

The Servant of India

EDITOR : S. G. VAZE.—OFFICE : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S HOME, POONA 4.

VOL. XII, NO. 44.

POONA—THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1929.

INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	525
ARTICLES :—	
The Viceroy's Statement ...	528
"A Tripartite Conference"? ...	529
The Prospects of Democracy.—III. By Professor T. G. P. Spear ...	531
Inter-Universities Conference ...	533
OUR LONDON LETTER :—	
On the Eve of the Announcement. By A. Fenner Brockway, M.P. ...	534
OUR EUROPEAN LETTER :—	
Washington and After ...	535
SHORT NOTICE ...	536
Books Received ...	536

Topics of the Week.

Advocates of Independence.

MOST of the Congress leaders accept the Viceregal statement, if not as an actual offer of Dominion Status, as an earnest of it requiring modification of the pledge, taken at the last Congress session, to launch a general passive resistance movement on the first of January next year. But it was of course to be expected that some would insist upon a literal interpretation of the Calcutta Congress resolution and urge that release from the pledge was possible to Congressmen only in the event of Dominion Status being bestowed upon India in fact by the 31st of December this year and not in the event of a vague promise to that effect being dangled before the people's minds. The number of such leaders is small but they are by no means negligible. Among them are Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar, Mr. Subas Chandra Bose and Dr. Kitchlew. We must confess logic is entirely on their side. The Calcutta resolution is cast-iron in form; it leaves no loophole for escape. When Mahatma Gandhi declared, on the eve of the Viceroy's pronouncement, that only a definite promise of Dominion Status made before the end of this year would obviate the eventuality of a no-tax campaign, we had an inmost feeling that even such a promise would be no sufficient ground for one who was inflexible in his loyalty to the Congress resolution to desist from the campaign. But the Viceroy's announcement does not even contain such a promise. It is no use cherishing the delusion that it does. No one can challenge the truth of Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar's statement that "there is no acceptance by the British Government of the demand for immediate and full Dominion Status without reservation; nor is there any promise that the decision of the Conference will *ipso facto* be accepted by the British Government." He is therefore right when he says that honesty alone should require Congressmen to

reject the Viceroy's offer and prepare themselves for the action to which they have committed themselves. But the pledges of politicians are never to be taken at their face value. The presence of Mahatma Gandhi at the helm of the Congress may perhaps have led some people to expect that a literal observance of the terms of the Calcutta resolution would be required of all Congressmen. His approval of the Viceroy's statement, however, as justifying absolution from the undertaking of the Calcutta resolution, should bring home to them the fact, now known to most Indians, that Mahatma Gandhi too is to be reckoned among politicians, and for the matter of that, in spite of his high idealism, among realist politicians. Mr. Subas Chandra Bose has thought it necessary to resign his membership of the Working Committee of the Congress, being at variance with all the other members on the reception to be accorded to the Viceregal statement. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has been kept on the right side, which augurs well for the success of the next Congress, but we may still anticipate no small trouble from the dissidents who, being influential, may increase their following unless the Round Table Conference is expeditiously held and results in the country's demand being conceded.

* * *

Unconditional Acceptance.

AT the other end of the scale are several other leaders who are for accepting the offer of the Viceroy without seeming to make any conditions such as are contained in the manifesto prepared by representatives of all parties in Delhi. Among such are no less influential leaders than Sir Chimanlal Setalvad, Mr. Jinnah, Mr. Jayakar, Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, and Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas. The conditions mentioned in it require (1) a general policy of conciliation to be inaugurated, (2) amnesty to be given to political prisoners, and (3) the personnel of the representatives to the Round Table Conference to be selected predominantly from the Congress group. The first two conditions are regarded by these leaders as unnecessary, being more or less implicit in the new policy. It is felt inconceivable, e. g., that the Government will be anything but conciliatory in their general attitude if, as is believed by the signatories of the Delhi manifesto, the Government intend to formulate and adopt a constitution, more or less of the Dominion type. And when the Act conferring Dominion Status is passed, it will necessarily be followed, as is usual whenever such big constitutional changes take place, by a general amnesty. Sir Chimanlal Setalvad and others therefore feel that, by attaching what look like conditions to the acceptance of the offer, we gain nothing which would not in the ordinary course be secured, but only detract from the gracefulness of our acceptance. This seems to be their reasoning since Mr. Jinnah himself in his own statement has referred to

general amnesty as a thing which will and must come. The difference on these two points is not therefore far-reaching. All are agreed that conciliation and amnesty are necessary to complete this *beau geste* on the part of the British Government, the difference being limited to the advisability of making a distinct stipulation to this effect so as to give it the appearance of bargaining. The third condition, however, will probably arouse a more serious opposition in certain quarters. The composition of the Round Table Conference is a matter for anxious concern to everybody, and all are united in asking that progressive opinion will receive adequate representation at the Conference. If the Government are at all serious about this Round Table Conference it cannot be imagined that they will commit the fatal mistake of packing the Conference with men of reactionary views. The presence of a very large proposition of advanced politicians is of course an indispensable condition to the success of the Conference, but it would have been well if the Congress were not asked to be assigned a predominant share of the representation: if only to avoid the opposition which the mention of any particular Party would necessarily provoke. Several leaders of the non-Congress groups have acquiesced in this condition, but it is too much to expect that there would be a general acquiescence in the country. This condition has already led to a demand by Mahomedans that the members of the Nehru Committee should be altogether kept out of the Conference. Considering all things, it would have been better if such a condition were not included in the manifesto.

* * *

Opposition in England.

It is strange that there being a unanimity among all political parties in England as to the necessity of eliciting the co-operation of the politically-minded classes in India by means of a Round Table Conference, there should be opposition, and if press reports are to be believed, serious opposition to the declaration of the goal of British policy in India to be Dominion Status instead of responsible government. Indian opinion is however unanimous in considering the former as by far a bigger stroke of policy than the latter. First of all, the announcement is about the future, and no one can immovably fix the future of a country at any particular point. The controversies about the goal are therefore largely futile. Secondly, there is hardly any difference apparent to any ordinary person—and the Declaration of 1917 was meant for ordinary persons—between responsible government and Dominion Status. If Sir Malcolm Hailey had not drawn an ingenious distinction between the two, no one would have thought of the necessity of a fresh interpretation of the Declaration. Thirdly, Dominion Status has been promised to India in State documents carrying no less authority than the Declaration as solemnly as responsible government has been promised in the Declaration. People in India never felt any particular need for a redefinition of India's political destiny. They almost felt that too much was made in the Nehru Report of Sir Malcolm Hailey's statement in the Assembly discounting Dominion Status. Frankly, therefore, Indian opinion is not likely to enthuse over the re-interpretation of the 1917 Declaration contained in the Viceroy's statement. Political parties in England were not consulted about this point perhaps because Lord Irwin and Mr. Wedgwood Benn felt that it was a point of less importance than the operative part of the statement which might perhaps be regarded in some quarters as a reversal of the policy which led to the appointment of the Statutory Commission. One would have thought that there might be some un-

willingness in England to institute fresh machinery for consulting Indian opinion, but, curiously enough, unanimity has been secured on this point and the statement is being attacked on a much less substantial point. It is not likely however that this attack will gather much force.

