

# Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA 4

VOL. XXII, No. 39 } POONA — THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1939 { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6  
FOREIGN SUBSN. 15s.

## CONTENTS

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK. ....	485
ARTICLES :	
Delhi Pourparlers ... ..	488
Mahatma Gandhi ... ..	489
South Africa and the War. By P. Kodanda Rao ... ..	491
REVIEW :	
Sigmund Freud's Theories. By Mrs. Irawati Karve, Ph. D. ... ..	493
SHORT NOTICES: ... ..	493
MISCELLANEOUS :	
Army Mechanisation.—Dr. Kunsru's Speech. ... ..	494
BOOKS RECEIVED ... ..	496

## Topics of the Week

### "India—the Test Question"

THE *New Statesman and Nation* has the following in its leading article under the above caption:

Britain cannot bluntly reject the Congress demands nor delay her answer, and equally mere verbal promises will be unavailing. Fortunately, the unacceptable scheme of federation has been postponed. What then can we do? Among our war aims, after consulting recognised leaders, we must include, in words acceptable to them, an understanding to establish their democratic freedom as a nation controlling her own destinies. This must carry a pledge admitting her like the Dominions as equal partner in the building of a new world order.

Meanwhile, it is easy without any constitutional changes to realise responsible self-government at the Centre immediately. It is unnecessary to bind the Viceroy to bow to the opinion of India's elected representatives; in fact let him do so. It is unnecessary to define the status of India's responsible Ministers; in fact it would suffice to appoint some to the Viceroy's Council: when they are appointed, let him accept their advice. It might be advisable to dissolve the present Assembly and conduct new elections under the existing provincial franchise. The briefest amending Act will be sufficient.

But if we are brave enough to face the act of faith, let us not spoil it by a timid choice of second rate men. There is only one man who could lead India in the new path. Second only to Mr. Gandhi, Mr. Nehru enjoys India's trust and respect.

The Congress has named him its leader in the present emergency. By making him Premier in fact, if not in name, we should not only win India; we should startle the world into belief in our sincerity.

From Washington to Moscow, every neutral is asking the question that India has posed: is this war for the Imperial *status quo* or a new democratic world order? Not to-day, but months and years hence, our answer may decide the issue of this war. If we give India liberty, we shall win the leadership of all the free peoples; but if we must meet a rebel India with coercion, will anyone in Europe and America mistake us for champions of democracy?

\* \* \*

### Suicidal

THERE are occasions when some people can serve their country better by their silence than by their statements. Sir Chimanlal Setalvad, Sir Cowasji Jahangir and Messrs. V. D. Savarkar, N. C. Kelkar, Jamnadas Mehta and B. R. Ambedkar issued a statement on the 2nd inst., on the eve of the interview which the Viceroy was to have with the Congress leaders, repudiating Mahatma Gandhi's claim that the Congress spoke for all communities in India, and warning the Viceroy against accepting the claim. On the question which is the subject matter of negotiations between the Viceroy and the Congress leaders there can be but little difference of opinion between these leaders and the Congress. If there were any serious differences, they might have pointed out what they were and presented their own views. It would not make much difference with whom the Viceroy negotiated as long as the terms were satisfactory. And if these leaders feared that the Congress would deviate from the right path, they might have indicated the right path, and even repudiated in advance any wide deviation therefrom.

\* \* \*

INSTEAD, they have taken the unfortunate course of running down the Congress by accusing it of making false pretences, being insincere and unreliable, autocratic and fascist, and of having no majority of voters behind it. If all or any of these accusations be well-founded, the appeal lies to the electorate and not to the Viceroy. In preferring the charges to the Viceroy, these leaders have betrayed only their petty jealousies and personal piques, unworthy of the great cause and the great occasion. Even Mr. Jinnah may be ashamed of them!

\* \* \*

### "Resistance to War"

THE communists of Bombay organised in that city on Monday last a general strike of workers

with a view, we presume, of demonstrating the fact that in this war their sympathies are not with England and France, but with the other side. We understand that the Bombay Provincial Trade Union Congress, which at present consists of all sections of the labour movement, passed, under the influence of its communist elements, a resolution some time ago in favour of such a strike, but the other elements later got the Congress to rescind the resolution. In this rescission the communists acquiesced for the moment, but they made it clear that their action was inspired by the sole desire to preserve unity in the labour ranks, and that they would reserve to themselves the freedom to give effect to the original resolution of the Congress, not in the name of the Congress itself, but in the name of the communist members thereof. This freedom they were not long in exercising.

\* \* \*

THE strike passed off without any untoward incident. Knowing full well, as they certainly did, the risks to which they were exposing themselves by their action, the communists would extort the admiration of all for their almost reckless courage in standing up for their view, entirely erroneous as it is in our opinion. We cannot imagine how they conceive it to be their duty to resist the war, if that be their object. Is it that they think that if England is on one side, India must be on the other? Or is it that, in their judgment, England is engaged in an unrighteous cause and India must throw her weight into the scale against England? Or is it that they feel that even if England appears at the moment to be upholding the right, she has an imperialist design in taking up this cause, and India must foil the attempt? Would these communists, one wonders, be reassured of the honesty of British intentions if, like Soviet Russia, Britain were to give a finishing stroke to a bleeding Poland and then to claim a half of the territory? Would they like England to show her devotion to collective security and indivisibility of peace in this entirely non-imperialistic fashion?

\* \* \*

WE are reminded in this connection of a recent utterance by Babu Subhas Chandra Bose in Bombay in which, describing the war in so far as England was concerned in it as an imperialist war, he called upon the people to resist it, but added further that if England granted self-government to India, this country might as well help England in prosecuting the war. This statement deserves comment. If this is an imperialist war on the side of England and therefore needs resistance on our part, how does it cease to be an imperialist war if England grants self-government to India? If the war is an imperialist war, it is because England hopes as a result of it to add to her territory like Russia or, if expansion be impossible, at least to strengthen her power over her existing territory. It may be said that if India obtains self-government, Britain's imperialist intentions will be arrested so far as this country is concerned, but should India, knowing it to be an imperialist war, take active part in conducting it, only because she herself will not be affected by this imperialism? Should she be indifferent to an expansion of British imperialism in other regions, which may take the form either of an extension of British dominions or a tightening of the Britishers' hold on other colonies like Ceylon, Burma and so forth? No, let us not be quite so cynical about other people's freedom, while showing

concern for our own. If it is truly an imperialist war, we must all resist it and must not allow ourselves to be bribed into supporting it by the grant of self-government. The communists are more logical. Only, the war cannot be called an imperialist war except in the sense that it is being waged for the purpose of putting an end to the most sinister of all imperialisms, viz. Naziism.

