he was being helped by his followers to escape, Corporal King followed him to arrest him. Let the Commission describe the events :

It appears from information subsequently obtained that Corporal King, an officer of great courage, in the face of the hostile crowd, himself followed Butler, who was being assisted by his supporters to escape, and attempted to effect his arrest. It would seem that King was immediately set upon by the mob and was compelled to seek refuge in an adjoining shop. He was followed by the crowd and either jumped or was thrown from a window, some 18 ft. from the ground, into the yard behind the shop. His leg was broken by his fall and while he lay helpless upon the ground he was beaten, oil was poured upon him and he was burned to death. (Para. 202.)

On this the Commission comment as follows :

It is, we think, a sad commentary on the conduct of the inhabitants of Fyzabad that no single person appears to have rendered to this unfortunate police officer assistance of any kind, or even to have attempted to dissuade the mob from offering violence to him. (para. 203).

The Commission somewhat modify this dogmatic charge later, in para. 243, where they say : "So far as is known, no one in Fyzabad had raised a hand to prevent the burning of Corporal King and the shooting of Sub-Inspector Bradburn on the 19th June."

On this Mr. de Rothschild said, and rightly, in the Commons Debate :

It will be seen that the first few words are "so far as is known," and that in itself is a confession of partial ignorance; but it is immediately followed by the assumption that nothing was done. But even if it is a fact that no help was offered, is that the fault of the law-abiding elements in Fyzabad? Were they there? Undoubtedly they were not there. After that, even Corporal King's police colleagues did not know what was happening, and in condemning the entire population of Fyzabad, which very likely was not conglomerated around the valley—as many of them no doubt had remained in their houses—the report does not show the judicial frame of mind that one would like to see on such an occasion.

On the outrageous assumption that all Fyzabad was guilty of the murder of Messrs. King and Bradburn, the Commission condemn the Governor for "apologising for the action taken on the 2nd July which must have caused alarm and inconvenience to the loyal and peaceful people who form the large majority of the inhabitants of Fyzabad." The action taken on the 2nd July was a raid on Fyzabad in which police, volunteers, bluejackets and marines took part and against some of whom some of the citizens complained that they had stolen moneys.

The Commission displayed their prejudice once again when they condemned the action of the Governor in indemnifying those who had suffered at

the hands of the police. Let the Commission speak for themselves :

Following this raid, a complaint was made to the Governor by certain residents that money had been stolen from their houses by the police. We are assured by the Governor that throughout he was satisfied that the charges of theft against the police were groundless and that he still holds that view. Nevertheless, the claims made were, after investigation by a Commission appointed by the Governor, admitted for payment; and the police were then instructed to inform those who had accused them of thefts, that their claims were admitted, and that they would be indemnified against their losses on application to the Warden for the district.

To an unprejudiced mind, the judicious action of the Governor would commend itself. Notwithstanding his own impression to the contrary, he asked a commission to investigate the complaints and, if the commission was satisfied, to offer compensation. The only view that the Commission could take of the action of the Governor was that it was "calculated to cause a feeling of bitterness and resentment amongst the police." (Para. 244.)

But enough has been said to show how thoroughly prejudiced the Commission was with reference to Mr. Butler and the Governor. There is, however, one other matter that may be noticed, and that is the efficiency of the police. It has already been stated that, differing from the opinions of the managers of the oilfields, the Inspector General of Constabulary had taken a serious view of the situation on the 18th June and, in consultation with the Governor, had made proper police dispositions to meet any possible contingency. (Para. 194.) According to the Commission, "throughout the 19th June, police reinforcements continued to arrive at San Fernando, the headquarters of the police in the south, and at Fyzabad, the centre of the trouble." (Para. 198.) The total police force available amounted to about 1,000 officers and men and, including volunteers, etc., some 1,920 people. (Para. 229.) It was also stated by the Commission that the police had anticipated trouble only at the oilfields and not on the sugar estates and "all other districts were therefore denuded of police and every available man concentrated on the oilfields." (Para. 215.) With all this previous preparation and concentration of forces, the police were unable to effect the arrest of Mr. Butler when the whole crowd that he was addressing consisted of some 200 persons! They retreated in utter confusion with the loss of two officers. The Commission admit that the police force was inadequate to meet the situation, but do not account for its inadequacy. If, as the Commission assert, the following of Mr. Butler consisted largely of people committed to violence and the police knew of it, it was the height of police inefficiency to attempt Mr. Butler's arrest with inadequate police force. Or, the Commission's estimate of the character of Mr. Butler and his colleagues was wrong. That the latter is true is borne out by the Commission's references to previous occasions of a like kind. They say :

It must be remembered that it was in accordance with usual practice to execute a warrant as and when the person against whom it was directed was found; that this practice had never on any previous occasion in Tāni-

dad led to mob violence; that Butler himself had upon an earlier occasion been arrested in almost similar circumstances without incident; that on 19th June when Inspector Power arrived in Fyzabad the crowd was orderly; that no demonstration was made against the police as they approached Butler and that it was not until Butler appealed to the crowd during, or after, the reading of the warrant that there was any hostile reaction on the part of the crowd. (Para. 207.)

