

# THE Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.—Office : Servants of India Society's Home, Poona ( D. G. ).

VOL. XI, No. 7.

POONA—THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1928.

INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.  
FOREIGN 10s. 6d.

## CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ... ..	77
ARTICLES :—	
Getting up the Case for the Prosecution. By Dr. H. C. E. Zacharias, Ph.D. ... ..	79
Mr. Banerji on the Commission. By Prof. V. N. Godbole, M.A. ... ..	81
The Transfer of the Government of India to the Crown. By Prof. G. R. Abhyankar, B.A., LL.B. ... ..	81
OUR EUROPEAN LETTER ... ..	83
OUR PARLIAMENTARY LETTER ... ..	85
OUR U. P. LETTER ... ..	86
REVIEWS :—	
Native Trusteeship. By H. Stanton ... ..	87
American Rural Life. By Rao Bahadur Prof. P. C. Patil, L.Ag., M.Sc. ... ..	88
SHORT NOTICE ... ..	88
BOOKS RECEIVED ... ..	88

## TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

IT is clear from Sir Basil Blackett's statement that he regards the vote in favour of the 'Sine die' postponement of the Reserve Bank as a rejection of the principle of the Bill and as a hostile gesture. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya expressed the sense of the National party when he said that what the country wanted was that the financial control now vested in the Secretary of State should be transferred to the representatives of the people. Unless this is assured to the satisfaction of the majority of the Assembly members, it is impossible to steer any bill proposing a Central Bank, through the Assembly. While the Government is positive about the undesirability of the representation of Legislators on the directorate of the Bank, the Assembly is equally convinced about the indispensability of the Legislators as an equipoise to the nominees of the Government. With such a divergence of views on a fundamental issue it does not come as a surprise that the Bill has been wrecked. Holding as we do the opinion that even without the presence of the representatives of the Assembly on the directorate of the Bank a shareholders' Bank was worth having, we naturally regret the decision of the Assembly to postpone *sine die* the Bill which would have given a Reserve Bank which although not a State Bank would have transferred real power from the Executive to an Indian Bank. Mr. N. M. Joshi was quite pertinent when he remarked that the convention about the non-inter-

vention of the Home Government when the Assembly and Government of India agreed on a financial measure was violated in this case and this violation was the beginning of the changes of tactics which made the chequered history of the Bill during its last stages. If so, Sir Basil Blackett must be personally absolved from the responsibility for this *debacle*. Certain journals have tried to justify the intervention of the Secretary of State by referring to the tangle which resulted from the negotiations over the qualifications of the Directors in the last session. But the tangle would have been avoided by less heroic measures than the dramatic suspension of the Bill. In fact a little more compromise could have been tried before the game was given up as hopeless. Although we do not think that the Assembly made the progress of the Bill impossible out of sheer cussedness, it is unfortunate that the majority of the members should have continued to be such great sticklers for a State Bank as if a sound Reserve Bank stands or falls with its acceptance. It is a pity that after so much travail an important measure should have been pilloried, after sincere attempts at compromise by the Finance Member as well as by the so-called opposition.

\* \* \*

AS Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University Prof. Jadunath Sarkar delivered as usual a very stimulating address before the students, which is full of practical suggestions for those who would enter life after receiving an academic education. The Universities, he said, have in all countries been the nurseries of the leaders of public opinion and captains of national enterprise, not only of the highest grade but of intermediate grades too. Our Universities have also been the means of furthering the ideals of democracy by throwing careers open to talent. Prof. Sarkar next dilated on the duties and responsibilities of the graduates of which one important part was to contribute their own share to the progress of mankind and for achieving this they must insist on the highest quality in every performance. The second duty was to rise above the narrow sense of national or sectarian units and fall into line with the world's workers in the higher branches of thought and research. We must therefore, he said, link together the efforts of our own workers and to bring our scholars' work into contact with the efforts made by the learned in other parts of

the world. Prof. Sarkar bewails the neglect of the social side of University life which consists in the teachers of the University frequently meeting together and exchanging ideas; we in the Bombay University can testify to the correctness of his diagnosis. Next he emphasized the need of mental discipline. A University has failed in its duty if it has not imparted to its graduates the power of self-control in the midst of distractions caused by appeal to passion, to national prejudice, racial pride or sectarian animosity. A true son of a University must be a defender of reason and liberty, of progress and of justice as against force and unreason; he is a worshipper of truth and freedom. This discipline or habituating the will to obey a law higher than our personal caprice is, according to Prof. Sarkar, the keystone of every system of education.

In conclusion, Prof. Sarkar warned the alumni against leaving their studies incomplete even in response to patriotism for the simple reason that a raw youth making premature theatrical demonstrations is not of much use to his country. To possess his soul in patience would require, he said, higher patriotism because he would then supply his country with an expert workman and supreme teacher. Every graduate as he leaves the University should make his choice between the eternal verities on the one hand and the popular delusions and misrepresentations of the hour on the other hand. The University has made the choice easier by placing before its alumni the lessons of history and offering to them the garnered wisdom of all ages and of all countries.

\* \* \*

THE mob excesses that accompanied the hartal in Madras on the 3rd inst. have led the European Association there to find fault with the police arrangements and to demand protection against

similar trouble when the Commission arrive in Madras. To this demand must, in our opinion, be attributed the action of Government in prohibiting under section 144 Cr. P. C. all propaganda having for its object the bringing about of a hartal on the day of the Commission's arrival in that city. The happenings on the 3rd at Madras were no doubt inexcusable; at the same time we cannot help saying that the action taken by Government is of a somewhat too sweeping nature. That it is so is borne out by the fact that one Madras Mahomedan M. L. A. who had all along been opposed to the boycott of the Commission was on arrival at Delhi on learning about the Madras Government's action forced to mark his disgust at it by going and joining the daily increasing ranks of boycotters. It is true that the Government orders in question do not apply to boycott propaganda; but we fail to see why they should have thought fit to ban all hartal propaganda, peaceful or otherwise. There can be no reasonable objection to the Government giving protection to those who do not wish to join in a hartal, and want to follow their daily avocations; but comprehensive action of the kind taken by the Madras Government seems to us to be far in excess of the requirements of the situation.

\* \* \*

WHILE Indian opinion for the most part regards the arrangements contemplated in Sir John Simon's letter to the Viceroy for Sir John Simon's Indian representation as utterly inadequate and disappointing, Mr. C. B. Chartres, President of the European Association, thinks they go too far and give to the Indian legislatures "more power than India could have got with any form of mixed Commission."

It is not yet quite clear whether Sir John Simon intends that provincial legislatures' committees should, like the Committee of the Central Legislature, submit their own reports to form so many appendices to the Commission's report. If this happened, it would, in Mr. Chartres' opinion "neutralise to a very large extent the advantages of a Parliamentary Commission." What these are Mr. Chartres has chosen not to enlighten us about; perhaps the so-called advantages are that Parliament should not see the other side of the shield and should pass an ex-parte decree. Not that we think that the facilities offered by Sir John Simon, even if largely availed of by Indian opinion, are going to compensate in any way for the exclusion of Indians from the Commission. Mr. Chartres does not find anything objectionable in the Commission taking evidence on questions connected with 'national security' in camera, which means it will not be submitted to cross-examination by the Indian Committee, should it be set up. But if the Committee were to take some evidence by itself alone, it is more than he can stand. If in spite of such liberal concessions on the Commission's part Indian leaders still choose to stand aloof, Mr. Chartres assures them that they do so at their own risk and says "the Commission will find other sections in India who will avail themselves of the opportunity for giving evidence." With the presence in our midst of the non-official European community and of the kind of non-Brahmans, Mahomedans and Depressed Classes who welcomed Sir John on his landing in Bombay as a great saviour, who ever doubted such a possibility?