\* \* \*

#### No Repression Now!

A NOTABLE change that has come over the editing of the Congress Bulletin recently is the discontinuance of that section of it in which, after the foundation of the Indian Civil Liberties Union, the then President of the Congress, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, started the practice of chronicling violations of individual freedom by the Governments in India under the compendious title of "Arrests, Imprisonments and Searches." It is not difficult to understand the embarrassment which would be caused to the Congress if the Bulletin were to blazon forth to the world the interferences with civil liberty that occurred under its own Ministries (since these could not be shut out from such a chronicle) along with similar infringements in non-Congress Provinces. But one would have thought that the Congress leaders might rise superior to any immediate party advantage that could be derived from the suppression of such information and make known to all concerned the many holes that are being made in the dike of personal freedom in this country, so that the people, irrespective of party, may patrol the dike day and night and close the holes. But the Congress can do neither of the two things necessary. It cannot persuade its Ministries to respect civil liberty. Emphasising the need for safeguarding such liberty, Mr. T. T. Krishnamachariar said the other day at the Annamalai University: "The muzzling of the press by Press Acts and the Criminal Law Amendment Act and of free speech by the frequent use of certain sections of the Criminal Law are not unknown to us," and certainly not more unknown under Congress rule than under non-Congress rule. Nor can the Congress subordinate its party interests to general interests, educating the people at large in the creation of a public sentiment strong enough to resist all encroachments upon civil liberty. The only thing that it could do therefore it has done, viz. it has left out all references to repression from its official Bulletin and helped as much as it could to starve the Indian Civil Liberties Union, though it was formed by one of its ex-Presidents.

\* \* \*

#### Propaganda

ANOTHER point that Mr. Krishnamachariar makes in the speech to which reference is made above is the mischief that is done under totalitarian regimes by the modern technique of mass propaganda which consists in a ceaseless repetition of what you want the people to believe. "Unfortunately," says Mr. Krishnamachariar, "such propaganda is not confined to Fascist countries, to Marxist Russia or to Imperialist Britain. It has crept into our country also. So long as these techniques are used by politicians belonging to various groups for the purpose of achieving freedom for the country it was at least useful. But it will not end there. Any method of getting control over the masses which could be used legitimately for a particular purpose would con-

tinue to be used for purposes not quite so legitimate. Pretending to serve national ends, but in reality furthering the interest of one particular pressure group in politics, the propaganda machine will grind ceaselessly. To a nation like ours, a dash of ethics with a flavour of spiritualism makes the appeal irresistible. In this country with its religions being incessantly perverted for the purpose of canonisation of every outstanding individual, the spell of hero-worship envelopes our very existence. A powerful personality makes a stronger appeal to the masses than the plain dictates of reason and what is worse is that, following the practice set in European Fascist countries, there are quite enough numbers of men of position who plead for the subordination of reason to instinct. An example of such an effort occurred recently when Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, in a commentary on satyagraha, said:

Satyagraha, as all know, is a new science and art. It has its own technique. It is not understood by us all. Most of us make an intellectual attempt to understand it; but it is the spirit that has evolved it and it is the spirit which must understand it. We are apt to judge Mahatmaji's technique and his steps and his decisions by a purely rational method. When his decisions do not appeal to our intellect, we deary them. *But we all know that Gandhiji senses things and decides by instinct, and ours is the duty to clothe his decisions once made with the necessary reason and logic.* It is true that this process requires faith in the new cult; for without faith even in science we cannot advance very far.

That, I say, provides the justification for the condemnation of this form of propaganda in the strongest possible terms, and I may assure you that the instance cited is only one of several hundred others which have appeared in the writings and speeches of our public men. That way, I suggest, lies a slavery, both moral and intellectual."

\* \* \*

#### Compulsory Registration of Marriages

THE Bombay Presidency Social Reform Association has circulated a note to municipalities in the Province explaining the utility of making marriage-registration compulsory, like registration of births and deaths. At present there is no record available of marriages performed according to Vedic rites. A case is cited of a widow remarriage that took place in 1926, which was disputed in 1939, in which the wife found it difficult to collect evidence in proof of the marriage. This measure, if brought into operation, would undoubtedly be a great gain as it would help to make the Child Marriage Restraint Act effective. A machinery would come into existence that would bring to light the violations of the above Act. In fact, this measure is an essential preliminary to all legislation regarding marital relations, like measures advocating monogamy and divorce, pending at present before the Bombay legislature. Mrs. Radhabai Subbarayan had given notice of a resolution to be moved in the Central Assembly last year, recommending such a step for the whole of British India. It is not likely that there would be much controversy over such a suggestion. We wish that the praiseworthy attempt of the Social Reform Association in advocating this very practical piece of social reform would be immediately taken up by all municipalities and local boards in the Presidency.

\* \* \*

#### Church and Race in S. Africa

THE *South African Outlook*, a Christian missionary organ in South Africa, in its issue for last month, referred with satisfaction to the "prospect of a widely representative attendance of Non-European delegates" to the World Sunday School Convention to be held in South Africa, and hoped that it would lead to "the Christianizing the youth of this country in all its racial and denominational groups." The *Race Relations News*, published by the South African Institute of Race Relations, in its issue for the same month, however, told another story:

No one who cares about race relations in our country can fail to be distressed by the withdrawal of the Dutch Reformed Church from participation in the World Sunday School Convention, to be held in Durban in July, 1940.

\* \* \*

IF the Non-European Christians are in, the Dutch Reformed Church is out—in a Christian Sunday School Convention! The cause of this action is the Colour Bar. Wrote the *News*:

That the conflict raged over the question whether the Convention should recognise a "Colour Bar," i.e. whether residences, meals, transport, seating accommodation, etc., should be arranged separately for Europeans and for Non-Europeans, is common knowledge. A World Convention of Christian bodies is bound to be international and inter-racial. At previous Conventions no Colour Bar had been imposed. Some organisations desired to maintain this precedent and tradition, and in view of the dominant opposition of White South Africa to "social equality" between members of different races, asked for the inclusion of a "No Colour Bar" clause in the constitution of the Convention. This amounted to a challenge to the D. R. Church, which had been one of the original signatories of the (twice-repeated) invitation for the Convention to be held in South Africa: for, the D. R. Church is against social intermingling of Whites and Non-Whites. Moreover, the difficulty of the D. R. Church was increased by the fact that proposed extensions of the segregation policy had recently become a bitter political question.

\* \* \*

HEATHEN India, which has a similar problem, has a more promising story to tell than Christian South Africa. The situation has been admirably summed up by the Rt. Hon. Viscount Samuel in Sir Radhakrishnan's *Mahatma Gandhi*:

The treatment of the outcastes—it must be frankly said by all who are true friends of India—is a dark blot upon her social and religious history. What kind of religion is it which condemns vast multitudes for no inherent fault, which first degrades, and then keeps them under, for no other reason than that they are degraded? True religion must ever seek to liberate and uplift, never to oppress the human soul.

Gandhi has realised all this with keen, direct insight. He has felt it deeply. In face of an obstinate, obscurantist resistance, he has striven incessantly and indefatigably to raise these millions of suffering people. ... And now he is able to see this movement also steadily gaining ground; he is able to feel the certainty of its ultimate success.