The Commission's approach to the disturbances is through and through vitiated by their prejudice against Mr. Butler whom they dub "the fanatic negro" and the Governor, Sir Murchison Fletcher, who, whatever his faults, displayed in this instance a sense of humanity exceptional among Colonial Governors. It will take too much space to examine categorically the many injustices that the Commission have done to both these heroes, but enough has been said here to show that the Commission were grossly prejudiced.

The virtual dismissal of the Governor and the continued imprisonment of Mr. Butler through judicial conviction have however larger significance. Regarding the dismissal of the Governor Mr. Benn said in the Commons debate :

What is of importance is the fact that the Governor, who said things that no other Governor has said, is, owing to the circumstances, which may be right or wrong, to be dismissed. The result is that every Governor in the Service knows that the one Governor who was not re-employed was the Governor who said that the labour code was the cause of the disturbances. The unfortunate thing is that the Commission reproved the Governor because he did not pursue repressive measures with sufficient determination. The one Governor who is not to be kept in employment is the Governor who did not shoot. That is a disturbing thing. If it had been a General Dyer, things might have been different. We had debates on Dyerism, and ever since then there has been a celebration at Amritsar of the massacres carried out under General Dyer. The harm done to the British cause in India through the stern and wicked acts of General Dyer, cannot be assessed. In contrast with General Dyer who was employed the Governor who is not to be employed is the Governor who does not take repressive measures.

Dyerism is not yet dead in the Empire; the events in Trinidad were another example of it. The underlying purpose of British imperialism is, as was stated by Sir Murchison Fletcher in the Trinidad Legislative Council and quoted by Mr. Benn in the Commons debate, "to inspire fear of the whites in the black people."

Of the other hero, Mr. Uriah Butler, now suffering two-years' hard labour in jail, Mr. Maxton said in the Commons :

"Butler was an agitator but, as far as I can gather not an unduly hasty one. He arrived in the island in 1922, after serving in His Majesty's Forces during the War. He was not rejected from the Army for mental defects. There was no suggestion that he was not capable of acting as a disciplined soldier. He served overseas in Palestine and with the West Indian regiment, and so far as I know had a good record as a soldier. Afterwards he went to work in the oilfields, and was injured, being maimed for life. He got no penny of compensation. . . . He arrived in the island in 1929 and the strike did not break out until 1935. That does not look like fanatical recklessness. He went on organising, teaching and preaching to the people trying for 13 years to stir them up to demand a better standard of life.

And Mr. Maxton paid a well-deserved tribute to Mr. Butler when he said :

Uriah Butler performed a service not merely to the House of Commons in bringing the condition of these people prominently to our notice, but he performed a great service to the coloured workers in every part of the Empire.

Commenting on the nature and intensity of the grievances of the workers in Trinidad the Commission themselves say :

It is sufficient here to observe that in the light of all the circumstances it is a matter for surprise that Butler did not secure more support than was actually the case (Para. 276.)

Reviewing the disturbances, it would seem that the workers had genuine and deep grievances: that Mr. Uriah Butler was giving voice to them; that no violence was contemplated by Mr. Butler or his followers; that nevertheless, the police took it into their head to discredit Mr. Butler in the eyes of his followers by effecting a spectacular arrest of him, and anticipated no trouble in so doing; that the crowd, which was no more than 200 strong, and had no violent intentions, was suddenly provoked by the provocation deliberately offered by the European police, and the police wreaked vengeance thereafter. The Governor struggled between his own consciousness of the justice of the grievances of the workpeople and the spirit of Dyerism among his police advisors and their mentors and, while permitting police action upto a point, restrained it constantly and acknowledged his obligation to the law-abiding section of the people and sought to bring about a settlement by negotiation than by stern shooting. In the end Dyerism triumphed. Mr. Butler is in jail; the Governor has been dismissed; and the local police have been exonerated, except for one incident; and when reproved at all, they were reproved for not indulging in more shooting!

THE REBUILDING OF RURAL ECONOMY.