\* \* \*

IN the current number of the *Indian Review* Sir Phiroz C. Sethna calls attention to the problem of the Second Chamber which in settling the reformed constitution is sure to vex many an Indian statesman. Sir Phiroz in this article summarises the salient features of the Upper Houses of Legislature in various countries and generally commends the composition of the Irish Senate for adoption in this country. It will be remembered that Mrs Besant's Commonwealth of India Bill models the Indian Council of State on the lines of the Irish Senate, showing that these are generally acceptable to Indian opinion, for they appear so very plausible. By a curious coincidence, however, we have just now before us proposals for a radical revision of the Irish Senate's constitution, the present one being declared on all hands to be a practical absurdity, whatever its theoretical excellences may be. The elections to the Senate are due to take place in September next and Government are anxious to prevent a repetition of the utter fiasco which the elections of 1925 were universally admitted to be. The Cosgrave Government appear to be contemplating the reconstitution of the Senate in two respects: (1) a reduction in the number of Senators with which the Opposition has already expressed agreement, and (2) the substitution of indirect for direct elections. The very points on which the Irish Free State's Senate was considered to have a superior merit to the Second Chambers in other countries are now felt in actual experience to be its drawbacks. For the purpose of election the whole of Ireland was to be treated as one constituency, the members being elected on the principle of P. R. from a panel selected from what Sir Phiroz Sethna calls Senatorial persons who by their "useful public service" over a long series of years "done honour to the nation." It was anticipated that the pull of local interests and local influences would thus be minimised and the electorate would have a very large number of preferences, thus making it possible for the pick of the country to be returned. The actual result however in 1925 was the selection to the panel of

"dud politicians and hopeless nonentities" and a very small poll culminating in the return to the Senate, of "Dail plus senility." All the peculiarities of the Irish Senate, which appealed, so strongly to the student of constitutional law, are therefore to be scrapped, direct election too going along with the rest. "The authority required for this purpose (of revising and, if necessary, delaying legislative measures) does not demand a direct mandate of the people, and the special qualities necessary to ensure that the work shall be skilfully done are more likely to be discovered by some process less haphazard than that by which the first batch of elected members were returned to the Senate." The Government therefore are thinking of falling back on the system of choosing Senators by a vote of both Houses from a panel upon which representation will be given to various important interests and organizations.

THE second session of the All-India Women's Conference on educational reform which met in Delhi during the week affords ample testimony of the lively interest, women all over India are taking in the all-round culture of their sex. Her Excellency Lady Irwin in opening the Conference defined the real goal of education to be the training of character, mind and body as an equipment for the great school of life. Women, Her Excellency said, were in India the depository of tradition and wished that they may long continue to be so. As those entrusted with the forming of their children's character in the early impressionable period, they must be at least literate. Lady Irwin next pointed to the need of teachers who look upon their profession as a privilege and as a vocation, and for this she said, the stigma on such a noble profession should be lifted in order to attract women of good birth. Her Excellency is positively of opinion that there must be a differentiation between the education of boys and girls and for this purpose a practical knowledge of domestic subjects and laws of health is, in her opinion, a necessary part of the curriculum for girls. In conclusion Lady Irwin suggested that the Conference should, by means of sober and well thought-out schemes, make itself the accepted mouthpiece of unofficial opinion on the subject of the education of women.

In her presidential address Her Highness the Begum of Bhopal expressed her gratification that a noble cause like education had wiped out differences of caste and creed. The stumbling blocks in the way of female education are poverty, *pardah* and early marriage. We are glad that in connection with poverty Her Highness enlarged on the importance of cutting down unnecessary expense and enunciated the sound maxim of balancing income and expenditure. With regard to the controversy between those who would favour identical courses for boys and girls and those who would differentiate them, Her Highness would suggest a *via media* and recommend an education which would enable a woman to create a happy home. On the subject of teachers she made an appeal to those women who are able to teach, to volunteer themselves as honorary workers. In conclusion, Her Highness warned the Conference against being content with merely passing some fine resolutions and expressing pious hopes and urged it to act upon the decisions arrived at. We congratulate the Conference on its good fortune in having a practical statesman like H. H. the Begum of Bhopal with her unrivalled experience of affairs, to preside over its deliberations.

## GETTING UP THE CASE FOR THE PROSECUTION.

By H. C. E. ZACHARIAS.

SIR JOHN SIMON'S "Open Letter" dated the 7th inst. and addressed to the Viceroy is the last official pronouncement on the Statutory Commission, defining its status, its scope, its procedure, in a long series of official pronouncements made during the past three months. During these months there has been always the same air of staged mystery: "Just wait, until the next pronouncement, and the matter will be quite clear." India has in turn been asked to wait for what the Viceroy had to announce on the subject, and Lord Birkenhead, and Mr. Baldwin, and the British Labour Party, and finally Sir John Simon. The game can be played no further; the end of the chain of bluffing has been reached; and the bubble after all has been proved to contain—air. The position remains where it was on November 8th, except that those who had hoped against hope and put the most favourable construction on the scheme, have been utterly disappointed and discovered again and again, that all the "explanations" are so much eye-wash and utterly incapable of changing the nature of the scheme, which is to revise the Indian Constitution without admitting India's right to self-determination.

Even technically, the Simon pronouncement, notwithstanding all its suave persuasiveness, of course fails to establish "equality" between the Indian Committee and the British Commission, since it expressly excepts cases of evidence offered to the British Commission alone. Sir John Simon calls the joint meetings of the British Commission and the Indian Committee a "Joint Free Conference": a curious expression, not further explained by him, but obviously meaning that it is "free from responsibility" to the only authority that matters, viz. the British Parliament; that it is informal and in the nature of something added by way of *accident*, leaving the *substance* what it was. We in India of course maintain that it is just this sort of evidence, which does not dare to come out into the light of an Indian sun, that stands most in need of Indian cross-examination: and if anybody would like to know what kind of evidence that might be, we would earnestly beg of him, carefully to study an article "Simon Commission at Work" by "A Political Correspondent" published in *The Indian Daily Mail* of the 11th. The author who obviously writes from inside knowledge, reveals, how for months, nay years (since Mr. Crerar was placed on special duty in this connection in 1926), the Indian Government have got up their case against the Reforms. To quote some passages:

"As was to be expected, the Commissioners will have placed before them statistics regarding the various classes and creeds of India; that there are spoken no fewer than 222 vernacular languages; that strife between the Hindus and Muslims has reached a pitch never before known; that the number of different castes amounts to some thousands; that

there are over 50 millions of untouchables with whom no other caste may associate in any way ; and finally, that out of a total population of about 320 millions approximately 95 per cent. are illiterate ; and the Commissioners are asked to infer that party politics as understood in England do not and cannot exist in India and that therefore Westminster is an exotic growth in India being foreign to the tradition and mentality of Indians who are steeped age-long in autocracy.

"The Commissioners are informed that out of the 230 million people inhabiting British India nearly 220 millions have been unaware that they are living under the benefits of the Montford Reforms. The Commissioners are asked to remember how infinitesimal is the number of those who voted at elections. They are reminded that Parliament which sent them out to this country was responsible not for the loudly articulate India but for the rural India to whom the British Raj is the one thing that matters above every other thing on earth, and they will be given "facts", collected by I. C. S. officers placed on special duty, one in each province and n one province even two, to collate the proceedings of their legislatures, in regard to things such as the number of offensive questions put, number of questions disallowed, amount of time wasted in "useless discussions," "the degree of exhibition of child's play" in the Councils, the number of social reform measures opposed by non-officials, number of private bills, number of Government bills, etc., etc. In some of the Provinces even police officers are said to have been attached to the special duty officers to throw into bold relief the breaches of the peace that had occurred in their Provinces, having a subtle bearing on the introduction of responsible government."