* * *

States and the Round Table Conference.

MR. N. C. KELKAR, M.L.A., and Mr. Patwardhan, as Joint Honorary Secretaries of the Deccan State Association (or the Daxini Sansthan Hitwardhak Sabha), have, we understand, sent the following cablegram to the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for India:—"Pray accept profound gratitude on behalf of people in Indian States for proposed Round Table Conference. Sabha would however urge inclusion of States' people with Princes to represent Indian States as an essential condition of success of Conference." They have similarly sent a telegram to the Viceroy, pointing out, first of all, that if the Simon Commission hears no more evidence but bases its conclusions on the States question, to which its inquiry has now been extended, on the evidence tendered to the Butler Committee, it will be grossly unjust to the people of the States who were, it is notorious, shut out from putting forward their point of view before the Butler Committee. The telegram then makes the further point that it is all the more necessary because they have been excluded from previous inquiries that the States' people should now be afforded an opportunity to represent their case at the Round Table Conference. This part of the telegram runs as follows:—"Sabha feels exceedingly gratified that His Majesty's Government will, before formulating its own proposals, confer with representatives of all interests and parties with a view to reaching maximum agreement on points in issue and that to this Conference States' representatives will be invited. Sabha gratefully appreciates this memorable declaration and trusts it will be widely interpreted and generously implemented. Sabha would particularly emphasise need of including among States' representatives subjects as well as Princes. Claim of Princes to be the sole representatives of States in diplomatic negotiations with British India, if allowed, would give to the proposed Conference an unrepresentative character in a vital respect. Apart from the larger question of establishing constitutional government in Indian States definite undertakings on the part of British Government for securing Indian States' people against misrule make the latter an interested party whose views must be regarded as an integral factor in any possible readjustment of existing relations between British and Indian India. Sabha would therefore strongly voice the unanimous demand of States' subjects for adequate representation at the Round Table Conference. Sabha has grave misgivings about ability of Princes to honour obligations newly undertaken without express consent of States' people and would therefore give a humble but urgent warning to Government of India and His Majesty's Government against grave consequences bound to ensue from the exclusion of representatives of States' subjects enjoying public confidence from participation in the coming deliberations."

* * *

Persecution of a Baroda Journal.

WE feel bound to protest against the continued attempt by the authorities of the Baroda State to suppress *Nava Gujarat*, the weekly journal of Baroda, for its championing the cause of the subjects of the State and for its fearless comments on the doings of the authorities. The attempt to do it openly having failed in 1927 owing to the intervention of important personages, the authorities are trying to starve the

paper into submission by underhand means. During May 1928 a journal in Bombay had published a copy of a confidential order to heads of departments not to give advertisements and notifications of the State to this journal. It is reported that confidential circulars were issued last year to the Library Department to stop subscribing to the paper and now we hear that oral instructions have been issued to the officer in charge not to sanction the journal in the new budgets for village libraries. As a result all villages have been deprived of the use of the journal by the intervention of the authorities and protests have been appearing in various quarters against such an action, which is clearly traceable to official intervention. It is time that the authorities in States recognized that such tactics are out of date and that an attempt to keep their subjects uncontaminated by new ideas and new intellectual forces is ludicrous. Now that the subjects of the States have become more vocal it is no use stemming the tide of independent thought directed against the ways and doings of the administrations. The proper way to meet criticism is, as H. H. the Nawab of Bhopal declared a few days ago, to issue a truthful statement giving the version of the State authorities. Truth, howsoever suppressed, will be out. The States must take a leaf out of the book of British India so far as journalism is concerned.

The Bombay Karnatak Co-operative Conference.

THE Presidential address of Mr. Ramadasa Pantulu at the Bombay Karnatak Co-operative Conference held at Dharwar deserves a careful study on account of its reference to some of the important problems intended to be tackled by the Banking Enquiry Committee. Mr. Pantulu is by no means self-satisfied; he points out that the ground still left uncovered by the Co-operative Societies and banks in displacing the moneylender from the field of financing productive operations in agriculture is vast. Since these institutions cannot dispense long term credit for redeeming prior indebtedness it is necessary in his opinion to create land mortgage banks since the other types of banks are not suitable agencies for taking up this work. Mr. Pantulu emphasized the great importance of co-operative marketing since under the primitive system of to-day the agriculturist loses a good deal of his legitimate gain. Considering that a large part of the capital in the Co-operative concerns is lying idle, not being absorbed in production, he proposes that it should be utilised in distribution by organizing sale societies; in fact the latter will be rendering a material assistance to primary societies by having their dues recovered promptly after the sale operation is completed. Mr. Pantulu deprecated the way in which Research Institutes and Agricultural Boards in India throw a large part of the blame for agricultural deterioration on the inertness and backwardness of the rayat; in his opinion the State and the vast majority of educated people are equally to blame in the matter. He recommended a scheme of co-operative education, involving the persistent education of the members of primary Societies in the principles of Co-operation, training a staff of workers versed in the technique of business management and lastly the promotion of the study of Co-operation among the general public. What Mr. Pantulu said about the indifference of an average joint stock banker to co-operation and co-operative banking is perfectly true and the only remedy seems to be more propagandism. It is impossible, he said, to expand the sphere of Co-operative credit so as to reach even artisans and small traders unless the State and the bankers make the Co-operative organisations an integral part of the banking system of the country. The State in his opinion ought to solve the problem of agricultural credit by means of special legislation

linking it up with the country's banking schemes, instead of simply preaching the virtues of self-help.

* * *

The Madras Excise Administration.

THE Report of the Madras Excise Department for the year 1928-29 reveals the tale of a slow but sure progress. The number of shops licensed for retail sale of country spirits decreased by 17 to 5,721; but the consumption has increased by some 1½ lakhs of proof gallons, which is set off partly by the decrease of the consumption of toddy. In regard to foreign liquor it is deplorable that the consumption of spirits and beer has shown an increase, that of beer having nearly doubled itself; even locally made foreign liquor has yielded an increase of excise duty of nearly Rs. 1 lakh. It is satisfactory to note that propaganda for discouraging the use of opium by means of booklets and lectures at child welfare centres is continued systematically. In view of the incidence of the total excise revenue per head of the population having increased by nearly one anna, it is the duty of Government to watch carefully the operation of the causes conducive to such a result and retard their growth. Part of the increase of revenue is no doubt explained by the enhancement of the rates of duty on country spirits in certain districts and the rise in the issue price of opium and the duty on bhang but a large portion due to increased consumption needs investigation. If, as is likely, the increased consumption of foreign liquors is due to their substitution for toddy, the result can hardly be regarded as satisfactory. It is a pity that the Commissioner of Excise regards the continued increase of illicit distillation as a warning against the policy of prohibition resulting in cutting off the supply of licit liquor; this sort of reasoning would land us in a vicious circle from which there would be no escape. The Report says that the efforts of temperance societies are proceeding on wrong lines but it fails to point out what the right methods ought to be. It appears from the Report that out of the recommendations of the Excise Advisory Committees with regard to closing of shops only two-thirds were carried out; with regard to a change of site however the major portion of them have been carried out by the Department. This records some progress from the point of view of the growth of public opinion and its effect on public policy. This is further seen in the fact that even in areas where there are no Advisory Committees, the Collectors have ordered the closure of 40 shops on the advice of other officers and of local bodies. Eight shops in the vicinity of important mills in the city of Madras had the hours of sale restricted.