If in Christian South Africa the influence of politics on religion has been to rivet more firmly the chains of the social outcastes, in heathen India it has had the opposite effect. Social evils are as much evils whether committed by Christians or heathens, and should be fought by all true social

reformers, whether Christian or other. It is to be hoped that the reformers in South Africa will achieve the success which those in India have so far achieved, and that this dark blot will soon disappear from the face of the earth altogether.

\* \* \*

#### Preservation of Private Forests

THE Government of Bihar is introducing a Bill in the legislature which has for its object the preservation of private forests in Chota Nagpur. The province of Bihar has a large forest wealth in Ranchi, Manbhum and Hazaribagh districts, but a great proportion of the forest area is in private hand and in this area the race for forest destruction between landlords and tenants is so great that these tracts are almost denuded of all forest. If landlords realised the value of a proper exploitation of their private forests, they would derive great wealth therefrom, and their tenants too would benefit by getting the necessary fuel and timber for agriculture and domestic purposes. But, between them, they manage to devastate the whole area, with disastrous effect upon the economy of the province.

\* \* \*

WHAT usually happens is that when landlords are in need of money—and it is seldom they are not!—they lease their forests to contractors, who try to make the last anna out of the area committed to their hands. Even the young sal saplings are cut and trees uprooted from their very stumps. Landlords get a little ready cash which they value more than tons of money they would make if they invested a little at first to improve the forests and waited for some time for their investment to yield its rich harvest. Tenants, too, abuse the right which may belong to them under the record of rights by cutting down trees below a certain girth for household and agricultural purposes. All this proceeds from ignorance as much as from want of thrift, and it is clear that, faced by such a serious situation involving the utter extinction of a valuable asset, the State cannot stand by but must intervene to preserve and improve the asset.

\* \* \*

THE provisions of the Bihar Government's present Bill are applicable only to forests in Chota Nagpur, and only to those forests in respect of which an authoritative record of rights has been prepared defining the rights of landlords and tenants in the produce of such forests. The Bill's scheme is, first, to impose a few simple restrictions on the exercise of these rights with a view to prolong the life of the forests, and, secondly, to take over (where such restrictions are thought to be insufficient) the forests for management by Government. The restrictions may take any of these forms: prohibition of the cutting of trees for the purpose of fencing (it is the common practice for tenants to cut down sal saplings for fencing); prohibition of the cutting of timber for other than reasonable domestic or agricultural needs; prohibition of the cutting down of trees at a height of more than six inches from the ground ("trees properly felled are cut close to the ground; this enables the young shoots to come up the following year and to grow into tall straight trees; but unskilled or careless woodmen often leave a stump three or four feet high; this means that the young trees which grow from the stump will be deformed and comparatively worthless"); prohibition on

tenants or landlords to graze any other than their own cattle in the forests; etc.

\* \* \*

BUT the private forests which Government will now take over under their own management will be worked as if they were Government forests. Government will spend whatever is required for working such forests and will receive whatever revenue accrues, and will pay to the owners any net profits received. If a deficit results in any year it will be carried forward to the next year without interest and the process will go on till the deficit is made up and a surplus is effected. Under scientific management the forests are likely to give good results, of all which the landlord is the beneficiary and he does not lose in any case except that he has to resist the temptation of raising a little money by giving his forest to a contractor for practically levelling it to the ground. Not only will the Bill benefit the landlords, but it will save the enormous waste of a national asset that is now taking place.

\* \* \*

THE intentions of the Bill are thus described in the statement of objects and reasons:

The bulk of the forests which lie in Chota Nagpur belongs to private persons, and they are being rapidly denuded by both landlords and tenants. The consequences are becoming more serious every year. The land from which the forest is cleared is nearly always unfit for cultivation; the soil is rapidly washed away, leaving bare rock; springs, wells and tanks dry up; cultivation is adversely affected; and the climate itself changes for the worse. In the plains, floods become more severe, owing to the denudation of the catchment areas.

## Articles

### DELHI POURPARLERS

AS we go to press, negotiations are in progress between the Viceroy and Congress leaders as to the manner in which India's active and wholehearted co-operation in the war can be secured instead of the passive and mechanical help that is now forthcoming. The point of immediate practical importance for the Viceroy is to explore the ways in which an effective co-ordination can be established between the Ministries in the Provinces and the Central Government in the prosecution of the war. Such co-ordination will be possible only when the Provincial Governments feel that they can enthusiastically identify themselves, not only with the underlying aims of Britain in waging the war, but with the policy which the Government of India will actually pursue in its warlike operations. In its absence the Provincial Governments will turn themselves, in so far as the prosecution of the war is concerned, into mere instruments of superior authority, which would be derogatory to any self-respecting Ministry; and when the superior authority is bureaucratic and the Provincial Ministries popular such acquiescence might prove fatal. It is therefore

urgently necessary if the Provincial Ministries are to remain at their posts with undiminished prestige that the Central Government should be immediately reconstituted on a popular basis so that any orders and instructions that may issue therefrom will be regarded in the provinces as issuing from a Government to which they can give a sort of mandate or at any rate from a Government in which they have confidence. It appears that the some such reconstitution of the Central Government is under the contemplation of the Viceroy, and that two methods of achieving the result are being considered, one of which is more radical than the other. We earnestly hope that a satisfactory solution will be found of associating popular elements with the Government of India, so that the latter will become, as it is not at present, representative of the Provincial Governments and Legislatures, in so far at least as the questions arising out of the war are concerned.

This opens up the larger question of so firing the imagination of the people as to make them translate the sympathy they feel for Poland, England and France into active support on a nation-wide scale. The kind of declaration asked for in this behalf by the Working Committee of the Congress is being unnecessarily misunderstood. Lord Zetland himself admitted that it was natural for India's aspiration for her own political freedom to be whetted when the cause of the restoration of freedom to a country which had been deprived of it by the use of unlawful force was made by Britain her own. Realising this, however, he complained that Indian leaders had chosen a wrong time to press her claims. He seems to think that India is choosing this hour of difficulty for Britain to win her freedom and

that she is making it a pre-requisite condition of her help that she shall be placed on a footing of equality with other free States. Nothing can be farther from the truth. Indians have confidence enough in their own power to wrest freedom from Britain even when she is unembarrassed by any external troubles. But it is clear that if Britain desires them to help in the prosecution of the war by a national effort, she must do something which will, as Sir S. Radhakrishnan has said, touch their imagination. And their imagination and the imagination of other non-European peoples will be touched if Britain does not regard the war as the outcome of a quarrel in a far-off corner of Europe, but treats it as an issue concerning a new world order. Britain in fact puts the matter on this high ground, and all that Indians want is that by taking some immediate action in India she shall show to the whole world that she will be true to this wider objective. The Congress Working Committee itself envisages Indian freedom as part of a larger scheme for the reconstruction of a new order in the world. It does not stress Indian political freedom as an end in itself; much less does it stipulate Indian freedom as a condition of India giving help in the war. But Indian leaders from the nature of the case will be unable, in spite of all their will, to persuade the people at large to give that utmost co-operation which it would be within their power to give, and for which the need becomes even more urgent now than before as the difficulties of Britain are thickening. It is to be devoutly hoped that the Viceroy and the British Government will have the vision to say the right word and take the right action, and that promptly at this psychological moment.