In fact the Commissioners will be given an account of India as profusely documented, as strictly matter of fact, as truthful, as Miss Mayo's.

And this account of what has been going on for years behind the scenes in preparation for this Commission is not only on the face of it accurate: it has received independent confirmation by two other facts. We refer on the one hand to the book "India Tomorrow" reported to be by a member of the Indian Civil Service, wherein that solution of the problem of Dyarchy (power without responsibility) is put forward which consists, not in granting responsibility, but in withdrawing power. Once more we find the case cut and dried, the anticipated solution led up to as it were inevitably. A coincidence? Well, then again, there is that report of the *Week's* correspondent as to what the fate of the Skeen Committee's report will be. And again, the answer is: not a step further on the lines of 1919. Not more Indianization, but less; not more duties entrusted to Indians, but less; not more responsibility, but less. England's alone is all the responsibility. A nation without a national army has no right to self-determination; and in order that there should accrue no such right, all possibility of India creating a national army must be eliminated. And in the meantime we are told that

the British War Office's plans include, besides complete "mechanization" of the Indian Army, the garrisoning of another 50,000 British troops there. Another coincidence? Again, Miss Mayo has shown, that and how a whole nation can be indicted: and if "Mother India" was a forerunner of the Simon Commission by chance, the long arm of coincidence must indeed be one of astronomical length. At all events the Statutory Commission stands now revealed as a Commission charged to enquire into the presumptive guilt, political unfitness and social barbarities of the indicted. For the indicted to claim "equality" with its judge is of course sheer madness. Besides, Sir John Simon has made it quite clear that his Commission does not possess any judicial functions. It is simply a Commission, getting up a case for the prosecution and Sir John has now very amiably agreed that the corresponding Committee to be set up for the defence, the Indian Committee, will be looked upon by them "as colleagues", and they are quite agreeable—to continue the *simile*—that, when counsel for the Prosecution makes his final speech before the supreme judge (i. e. the British Parliament), counsel for the Defence is also to be given a chance of being heard.

It is all very nice and quite in keeping with people who actually believe that they are, to use Mr. Baldwin's phrase, "God's Englishmen", specially selected by the Almighty to do deeds of valour and trusteeship of which no lesser breed would be capable. But in the face of it all, what is there really left for India to do, but to refuse altogether to "defend" herself in such a self-appointed Court of Justice? England today wishes to take away, what little independence India has got, and just as England conquered India with the help of India so today England is endeavouring might and main to get Indians to help her in rivetting further shackles on India. So far she has received the help of no responsible Indian of note, Lord Sinha and Sir Muhammad Shafi excepted. For the rest there are Messrs. Bole and Company and to expect *esprit de corps* from them would indeed be absurd. Unfortunately the Anglo-Indian press has given such partizan accounts of the whole Boycott Movement, that strangers can hardly be blamed if they have got a totally wrong idea, whether of its scope or of its strength. The worst culprit in this respect perhaps has been the *Statesman* which on the 7th had the audacity to come with a first leader on "The Hartal Exposure", in which it summed up the unanimous manifestations on February 3rd throughout India against the Simon Commission as having proved "beyond all questioning that India is not hostile to the Commission and that the Congress opinion is negligible"! What wonder, if, with only such a shameless campaign of falsehood to draw upon for its information, even a paper like *The Examiner* can form the opinion that the lack of disorders in Bombay was due entirely "thanks to the precautions taken by the police" (issue of 11th inst.) when it is agreed on all hands that all the huge demonstrations of that day passed off so peacefully in Bombay, because of the splendid temper displayed, both by the crowds and by the police; because, in Bombay, thank

God, there is no deep-seated, traditional antagonism between the two, and because there the leaders of the people did their duty and had taken their precautions to see to it that the peaceful and non-violent nature of the demonstrations was maintained.

#### MR. BANERJI ON THE COMMISSION.

MR. D. N. BANERJI contributes to the January number of the *Contemporary Review* a very thoughtful article on the Indian Commission and its tasks which deserves to be read by all who would wish to arrive at an impartial judgment on the matter. Mr. Banerji at the outset says that the reasons given in the statement issued by the Viceroy for an exclusively Parliamentary Commission leave the Indians unconvinced; nor is there any warrant, he says, in the Government of India Act for the position that there is a statutory obligation to appoint none save British members of Parliament. The principle of communal representation has in his opinion set hell loose in political India; with the recognition of separate right of each community as such, are generated those fissiparous tendencies which inhibit the crystallization of a common programme. The rights of minorities can be insured, in his opinion, by a Declaration of Rights whereby every citizen is entitled to any public office for which he has established a claim. Mr. Banerji believes that the Indianisation of the Army is a live issue and should not be burked. Mr. Banerji comments on the shadowy character of the control exercised by Ministers over the transferred subjects, and instances the racial disabilities operating to the detriment of Indian doctors in the Medical department. Taken all round he thinks that the provincial Ministers have a "precarious tenure and flimsy responsibility." Mr. Banerji speaks in the same strain about the Indian members of the Viceroy's Executive Council. They have, he says, no adequate power to carry out far-reaching reforms and to formulate general policies. It is unfortunate, says Mr. Banerji, that the normal expansion of transferred subjects was handicapped by the ingenious and ill-starred device of the Meston award.

The vital task before the Commission, according to him, is the framing of recommendations for a feasible scheme of provincial autonomy which would make self-government in the provinces an effective and growing reality. This proposal does not postulate any violent break in the existing administrative machinery. Of course Mr. Banerji allows, even under the scheme of provincial autonomy, the safeguarding of the rights and emoluments of the Indian Civil Service. He does not attach much weight to the objection that with the establishment of provincial autonomy, the provinces would be disparate and scattered entities without liaison with the Central Government as the sphere of the latter can be clearly marked out without much difficulty. He thinks it is imperative to introduce the element of responsibility in the sphere of the Central Government. What is required to effect this is to make the Indian Executive Councillors responsible to the Legislative Assembly. With the exception of the Foreign and Political Department, the defence of India and problems of naval and aerial strategy all the departments should, in his opinion, be transferred to Indian Ministers. The more progressive and enlightened ruling Princes, according to his notion, have already begun to perceive that they have nothing to lose but may have a great deal to gain from the Indian Government of the future. But Mr. Banerji apparently has forgotten that such rulers can be counted on the fingers and that the majority of the Princes are hostile to any introduction of responsibility in the Political Department. He believes that the ideals involved in the

struggle for self-government fire the imagination of the aristocratic and ruling elements just as in the case of the intelligentsia in British India. We can only hope that his belief is well-founded. Lastly in spite of criticisms Mr. Banerji thinks that maintenance of peace and the dealing out of even-handed justice are factors which cannot be disregarded and for which we have to thank the Indian Civil Service. "But England's task remains incomplete and the destiny of the British Empire unfulfilled until she admits India to the fellowship of freedom"; this is Mr. Banerji's positive conviction. In support of which he quotes from an illustrious English member of the Indian Civil Service: "Even if the Indian Civil Service were manned with angels from heaven the inherent defects of a bureaucratic system would thwart their best intentions and make them foes to political progress. Not in dishonour but in honour proudly, as shipbuilders make over the finished craft to seamen, must they now yield up the direction of India."