CURE FOR DEAFNESS.

FINE OLD REMEDY.

THE wonderful curative power possessed by many old herbs has never been surpassed by modern treatment, and one of the most important of these old-fashioned remedies is the "AURAL HERB COMPOUND," which has been found remarkably successful in cases of nasal catarrh, noises in the head and deafness. Severe and long-standing cases, which had resisted all modern remedies, have been quickly and permanently cured by this old herbal preparation. Recommended with the utmost confidence. Price Rs. 4 per tin, post free, direct from

AURAL MEDICATION Co.,
160 Birkbeck Road, Beckenham, England.

Articles.

THE VICEROY'S STATEMENT.

HIS EXCELLENCY the Viceroy deserves well of the country for the courage with which he has come forward to propose a Conference between His Majesty's Government and the politically-minded classes as a means of overcoming the impasse which had settled on the country since the appointment of a purely British Statutory Commission. That event had led to a growing estrangement between Government and the people, so much so that no friends had been left to Government outside the ranks of the advocates of sectional interests and obscurantist views. To a statesman of Lord Irwin's sympathy and perspicacity such a position was unbearable, and it seemed difficult to restore public confidence which had been completely shattered except by a frank admission of the blunder made by the appointment of the Simon Commission. Lord Irwin's resourcefulness has however discovered a method by which Government could save their face and yet invite in an acceptable manner the co-operation of Indian politicians in framing a constitution which had been unanimously refused on account of the exclusion of Indians from the Statutory Commission. The Chairman of the Commission was himself induced to suggest a change in the procedure of the subsequent proceedings of the constitutional inquiry which was likely to be regarded by public opinion in India as making sufficient amends for the injury caused by his own Commission.

After the report of the Commission is received and considered by the Government of India and the Imperial Government, but before the Imperial Government formulates its own proposals and submits them for legislation to Parliament, a Conference is to be held with all the different political groups in India for the express purpose of enabling the Government to present to Parliament a Bill acceptable to all sections of opinion in this country. This implies in one sense nothing less than the scrapping of the Simon Report in advance, and it was therefore necessary that a proposal of such complexion should emanate from the Commission itself. A pretext for the desired change was found in the exclusion of the Indian States from the scope of the Simon inquiry, which had left a gap that could not be filled up except by extending the inquiry so that it might embrace this question as well. The gap had been long perceived in India and the people in the Indian States were persistent in drawing attention to it. Lord Olivier had made pointed reference to it in his Question in the House of Lords, but Government had professed all along not to have noticed it. Now however it came handy, and only a few days before Lord Irwin's departure from England it came as a revelation to Sir John Simon who brought it to Government's notice and suggested, to all interests and purposes, that a Round Table Conference should be convened.

Originally, Government was to base its own proposals on the Simon Report and embody them in a Bill and then refer the Bill to a Joint Select Committee to which Indian public men could submit their own claims and counter-proposals. Although it was provided that the Government would not be held committed to its own proposals, still it was clear that at that stage it was hardly possible for Indian politicians to have any radical changes introduced into the official Bill. By the procedure now adopted, before a Bill is got ready, Government will ascertain the demands of the Indian people, make every endeavour to bring about an agreement between the representations made by different sections of opinion, and put forward an agreed scheme, if such a one results from the deliberations at the Conference, as its own proposals. The reference to the Joint Select Committee will then supervene, and at this stage any remaining differences can be smoothed away or reconciled. Thus the Round Table Conference meets to a very large extent the objections urged by public opinion to the Statutory Commission, and the Viceroy deserves the sincere congratulations of the country for the statesmanship displayed by him in thus responding to public opinion. The response which his own statement will evoke from the public will, we are sure, be whole-hearted and is in fact very satisfactory.

It is possible to make almost anything or nothing of the proposed Conference. It can well become the full-fledged Round Table Conference which the country has been persistently demanding or it may just represent a half-hearted attempt to consult Indian opinion and bring about an understanding between various schools of thought. We ourselves would prefer to believe that if the Conference is held during Lord Irwin's régime and while the Labour Party is in office, it will be the Round Table Conference asked for by public opinion; that the Government would first use their good offices at this Conference to hammer out an agreed scheme, and that when it is framed, Government would proceed straightaway to give legislative effect to it. Mr. Lansbury and other Labour leaders have invited us to put the most favourable construction on the Viceroy's statement and we would fain do so. We therefore hope for the very best results to flow from the Conference.

The statement also contains a reaffirmation of the goal of British policy in India and a definition thereof as the attainment of Dominion Status by India. We ourselves are unable to attach much importance to it. As the Declaration of 1917 was construed in an illiberal spirit by Sir Malcolm Hailey making it possible for British statesmen to leave India, even ultimately, in the position in which, e. g., Malta is at present, (Malta enjoys responsible government but her constitution falls far short of Dominion Status), the new liberal interpretation might be useful. But since after all, in spite of the ingenuity displayed by Sir Malcolm Hailey, there is no question that it was Parliament's intention to place the attainment of Dominion Status as the goal of its policy before India, not much is gained by the reiteration of this goal in the state-

ment. What however was intended as the goal has now come, we believe, to be the immediate objective of Government's policy. The Delhi Manifesto well says, "We understand that the Conference is to meet not to discuss when Dominion Status is to be established but to frame a scheme of Dominion Constitution for India. We hope we are not mistaken in thus interpreting the import and implications of the weighty pronouncement of His Excellency the Viceroy." It is in this sense alone that the public in India can feel enthusiasm for this part of the statement, and since the Labour leaders of even extreme views are united in going a wide interpretation to the statement we would fain adopt that interpretation ourselves. The Labour Government and the Viceroy have earned the lasting gratitude of Indians by making it possible for India if only we learn to sink our own differences, to attain nationhood at no distant future.

"A TRIPARTITE CONFERENCE" ?