## MAHATMA GANDHI; a Reminiscence.

### I

THE 2nd October was the seventieth anniversary of the birthday of Mahatma Gandhi. It was celebrated not only in India but in many other parts of the world, and tributes have been paid to his unique personality and services to humanity. Not the least among them is the publication of *Mahatma Gandhi: Essays and Reflections on his Life and Work*,\* edited by Sir S. Radhakrishnan and presented to the Mahatma on his birthday. It was a noble conception nobly executed, worthy of the subject and the editor. The book contains tributes by sixty men and women of eminence in various fields of human activity in many parts of the world. Not the least important, scholarly and balanced of these is contained in the Introduction by

\* *Mahatma Gandhi*, Ed. by Sir S. RADHAKRISHNAN. (Allen & Unwin.) 1939. 383p. 7/6.

Sir Radhakrishnan himself. The tributes are not emotional exuberances perhaps permissible and forgivable on such occasions, but critical appreciations and reflections on the man and his work. Special significance attaches to the tribute paid by of the Rt. Hon. J. C. Smuts, once again the Prime Minister of South Africa, for the reason that he himself gives.

It is fitting that I, as an opponent of Gandhi's generation ago, should now salute the veteran as he reaches the scriptural limits of three score years and ten. . . . Men like him redeem us all from a sense of commonplaceness and futility, and are an inspiration to us not to be weary in well-doing. . . . It was my fate to be the antagonist of a man for whom even then I had the highest respect. That clash on the small stage of South Africa brought out certain qualities of Gandhi's character which have since become more prominently displayed in his later large-scale operations in India. And they show that while he was prepared to go all out for the cause a

which he championed, he never forgot the human background of the situation, never lost his temper or succumbed to hate, and preserved his gentle humour even in the most trying situations. His manner and spirit even then, as well as later, contrasted markedly with the ruthless and brutal forcefulness which is the vogue in our day.

Most people, whether admirers or critics, will agree with following estimate of Gen. Smuts of the Mahatma:

Many people, even some who sincerely admire him, will differ from some of his ideas and some of his ways of doing things. His style of doing things is individual, is his own, and, as in the case of other great men, does not conform to the usual standards. But, however often we may differ from him, we are conscious all the time of his sincerity, his unselfishness, and, above all, of his fundamental and universal humanity. He always acts as a great human with deep sympathy for men of all classes and all races and especially the under-dog. His outlook has nothing sectional about it, but is distinguished by that universal and eternal human which is the hall-mark of true greatness of spirit.

Gen. Smuts had felt the full force of the Mahatma's technique of political action, and in consequence his criticism of the method is all the more significant, for he repeatedly suggests that the Mahatma's "distinctive contribution to political method" "deserves the attention of political thinkers" all over the world. It works, says Gen. Smuts,

not by reasoning or persuasion, but by arousing the much deeper-lying emotions of fear, of shame, of repentance, of sympathy, of humanity, and of other feelings below the threshold of conscious thought, which in their mass effect prove much more potent than reasoning or persuasion. . . . The technique is based on the principle of suffering and the purifying effect of vicarious suffering and ennobling effect which high tragedy has in accordance with the Aristotelean definition. . . . The argument of suffering is and remains the most effective in the world.

Of the effectiveness of the method in South Africa Gen. Smuts says:

For him everything went according to plan. For me—the defender of law and order—there was the usual trying situation, the odium of carrying out a law which had not strong public support, and, finally the discomfiture when the law had to be repealed. For him it was a successful coup.

Of its achievement in India Gen. Smuts says:

In India it has worked wonders and carried Gandhi to successes and heights of achievement which would probably have been unattainable otherwise.

Gen. Smuts speaks of the "skeleton in the cupboard" of South Africa in the form of the "Indian problem". Once again it has been given to him, as Prime Minister of South Africa, to attempt a solution of that problem, and it is to be hoped that the gallant General will remember his own estimate of the Mahatma and his method and act wisely and well.

## II

On the occasion of the celebration of the anniversary of his seventieth birthday, there is much in the world to depress the Mahatma and give a sense

of defeat and frustration and even shake his faith. For over thirty years of his very full and significant life he has been preaching and practising with all the conviction and zeal of a prophet the doctrine of non-violence in thought, word and deed in all aspects of human, and even sub-human, relations—almost a cosmic concept. Love, and not violence, everywhere, in all circumstances, for all causes. He had hoped to see his method believed in and adopted increasingly in India first and then in other parts of the world. India would once again have had the proud privilege of leading the world from violence to non-violence, from hate to love. He gave his message at a time when it had a special appeal to a disarmed India struggling for self-respect, and a war-weary world reaching out for an alternative method. If the League of Nations was the tribunal for the expression of the moral judgment of the world, the Mahatma's method was the instrument for giving effect to that judgment. It was a magnificent and inspiring vision, not beyond the reach of realisation.

But as the days passed, the vision grew dim and dissolved away. As if to mock the Mahatma's non-violence, violence has overspread the world, both in national and international affairs. To-day it seems to have reached its high water-mark. And Mr. Edward Thompson would seem to be right when he said of the Mahatma:

He is at a disadvantage to-day, in a world where nation after nation is being welded into a club of destruction to strike down other nations. His *ahimsa* weapon, which in his hands was so sharp and strong, is blunted.

In spite of such successes in India as Gen. Smuts referred to, the Mahatma has to confess in the last issue of the *Harijan* that he failed to persuade the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress to declare at this supreme moment "their undying faith in non-violence as the only sovereign remedy for saving mankind from destruction." His own instruments are slipping away from his hands. He confesses his helplessness to persuade the Congress to an "extended application of non-violence". He speaks of his "limitations and weaknesses" and of the "many local cases of violence that I helplessly witness daily".

Incidentally, he refers to the limitations of Congressmen and pays a compliment to the British Government:

All that they (Congressmen) had learnt truly was that they could put up a successful fight, on the whole non-violent, against the British Government. Congressmen have had no training in the use of non-violence in other fields. Thus, for example, they have not yet discovered a sure method of dealing successfully in a non-violent manner with communal riots or goondaism. The argument is final inasmuch as it is based on actual experience.