V. N. GODBOLE.

#### THE TRANSFER OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA TO THE CROWN.

IN my article published in your last issue on the subject of the new theory of "direct relations" advanced by some princes I examined the history of the question of Indian States up to the year 1858, when the third period referred to therein dates. This is marked by the transfer of the Government of the East India Company from the double control of the Court of Directors and the Board of Control to the Crown. Although, since the Board of control was created, its President was responsible to Parliament, the Executive Government in England did not interest itself in the affairs of India. The Governor General was directly associated with the Court of Directors to whom he was to pay due obedience, and the Board of Control and the Board of Directors between themselves managed the whole concern, the Cabinet or the constitutional advisers of the Crown being no more than nominally responsible for its administration. The result was that the administration of India became irresponsible. It was therefore thought necessary, nay indispensable, to do away with the double control and to create a Secretary of State assisted by a Council entirely responsible to Parliament who, in his turn, delegated his authority to the Governor General in Council as his Agent. Viscount Palmerston, while introducing the Government of India Act in 1858 made this position perfectly clear. He observed: "The principle of our political system is that all administrative functions should be accompanied by Ministerial responsibility to Parliament, responsibility to public opinion, responsibility to the Crown. I say then, that as far as regards the executive functions of the Indian Government at Home, it is of the greatest importance to vest complete authority where the public have a right to think that complete responsibility should vest, and that when as in this country there can be but one governing body responsible to the Crown, to Parliament and to public opinion consisting of the constitutional advisers to the Crown for the time being, so it is in accordance with the principles and practice of our Constitution as it would be in accordance with the best interests of the nation that India, with all its vast and important interests, should be placed under the direct authority of the Crown, to be governed, in the name of the Crown, by the responsible ministers of the Crown sitting in Parliament and responsible to Parliament and the public for every part of their public conduct." This statement lucidly gives the reasons and also the meaning of what is conveyed by the

phrase "Transfer to the Crown". The Government of India hereafter was to be controlled by one minister, viz. the Secretary of State for India acting and working as a member of the British Cabinet, responsible to Parliament. Thus government of this third period was entirely distinct from that carried on by the East India Company in the first two periods. Responsibility to Parliament was not secured in the first two periods; while it was made a pivot on which the constitution was to rest since 1858. It is no doubt true that since the transfer of the government to the Crown, so far as the Indian States were concerned, there was not keen interest evinced by Parliament in their affairs as was the case during the time of the East India Company. The numerous debates which were raised by members of Parliament, the agitation of the English organisation called the Indian Reform Society started in the year 1853 with nearly 70 members who were also members of Parliament and the great efforts made by such men as Mr. John Dickinson, Major Evans Bell, &c. undoubtedly prove that a close eye was kept on the affairs of the Court of Directors and the policy of annexation and lapse pursued by Lord Dalhousie. Since this transfer made the Executive Government in England directly responsible for the government of India the system of periodical examination into Indian affairs by Parliament was abolished, and Indian States affairs ceased to loom large on the Parliamentary horizon. Whatever that may be, from a constitutional point of view responsibility for the government of India was fixed on the Secretary of State for India by a statutory provision enacted in the year 1858.

There is considerable misunderstanding about the position of the Crown involved in this transfer. Many Indian Princes are under the belief that the government was transferred directly to the Crown as distinguished from its position as the executive head of Parliamentary Government of the United Kingdom. They believe, of course erroneously, that the Crown being represented in India in the person of the Viceroy, the Indian Princes are related to the Crown directly through the Viceroy. There is however no ground for thinking so. The Government was not transferred to the Crown in the sense that it was delegated to the House of the Royal family of King George the Fifth but to the House of King George the Fifth as the political Sovereign of the United Kingdom. "The Government, therefore, through and in the name of the Crown, is to be carried on by Ministers, responsible to Parliament and the public." The reason why the word "Crown" has been used in the phrase "Transfer to the Crown" has been given by Viscount Palmerston in the following words: "I believe that there can be no doubt that, so far as the impression on the minds of the people of India is concerned, the name of the Sovereign of a great Empire like this must be far more respected, far more calculated to produce moral and political impressions than the name of the Company of merchants, however respectable and able they may be. We have to deal in that country with Princes, some ruling independently, some in a state of modified dependence upon us and with feudal Chiefs proud of their position, cherishing traditionary recollections of a wide empire and of great sovereigns to whom their ancestors owed allegiance. How can we expect them to feel any great respect for a mere company of merchants? The respect they feel, the allegiance they yield, will increase tenfold if one were given and the other tendered to the Sovereign of a great and mighty empire." This explanation explodes, in my opinion, the fallacy under which the Indian Princes are labouring. It was to pander to their prejudices and to tackle their vanity that the word

"Crown" has been inserted in the phrase "Transfer to the Crown." It is thus clear that "Crown" here means, not any individual sovereign or his dynasty but the political head of the constitutional government of the United Kingdom. The political relations of the Indian States, therefore, are not with the House of King George V or with his person but with him as the political head of the United Kingdom.

Another important reservation which deserves to be clearly remembered in this connection is that allegiance to the sovereign and political relations with the sovereign, do not mean one and the same thing. The learned authors of the English Empire Digest have authoritatively explained the position as follows:—"Now, seeing the King has but one person and several capacities one political capacity for the realm of England, another for the realm of Scotland, it is necessary to be considered to which capacity allegiance is due, and it was resolved that it was due to the natural person of the King (which is ever accompanied with the politic capacity and the politic capacity as it were appropriated to the natural capacity) and it is not due to the politic capacity only, that is to his Crown or Kingdom distinct from his natural capacity." So far, therefore, as allegiance, homage, loyalty, reverence and affection are concerned, they are always due to the natural person of the King. But the question of political relations relates to His Majesty's political capacity. In this capacity the Sovereign acts through his ministers who are responsible to Parliament. In the case of the Indian States, this political sovereignty is exercised through the Secretary of State for India, he in his turn exercising it through the Governor General in Council. The relations of the Indian Rulers, therefore, are directly with the Government of India, indirectly with the Secretary of State and only remotely with the Crown. The present cry of direct relation with the Crown seems to me to be mischievously raised with a view to snap asunder the political relations of the States with the Government of India. Further it is well-known that the King can do no wrong, which means that for every act done by or in the name of the King a minister is responsible. Similarly, whatever is done in the name of the Crown towards the Indian States must be supposed to be done by the Secretary of State for India acting, if necessary, with the advice of the Cabinet in England, which is entirely responsible to Parliament. When once this position is clearly understood, the distinction between a Viceroy and the Governor-General becomes obvious. As already pointed out, allegiance is due to the body or the person of His Majesty. On ceremonial or on State occasions this is shown to His Majesty's representative, the Viceroy. But as the human body of His Majesty is entirely distinct from his political body or his personal capacity for the political capacity as the head of the administration, the Viceroy as representing His Majesty on ceremonial occasions is entirely distinct from the Governor-General who is a representative of the political capacity of the Crown. The Viceroy, therefore, has nothing to do with the political relations of the Indian States. Even the term Viceroy is not recognised in the Constitution and is not used in the warrants of appointments now. This view is supported by Sir W. Hunter and Sir O'Moore Creagh. The present stunt of direct political relations with His Majesty is mischievous in the extreme and devoid of any constitutional or historical foundation. The relations, therefore, of the Indian Rulers are with the authorities created by the Government of India Act of 1858.