THE *Hindu's* London correspondent has cabled to that journal the news learnt by him "on high authority" that "the States' representation on the Round Table Conference will be confined to the Princes." There is not the least doubt that if the arrangements for the Round Table Conference were to be shaped in accordance with the desire of the Princes, the people of the States would have no seat at the Conference; but we are loth to believe that the Labour Government would be a party to such a flagrantly inequitable arrangement. So far as the Viceregal statement itself is concerned, it contemplates His Majesty's Government issuing invitations to "representatives of different parties and interests in British India and representatives of the Indian States to meet them." There is nothing in this which implies exclusion of the people of India from the Round Table Conference, but the Princes have evidently interpreted the statement to mean that while British India would be represented by leaders representing different schools of thought, Indian States would be represented by themselves alone. H. H. the Maharaja of Bikaner, e. g., coolly assumes this and points for evidence to the fact that, instead of adopting the simple phraseology of Sir John Simon's letter that His Majesty's Government would meet "representatives of British India and representatives of Indian States", the Premier in his reply to Sir John Simon and the Viceroy in his statement speak of His Majesty's Government meeting "representatives of different parties and interests in British India and representatives of the Indian States." The mention of "different parties and interests" in British India and the absence of such mention in Indian States, imply, according to the Maharaja of Bikaner, recognition on the part of the British Government of a fundamental community of interests between the rulers and their subjects in Indian States and the reasonableness therefore of limiting the representation of Indian States at the Round Table Conference to the rulers. There is no foundation whatsoever for this

fanciful and far-fetched interpretation of the Viceroy statement and the Premier's reply.

There is no identity of interests between the Princes and the people in every respect, and the principle of giving due representation to all parties and interests, which is specially mentioned in the case of British India, must apply to Indian States also. And if what the London correspondent of the *Hindu* reports proves true, viz. that "the (States') People's Conference will have to depend upon action being taken on their behalf by the representatives of British India", the Round Table Conference would be vitiated by a vital defect in its composition. The people of the Indian States must no more be required to rely upon the people of British India to plead their cause than the people of British India upon the people of Indian States or the rulers of Indian States upon their subjects. We refuse to believe, and shall continue to do so till proof to the contrary is forthcoming, that the Labour Government will shut out any important section of Indian opinion from the Conference or will ignore any integral factor in the political situation in devising the future political constitution for all-India. The right of the people of the States to representation at the Round Table Conference can easily be established. A conference between the two halves of India has become necessary because possibly a change in the existing relations between them might be required before British India as she will emerge from the impending constitutional reforms can be fitted into the all-India political structure. The existing relations are determined largely by treaties, engagements &c., subsisting between the British Government and the States. If a change is now to be introduced into the treaty position it can be done, it is felt, by the mutual consent of those who will be affected by the change. The parties who will be affected by a change in the treaty position are not merely British Indians and Indian rulers, but the subjects of the Indian rulers as well. Several of the treaties made with Princes contain express provisions guaranteeing the people in the States against gross misrule of the Princes and even where no such provisions exist the right on the part of the British Government to intervene in the internal administration of the States is admitted by the Princes to be implicit in the British Government's paramountcy over the States. This right of intervention, whether expressed or implied, but in any case unquestioned, may undergo either extension or curtailment as a result of the negotiations that will take place at the Round Table Conference. It is therefore obvious that those in whose interest this right is to be exercised must be heard before the British Government either abandons any power of interference it now possesses or acquires any new power for the future. This is but one of the many illustrations which can be given to show how the people of Indian States will be affected in a manner different from or perhaps contrary to that in which the Princes will be affected by any changes in the relations that subsist at present between British and Indian India. The people of the States must therefore be accorded separate and indepen-

dent representation at the Round Table Conference from any representation that might be given to the Princes.

That the States' people are as vitally concerned in the negotiations that may take place at the Conference as British Indians or Indian Princes will be granted readily enough, but a constitutional theory is advanced by the Princes by which it is sought to be proved that the people, having no voice in government, cannot participate in such negotiations themselves, but must be content with having these conducted for themselves by their rulers. The Maharaja of Bikaner has reiterated this theory in his recent speech, but he expounded it at greater length in a former utterance in which he put forward the Princes' objections to the Nehru Report as under :—

The relations of all nations and governments, including the most democratic amongst them, are with the ruler in the case of autocracy, and with the rulers and the governments in cases of constitutional monarchy and democracy. Thus in matters affecting the States the lawful authorities with whom alone any such negotiations can be conducted are the rulers and the governments of the States, whether such governments profess autocracy, bureaucracy or democracy; and excepting in the case of mobocracy, no government worthy of the name could for a moment agree for such negotiations to be bilateral and conducted on the one side with lawfully constituted government of the State or country and at the same time on the other side with the millions of subjects of a State.

According to this theory, such negotiations as may take place at the Round Table Conference must be carried on, as the Maharaja himself says in one part of his speech, between the Imperial Government and the Governments of the States. It was in accordance with this theory that the political relations were handled by the British Government so far. Ignoring their own subjects, they conducted negotiations with the Princes, who, on their part, participated in them without consulting *their* subjects. The Governments carried on conversations, leaving the people in both cases on one side. If from the proposed Round Table Conference the people in British India were to be excluded as in the past, then perhaps it could be argued with some show of reason that the people in Indian States should similarly be excluded. But on the same principle and for the same reason on which and for which the people in British India are allowed to share in the negotiations, the people in Indian States also must be. You cannot concede a *locus standi* in these negotiations to the former and deny it to the latter. You cannot therefore have a "tripartite" conference between the British Government, the British Indian people and the Indian rulers, which alone, the Maharaja of Bikaner declares, the Princes would be willing to attend. Either you can have on the principle laid down by the Maharaja a Two Power Conference—a conference, that is, between the British Government and the Governments of the Indian States; or, on the principle evidently kept in view by Lord Irwin and Capt. Wedgwood Benn, a Four Power Conference, the parties to it being the British Government, the British Indian people, the Indian Princes and the Indian States' people.

The Conference proposed is not intended to be bet-

ween plenipotentiaries; but merely preliminary as a means of ascertaining how the conflicting interests of the various parties concerned can best be reconciled. The admission of the people's representatives to it does not therefore offend against the constitutional principle invoked by the Maharaja of Bikaner, a principle which is right enough in its context, but which becomes mischievous when applied to wrong cases. Not only is such admission entirely unobjectionable, but absolutely necessary. The British Government and the Government of India who have devised this Round Table Conference for the express purpose of holding direct conversations with the people who for some reason or other stood apart from the Simon Commission obviously repudiate the doctrine cited by the Maharaja as inapplicable to the present instance and we have no doubt that they will frustrate the frantic attempts being made by the Princes to keep their own people out of the conference. What a superciliousness the Maharaja betrays when he exclaims that it is "impossible to expect the Princes to depute the duly constituted representatives of their governments to sit and to negotiate on an equal basis with so-called representatives of their peoples as a separate and independent party"! What our Princes and Princelets however consider it *infra dig.* to do, the paramount power to which they all bow feels no humiliation in doing. Nor have the Princes themselves apparently any objection to sit by the side of the subjects of the paramount power and deliberate with them on a footing of equality. It is a strange sense of dignity indeed which thus impliedly holds the subjects of another State as superior in status to the subjects of one's own State. We cannot believe that the Maharaja of Bikaner, gifted as he is with remarkable political insight, will not on further reflexion realise the absurdity of the position he has assumed on this subject and waive his objection to the inclusion of the representatives of the people of the States at the Round Table Conference.