A HUNDRED years ago, India's rural economy was one of self-sufficiency and her economic system as a whole, was rather balanced. The Industrial Revolution in Great Britain ushered in a new world economic order based on the industrial supremacy of Western Europe, the rest of the world supplying raw materials to it and purchasing finished goods from it. India also adjusted her internal economy to suit the

new requirements and after 1860 became a large exporter of cotton, jute, tea, cereals, oil-seeds, and many other tropical products for which the West then depended on India. No doubt India's external trade increased by this, but her internal economy became unbalanced, as she gradually came to depend almost entirely on primary production. The expansion of export trade brought in much money into the

country, but owing to the working of a vicious economic system very little of that money went to the pockets of the tiller of the soil. Merchants and moneylenders carved out large portions of it for themselves, and little was left to the agricultural classes. In all backward countries agriculture is a partnership between the landlord and tenant, but in India the moneylender is also an important partner. But these two sleeping partners take little risk and generally obtain their shares on the threshing floor; what is left to the tiller in most years is quite inadequate for his annual requirements. As a result, production has become inefficient and insufficient; for, without an equitable system of distribution, there cannot be an adequate incentive to increased production.

Was it any wonder that the policy of *laissez faire* and the exotic system of law worked havoc among the improvident Indian peasantry? Both these may suit a commercial society, but they have proved injurious to India. The Famine Commissions of 1878 and 1901 discovered the incongruity of *laissez faire* principles in the Indian environment, and, largely as a result of their recommendations, Government entered the field of rural credit by increasing takavi advances, by passing laws against land alienation, by placing tenancy conditions on a statutory basis and, above all, by organising co-operative societies for supplying the credit needs of agriculturists. Positive efforts were also made for making agriculture more secure and profitable by carrying out irrigation works and by setting up agencies for agricultural experiments. But all this has had only a partial success. There has been little change in our rural economy, and it still remains poor and backward. The total production of India is much too inadequate to meet the needs of our teeming millions and therefore the bulk of the rural population have not got adequate incomes and their standard of living is despicably low. Unless rural incomes increase there is little scope in India for industrial development, and all progress—political as well as economic, and even spiritual—is bound to be retarded.

Rural credit is the pivot of rural economy, and a reform of it is to-day the *sine qua non* for economic progress in this country. For a long time, it was thought that the hope of the rural folk lay in co-operative societies of the Raiffeison type. Co-operative societies have been widely established during the last 30 years and we have in Madras about 11,330 such societies with a total membership of 9,00,000. In most Provinces of India, co-operation has been a failure by all accounts and even in Provinces like the Punjab, Bombay and Madras, where co-operation is said to have somewhat succeeded, it has only touched the fringe of the rural problem. Even now, not more than a fifth of the rural loans comes from co-operative societies. Of the 11,330 societies in Madras, even where the society is active, its operations are marred by local factions and communal rivalries, and thus its sphere of usefulness is rather narrow. Good management is essential for the success of the movement, but one despairs of

getting good management from the untrained honorary workers who now manage or rather mismanage societies. Above all, co-operation still remains in the hands of the rural middle classes and has hardly penetrated into the strata of actual tillers and tenants, not to speak of the large mass of rural labourers. These are the classes that stand in need of aid, but they still depend largely on moneylenders for their credit needs and therefore they have to eke out a miserable existence. Not rarely co-operation has been used as a convenient agency by the larger ryots, to obtain money to be lent out at high rates of interest among the smaller ryots and cultivators.

Co-operation in its pure form may succeed where, as in Canada, large farmers feel the need for combined action in export trade or, as in Western Europe, where a class of frugal and hardworking peasants feel the urge for cheap credit, orderly marketing, or combined production; but it cannot function properly among improvident peasants who do not know the right use of credit and who cannot visualize the benefits of joint action for common interests, especially when the peasants are not all bound together, as in Europe, by common religious or social ties. It is extremely difficult for co-operation to succeed in a country where the rural community is divided by inexorable barriers of caste and creed, where there is little mutual confidence, where loyalty is confined to small social groups, where everybody will turn to money-lending when he has saved a few rupees, where exploitation is regarded as a normal incidence of leasing, lending and employing. In such an environment co-operation necessarily loses its purpose; it may become a mere form. Therefore, if co-operation is to succeed in India, far-reaching agrarian, social and financial reforms will have to be carried out by Government. If there is strong economic urge, the more powerful sections of the rural community may organise co-operative undertaking; but to expect the tillers of the soil to benefit by voluntary co-operation in the present circumstances is to ignore the fundamental facts of Indian economy. If the poorer classes are to be helped, their economic life must be regulated, and their interests must be protected, by a paternal agency; and they must be brought under such a thorough but benevolent discipline as will gradually enable them to stand on their own legs.

Further, the co-operative societies must not be mere lending agencies, as most of them have long been, but must take up the whole task of rural uplift. They must interest themselves in agricultural improvement, marketing of produce either directly or through marketing societies, catering for a larger area, organisation of cottage industries, cattle breeding and, above all, in the improvement of the quality of life. In other words, co-operation must attend not only to better farming but also to better business and even better living. To supply credit on the most reasonable terms may not even help better farming, for facile credit in the hands of unwary ryots may be (has been) a curse rather than a blessing. If the ryot is to be made safe for credit, if he is to become

creditworthy, he has to be disciplined in the use of credit, and this discipline is not an easy process; it may take time and involve hard work by a benevolent government. But once the discipline is gone through, Government's task will become easy and the rebuilding of rural society will advance quickly.