Mr. Edward Thompson emphasises this aspect and thinks that the Mahatma's weapon of non-violence depends for its effectiveness not only upon the resolve of one party to be non-violent

but also upon the humanity and considerateness of the other party. He says:

It was a pair of scissors, needing two blades, his own and his opponent's. It succeeded in India because it was used against a Government that, however imperfectly, recognised that the game of insurrection and repression had rules: his enemy had streaks of humanity and liberalism. The Government therefore found itself ultimately helpless, when line after line of Nationalists stood up fearlessly, to be struck down by the *lathis* of the police, while British spectators were overcome with shame and American journalists hurried off to cable home their indignation. It was a world in which, if you had the strength to endure to the end, you were sure to be saved and to see your cause saved also!

Mr. Thompson thinks that the method would be inapplicable if the opponent is a Nazi or Fascist Power. But the Mahatma has not admitted that non-violence will not succeed, however the opponent may choose to behave. In the latest issue of the *Harijan* he says:

I have not lost the hope that the masses will refuse to bow to the Moloch of war but will rely upon their capacity for suffering to save the country's honour. How has the undoubted military valour of Poland served her against the superior forces of Germany and Russia? Would Poland unarmed have fared worse if it had met the challenge of these combined forces with the resolution to face death without retaliation? Would the invading forces have taken a heavier toll from an infinitely more valorous Poland? It is highly probable that their essential nature would have made them desist from a wholesale slaughter of innocents.

### III

A lesser man would have given up his faith in non-violence. But not the Mahatma. He admits only the weakness of others and his own limitation, but not a diminution of his faith in his technique and its practicability, and is not without hope that it will one day prevail. He asserts:

I have no manner of doubt that if it is possible to train millions in the black art of violence which is the law of the beast, it is more possible to train them in the white art of non-violence which is the law of regenerate man.

He cherishes a high mission for the Congress and India:

Of all the organisations in the world the Congress is the best fitted to show it the better way, indeed the only way, to the true life. Its non-violent experiment will have been in vain if, when India wakes up from the present fear, she does not show to the world the way of deliverance from the blood bath. The criminal waste of life and wealth that is now going on will not be the last if India does not play her natural part by showing that human dignity is best preserved not by developing the capacity to deal destruction but by refusing to retaliate.

He would urge co-operation between England and India in a non-violent combat with the totalitarian powers.

I would at once ask the English to lay down arms, free all their vassals, take pride in being called "Little Englanders" and defy all the totalitarians of the world to do their worst. Englishmen will then die unresistingly and go down to History as heroes

of non-violence. I would further invite Indians to co-operate with Englishmen in this godly martyrdom. It will be an indissoluble partnership drawn up in letters of the blood of their own bodies, not of their so-called enemies.

Whether his advice be accepted or not by others, he is clear about his own position. His faith is invincible.

My line is cast. . . . I have no choice as to the means. It must be purely non-violent. . . . And even at the risk of being misunderstood, I must act in obedience to "the still small voice."

The Rt. Hon. Viscount Samuel recalls that the saying "To the dead the roses; to the living the thorns" was said in irony and suggests the offer of roses to the living, when well deserved. He thus ends his own tribute to the Mahatma:

Gandhiji, at this moment of retrospect, may well feel content with the survey. Let others, too, bring him their tribute. He has often been pricked and scorched with the bitter thorns. Let us offer him now the roses of our gratitude.

## SOUTH AFRICA AND THE WAR

THE debates which preceded the declaration of war by South Africa cannot but be of immense interest to us in India. From the South African papers to hand by the last mail, it appears that on the 4th September last, the day after England declared war against Germany, Gen. Hertzog, then Prime Minister, moved the following proposition in the Union Parliament:

The existing relations between the Union of South Africa and the various belligerent countries will in so far as the Union is concerned persist unchanged and continue as if no war is being waged.

Upon the understanding, however, that the existing relations and obligations between the Union and Great Britain or any other member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, in so far as such relations or obligations result from contractual undertakings relating to the naval base at Simonstown; or from its membership in the League of Nations; or in so far as such relations and obligations result more implicitly from the free association of the Union with the other members of the British Commonwealth, shall continue unimpaired and shall be maintained by the Union, and no one shall be permitted to use Union territory for the purpose of doing anything which may in any way impair the said relations and obligations.

Gen. Smuts moved the following amendment:

This House declares that the policy of the Union in this crisis should be based on the following principles:

- (1) It is in the interest of the Union that its relations with the German Reich should be severed and that it refuse to adopt an attitude of neutrality in this conflict.
- (2) The Union should carry out the obligations to which it has agreed and continue its co-operation with its friends and associates in the British Commonwealth of Nations.
- (3) The Union shall take all necessary measures for the defence of its territory and South African interests, and the Government should not send forces overseas as in the last war.

- (4) This House is profoundly convinced that the freedom and independence of the Union are at stake in this conflict, and it is therefore in our interests to oppose the use of force as an instrument of national policy.

Gen. Hertzog's resolution was defeated and Gen. Smuts' amendment was carried by a majority of 80 to 67.

It was common ground between the two Generals that South Africa was, as an independent nation, free to make her choice and that any decision must have reference to the national interests of South Africa, and that, in any event, there was no question of active participation in the war by the despatch of South African troops abroad as was done in the last war.

The real difference between the two Generals was whether South Africa should declare a state of neutrality or of belligerency and the interpretation of national interests. Gen. Hertzog avowed that his policy was in consonance with loyalty to both the Dutch and British sections of the South African Whites. (He was not thinking of the non-Whites, for he said that the population of South Africa was only 2 million people!) It was also in consonance with South Africa's political status, and with her obligations to the British Commonwealth of Nations and the League of Nations. And above all, it would keep South Africa out of the war. Gen. Smuts, on the other hand, contended that the merits of the case as well South Africa's obligations to the British Commonwealth of Nations and international law and practice demanded that she should "sever relations with Germany, have no trade with her, have no truck with her, that her representatives in this country, her ships in our harbours should all be treated on that basis—the recognised basis of international law."

There was a difference of opinion between the two Generals on the merits of the war. Gen. Hertzog recalled that at the Imperial Conference of 1935 he had predicted that unless that "monster, the Treaty of Versailles," was altered so as to return to Germany what had been taken away from her, there would be no peace in the world, for the embittered German nation, led by Herr Hitler, would do anything to end her humiliation. "I have gone through this struggle myself," said the General, "and I know what it is to be trampled underfoot so long that eventually one prefers destruction to further humiliation." He denied that Herr Hitler aimed at world domination, and asserted that, in consequence, he was not a danger to South Africa. Gen. Smuts admitted that there might be a difference of opinion in this matter, but held that since September 1938 Herr Hitler's objective had undergone a change. Till then people could trust Herr Hitler; they even recognised that there was a strong case in his favour when he claimed the return of Sudetenland to Germany, and there was a disposition to make concessions to him. But his subsequent annexation of non-German parts of Czechoslovakia had shown

that the real objective of Herr Hitler was world domination, and that that was a threat to South Africa.