The Indian States in the first period were entirely under the Court of Directors. In the second period the Governor General in Council who was subordinate to the Board of Directors and to whom he was to pay due obedience controlled their relations. The expressions used in the Acts beginning from 1773 up to the present moment are almost identical. *The superintendence, direction and control* of all the territorial acquisitions made by the East India Company vested in the Governor General by the Act of 1773. This Act required the Governor General-in-Council to pay due obedience to all such orders, as the Governor General in Council may receive from the Court of Directors by section 33 of the present Government of India Act. The superintendence, direction and control of India, meaning both Indian and British India vest in him. Section 3 of the present Act states that the Governor General is required to pay due obedience to the Secretary of State, who in his turn occupies the self-same position as was occupied by the East India Company, or by the Court of Directors and the Commissioners of affairs otherwise called the Board of Control. The East India Company up to 1858 and the Government of India after 1858 exercised jurisdiction not only over British India but over Indian India. Sections 2 and 32 of the Government of India Act make this position quite clear. Similarly tributes are made payable to the Government of India and the expenditure of the Political Department is also borne by the Government of India. The power of discussing questions relating to Indian States can be given to the Central Legislature provided the Governor General gives his sanction. The control of defence of both British India and Indian States vests in the Governor-General and with the assistance of British Indian Army, he alone has the power to keep peace and order in the Indian States. The Governor-General is also the head of the Political Department which superintends, directs and controls all officers of the Indian States. All treaties have also been made by or in the name of the Governor-General and in none of them does the Viceroy figure. Recognition of succession, minority administrations, settlement of inter-states disputes and corrective measures about removing misrule—all are undertaken by the Governor-General as the head of the Political Department. So long therefore as the Parliamentary Statute holds good, the Indian States cannot be dismembered from British India, that is to say, they cannot be separated from and made independent of the Government of India. The claim, therefore, which the Maharaja of Bikaner is setting up for the States as politically separate and constitutionally independent units of this Indian Empire is untenable. In view of the pronouncements made at the time of the passing of the Act in Parliament and in view of the express provisions of this Constitution, the Indian States and the British India are not sister polities, each entirely different from the other. This position urged by the Maharaja of Patiala has not been supported by any historical evidence or by any treaties held sacrosanct by the Indian Rulers. For these reasons we maintain that the Indian States are under the control of Parliament through the Secretary of State for India who in his turn has delegated his powers to the Government of India; that the States are in a position of subordinate union with the Government of India: that even in matters of internal administration it is the right of the Government of India with a view to ensure peace and order to interfere in the internal affairs of the Indian States to secure good government to the people consigned to the charge of the Indian Rulers. This position is supported by Parliamentary Statute and by the political practice of the Government of India, and by the

despatch of Lord Reading sent to H. E. H. the Nizam. The power of the Governor-General under section 33 to supervise and control the affairs of the Indian States is recognised by such an eminent authority as Sir Frederick Whyte in his monogram on Federation published under the authority of the Government of India. That the Governor-General is not an Agent of the Crown but that of the Executive Government of the United Kingdom, has been admitted by such an authority as Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer in his 12th lecture to the Madras University. The history which we have given above of the third period knocks the bottom out of the new-fangled fantastic theory of direct relations.

G. R. ABHYANKAR.

## OUR EUROPEAN LETTER.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

GENEVA, Jan. 26th.

### THE SIMON COMMISSION.

PUBLIC opinion in England is deeply anxious, the apparent fortitude notwithstanding, about the reception and reactions in India to the Simon Commission when it is actually there as a *fait accompli*. Sir John and his colleagues go there in this preliminary visit not as judges but as diplomats. Here are all the elements of the characteristic John Bull attitude—nerve, and bluff, and political wisdom. These, however, are qualities which serve a pioneer and carry him through primitive conditions: they do not always wear well in an organized world and in civil societies. The demands made upon British statesmanship and enterprise to-day are not the same as in the age which is now definitely past. The change is Britain's "Quo Vadis?"

### INDIAN BOYCOTT—A CHALLENGE TO BRITAIN'S TRADE.

The challenge is manifest even in Britain's trade and industries. "It seems strange to write of politics as affecting demand, but it is only too true and Lancashire in particular will do well to realise it," says Professor Stanley Jevons. Boycott in India and China has meant much and Britain has been made to realise that a discontented subject cannot make a contented customer. The old methods in industry, besides, have become as obsolete as in politics. In the coal, cotton, and chemical industries, and in the carrying trade the same causes recur. Excess of miners and excess of pits; restricted markets; and merchant marines subsidised and developed by the Government in America, Germany and other countries challenging British supremacy in a trade traditionally British; all three lead to the same conclusion: the necessity to combine and control national production. Combines as the cause of American prosperity have become a legend; and Britain is the chief stumbling block in European cartels. Germany and Italy are rising from their ashes like a miracle due to appropriate adjustment to new needs, but in Britain the truth is cleverly shelved and the perennial pretext of "foreign-inspired" Labour serves to explain all industrial ills. The recent meeting of the General Council of the Trade Union Congress and representative employers

is proof of the futility of such tactics and the need for concerted action.

#### BRITAIN AND DISARMAMENT.

In the domain of international affairs the same jolly spirit prevails. The British memorandum on Security addressed to the Secretariat of the League of Nations as a definite indication of the British position with regard to Disarmament to serve as a basis for the discussions in the Preparatory Disarmament Conference reflects it. The strength of the Covenant of the League of Nations, according to the British thesis, must lie "in the measure of discretion which it allows to the Council and the Assembly in dealing with future contingencies which may have no parallel in history... Strict rules might bring it to pass, by an unhappy turn in definition, that the aggressed and not the offender might be declared to be the "aggressor". Definition might prove a trap for the innocent and a sign-post for the guilty... Locarno is the ideal type of security agreement". Yet, how may France put faith in a pact which the Dominions have made plain that they would not support with armed force, and still more, how may such triangular pacts pave the way for a united Europe, not to speak of an effectual League of Nations? Locarno or Geneva? still remains an open question.

#### AMERICA AND EUROPEAN POLITICS.

It is these European pacts which alarm America as ever. Public opinion in the United States is as reproachful as Washington was in his day, of "entangling alliances". Hence the difficulties in the way of Monsieur Briand's proposal to have a bilateral pact between France and America perpetuating peace. Hence America's rejection of the French limitation of restricting outlawry of war to aggressive wars only, in the case of a multilateral pact, and the general tumble-down of the proposal. The Latin Americans' grievances against the United States at the Pan-American Conference at Havana coming at this moment have their repercussions in Europe. Thus the peace movement suffers a check, and exit idealism. Realism takes the place and within a week two admirals on either side of the Atlantic have made predictions which reverberate through two continents. Admiral Plunkett said in the Republican Navy Club in New York: "We are nearer war to-day than ever before because we are pursuing a competitive trade policy and crowding other nations into the background. A policy of this kind invariably leads to war, but if you do not want war, you had better be a worm and crawl into the nearest hole". And a British counterpart: "If anything could possibly bring on war between these two great nations it is these naval programmes and declarations from the navies of respective countries that war is inevitable. That was the insane policy which obtained between Germany and Great Britain between 1900 and 1914 and which was one of the contributory causes of the World War". Introspection of this kind aggravates evil, and there is very substantial evil in the Anglo-American rivalry.

#### HAPPENINGS IN RUSSIA.

In Russia, the Revolution takes a new turn with Trotsky's exile in Turkestan. The exiled leader bears with him the Marxian banner, and possibly the Bolshevik idea of world-revolution also follows him. Stalin, the peasants' man, is in power and is reputed to be inclined to realism and compromise. By the former term it has been understood that he will recognise the need to conciliate capitalists. Happy prospects of needy primitive Russia contentedly controlled by American and British capital, technicians, and machinery are evoked. Other and more probable consequences may be imagined. Like in the French Revolution the logic of events may prove different from the logic of ideas. Turkestan may well happen to be Trotsky's Elba and not St. Helena. Besides, even if individualism be the natural reaction to Bolshevism and the Russian peasant comes to be as solid and stubborn a factor in national politics as his French cousin, that would only make Russia stronger, not weaker. A wakeful, watchful Russia, regardful of her interests, may no more be a prop to the system of the politics of Western Europe than when she was a proselytising revolutionary. The Revolution may have had the one permanent result of turning her Eastward.