The co-operative movement as it now functions cannot carry out such a comprehensive task. Therefore it is necessary to modify it to suit our requirements, although it may then cease to be 'co-operation' in the strict sense. But, after all, co-operation is only a means, and not an end, and in some circumstances it may not be the right means to the end sought, namely, a rise in the economic welfare of the masses.

As to the lines of reconstruction, opinion may vary. In my opinion, we need large co-operative societies (1) generally covering more than one village, (2) managed by paid workers carefully trained for the purpose, (3) engaged, not only in supplying credit, but in the many-sided work of rural uplift, (4) undertaking, wherever possible, joint efforts in purchase and sale and even in production, (5) operating on the basis of 'controlled credit' of the type that has been introduced in Madras and (6) working as a unit of a rural welfare service controlled in each District by the District Officer, whose prime concern must be economic welfare. If the unlimited liability is standing as a hindrance to this reform, it must be modified. The work of different development departments for economic, intellectual and physical amelioration must be co-ordinated in such a way as to enable the ryot to obtain all his needs from some familiar agency in his neighbourhood. The different departments have not so far established intimate contacts with the cultivators, and if they must, it can only be by making the District Officer and his staff the co-ordinating agency for rural welfare. By carrying out such a reorganisation, we may obtain many of the benefits of the Soviet system without its defects. But if such a reorganisation is not immediately attempted disaffection may grow among the rural masses, and then more radical remedies may become necessary.

Our Provincial Governments have lately interested themselves in debt relief. No doubt, indebtedness is the first problem to be tackled, as rural uplift is not possible while the Atlantean load is on our agriculturists' shoulders. But legislation to scale down debt can only be the first step, and unless that is followed up immediately by other steps, the effect of such legislation may be more injurious than beneficial. A reform of our rural credit and a rebuilding of our whole system of rural economy is our most urgent need to-day. If this is not undertaken immediately, dangerous forces may gather momentum and may precipitate radical and unsettling upheavals. It is hoped that our statesmen will realize this and give the matter their earnest attention. If we don't rebuild our rural economy, it may be pulled down with a vengeance.

P. J. THOMAS.

WELCOME TURN IN BOMBAY FINANCES.

THE budget that the Hon. Mr. Latthe had presented to the Bombay Assembly in August last was no more than an appeal for time. The budget that he has recently presented to the legislature for the coming financial year is thus the first of his and his party's considered programme of financial reform in the presidency. Judged in this light, the budget contains many welcome features which should justify the hope that the present Ministry, if allowed enough time, will be able to produce even more satisfactory results in future. While enthusiasts are likely to be disappointed at the small size of actual achievements, the theorist would quarrel with the Ministry's lack of courage in positively redressing the balance in favour of the poor by taxing the other classes. The ministry must have its own explanation for everything, but it is useful to examine the principal features of the budget from an objective standpoint.

The revised position for the current year has shown a definite improvement. This, of course, is due to widefalls both in the shape of a share in Income Tax and added yield of certain taxes. We must not, however, grudge to the Ministry the fruits of their own good sense in not actually spending the amounts for which no valid claims were made. Thus amounts sanctioned for remissions of revenue and construction of village water works were not actually spent whenever no sound reasons for the expenditure were forthcoming. In fact, the omission from the new budget of the item for relief to rack-rented tenants is a virtual admission of the essential justice of the existing pitch of taxation of land. The replacement of this item by a provision of 5 lakhs for relief of agricultural distress is open to very serious objection. In fact, as has already been pointed out on the floor of the Assembly, a very large number of fresh appropriations for a beneficent purpose suffer from lack of definite detail and of the underlying principle of distribution. Both for financial and constitutional reasons such lump sum appropriations must be eschewed from all future budgets.

On the revenue side, it is a relief to know that in respect both of excise and land revenue the Congress Ministry is progressing along lines long made familiar to reformers in this Presidency. The Ministry's proposals to introduce prohibition in selected areas where local opinion is ripe and to restrict the sale of liquor on days when the temptation to the poor addicts is likely to be greatest are along approved lines. If the cause of real social reform is thus cautiously promoted there will be satisfaction all round and there will be enough time to make the necessary financial readjustment. The Government's lack of any programme for land revenue reform is, to say the least, surprising. A general remission is, of course, out of the question. But there is urgent need of putting the land revenue on an improved and more elastic basis. There is no mention of any such plan in the Finance Minister's speech.