The most effective part of Gen. Smuts' case was Germany's claim for the return of the Colonies, which included German South-West Africa. "We are not dealing with a far-away problem in Eastern Europe, but with an issue which may touch us here." And he added: "When the German demand for the return of South-West Africa is made at the point of the bayonet, we will stand alone."

From the press summaries available, it is not clear whether Gen. Hertzog had taken note of the problem of German South-West Africa and whether he intended to return it in view of his sympathy for the return to Germany of what had been taken away from her by the Versailles Treaty. His previous actions do not lend support to the view that he was willing to return the colony. His War Minister, Mr. Oswald Pirow, had an ingenious solution: Germany should be given the Portuguese colonies!

Nor did Gen. Smuts explain how, if Hitler aspired to world domination, South Africa was in any greater danger than all the other countries in the world which had so far remained neutral and some of which are situated far too inconveniently near to Germany. World domination will not be limited only to the recovery of Germany South-West Africa and the annexation of South Africa.

Gen. Hertzog referred to South Africa's obligations as a member of the League of Nations. But the League has not met and pronounced, nor called for sanctions, economic or military. He admitted the obligations as a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, but they would be fully met by his policy of friendly neutrality towards Britain. But Gen. Smuts felt that it was not enough. "Such an action would practically dissociate us from our friends in the Commonwealth. Nothing would be more fatal for this country, poor as it is in defence and rich in its resources, than to dissociate itself directly or indirectly from its friends in the Commonwealth."

Gen. Smuts advanced a constitutional argument in favour of his amendment and against Gen. Hertzog's proposition:

To my mind, if we are to take up the middle course the Prime Minister proposes, we would be adopting an attitude unknown to international law. In a war you are either a friend or an enemy. The Prime Minister wants to be a friend, but he wants to temper his friendship with acts and behaviour which no hostile Power will ever recognise as legal or proper. If we are prepared to adopt this course we shall be up against the gravest difficulties possible. No nation in the world—certainly not Germany—would be under an obligation to recognise that behaviour.

It is venturesome to question the constitutional authority of Gen. Smuts. But it may be that the evolution of international law in case of war is



not completed, and Gen. Hertzog, who is not without experience of international law, may prefer to write a new chapter. Germany herself is writing several new chapters in international law and is not likely to boggle at Gen. Hertzog's innovation, if it suits her.

Finally, Gen. Hertzog said that Gen. Smuts had agreed that "we would not take part in any war unless it was in our direct interest to do so." And he advocated qualified neutrality. Gen. Smuts agreed with the premise, but came to a different conclusion. "I think that from the narrowest point of view of South Africa's own interests we should be false to the future of South Africa if we adopted the course advocated by the Prime Minister."

It is interesting to note that neither of the protagonists suggested that general principles of democracy and international morality were at stake. It is true that Gen. Smuts ended his amendment by suggesting that the use of force as an instrument of national policy should be opposed, but that too he defended on the ground that it was "in our interests." And he discovered this only on this occasion, and not all the time, since the foundation of the League of Nations, of which he was a distinguished sponsor, that force was being used as an instrument of national policy by Japan, Italy and Germany.

P. KODANDA RAO

## Reviews

### SIGMUND FREUD'S THEORIES

**MOSES AND MONOTHEISM.** By SIGMUND FREUD. (Hogarth Press.) 1939. 22cm. 223p. 8/6.

THIS book is a reiteration and wider application of the theory propounded 25 years ago in Freud's book "Totem and Taboo." Half of the book is devoted to reconstructing the history of the Jews from their exodus from Egypt to the founding of a religion under the God Jahve. Freud places the exodus just after the reign of Ikhnaton. Moses, an Egyptian Governor imbued with Ikhnaton's monotheism, flies away from Egypt with some of his followers and, also taking the Israelite tribes with him, imposes the new religion on them. The tribes kill Moses, take up another religion, but finally go back to Mosaic monotheism after a few centuries. Not a single fact, in the sequence given above, is based on archaeological evidence. The sequence is at best today a conjecture awaiting historical evidence. Just as the idea of Totem and Taboo arose from the killing of the father, so did the idea of a supreme god arise from the same source. The mighty father who was put to a violent death asserted his supremacy in the form of a godhead after centuries of repression. Freud gives a sequence of social evolution. At first there were small herds with the male reigning supreme. The sons are all driven away, but conspire and kill the father. After the deed comes a revulsion of feeling and the mother-taboo. The killing of the father

ushered in an era of matriarchate and mother-goddesses, which in turn gives place to patriarchal families and a supreme god reigning in heaven. The last phase is depicted in Jewish history, where the Jews enacted anew the ancient sin of father-murder in the killing of their leader and prophet Moses, in whom the revulsion came in the form of monotheism.

Freud asserts that just as there are memory traces of a remote period in an individual's life, so also there are memory-traces of race-history. These repressed memories sometimes came to the surface as in the case of St. Paul, who suddenly became aware of the fact, that mankind had committed a sin which had to be atoned for. The sin was atoned for by the son of God. According to Freud, the original sin so suddenly realised by St. Paul is the mass-murder of the fathers in the primitive horde. The son in the shape of Christ atoned for it, but in so doing, reigned instead of the father. Thus, whereas the Jewish religion had contented itself with a mere reinstatement of the supremacy of the father, the whole drama was played to the end in the Christian religion. Freud asserts that the step from matriarchate and mother-goddesses to patriarchate and supreme god is a great spiritualising step, inasmuch as the fact of motherhood can be grasped by the senses, while the fact of fatherhood is a mental reconstruction! What then about the primal horde, where the father reigned supreme? Why does phylogenetic memory stop at the supposed father-murder and does not go back to prehuman ancestry?

The sequence of father-horde, matriarchate and patriarchy is not acceptable to the majority of sociologists. The transition from polytheism to monotheism has been accomplished by other nations without the sense of guilt pervading the Jewish and Christian religions. According to Freud, Egyptian monotheism arose out of imperial rule and supremacy. Apparently no memory traces of original sin were required there. Why then does he make that the source of all monotheism?

It is a curious book, conjecture piled on conjecture, analogies taken as proofs, and the psychology of modern life is projected into dim half-understood ages in the history of the race.

The only justification of the book seems to be the psychological necessity of the Jews in their present condition, the necessity to remind themselves that though physically weak, they are spiritually great; though driven out from their countries, they are God's chosen people; and that history shall repeat itself by bringing about the utter ruin and downfall of their persecutors.

IRAWATI KARVE

### SHORT NOTICES

**ESSAYS AND STUDIES.** By THE MEMBERS OF THE ENGLISH ASSOCIATION (U. P. BRANCH). (Indian Press, Allahabad.) 1938. 28cm. 179p. Rs. 2.