But the duty of the Labour Government is plain: they cannot admit the leaders of opinion in British India and keep out their counterparts in Indian States without involving themselves in a grave and ruinous inconsistency. The people of the States will be thrice injured by their exclusion from the ensuing Conference: they were not allowed to represent their case before the Butler Committee; they will not presumably be allowed to do so before the Simon Commission, who, we guess, will pronounce on the States question without receiving any evidence on it; if they are now elbowed out at the Round Table Conference, they will be in the position of having to submit to decisions taken behind their backs right through. Nor will they, we think, tamely submit to such decisions in future. They have come to realise the value of constitutional opposition too well to allow the Princes to hug the delusion to their bosoms that any arrangements which may be agreed to between the British Government and the Princes but which do not carry the hearty assent of the people can be carried out in practice. The British Government will find, in short, to use a slang expres-

• sion, that the Princes will not be able to deliver the goods without the support of their subjects. The paragraph in Mr. N. C. Kelkar's telegram to the Viceroy, published on another page, is very significant. It says, "The Sabha has grave misgivings about the ability of the Princes to honour obligations newly undertaken without the express consent of the States' people." It but re-echoes in polite words what we have stated somewhat bluntly above:

the Princes will not be able to deliver the goods. Material and practical considerations should thus strongly reinforce the appeal which ethical and ideal considerations would make to Mr. Wedgwood Benn and Lord Irwin in rejecting the Princes' claim to be the sole representatives of the States and in conceding the claim of the people of the States for adequate independent representation for themselves at the Round Table Conference.

THE PROSPECTS OF DEMOCRACY.

III.—OBSTACLES TO ITS REALIZATION.

IF the foregoing is the ideal of democracy we may well ask, What democratic system in existence then can be saved? The answer is that all such systems from the Greek City States and the Swiss Forest Cantons to the Referendum and Proportional Representation are not so much expressions of the democratic principle as approximations to it, means of moving towards the goal of true democracy. Democracy is not so much a system that exists as an ideal to be attained. Existing systems must be judged by their results in moving towards this goal, and if they are faulty, must be discarded. But the ideal remains; it is only the method of approach which is altered. Thus there is nothing particularly sacrosanct about the Parliamentary system, Federalism, the universal suffrage or any other nostrum for realising democracy. The means of realising this ideal must be freely adapted to the circumstances of particular countries, and one method may be substituted for another, so long as the same ideal is steadily aimed at. The political progress of a nation is to be judged, not by the particular system of government which it adopts, but by the ideal towards which it is working, and its constancy in pursuing it. Thus France in 1848 substituted the Presidential form of approach in place of the limited Parliamentary; the *coup d'état* of 1851 was a violent substitution of the plebiscitary method for the Presidential, which in 1870, by another sudden shock, was changed for the responsible Parliamentary method. Though opinions might differ as to which was the best method, the fact is that throughout that period the goal of democracy remained unchanged, "constant as the northern star." In sharp contrast to this are the modern Fascists, who not only denounced the working of the existing Italian parliamentary system as undemocratic (which it was), but denied democracy itself. The result is a system based on nothing but (at first) fear of revolution and force, a tyranny in the Greek sense of the word, which has no hope for the future, and which can only be changed by voluntary abdication or bloodshed. The only alternative to the democratic ideal, self-government and voluntary co-operation right through, is paternalism or authori-

tsrianism whose end is the slave mentality (mental if not physical) and the Servile State.

For the realisation of democracy it is obvious that something much more than juggling with ballot boxes and virtuosity in lobbying is required. It is the individual which counts and to the individual we must go. The democratic man is a "homo sapiens", who "sees life steadily and sees it whole," who has a "balanced outlook upon life." More important than any electoral system is therefore a system of education, without which the potentialities of man can never unfold themselves, but remain like dropped seeds in an infertile soil. Plato and Aristotle saw clearly that education and psychology were the twin foundations of political science, and Pestalozzi and Rousseau (in education an innovator as in so much else) in modern times applied, as we might say, the principle of self-government to education. Is the enfranchising of our ignorant multitude really a step towards democracy or does it not make the seizure of power by a dictator (aided by the resources in mendacity which modern journalism provides) all the more easy? It may be an earnest of the intention to build up a democracy, but it is hardly positively a progressive step, and in modern conditions it may be a very dangerous one. It is true that most European countries did this and got the education afterwards, but Russia and Spain and Italy have paid the price in dictatorships. Similarly education without political power may lead only to more intelligent and efficient servility. So the Germans, with all their splendid expert organisation, when their leaders blundered during the war were helpless to replace them. It is all a question of ways and means, of what expedient will best promote the self-development of the individual without endangering the safety of the state and the whole ideal of government. It is not contended that universal suffrage or any other political expedient is necessarily bad, but only that no one expedient is infallible *per se*: all must be judged by the degree in which they develop the personality of the average citizen. Thus electoral devices like the alternative vote, decentralisation, etc., are ways of making the vote of a citizen more effective, and more radical proposals for economic reorganisation like

those of Guild Socialists, the Syndicalists and the Functionalism of Prof. Laski and his school, are ways of increasing the control of the citizen over his life based on the realisation that politics or public affairs are now too intimately bound up with economics or private affairs and the whole of social life, to be neglected or left to run their own unregulated course. The various schools of social thinkers are only the recognition that self-government and its corollary, willing co-operation and mutual control, must govern the whole of life and not merely its conventionally public aspect.

The real obstacles to the realisation of democracy are not the opposition of interested or mediæval minded groups, or the defects of particular machines; statistics of corruption, revelations of graft and self-seeking and all the ills which parliamentary institutions are heirs to, are only the symptoms of difficulties which lie much deeper in the conditions of the modern world.

These fundamental difficulties are in the main the great size of modern countries, the numbers of modern populations, and the fact that much of the necessary work of the world is of so unattractive a nature that none could do it unless compelled, or unless his mind had not yet risen to conceiving any alternative. Expressing the people's will to-day is not so easy a matter as when the ideal state was "the largest number which suffices for the purposes of life and can be taken in at a single view".* How can the vast populations of a modern state be civilised right through? Will the cinema goer ever appreciate Shelley and Shakespeare? Who would be a miner or sweeper if he could avoid it, or who would wish to go on being one after once becoming conscious of new desires and a larger life?