The admission of the Finance Minister that under the existing constitution no striking retrenchment is possible need cause little surprise. In fact, barring

the partial lowering of salaries in the highest grades, there is little doubt that even under a fully autonomous constitution the cost of administration will not materially fall. In fact, with increasing elaboration of the constitutional machinery and the growing scope of governmental functions, this cost is likely to increase. The attempts to increase the yield on capital expenditure such as the Bombay Development Scheme and the irrigational system of the Presidency are very well-intentioned. Much need not, however, be expected from them. In the case of the Bombay Development Scheme the recklessness of a past government must be counted as a permanent drag, and in the case of the latter only a greater utilisation of water must be expected to yield lasting improvement. The proposals of Government to enhance the yield of the surcharge on electricity, of stamp duty and of the tobacco tax strike one as being too halting and apologetic under the circumstances. The reduction of grants to local bodies is obviously a retrograde step.

The new items of expenditure are small in amount and as such they have been already criticised. But it must be admitted that the Finance Minister has exhibited a very real consciousness of the fact that his success will be judged by the nature of the scheme of expenditure. He himself classifies public expenditure under three heads, primary, developmental and cost of collection. According to his own figures, his budget for the new year increases the percentage of cost of collection by $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, and lowers the ratio of primary expenditure by 2 per cent., thus causing an improvement of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in the share of the so-called nation-building departments. Where the difficulties of classification are so great such a slight improvement in the share of the beneficent services must be considered to be most disappointing.

It is true that such new expenditure as has been sanctioned is mostly for those sections of the population which have an overdue claim on the purse of the Government. A reduction in the tagal rate, a liberal forest policy, initiation of panchayats, improvement of water supply in villages, encouragement to medical practitioners to settle in rural parts to minister especially to the needs of the poor, the expansion of minor irrigational works, development of rural communications as per plan extending over seven years, extension of educational facilities to villages and, last but not least, direct encouragement of improved agriculture are all items of expenditure which must be welcomed for two reasons. In the first place, all this expenditure is calculated, if properly administered, to be productive in its effect. By improving the health and efficiency of the villager and by providing him with more productive instruments and technique the new policy will bring about a betterment in the lot of those whom it benefits. In the second place, this new expenditure, however small, redresses the balance of net advantage slightly in favour of the class that has till now borne the brunt of public administration in India, namely, the rural poor.

Apart, however, from the administrative drawbacks of the particular proposals included in the

scheme of new expenditure, there are some fundamental objections that must be urged against the form that it has assumed. Most of the new expenditure is either being met out of balances or out of windfalls. This is a most unsound way of undertaking expenditure which is in the nature of a first instalment of a long-term scheme. The criticism offered in certain well-informed quarters that as compared with the ultimate needs of reform the amounts allowed in the new year's budget are no more than paltry may be discounted on the ground that even if a general liability for fresh expenditure is undertaken the appropriation for any single year must cover only that part of the intended expenditure which can be usefully incurred during the given year. But for meeting a recurring expenditure, however small its amount, out of moneys which are virtually, and in some cases even avowedly, in the nature of windfalls there can be no justification whatever. In the second place, while one of the hitherto neglected sections of the people, namely, the agriculturist of small means, is attracting some attention, the other claimant for the sympathetic attention of a just and democratic government, namely, industrial labour, is not being sufficiently noticed. As with the rural, so with the urban interests, we must all allow our Government to have its own programme of gradual reform. But in the budget now presented there is no progress towards any scheme of social legislation.

The Finance Minister must indeed be congratulated upon his evincing a wholesome sense of realism. That the productive capacity of the masses must be increased, that for a comprehensive scheme of economic betterment an industrial survey must be planned and that a widespread national awakening is essential for the success of progressive schemes are truths in the light of which all finance members must regulate their essential steps. It must be admitted that in certain respects the expenditure provided by the new budget will help to secure these objects in some measure. But the advance made is by no means adequate, as the Finance Member's own figure of a $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. increase in the ratio of nation-building expenditure will show. A bolder, more comprehensive and better planned policy of administrative and financial reform is necessary. It is clear that the unwillingness, or the inability, to explore fresh sources of revenue is the real explanation of the halting and almost cheese-paring policy of the Ministry.

Any investigation into the burdens of taxation and the benefits of expenditure in our provinces will show, as was seen by the Taxation Inquiry Committee, that Indian finance is doubly regressive. The poor bear a more than proportionate share of public burdens and gain a less than proportionate share of public advantages. The fresh expenditure sanctioned in Bombay will to a certain extent, especially in rural areas, reduce the regressiveness of the benefits financed by public moneys. But the Bombay budget leaves the regressiveness of taxation intact. Unless the relative share of the poor man's contribution to the public purse is reduced, either by reduction of taxation of the poor or by enhancement of taxation on the rich, the necessary justice and the desired progress will not

be achieved. A government which hopes to please all parties and which does not know when it will have to throw itself on popular sympathies for a wider political struggle is ill fitted to secure justice and happiness to the poor and progress for all. But if the present Government has made up its mind to work the reforms for the all-round betterment of the people, a bolder taxation policy is urgently called for.