#### RUSSO-JAPANESE ALLIANCE?

The end of the Anglo-Japanese alliance and the recent wide extension of Parliamentary franchise in Japan are a coincidence of changes with a cumulative significance. Barred of an outlet for her swelling population in Canada, the United States, and Australia, and possessed of meagre natural resources, necessity and policy throw her on the side of Russia. A Japanese delegation is now actually at Moscow negotiating a commercial treaty between the two countries. A Franco-Japanese alliance is a standing idea. The much-rejoiced Soviet failure in China may take a surprising turn and result in Russia's backing for Japan's position in Manchuria. The affairs in China are tending, if not to an ending, at least to a new beginning. Chang-Tso-Lin's failing power has coincided with Chang-Kai-Shek's reappearance and his bold dash to bring North and South together. This creates nowhere so much disappointment as in Britain. Nothing stands in his way to come to an understanding with Japan, America, and Russia. New developments have removed old obstacles. Britain alone of all the Powers cannot face this change in the Far East for reasons of trade, prestige, and diplomacy.

#### KING AMANULLAH'S EUROPEAN VISIT.

The entry of the King of the Afghans into Europe has marked an epoch in the relations between the East and the West. His utterances in India which preceded him added originality to a significant personality and heightened expectation. His magnificent reception in Rome set a high standard which other Capitals are vying to surpass. It is perhaps a sign of the times that while the Moslem theological college at Cairo withheld an honour from him because he would not change his customary head-dress, which fell short of the correctness of orthodoxy, the



head of the Catholic Church should have conferred a distinction on him. In the countries he visits the opinion that all this flattery is an earnest of the wish to have opportunities in collaborating with him in the development of his mountain-kingdom is hardly concealed. To win the East by cordiality in the West is a precedent, and it is widely recognised that when King Amanullah visits London and then Moscow, another of the determining links between the East and the West will have been laid.

We are living in quickly moving times and the obvious pauses which might benefit those who must wait for forces to become concrete before they can see them cannot always be staged. When we in India are still picturing Dominion Status as a divine far-off event, its elasticity grows and grows. Within a few months after Canada got a place in the Council of the League of Nations came the news of a Canadian Embassy in Washington. Plausible considerations covered this step of direct diplomatic relations with the United States. Now Paris will have a Canadian Ambassador, and the precedent has been used to cover the next step. The President of the Irish Free State is touring the United States with the express object of enlightening the people of the States on the change in the status of Ireland. It is a curious commentary on the importance of public opinion. Britain is conscious of the query which the spirit of the times puts her. The appearance of inconsiderable minorities in support of the opposition to the boycott of the Simon Commission in the place of the considerable one now causes no illusions even in England. Naturally public opinion here moves slowly where the changing East is concerned but to set it going is our job.

## OUR PARLIAMENTARY LETTER.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

Delhi, February 11.

### WHY THE RESERVE BANK BILL WAS DROPPED?

THE career of the Reserve Bank Bill has been full of surprises and the Assembly has apparently seen the last of it. After the attempt of Sir Basil to bring in the new Bill was foiled by the President, Government tried to achieve their object by proceeding with the old Bill in the Assembly, get it amended in the Council of State, and fight the essential question of the Shareholders' vs. State Bank in the Assembly again. Monday and Wednesday were spent in discussing clause 8 of the Bill which provided for the Directorate of the Bank. The non-official side was defeated on every point in spite of the determined opposition they put up, and Government seemed to have succeeded in securing the composition of the Directorate according to their wishes. It was on this question of directorate that there was a breakdown in the Simla session, but the meagre attendance on the non-official benches made the Government's task easy. The amendment to Clause (e) withdrawing the right proposed to be granted to elected members of the Assembly to elect three directors drew bitter speeches from nonofficial benches. Every member, to whatever Party he belonged, deprecated the spirit underlying it, putting the elected part of the House under a disability. It was certainly a preposterous argument that even a commercial expert should be unfit to serve on the

directorate for the sin of being a member of the Central Legislature. Mr. Jayakar showed in a cogent speech how big business had been run on big lines in Bombay, by men who were as politically-minded as any M. L. A. But Sir Basil Blackett would not budge an inch. He in fact held it 'a cardinal principle' that the Legislatures should have no representation on the Board, with a view to divest the Bank of all political influences. One cannot help agreeing with Mr. Jamnadas Mehta that the presence of Government nominees on the Directorate was equally a political influence. Pandit Malaviya tried to find out from Government if there were any hard and fast conclusions already arrived at from which they could not move. Sir Basil replied that their views were best reflected in the new Reserve Bank Bill and the Government of India held strongly that the Assembly on no account should have a representation on the Directorate. He also made it plain that if their amendment was lost the career of the Bill would again be threatened. That practically put an end to all arguments. The voting was, however, in favour of the Government. When Government won on such a crucial point, it was no wonder if it had sweeping victories with regard to the other clauses giving representation to the Council of State and the provincial Legislatures. Mr. Joshi's attempt to secure representation to Trade Unions received scanty support although he said it represented a vast constituency. It seemed as if demoralisation had set in completely on the non-official side, but the last effort of throwing out the whole clause gave a chance majority for the Opposition. The decision of the President in allowing a member to record his vote when the tellers had taken away the papers is said to have little precedence. But the effect of it was that the whole of clause 8 was turned down; and Government found themselves in a very awkward position, for it was no use going on with the Reserve Bank Bill, when there was no provision for the Directorate. Government took time to review its position; and all absurd rumours about the intended prorogation of the Assembly or the rumoured determination of Government to take the mutilated Bill to the Council of State were laid at rest, when on Friday Government declared that it had no intention to proceed with the Bill. Funeral orations were delivered by prominent members who heaved "a sigh of relief", but not without a heavy heart. Thus one of the most important pieces of legislation has been turned down and as Mr. Cocke said, it is not possible to say if we shall have another like attempt in ten years to come.

### SIR JOHN SIMON'S STATEMENT.

The Statutory Commission is an equally important subject and has engrossed the attention of the members of the Assembly. The Viceroy's statement on the 2nd seemed to satisfy nobody. But equally disappointing has been found Sir John Simon's letter to the Viceroy. It has to be confessed in fairness to Sir John Simon, that the letter goes a somewhat further than the Viceroy's speech; but all the advance is merely procedural. The statement speaks of 'free joint conference' but that all evidence will not be submitted to both the wings is made plain and when it is declared that the report of the Indian half would be treated as an appendix the whole show about equality is simply given away. The statement was designed to rope in the waverers and these would have fallen in but for the presence on the spot of the other well-known leaders. The All-Party meeting had declared that the statement is disappointing and its objections based on principles remain unaffected by it. The next question is about the resolution of no-confidence in the Commission. It is very difficult to say at the present moment if it will be carried, as many elected members have not yet come and none

knows if they will come at all. But a defeat on that resolution would be nothing short of disastrous and every attempt is being made to safeguard the fate of the resolution.