I HAVE enjoyed reading this book. I approached it as a thorough-going sceptic in the beginning. For I am one of those who think that for an Indian to turn out creative or critical work in English in the manner of an Englishman is like trying to strike root on barren soil. But the

foreword by the president of the Association, Prof. Amaranatha Jha, was very assuring. And articles like "Medieval Sidelights on *Paradise Lost*" and "George Crabbe" justified the publication along with other illuminating critiques on English poetry. It is rather hard to understand the enthusiasm of an Indian student of English literature for Kipling's work. It has to be admitted nevertheless that the two articles on Kipling in the collection bring out the 'soul of goodness' in his work, observingly.

A far more significant line of thinking has been opened up by the articles on "The English Association", "The Teaching of English Composition" and "The Universities of India." Along with the foreword, they make an earnest attempt at solving the queerest of all queer problems—the teaching of English in India. That English will continue to dominate our cultural and national life for many years more is hardly to be doubted. It is also true that the sounds of spoken English have been almost tragically neglected in our country. But it is desirable to modify slightly the means of study recommended in the brilliant article on "The Universities of India" for establishing a new scale of values in academic India: the mother-tongue of the student ought to replace 'a modern European tongue' and count, along with a classical language and English, as an important factor in moulding the outlook of the younger generation. Mr. Deb himself, in fact, is candid on this point. He says that his proposal may not be impossible for the 'small and honourable minority' and that it is addressed only to them. But even this minority will have to realise the paramount place of the modern Indian languages in any scheme for a formulation of new values in the academic life of this country.

The book is excellently got up. We need not mind the multiplication of the branches of the English Association in India if this is the spirit in which they may be expected to work.

We congratulate the U. P. branch of the English Association on having adopted and followed such a high standard in the sphere of literary and educational criticism.

V. K. GOKAK

**SOCIAL REFORM ANNUAL, 1939.** Ed. by P. S. BAKHALE. (Bombay Presidency Social Reform Association.) 1939. 22cm. 156p. As. 12.

THIS is the second publication of the Bombay Presidency Social Reform Association in a series started to review, co-ordinate and compile information about the progress of Social Reform, and point the direction for further advance.

A most interesting discussion contained in this number deserves special notice. The funny phenomenon of a double marriage ceremony undergone now-a-days by the self-same parties, under old Vedic rites as well as the Special Marriage Act, need proper analysing and explanation. Two totally different methods seem to be adopted without a sense of their evident incongruity and consequences following under the legal system. While evincing a desire for a reformed marriage system, this clearly displays a partiality for the old custom, certain merits of which cannot evidently be allowed to disappear. Various legal luminaries have offered their opinions; Dr. Ambedkar among these has offered constructive suggestions which show the way for further improvement in existing legislation. To quote his own words, "It is desirable to have the Act amended in such a way as to have the marriage performed in both ways and to give the parties an opportunity to declare by what rules their marital rights as to divorce, maintenance and right to property shall be governed."

The comprehensive article and valuable statistics on the operation of the Child Marriage Restraint Act in various provinces and States, the inventory of Bills on Social Reform pending before the various legislatures, central and provincial, and other interesting accounts of social work and social problems by well-known workers in those particular fields impress upon the reader the essential need of gauging the advance that is being made in the cause of Social Reform. One looks forward to an enlarging of its scope next year, and to its dealing comprehensively with still more problems, needing urgent attention.

SHANTA BHALERAO

## ARMY MECHANISATION MR. KUNZRU'S SPEECH

*In moving a motion for adjournment in the Council of State on 18th September, Dr. Hinday Naih Kunzru made the following speech on the Chatfield Committee's recommendations.*

**S**IR, I move:

The adjournment of the business of this House in order to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the unsatisfactory announcement made by His Majesty's Government regarding the recommendations of the Chatfield Committee.

Before I deal with these recommendations, Sir, I should like to refer to the sum of Rs. 45 crores provided by His Majesty's Government for the modernization of the forces in this country, including the British forces maintained here. Rs. 33¼ crores are given as a free gift, and Rs. 11¾

crores have been advanced free of interest for five years. There is no one here who does not appreciate warmly the gift made by His Majesty's Government. In times like this the modernization of the forces is necessary, and had we had to depend on our own resources it would have been utterly impossible. But while I appreciate fully the generosity of His Majesty's Government, I cannot fail to take into account other considerations which have a very important bearing on the question that we are considering and the fact that India is a valuable part of the British Empire.

Sir, the Report of the Chatfield Committee raises many issues, but it is impossible for me to discuss all of them in the course of 15 minutes. I would, therefore, confine myself to such points as appear to me to be most important. There are three recommendations which seem to me to be

of a more fundamental character than any of the other recommendations made by the Committee. One is that Indian forces should help His Majesty's Government in maintaining "India's external security". The second is that one-tenth of the forces in India should be available for this purpose. The third is that if these forces are used outside India in an emergency, their ordinary maintenance charges should continue to be borne by India. The Committee consider that this last recommendation of theirs, while justified on general grounds, can be regarded as fair in the light also of the contribution of £2 millions to be annually made by His Majesty's Government towards military expenditure in this country.

I will take these points in the order in which I have mentioned them. So far, Sir, we had been assured that the forces maintained in India were no more than were necessary for the protection of India against minor attacks and the maintenance of internal security. Now, however, we are told that modernization, resulting in increased striking power and a greater mobility, will enable us not only to reduce our forces but also to regard one-tenth of them as an Imperial reserve. This matter is one of considerable constitutional importance, for it vitally affects our freedom. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief in his broadcast stated that it was necessary for the defence of India herself that she should help in the maintenance of security in the Red Sea and the Suez Canal. His language reminds me of the remark of Mr. Baldwin some years ago that England's frontiers were on the Rhine. We have been told in effect by the Chatfield Committee that our frontiers are in Egypt, on the Suez Canal and in Singapore. This recommendation is sought to be justified on the ground that the situation has changed considerably since the Garran Tribunal reported and that in modern circumstances it is necessary for India in her own interest to bear a larger responsibility in respect of her defence. Her defence might be best secured by measures taken outside her borders.

Now, Sir, I should like to ask one or two questions on this point. Are we alone interested in Singapore and the Suez Canal, or have, say, Australia, New Zealand, too, any interest in them? If I remember aright, the Singapore base was constructed primarily because Australia and New Zealand pressed for it, but have His Majesty's Government thereby secured any claim over any portion of the Australian or New Zealand forces for the defence either of Singapore or the Suez Canal? These countries which are self-governing may of their own free will help England, not only with a small portion of their forces, but with a very large proportion of them; but in this country an additional responsibility is imposed on us without giving us the political power that these countries have. We have repeatedly asked that our men should not be sent beyond our borders without our consent, and we are told now that our forces will be sent out of India as a matter of course, that we must maintain an Imperial reserve and that His Majesty's Government will not pay for the use even outside India of the reserve which will consist of one-tenth of our forces. Reading between the lines of the Chatfield Committee's Report, it seems to me that what the Committee is really asking for from us is not co-operation merely in the defence of Egypt but co-operation everywhere with the Imperial Government whenever a crisis arises. If that is the situation, let it be frankly

facial. To-day you have told us that our external frontiers are in Egypt. Tomorrow you may tell us that the defence of Cyprus, Malta or Gibraltar is also vital in our own interests. To what extent then do you propose to go on imposing burdens on us? Such burdens can be imposed only with the consent of a self-governing India, but they cannot be accepted by us at present.