It must be admitted that, as against the standstill budget of last year, the present budget represents a very welcome turn in our provincial finance. The sympathies and good intentions of the Ministry are only too transparent. If by chance the constitutional deadlock had swept off the Congress Ministries in all provinces, Bombay would have lost a very notable step forward on the road of financial reform. More assurance and bolder planning ought to produce next year a budget which is on the revenue side at least as strong as it is well planned on the expenditure side.

D. G. KARVE.

Review.

ECONOMIC INQUIRY IN THE PUNJAB.

AN ECONOMIC SURVEY OF SUNER. By LAJPAT RAI DAWAR. (Board of Economic Inquiry, Punjab.) 1936. 24cm. 267p. Rs. 3.

SUNER in Ferozpur District has an area of 1916 acres and a population of 1187 consisting of Sikhs, Mohamadans and Hindus. Of the 257 families 116 are wholly dependent on agriculture, 61 wholly independent and 80 families are partly dependent on agriculture. In this village agricultural labourers get at times high wages of 8 to 10 annas. An inundation canal irrigates some four hundred acres of this village for about a hundred days in a year. This is a useful source of irrigation for kharif cropping, and for preparing the soil in time for the rabi crop. Twenty-six wells of the village irrigate about half its area. Even then rainfall becomes the determining factor in the cropping scheme of the village. The number of owners has been steadily increasing from 134 in 1887 to 190 in 1931 with an average holding of 9.5 acres. Of these 120 own holdings less than five land in extent. Of the 180 cultivators 92 cultivate extents less than five acres. Suner is a village in which the work of voluntary consolidation was very effectively done to the great advantage of the owners and of agriculture. Of the total area of the village 1200 acres were consolidated: 486 plots in 1200 acres were consolidated into 160 plots. The average area per plot rose from 2.45 to 7.4 acres, the area actually transferred being 532 acres. Tenants without occupancy rights generally remain for a year, and, according to the investigator, they do not take the same interest in cultivation as the owners. Taccavi loan has been almost unknown in the village. The land revenue has risen from Rs. 1089 in 1852 to Rs. 2400 in 1913. The village pays in addition Rs. 250 as khushaisayati, 299 as local rates, Rs. 120 as lambardar tax, Rs. 192 as chaukidar tax. Water rates fluctuate from Rs. 307 to Rs. 902 according as the channel water is used for cultivation. The chaukidari is collected from people who are graded into five classes according to their means and the last class is exempted. The village is heavily indebted. The high cost of

brides and the heavy cattle mortality have been the causes of indebtedness. The other usual features of village surveys are also found here. In these village surveys the drink evil finds no mention. Is it that in none of these villages no one drinks or is it purposely left out? Apart from the crores that the provincial coffers are getting, many more crores leave the pockets of the poor people who have taken to drink. Rural parts contribute, as much if not more, to the drink revenue of the state, and a study of the effects of drink on rural economy should not be left out of account. Now that prohibition is being more practically thought of, it will add to the value of these village surveys if the effect of the drink evil is calculated.

N. S. S.

SHORT NOTICES.

THE LAW OF PAKKI AND KATCHI ADAT AND TEJ-MANDI CONTRACTS. By RAMNIKLAL R. MODY. (N. M. Tripathi & Co., Bombay.) 1937. 22cm. 249p. Rs. 3.

WE welcome this second edition of a book dealing with certain side branches of the customary commercial law of India, particularly of the Bombay market. The incidents of the transactions as recognised by the Indian Law Courts have been thoroughly dealt with and the case law brought up to date. Both the Katcha and Pakka Adatia make it easy for their constituents to deal in futures, the Katcha merely putting the constituent in contractual relationship with another party and the Pakka guaranteeing to him the carrying out of his order once accepted. The Adatias are clever enough to make it difficult to prove any of the transactions as wagering or gambling. Settlements are made in most cases by paying merely differences, but it is hard to prove that it was so intended from the very beginning as the law requires. Speculation when healthy no doubt helps to settle the prices of commodities in a competitive market, but when it lures people merely to pocket differences it reduces itself to a social evil. People who have nothing to do with cotton, jute, oil-seeds, silver and other commodities contract through the adatias to buy or sell huge quantities of them in future, and if some of them grow suddenly rich others are led to resort to worse types of gambling. Western India is at present passing through a phase of the midnight revels of gamblers on the digits of cotton prices with the paraphernalia of news-sheet vendors, astrologers, spies, cheats and hooligans.