The problem of size and numbers is the furthest on the way to solution as it has engaged attention ever since the difficulty of applying Rousseau's ideas to a country state was realised. The British Constitution was the first model, and all the refinements of political science from Federalism downwards are steps in this direction. It is the problem of giving to a whale the delicate nervous system of an ant. More recently it has been realised that mere political decentralisation will not solve the whole question. Since government, society and the individual are under modern conditions inextricably intertwined, democracy must express itself through the whole of life, social and economic as well as political. This is the foundation of the various social theories. Marx's State Socialism was a move towards the ideal of democracy although, soured as it was by hardships, a bad tempered and very wooden one. The later communists have retained the bad temper and woodenness and dropped the democracy, and thus produced their fanatic and violent authoritarianism based only

on force, and with no more moral claim to obedience than Fascism. The bomb and the big stick are short cuts to nothing but the breaking of heads. Since Marx, however, our social thinkers have improved in technique; they are neither bomb throwers or social drill serjeants; they aim at making the organs of government multiple, to cover all aspects of life, because they realise that society is multi-cellular. One man has many needs, and they must be met in many ways.

The civilising of society right through depends on real education and the development of some means of self-expression for the masses. For the former universal education is only a beginning and for the latter there must be democratic art in its different forms to provide means of self-expression for the mind as athletics already do for the body. Here science promises to do what might otherwise not be possible, to combine a democratic with a centralised art, the village craftsman with the metropolitan virtuoso. We see the beginnings of these possibilities in England in the gramophone and broadcasting as well as in the cheap printing of literature, music, and art on the side of mass distribution, and in community singing, the revival of country patriotism, of village craftsmanship, country dancing, and institutions like the Glastonbury School of Art and the Welsh Eisteddford on the side of local and individual self-expression. Culture is much more than passive receiving, the painting of a fresh coat of enamel on the outside of the platter; it receives only to give forth. So people can receive the seeds of art from science, and fertilise them into a democratic culture by their own individual and corporate efforts at self-expression. This process has hardly begun in India yet perhaps; we have been too busy in teaching English in order to provide clerks for office stools, but nevertheless there is the dream, there is the power for creating new life. Science, Janus-like, has two faces, bad and good. Rightly used, she may be the recreator as much as the destroyer of the world.

The last problem remains, which has baffled every civilisation up to the present. How are we to avoid a menial class, whether servile or free, subjected by force or by law or by religion? Here again science provides the hope. By labour-saving devices, by methods for increasing production, by tapping new sources of power like the steam engine and electricity, by its increasing mastery over nature and its knowledge of man, science is steadily reducing the essential menial work to vanishing point. Indeed it would have made more progress already had not its early exploiters been more moved by the thought of profits and power than the needs of humanity. It has been reckoned that in a perfectly organised community it would only be necessary for each individual to do three hours of mechanical or menial work per day. This would not mean the end of physical

* Aristotle's *Politics*, Bk. VII. 6. 14.

labour of course; in democratic society each man would do what best expressed and fulfilled his own inner needs. Public school boys, for instance, would make excellent agricultural workers.

Let no man say that the modern world is dull and that life is but a tedium to be endured.

*"The fault, dear Brutus, lies not in our stars,
But in ourselves."*

He who complains of a dull world is like a man who knocks his own head with a hammer and then complains of the pain. There is an infinity of interest to see if a man will only look for it. Behind the cynicism and apathy left by the war in Europe and the non-co-operation movement in India, the despairing attitude of "moderate Satanism" (as Mr. C. E. Montague calls it), neither very good nor very bad, behind complacency in high places and jobbery and hate in low, stand the "cloud capped places, the gorgeous towers" of a new world waiting to be seen by struggling humanity. Nor is this vision any mere shadow of a dream to be wistfully talked of and forgotten. There have been periods of hope and new ideas before, as at the Court of Akbar in India, or of Elizabeth in England or in the 18th century in France, but they have lacked the power to realise these dreams. But now a new power is upon us which can thoroughly cleanse our floor. If you go into company meetings or the halls of county families or even theological assemblies you will easily understand that the world will shortly perish, but if you go to thinkers, to meetings of the people and above all to the laboratory, you will find a new world throbbing with new ideas, new hopes and new achievements. The old world may indeed grow old and die, but a new world is rising to take her place. Democracy has not crushed her wings against the sharp spikes of actuality; she is but spreading her wings to take her flight.

T. G. P. SPEAR.

(Concluded.)

INTER-UNIVERSITIES CONFERENCE.

VERY few can doubt that the Inter-Universities Conference has so far justified its existence and we think it is likely in future to give the needed assistance to the various Universities in correlating their activities. In his opening address H. E. the Viceroy placed before the Universities a very high ideal for the maintenance of standards and pointed out some serious defects in their working. The problem in India is, he said, how to utilize the ardour of youth due to the letting loose of new energies by new forces driving the modern world so as to realize constructive ends and prevent it from being destructive. In his opinion a University ought to maintain three standards: the standard of learning, a right standard of judgment resulting in a proper appreciation of values and a standard of conduct leading to a disciplined life and the right use of liberty. His Excellency rightly regarded the youth

of India as the material for the future public services and economic expansion of India and said that its success or failure would depend on the training in character given by the Universities. In view of the changed demands made on an average graduate, Lord Irwin advised the Universities to raise their standard for the obtaining of a degree because a low standard prevents a University from supplying the right sort of men for civic life and in the case of an individual University lowers its reputation in comparison with others. Another valuable piece of advice given by him was to reject those applicants for the entry into a University who have neither capacity nor equipment to profit by University training. We believe that in effect this would amount to a stiffening of the standard of the school-leaving examination. Lord Irwin suggested the specialisation of certain Universities in specified faculties and subjects so as to avoid overlapping and undue waste of resources and energy. This is certainly a practicable suggestion and would prevent re-duplication of costly apparatus in several places in India. Lastly he emphasized the need for educating public opinion to realize the value of university reform and give support to it, since no reform can be successful if the parents, guardians and employers are indifferent or averse to it.

In a paper read before the Conference Sir Philip Hartog dwelt on the paucity of the books possessed by Indian College Students. In his opinion this was due to the excessive use of cram notes which in many cases supplanted the text-books. This is really an old complaint and we are glad that Sir Philip Hartog has voiced it again. His second observation is that there are at present too many lectures, which is partly due to the fact that students cannot be trusted to answer examination questions without having heard lectures on every portion of the subject. As a remedy for the shortage of books he suggests the organization of a lending branch of the college library, to supply text-books on reasonable hire. Sir Philip thinks that the efficiency of the training given to an average student would be increased immensely, if all students were thus supplied with books.

It is satisfactory to note that the Conference have unanimously adopted a resolution recommending the creation of an All-India Medical Council composed of the medical faculties of the universities, spokesmen of the Government of India and of the medical practitioners for supervising medical qualifications and standards in universities. Another resolution recommended that steps should be taken towards making physical training compulsory for all under-graduates of universities, granting exemptions only in the case of those who are medically unfit. This resolution is bound to be heartily welcomed by every one interested in the welfare of the university students. With regard to the extension of the University Training Corps the Government declared that they would agree to such proposals provided the university which asked for it was prepared to meet the entire expenditure on the scheme of training. It is rather disconcerting to learn that the Boards of

Intermediate Education and the Intermediate Colleges under their control have not been functioning properly, according to the expectations of Sadler Commission, in the Calcutta University.