#### NON-OFFICIAL BILLS.

Thursday was a day for non-official bills. It was mostly devoted to their formal introduction, some of them being circulated for eliciting public opinion. Discussion centred round two or three of them. Mr. Mohammed Yakub in moving for circulation of his Bill to regulate and amend the publication of Law Reports attributed increased litigation to the increased number of Law Reports. He was opposed by Sir H. S. Gour, Mr. Jayakar and Mr. Kelkar as the effect of the Bill would, in their opinion, be the restriction of avenues of knowledge. Mr. Neogy's Bill to amend the Inland Steam Vessels Act with a view to give power to Government to fix the maxima and minima of rates and other allied things was also decided to be circulated for public opinion. It is a feeble attempt to end the rate war by which indigenous Steamship Companies have been so far ruined. But even that was opposed. The Government did not show much sympathy for it; and they are going to decide upon their course of action on it after they receive opinions from the Local Governments. Sir Hari Singh Gour's Age of Consent Bill received general support in the Assembly. He said: "If the Government oppose this elementary piece of justice they must face the criticism that they are the enemy of social progress". On Lala Lajpatrai's suggestion it was agreed to circulate the Bill for eliciting opinion.

#### THE ELDERS AT WORK.

In the Council of State Government is having its way, as the Swarajist members are absenting themselves. The Bill for the registration of partitions by written and registered instruments was opposed by the Hindu members present. All the amendments were unceremoniously rejected and Mr. Desikachari had to confess that even in the absence of the Swarajists, the Assembly would throw it down, much more so if they would be present at the time. It is a sad commentary on the composition of the Council of State. The resolution of Lala Ram Saran Das that 15% ad valorem duty should be levied on the import of artificial ghee was lost and an amendment recommending an enquiry into the problem received no support. Sir Pheroze Sethna's resolution asking for the publication of correspondence regarding the appointment of the Simon Commission was strenuously opposed by Government. Sir Pheroze wanted to know what part the Government of India played in this matter and if Lord Birkenhead was imitating Lord Morley in keeping the members of the Viceroy's Executive Council in the dark. He thought the secrecy of the procedure in regard to the appointment of the Commission showed that the three Indians on the Executive Council were never consulted. As expected, the resolution was rejected.

#### OUR U. P. LETTER.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

ALLAHABAD, FEB. 10.

#### SIR JOHN SIMON'S STATEMENT AND AFTER.

THE announcement made by Sir John Simon regarding the procedure of the Statutory Commission's inquiry has pleased nobody. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, the distinguished President of the last session of the Liberal Federation, and Dr. Annie Besant, who happened to be here on a short visit at the time, were the first to reject the offer of a "joint free conference." Dr. Besant held that Sir John Simon's explanation

did not involve any real equality. Sir John remained the arbiter of what should come within the cognizance of the Parliamentary Committee and the Indian Committees respectively and they were not therefore in an equal position enabling them to come to a decision on identical facts. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru's opinion showed clearly that he remained unconvinced and unrepentant. "I see no reason to alter my opinion or to advise my party to alter their attitude."

#### MR. CHINTAMANI'S VIEW.

Mr. C. Y. Chintamani, General Secretary of the Liberal Federation, explained the position at greater length and pointed out that there was no other course left to self-respecting Indians but to successfully carry on the boycott. In an interview granted to your correspondent this morning he expressed himself as follows:—"In my opinion, this statement by which so much store was laid leaves the position substantially unchanged. In different language worthy of the consummate advocate that he is, he (Sir John Simon) has merely repeated in substance what was stated by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald in the House of Commons and by Lord Irwin in his latest statement. The phrase "Joint Free Conference" may take in the superficial and the unwary but cannot have the magic of converting the Committee of the Legislature into a body of equal status and authority as the Commission itself. To me the issue has been very simple from the very beginning. Why are not Indians deemed fit to be members of the Commission itself? The reasons urged for their exclusion are an elaborate camouflage which very thinly veils the real and unexpressed reason. The British arrogate to themselves the exclusive right to determine our whole future. While I do not deny, because it cannot be denied, the supreme authority of the British Parliament, I do rebel against the imperialist notion that my countrymen cannot be admitted even to an equal share in the scheme of inquiry and report. The whole scheme of the present Statutory Commission, as conceived and executed, condemns the people of India to an inferior position in the Empire, and Indians ought not to and will not accept such a dishonouring position. To me this is the core of the whole matter and I affirm that after reading Sir John Simon's statement I must adhere to the position that we must have nothing whatsoever to do with the Commission at any stage and in any form. In saying this I am aware that my commonsense, intelligence and motive will all be questioned, but this does not trouble me. I am confident that the Party with which it has been my honour to become keenly identified ever since it came into being will endorse and support the opinion here expressed and that the Liberal Federation will not modify the opinions which it formally recorded at its last annual session at Bombay. And I am rejoiced at the clear and decisive position taken up by Messrs. Jayakar and Kelkar as the leaders of the Party of Responsive Cooperation. Let us go forward with our own work, unrelenting and unrelenting, and also, unconcerned by what our opponents may choose to say of our attitude or of curse!

ves." The position therefore remains unaltered even after the much advertised statement of Sir John Simon has been made.

## REVIEWS.

### NATIVE TRUSTEESHIP.

**KENYA FROM WITHIN, A SHORT POLITICAL HISTORY.** By W. MCGREGOR ROSS. (George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London.) 1927. 8¾ x 5¾. pp. 486. 18s.

THE rise of Britain's African Empire has caused much heart-burning not least in Indian breasts. Therefore any book which sheds light on the subject is to be welcomed. If in addition the book is written in a spirit of fair-mindedness and honesty, revealing facts without fear or prejudice or favour, it is to be doubly and trebly welcomed. Such a book is "Kenya from Within," and I must say that few books have given me greater pleasure in reading. The author, Mr. W. McGregor Ross, was one of those thanked in a resolution of the E. A. Indian National Congress for his help to the community. I know that that would be sufficient disqualification in the eyes of some people who otherwise might accept him as an authority on the subject. But to the unbiassed it must be apparent that Mr. Ross has approached his task with an open mind and that he has striven only to present facts as they occurred, not as he would have liked them to have occurred. Few men could possess greater qualifications for the work, for as he himself says in his book he has watched Government in East Africa from 1900 onwards, and that from a very advantageous position. He was for eighteen years Director of Public Works in the Colony. If anyone had the opportunity of seeing the place develop, he certainly had. Add to this a fine literary style and a forceful power of narrative, and you have what must be one of the best books on the latter-day history of Kenya.

Starting from earliest times, Mr. Ross soon gets to grips with the main problems that are agitating minds about Kenya. In the forefront of course is the land question. He examines in detail the various land laws by which the Colony has been ruled, and we must say that the story makes a sorry page in British Colonial history. The reader must remember, however, that this is the work of a handful of malevolent spirits. And lest one's charity for the poor African should get the better of one to the detriment of these few, the author reminds us that they too are human beings just like ourselves and our friends, who have found themselves in a strange environment. What that environment is we may gather from Mr. Ross's own *dictum* "the portion of East Africa which is now termed Kenya Colony has been one of the places where it has been possible to 'get rich quick.'" Still, after making all due allowances, the story of the land-grabbing fills one with disgust, for it is nothing short of theft. In the author's words, "When there was so much good land in the country that was positively vacant, what excuse is there for private owners being on land which we know to have been native property and under native occupation?" The Catholic clergy in Kenya in a memorandum submitted to the Parliamentary Commission also support the view that the land still belongs to the native. "This, however, is certain, when the Europeans came here the land belonged to the natives, and it is difficult to see how they have lost their rights in ownership." It is clear that nothing but restitution can blot out this smirch on Britain's honour. The issue has been com-

plicated in so far as the original settler-holders have in many cases sold out to others and left the country. Direct restitution is therefore impossible, and Mr. Ross suggests that the remedy is that Africans should be allowed, when occasion offers, to buy land that they want. But this seems to me manifestly unfair, that the natives should have to pay for what belonged to them, and has never ceased to belong to them. The lands should be restored at public expense. Mr. Ross has shown that compared with the natives the non-natives are grossly undertaxed. Why not a special "restitution tax" on them? It does not seem unfair. We must bear in mind that this situation has arisen under the cognisance of the Government, even if we call it a weak Government. The present holders will receive a fair price for their lands. They took the risk of submitting to the laws of the country when they entered the Colony. And what they will contribute towards the purchase price of their own lands would be nothing in comparison with what the African would have to pay to receive back what elongs to him. Besides, there are still large numbers of the original settlers, who admittedly bought their land for speculative purposes. No one need feel any compunction for them.