The present book describes in detail the nature and *modus operandi* of what are called Teji-Mandi transactions, wherein the Lagadnar (applier) for a certain consideration purchases the option of buying or selling a certain quantity of a commodity at a future date at a fixed rate. The man is utterly indifferent whether he is going to buy or to sell and is ready to do either as the price goes up or down. In a series of decisions between 1908 and 1916 Justice Beaman of the Bombay High Court dubbed all such transactions as essentially wagers. But such is the nature of the present law about gambling, gaming and wagering that later decisions of the Bombay High Court and the Privy Council have removed that stigma from the Teji-Mandi transactions. Merely because the Teji-Mandi transactions help some persons to minimise their losses if they are compelled by circumstances to decide today to buy or sell a certain commodity at a future date, all are left free to deal in such transactions. Mr. Mody supports this orthodox view of law by quoting *in extenso* the reasonings in the various rulings on this branch of Commercial Law. But the thoroughness with which

he has accomplished his task merely proves the necessity of fresh legislation for the protection of the beguiled people.

K. G. K.

AN ATLAS OF INDIAN HISTORY. By E. W. GREEN. (Macmillan.) 1937. 28cm. 43p. Rs. 2.

THE main purpose of this Atlas comprising 20 clearly printed maps in bold colours is to show that, from the dawn of history, India was no isolated country, but was in touch with regions which have influenced the course of her history down to the present age. The glorious past of India's trade, revealed by the recent discoveries at Mohenjo Daro and Harappa, can be read with reference to Map 1. Map No. 4 shows how almost every invader between 500 B. C. to 500 A. D. made himself master of Balkh before Marching on to India. Map No. 8 illustrates how, from 250 B. C. to 1000 A. D., Hindu colonies spread to Malaya, Java, Sumatra and Cambodia till the monopolisation of the sea-routes by the Arabs gave them a set-back. Map No. 11 explains the inroads of the Muhammadens from 600-1200 A. D. India's relations with the West during 1450-1600 A. D. have been shown clearly in Map No. 14. The above-mentioned maps thus enable the student of history to see how certain activities in certain distant quarters of the world have influenced the march of events in India. Maps showing the Aryan settlement (2000-800 B. C.) the Mauryan Empire (300-184 B. C.) and the Gupta Empire (300-500 A. D.) will also be found instructive. We wish, however, that the explanatory notes for the maps were a little fuller. A map showing the expansion of European power in America and in the Far East during the 17th and 18th centuries A. D. could also have been included with advantage because the struggle, between European powers, for supremacy over the Indian Ocean had not only its counterpart in, but was influenced by the curve of European ascendancy over the Atlantic during those centuries. The last map in the Atlas shows the Indian Empire from 1858-1930.

The present Atlas thus depicts historical events in India in their geographical setting and helps to trace the march of events in their true perspective.

B. G. NENE.

SAKUNTALA. By KEDAR NATH DAS GUPTA and LAURENCE BINYON. (Macmillan, Bombay.) 1937. 20cm. 149p. Rs. 2.

THIS is a new version of the eternally fresh Indian classic, the Sakuntala of Kālidāsa, made solely for the purpose of presenting the play on the stage to an English audience. The original play in seven acts is, therefore, abridged into three acts, the first act, divided into four scenes, giving the story of the first three acts and a part of the fourth of the original, the second act in two scenes giving the story of the fourth and fifth acts, and the third act in three scenes giving the remaining portion of the original. While the division of the acts into scenes is very judiciously made, it is not clear what principle underlies the division of the play into three acts only. Perhaps the writers recognize three distinct stages in the action of the play and make the division into acts to correspond with these, leaving aside or perhaps unaware of the five stages in which orthodox Indian dramaturgists divide the action. They have used blank verse throughout both for the verse and prose of the original though it was possible to put in a few lovely lyrics to enhance its charm and break the monotony of its interminable blank verses. "Fidelity to what is universal in Kālidāsa has been sought for

rather than the reproduction of exotic beauties." There could be no doubt that the rendering is very happy in many places, revealing how, in spite of difference of age, customs, race and language, a kindred spirit is touched by the fine frenzy of another, and the result is a very fine specimen of noble poetry that gives to the English-speaking world the right measure of poetic splendour reached by the Shakespeare of India.

What makes the publication of still greater value is the brilliant essay on "the inner meaning" of the Sakuntala by Rabindranath Tagore. Here is a specimen of the scintillating power of poetry which has kindled such fine rapture in our great poet. The whole essay, from beginning to end, is so poetic that it is more creative than interpretative. This is not the place to enter into a detailed discussion of the interpretation offered, but it must be remembered that it is a poet's interpretation of a poet and therefore has a value far more abiding than ordinarily attaches to a mere critique.

The book is available at the comparatively cheap price of Rs. 2.

C. R. DEVADHAR,

SIR C. V. RAMAN. BY S. RAMACHANDRAN (S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras.) 20 cm. 1938. 138 p. As. 12.