Our London Letter.

ON THE EVE OF THE ANNOUNCEMENT.

THOSE who are following Indian affairs closely in England—alas, a mere fraction of our people—realise that we are fast approaching a crisis. The early publication of the Reports of the Simon Commission and of the Indian Committee which co-operated with it, together with the important meeting of the Indian National Congress in December, will compel the Government to define its attitude in definite terms. Great pressure has been brought upon the Government to make a clear statement of its intentions before the December meeting of the National Congress. I do not know in detail what the decision is, but I do know that the proposal has been seriously discussed by the Cabinet and I am hopeful that a pronouncement will be made. Whether it will go sufficiently far to meet the temper of India I cannot yet say.

One difficulty is that the report of the Simon Commission will not be published before January, and it is argued that it is not possible for the Government to anticipate that report. The answer merely is that the recommendations of a Commission can legitimately determine details, but it is the duty of a Government to determine principles. Since the appointment of the Simon Commission and Labour's unfortunate participation in it, the Labour Party Conference has reaffirmed its recognition of India's right to self-government and self-determination, its pledge to introduce Dominion Status, with the consent of India. This is the declared policy of the Party, and there ought to be no hesitation in the Government announcing its intention of putting it into operation, while awaiting, as it must, the recommendations of the Simon Commission as to details.

It is very doubtful whether the Simon Commission will publish a unanimous report. The views, for instance, of Lord Burnham and Major Attlee would seem to be irreconcilable. It is possible that Sir John Simon may succeed in drafting a common report, with dissenting minutes to particular paragraphs by different members of the Commission. But even if he does, the dissenting minutes are likely to be on such important matters that they will in fact form minority reports. I am told that Major Attlee is pressing for Dominion Status, with the support of Mr. Vernon Hartshorn, and that in the final stages of the discussions Sir John Simon is tending towards a reactionary view. Lord Burnham is reflecting the attitude of official circles in India.

The Indian Committee has made much greater progress with its work. Indeed, it is already in the hands of the Government printers. The report which the Chairman, Sir Sankaran Nair, has drafted has been signed by all the members of the Committee, though in this case, too, there are a number of dissenting minutes. Before Parliament meets at the end of this month the report will be in the hands of the Secretary of State. What will he do with it? Will he withhold its publication and presentation to Parliament until the Simon report is forthcoming, or will he immediately lay it on the Table of Parliament, so that its recommendations may be made known in England and India?

I believe it is the desire of Sir Sankaran Nair that it should be published immediately and that he will bring strong pressure upon Capt. Wedgwood Benn in this direction. If the Secretary of State is wise, he will take the course of presenting the report immediately to Parliament. It is obviously desirable that it should be published before the National Congress meets. Congress will not regard the report as having any authority, it is true; but before it reaches its critical decisions regarding the inauguration of organised resistance and Independence, it should have as much information before it as possible. Moreover, it will be of great value to know the attitude of Congress to the recommendations, particularly to such issues as universal franchise and a common electorate. I don't think it will be found that the Indian Committee's report is a rival in form to the Nehru report. Sir Sankaran Nair and his colleagues have contented themselves with laying down a series of broad principles rather than applying them in detail.

The friends of Indian aspirations in this country have concentrated during recent weeks in urging two things upon the Government. First, that a definite pronouncement should be made of the intention of the Government to introduce a measure of Dominion Status. Second, that an invitation should be given to the leaders of the Indian Parties to meet representatives of the British Government to work out in detail the application of the Dominion principle. Such a Conference should have before it not only the reports of the Simon Commission and its Indian Committee, but proposals initiated by the Indian Parties themselves, and notably the Nehru Report. I cannot state at the moment how far the Government will go to meet these suggestions, but I believe it may go a considerable way. The momentous question is: Will it go far enough to enable Britain and India to co-operate in the establishment of India's new constitution, or is the new constitution to be foredoomed to failure by antagonism and conflict?

A. FENNER BROCKWAY.

House of Commons, Oct. 16.

Our European Letter.

WASHINGTON AND AFTER.

THERE is no doubt about the popular feeling caused by the visit of the British Premier in America and judged by that measure it is an immense success. Americans have always had the feeling that the British were their most powerful rivals for world pre-eminence and Mr. MacDonald's official visit to President Hoover has been accepted in a very definite sense as an "act of homage". Dr. Stresemann's death and the world-wide appreciation of the place he occupied in the making of Europe has shown that in democracy like in industry the mechanical aspect of affairs is only apparent and the force and need of personalities remain as great as, if not greater than, before. Nevertheless, in this age it would not do to minimise the effect of public opinion, by which is meant currents of popular feeling, and while Mr. MacDonald's influence is obviously of the sort which can release these, despite his remarkable career and abilities, he has yet to show himself as powerful as the late Foreign Minister of Germany in controlling them.

Words doubtless have mnemonic effects, but unless followed by acts they cannot in fact exorcise the evil. Mr. MacDonald's American visit has cleared the fog out of the Anglo-American problem, but some situations are not made easier on account of their being perceived clearly. All the fervent popular welcome notwithstanding, from the very beginning of the negotiations concerning the Premier's visit there has been a certain aloofness in Washington. On a certain Wednesday the world waited with keen expectation for an epoch-making announcement from America only to have to plod through oft-repeated phrases and vague generalities which made up the joint statement signed by the President and the Premier on the eve of the latter's departure from the American capital. Referring to this the special correspondent of the *Daily Mail* said :

"A sensation was caused in Washington today by the nature of the general statement on naval limitations issued by President Hoover and Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, owing to its extremely guarded and uninformative character. Upto yesterday evening official spokesmen on both sides were enthusiastic in anticipation, and from British officials especially indications were given that the document would be a record of real and notable achievements. This morning the tone changed, and at the White House doubts were expressed whether it would be possible to publish the document today. Eventually the publication was secured, and then it became quite evident that it was a very different affair from that originally penned by Mr. MacDonald... I understand that it was only Mr. MacDonald's intense desire that it should be issued, before he left Washington that resulted in final agreement on its form at a conference in the White House at noon and that important phrases under discussion were deleted in order to avoid further delay."

And the London correspondent of the *Journal de Geneve* :

"To put it bluntly, this is for the fourth time at least since the beginning of September that the Americans

have given the British Labour Premier a lesson in prudence and restraint."

On the British side it is doubtful whether, generally speaking, substantial achievement was expected from this visit. London opinion revealed a sense of disappointment following the statement I have referred to all the same. But the country on the whole is extremely appreciative of the Premier's efforts and more perhaps even than Mr. MacDonald himself, the British people with its sure political instinct realises that the question under discussion is one which touches it most profoundly and its national existence in a most direct manner. Consequently it is widely recognised that no amount of tact exercised in envisaging it can be too much.