Now, Sir, I come to deal with the financial aspect of the question, which is no less important than its constitutional aspect. The House knows the provision made in Section 22 of the Government of India Act, 1919, with regard to the employment of forces beyond the external frontiers of India. Roughly speaking, it was laid down that no expenditure could be incurred on military operations carried on beyond the external frontiers of India without the consent of both Houses of Parliament. This provision was made use of in 1914, but only after the Imperial Legislative Council had passed a Resolution expressing its desire to bear a share of the heavy military expenditure in which His Majesty's Government were involved. Later on, when the provision was made with regard to the transfer of the naval forces of India to the Admiralty in an emergency, Section 22, to which I have referred, was amended expressly by Parliament in 1927 in order to provide that expenditure on the transferred naval forces shall not be defrayed without the consent of both Houses of Parliament unless they were employed on Indian naval defence. In the new Government of India Act the language has been altered. Section 150 of the Act says:

No burden shall be imposed on the revenues of the Federation or the Provinces except for the purposes of India or some part of India.

The language is obviously wider than before. The Joint Select Committee in dealing with a similar proposal in the White Paper said that:

A contribution in the general interests of India would come within the scope of that provision.

But they went on to add:

Under the new constitution, however, the recognition of interests of this nature would fall within the province of the Federal Ministry and the Legislature since *ex hypothesi* they would not be defence interests. If, therefore, the questions would arise of offering a contribution from Indian revenues in the circumstances that we are discussing (and the interest in question is not under the other reserved department of external affairs), we are of opinion that it would need to be ratified by the Federal Legislature.

Under the section as it stands it was thought that only a modification of the Act could permit the defraying of expenditure from Indian revenues on operations carried on outside the Indian frontiers. Now, however, by laying down that India is vitally interested in the defence of Egypt, by saying in other words that Indian forces can be employed in Egypt "for the purposes of India", it appears to me that you are getting round this provision and that the constitutional safeguard which it was meant to provide has been rendered nugatory.

There are many recommendations that I should like to refer to, but I shall be able to deal only with one more before my time is over. It concerns, Sir, the contribution made by His Majesty's Government towards Indian military expenditure.

Those who have read the Report of the Garran Tribunal will recognise that, whatever reasons might have been advanced for making a contribution of one and a half million pounds and whatever grounds might be put forward now for increasing it by half a million pounds, England agreed to give it because of the maintenance of costly British forces in this country and the long controversy between India and England over the payment of the capitation charges. I do not at all agree that the payment of this contribution gives any moral right to England to look upon any part of the armed forces of India as an Imperial reserve. It gives her no right to ask us to maintain any forces not needed by us, unless India decides of her own free will to help England. I have no doubt that she would have co-operated fully if the constitutional situation were far different to that which prevails now. But in the existing situation you cannot merely by your fiat go on increasing the burdens to be placed on Indian shoulders.

Now, Sir, we have been told that an advantage to be derived from the capital contribution of Rs. 45 crores made by His Majesty's Government is that it would be possible to organise and, where necessary, expand the ordnance factories which supply all the three services. Now, I am glad that our ordnance factories will be expanded, but I should like to know whether any new branch of manufacture will be started. I refer in this connection particularly to the manufacture of aeroplanes. We may be told that our own requirements are not sufficient to make the manufacture of aeroplanes economical in this country. But to-day His Majesty's Government are purchasing aeroplanes from Canada and Australia. The manufacture of planes in these countries has been made possible only because of the co-operation of His Majesty's Government. For their air forces are not large enough to require the manufacture of aeroplanes in their own territories. Apart from this, Sir, I should like to draw the attention of the House to an agreement recently arrived at between the British Government and the Australian Government with regard to the manufacture of aircraft. I am quoting, Sir, from the report of a discussion initiated by Mr. Wimperis on "Air Power", in *International Affairs* for July-August, 1939. He states here that *The Times* of the 11th May, 1939, reported:

That the Home Government and the Australian Government had joined together to create centres of aircraft manufacture in Melbourne and Sydney, and that a start was to be made on behalf of both Governments on no less than ten million pounds worth of aircraft.

Well, this is what can be achieved by means of co-operation. If His Majesty's Government are going to place new burdens on us, they might at least help us to increase our industrial development, especially in those directions which are necessary for the defence of India. We all know, Sir, that the present inability of India to provide for modern defence requirements is due to the fact that she is primarily an agricultural country. If she is to be enabled to meet her own responsibility in future, she must be able to industrialise herself. His Majesty's Government could give

valuable help in this connection, but, while they are going to purchase aircraft from Canada and Australia, they have not thought it necessary to enter into any arrangement with India for the manufacture of aeroplanes in this country.

Sir, as I have no more time, I shall conclude my observations by saying that even after taking into account the generous free gift of Rs. 33½ crores made by His Majesty's Government, I cannot but look upon the recommendations of the Chatfield Committee as highly detrimental to our constitutional future and as throwing the door wide open to the imposition of indefinite military and financial responsibilities on us in the future.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

- EXERCISES IN THE BATH. By T. R. TONGA. (Putnam.) 1938. 20cm. 125p. 5/-.
- CRIME AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE. By ABUL HASANAT. (The Standard Library, Dacca.) 1939. 18cm. 915p. Rs. 5/8.
- THE INDIAN INCOME-TAX ACT. By T. S. VISWANATHA AIYAR and S. KRISHNAMURTHI. (The Madras Law Journal Office.) 1939. 25cm. 196p. Re. 1.
- GENERAL WAGE CENSUS. Part I-Perennial Factories. (Bombay Labour Office.) 1939. 23cm. 183p. As. 11.
- AN AFRICAN SURVEY. By LORD HAILEY. (Oxford University Press.) 1938. 22cm. 1837p. 21/-.
- DR. SIR CHIMANLAL H. SETALVAD. By J. R. B. JEEJEEBHOY. (Taraporevala.) 1939. 22cm. 93p. Rs. 2/8.
- MOSES AND MONOTHEISM. By SIGMUND FROED. (Hogarth Press.) 1939. 22cm. 223p. 6/8.
- AN ATLAS OF FAR EASTERN POLITICS. By G. F. HUDSON and MARATHE RAJCHMAN. (Faber and Faber.) 1938. 22cm. 160p. 7/6.

States People's and Kisan Organisations and Workers !

## READ ORISSA STATES ENQUIRY

Vol. I

JUST OUT

Price : Rs. 5 — Postage : As. 8

Available from :

1. Secretary, Orissa States People's Conference,  
Chandi Chowk P.O., CUTTACK.

Or

2. "The States People,"  
138, Medows Street, Fort, BOMBAY.