AMONG those who have enhanced the prestige and honour of India abroad, Sir C. V. Raman, the Indian Scientist, ranks high. His biography, like the one under review, written in Tamil, must serve as a beacon light to the youngsters in Tamilnad. We get glimpses of his precocious genius, of his early infatuation for scientific research, and of his later world wide achievements. We understand that the publishers have so far published two hundred and eight books in Tamil on various subjects. Their publications are in a class by themselves. In printing and get up they have set up new standards so far as Tamil publications go. The publishers stand for puritanism in language, and consequently eschew all Tamil words of Sankritic origin and instead coin new words whose meaning cannot be understood by the man in the street without the aid of a lexicon. It looks rather incongruous that the publishers who stand for purity in Tamil language should have printed the cover of the book in English, while the contents inside the book are in uncontaminated Tamil. The English title page of the book is misleading. Do lovers of pure Tamil also require a foreign cloak?
S. R. V.

THE CHILD IN INDIA. Ed. By CLIFFORD MANSHARDT. (Taraporevala, Bombay.) 1937. 22cm. 166p. Rs. 4.

THE title of this book is the Child in India, but before many pages of the book have been read, one is impressed anew by the fact that society as a whole must be considered in trying to solve the problems of any of its parts. As we are here reminded, the welfare and care of the child should begin long before it is born. It should have healthy parents; it must be brought into the world by a competent person. And care must be taken to provide it with adequate food, shelter and education.

A part of the book considers the needs of all children. The chapters on Maternal Welfare, Education of the Pre-School Child, Changing Objectives in Indian Schools, Behaviour Problems of Childhood, Training for Character, and Recreation and Play all discuss problems which are or should be, of value to any one who, in any capacity is responsible for the welfare of children.

The first chapter is the outline of the formation and growth of the Society for the Protection of Children in Western India written by Mr. R. P. Masani, one of founders of the Society. As he explains, the Society was organised to care for children who, for one reason or another, needed the protection of the State. Other chapters discuss the reasons for the delinquency of children, and also, ways of caring for and helping them to become self-respecting and self-supporting adults.

The book is a challenge to every one who is interested in the future citizens of India. May it reach a number of people who will be inspired to give young India a helping hand!

M. C. RAO.

Correspondence.

AN AGENT FOR EAST AFRICA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—I am surprised with the remarks that you have made in your "Topics of the Week" of February 10, regarding Indian agency in East Africa.

I would have understood if any other paper had made such remarks, but I certainly did not expect these remarks from the SERVANT OF INDIA, the official paper of the Servants of India Society.

During the tour that you undertook to East Africa and during the tours of the Rt. Hon. Srinivasa Sastri as well as Mr. Kunzru and Mr. Kodanda Rao, we had fully expressed our reasons why we did not want an Agent for East Africa, and all of you had accepted our reasons as cogent against the appointment of a Government of India Agent in East Africa. Even in South Africa it is a matter of opinion whether the Agent has done any good to the South African Indians, but that apart, the conditions in East Africa are totally different and Mr. Kodanda Rao, Mr. Kunzru and Rt. Hon. Srinivasa Sastri have all heard and accepted our arguments against such an appointment.

Your argument, particularly in the latter half, means in plain language that the Government of

India wants a C.I.D. official to spy on the local Indians here. If the local Indians want the help of the Government of India to put their case before the Secretary of State for the Colonies and if the Government of India does not trust the Indians in this Colony, it is quite clear how much help we can get out of them if they appoint an Agent here with the aim of spying on us or trying to so manage things here that outwardly at least things in East Africa look calm and quiet. I at least would rather not have an Agent of Government of India in this Colony in spite of the threat that such an attitude on our part will mean the loss of the support of the Government of India. After all, we can always appeal to the people of India, and I am quite sure that the people of India will certainly not take the attitude that they want a spy to find out whether we are right or wrong before they support us because, they will be able to make up their minds as to the fairness of our demands without the necessity of spying, and after all the support of the people of India is far more valuable than that of the Government of India, though we would naturally like to have support from both quarters as we have had up to now.—Yours &c.

S. D. KARVE.

[The members of the Servants of India Society referred to by him, knew of the view advocated by Dr. Karve, but did not share it. As far as we know, public opinion in India as well as the Government of India do not share the view that an Indian Agent is unnecessary in East Africa; they have yet to be convinced that such an appointment will not be to the advantage of the Indians in East Africa as well as to the Government and people of India and the Colonial Government and Colonial Office. Even the people of India, as apart from the Government of India, cannot render the maximum service that they can render to Indians abroad, including those in East Africa, without Agents of the Government of India. We are, however, opposed to the appointment of an Indian Agent in East Africa against the wishes, however suicidal, of East African Indians. We assure Dr. Karve that nothing was further from our thought than that the Indian Agent should be a spy on Indians in East Africa.—Ed.]

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.

Mysore
Sandal Soap

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

Available Everywhere.

GOVERNMENT SOAP FACTORY,
BANGALORE.