The labour question presents, if anything, even more dismal aspects; it is merely exploitation of the ignorant black for the benefit and enrichment of the white, often without any regard for the former as a human being; in the author's words, "a system of crude exploitation which a preponderating white group upheld." Here too the reader must be warned against thinking that there were none found to raise their voices against the system, or to show a better example themselves. But the fact remains that the policy of exploitation had the support of high Government officials, so that Mr. Ross can write, "British Government in East Africa had reached the nadir of its recession from established British standards." Yet the accepted policy in regard to Kenya is that of a "native trusteeship." It ill accords with facts. For it implies that the local Government acts as the beneficiary and protector of the helpless native against the rapaciousness of the non-native, where as the contrary has been the case.

Mr. Ross goes fully into the Kenya Indian question. The gravamen of the charge levelled against the Indians in Kenya is that they compete with the natives and prevent, or at any rate retard, their development. The author shows that neither in trade, nor in agriculture, nor in skilled work, nor in the professions, nor even in Government service is this a fact. He sarcastically remarks, "If Europeans had, from the first, conducted trade operations to identically the same extent, (as the Indians) we should hear nothing but appreciation for the stimulus that they were supplying to backward native tribes, and of the concomitant trade facilities which the latter were enjoying." These words have a familiar ring for those of us in India. Readers of this paper will recall occasions on which they have been used in regard to the British exploitation in this country. I do not deny whatever truth might be contained in them. But they sound perilously like the bankruptcy of the doctrine of trusteeship when used. Other questions affecting Indians in Kenya have been those of franchise, segregation and the reservation of the highlands, which have been well before the public over here. But Mr. Ross is able to throw added light on them such as cables and newspaper articles cannot do. He has written a very close history of the anti-Indian agitation, and one must share his contempt for those "political" Europeans who staged it. Hardly ever at any time honest, it sunk to the depths of degradation in dragging the name of Chris-

tianity into it. Christianity has been used as a cloak for vice many times, but this surely must be a classic occasion. And strange it must seem to the casual reader, that when these "Christians" were invoking Christianity to gain absolute political power, it was left to non-Christian Indians to suggest that this was not compatible with the most-vaunted doctrine of "native trusteeship."

It is a great book, nobly conceived, and written in a spirit of conciliation, born of charity and justice: two qualities which more than any others are needed to-day in the solution of the many racial problems that confront us.

H. STANTON.

### AMERICAN RURAL LIFE.

**VILLAGE COMMUNITIES.** By EDMUND DES BRUNNER. (George H. Doren Co., New York.) 1927. 8¾ × 5¾. pp. 244 + vii. \$ 2.25

THE study of American representative villages and their comparison is very interesting to American readers. It however cannot interest Indian readers in the absence of any comparison with Indian villages. It is no doubt true that village community studies, if conducted on similar lines in India, will disclose contrasts and present a different picture when compared with American village communities.

*Economic Condition.*—The American village community has consolidated schools, country schools, church, bank, stores, play-ground, generally a park and also a cooperative company. There are roads and cross roads to reach the farms and they have pipewater. The average valuation of the property per household (for Alford) is Rs. 10,000 as against Rs. 913 at Jategaon (Poona dist.) It may be noted that land valuation in America for assessing rates and taxes is not a full valuation; whereas valuation at Jategaon worked out by Dr. Mann is full valuation at market rates. At Alford all the population is gainfully employed, even half of the men over 65 being so employed. In India in most of the villages farmers have no sufficient work throughout the year.

*Educational Facilities.*—Most villages have consolidated schools in addition to country schools with spacious buildings to house them. For example, Alford village school building is worth Rs. 33,000 with a hall to accommodate 450 persons. The pay of the teachers varies from Rs. 225 to Rs. 330 per month. The school in addition to the high school course provides four years' course in agriculture in which farm management and civics are taught. The school boys have a committee consisting of two representatives from each class who keep discipline. This self-government helps to build character and self-reliance. The country school is not so ambitious, the buildings being small and teacher's pay about Rs. 190 p. m.

Between the 140 villages investigated there are 287 public schools and 12 private schools. Two-fifths of the teachers are graduates; and 72 p. c. of the child population attend school. Two-thirds of the students attend the village school; and one-third attend high schools. It has been ascertained that generally one half of these join college later on.

P. O. PATIL.

### SHORT NOTICE.

**STUDIES IN BROWN HUMANITY, BEING SCRAWLS AND SMUDGES IN SEPIA, WHITE AND YELLOW.** By HUGH CLIFFORD. (The Richards Press, Ltd. London.) 1927. 8 × 5¼. pp. 264. 7s. 6d.

THIS book, first published in 1898, contains short stories of native life and light essays connected therewith, by an administrator. It was worth republishing and is worth buying, and we have no intention of spoiling anyone's pleasure in it by reproducing any of the stories.

If the book is read with the intention of discovering evidences of race prejudice the reader will not be disappointed. Such things are always found by them that search diligently for them. But the unbiassed reader cannot but be impressed by the note of affection for the different peoples of the land that run through the book. "He that loveth hath fulfilled the Law." And we cannot but be struck with the way in which the findings of recent psychology are anticipated in the author's studies of primitive mentality. This argues something more than the very common sentimental affection of the Sahib for the simpleminded—a real penetrative sympathy.

The misrule of the Chiefs, before British occupation, is painted in lucid colours; but it is recognised that British rule is far from perfect. It will be displeasing to many to find that the Indian go-between appears to some extent as the villain of the piece, "the Tamil sleek, the bearded Sikh," though the qualities of the latter are generously recognised. But it will be better than empty rage to examine whether there is not something in the charge, for example, in Chota Nagpur, where the conditions are somewhat similar. Also, it must be remembered that much could be said without offence in 1898 that would be exceedingly tactless now.

It is a pity that the author allowed himself to copy Kipling in style. He does do it well, and has not had the same popularity. But if he is not so good a journalist as Kipling he is a much better anthropologist and the merits of his own knowledge and understanding are sufficient to commend his book without his borrowing the use of casual capital letters and unexpected punctuation. Kipling, often inaccurate as regards facts, gives atmosphere; Clifford has no need to create atmosphere as he knows his facts.

WALTER O. FITCH

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

- AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BENJAMIN ROBERT HAYDEN.** By B. R. HAYDEN. (Oxford University Press, London.) 1927. 6 × 3¼. pp. 424. 2s.
- CHURCH AND STATE IN MEXICO, 1822-1857.** By WIFRID HARDY CALCOTT. (Duke University Press, Durham.) 1926. 9½ × 6½. pp. 357. \$4.00.
- INDIAN AGRICULTURE (India of To-day Vol. VIII).** By A. H. HOWARD AND L. C. HOWARD. (Oxford University Press, London.) 1927. 7½ × 5. pp. 98. Rs. 2-8-0.
- BARODA ADMINISTRATION REPORT, 1926-27.** (Baroda State Press, Baroda.) 1928. 9½ × 6½. pp. 248. Rs. 2-12-0.

2/6 to £3 Daily. Any person with good business capabilities could add considerably to his income. Address Hollandsche Verkoop Centrale Buitenveldert, Amsterdam, Holland.