Remarkably few details have been published about the actual agreement between the American and British executives as regards technical points. From the little that is known it is clear that President Hoover is likely to find Senator Borah and Congress as immovable as all his predecessors, should he attempt any definite treaty which would in the least measure compromise the points on which Congress has shown itself adamant. From the American press it would also seem that "Mr. MacDonald has been aggressor", by which is meant that he took the initiative in introducing the question of the Freedom of the Seas in the conversations. Whatever may be the ultimate nature of the conclusions that will be reached between now and January and later in the course of the London Conference, the agreement that has been reached so far is altogether lacking in conviction. There is still a divergence of some 30,000 tons between the British and American computations and if the United States would turn them into 18 cruisers instead of 15 it would go counter to the accepted thesis but if, on the contrary, this right were denied to the States, Congress would never ratify the accord. In any case the immediate consequence of this understanding should be an increase in the United States navy by fifteen cruisers, an ironical conclusion to an effort at reduction of armaments! Besides, the business-like and economy-loving Hoover is so much in earnest about the whole affair just because he wants to avoid this expenditure.

Parity—the point of the accord—Mr. MacDonald told Americans they could have "heaped up and overflowing" and repeated again and again that war between them was "unthinkable." "Parity" in the present conditions is illogical if war is unthinkable, for it means expenditure which the United States is at pains to avoid, and, it may also be added, an extravagance which Britain could ill afford. The question, then, arises whether "Parity" does not conceal some other demand. It is widely believed, and the previous as well as present history of the negotiations would seem to confirm this opinion, that what Americans really want is the Freedom of the Seas, and they ask for parity so as to have an effective guarantee of this principle. Consistently with the declarations of the Kellogg Pact such a guarantee should come not through parity but by means of re-consideration and codification of sea law. Some recent letters on the subject in the *Times*, however,

serve to show how heavily British tradition weighs in this regard.

The question, then, has to be political, not juridical. Politically the expression, Freedom of the Seas, has an enormous significance in our time. Professedly the right of neutrals to carry on trade unmolested by belligerents, actually it means nothing less than the impossibility for a belligerent Power to ensure victory by the most powerful—and some say the only possible—means of blockade. By insisting upon this right the United States attempts to deprive Great Britain of this sure economic weapon in a crisis which has been hers traditionally. Keenly alive to the realities of American ascendancy, Great Britain attempts to compromise by sharing the privilege with America. As a matter of fact, the British proposal is the same thing as Monsieur Briand's idea when he put forward the plan for the outlawry of war. That plan, it would be recollected, was to be confined to an understanding between France and the States and if it was transformed into the Kellogg Pact it was certainly not due to any lack of shrewdness on Monsieur Briand's part. In fact the Kellogg Pact may yet prove to be his notable achievement. We have known Secretary of State Kellogg's reply to Monsieur Briand and we shall soon see how Secretary of State Stimson will deal with Mr. MacDonald. All signs point to his being no less cautious.

When Mr. MacDonald pleaded for patience with a sea-faring people which so wholly depended on the sea for its prosperity and even its existence, he spoke nothing but the truth. Any success his policy may have at home depends on this fact. It is no exaggeration to say that for the British to have the United States against them would mean a tremendous gamble, if not certain ruin.

But the Premier has formidable difficulties in his way. Any support that he may have from the Conservatives in this policy would be grudgingly given on account of their tradition. The swing to the Opposition is not a sea-change for them. It cannot be too often repeated that the eclipse of the Conservatives is not due to their lack of influence. It is due to lack of leadership and Labour's rise is not accounted for so much by exceptional leadership as the inevitability of the political situation. That inevitability depends upon the Government's success as regards home policy. No amount of achievement in foreign policy would make up for this. Further, in the last few days the scrutiny to which the Dominions are subjecting the Premier's policy has come to light. The Dominions, for obvious reasons, are zealous partisans of British naval supremacy. Nowhere was the Egyptian treaty, now under consideration, more critically regarded than in Australia, and Mr. MacDonald's reported plans for the demilitarisation of the naval bases at Halifax and in the West Indies as a *beau geste* to the States are similarly being subjected to much controversy in Canada.

Finally, Monsieur Briand is not the sort of man

to content himself with the Kellogg Pact as a substitute for the *Entente Cordiale* now slipping off his hands. By all reports he is furiously alive. "Europe is at our door", said Mr. MacDonald in America. Some day the present administration will wake to find that England is in Europe.

Geneva, October 18.

SHORT NOTICE

TEMPLE GAIRDNER OF CAIRO. By CONSTANCE E. PADWICK. (S. P. C. K.) 1929. 22cm. 330p. 7/6.

TEMPLE GAIRDNER is an example of the latter day missionary whose penetration as regards things spiritual transcended and overcame the demands of a purely external world. This rich experience, he once explained, in the following words: "The only thing in the world worth living for is to find out the will of God and do it." Gairdner reminds us of all those qualities possessed in such rich measure by saints like Bernard of Clairvaux and St. Catherine of Genoa. In two respects he stands out very prominently. His intellect was of a first rate order. He was "gifted with the power of grasping a subject, probing it, mastering it, and then passing on the results of his studies to others." His knowledge of Arabic was 'remarkable.' Added to this strikingly effective intellect, Gairdner had the desire to build up in Egypt an indigenous church worthy of the country. There was the 'blending of the eastern and western music in the congregational singing.' He was a mystic in every sense of the term. This was demonstrated in the last hours of his life as for instance when he says, "I am lying back resting on the ocean of God's love."

The biography of Temple Gairdner is an effective reminder to all those who labour for a better world order. He calls us not to a round of wearying duties performed with the aim of efficiency but to a life where the 'inward calm' and the 'quiet ecstasy' will prevail. This speaks louder than all the achievements of an age run riot with maddening ideas of success.

H. C. BALASUNDARUM.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- MARRIAGE AND THE STATE. By MARY E. RICHMOND and FRED S. HALL. (Russell Sage Foundation.) 1229. 20cm. 395p. \$2.50.
- LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION. By MICHAEL WEST. (Longmans.) 1929. 20cm. 177p.
- WOMAN'S MENTAL ACTIVITY. By FLORENCE DANIEL. (Daniel.) 1929. 18cm. 57p. 2/6.
- THE NEW WORLD PROBLEMS IN POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY. (4th Edn.) By ISALAH BOWMAN. (George Harrap, London.) 1928. 24cm. 803p. 21/-.
- A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF DIPLOMATIC EVENTS IN MANCHURIA. By HAROLD PARLETT. (Oxford University Press.) 1929. 25cm. 93p.
- GOPAL KRISHNA GOKHALE. A Historical Biography. By T. K. SHAHANI. (R. K. Modi & Co., Bombay.) 1929. 22cm. 388p. Rs. 2-8.

WANTED—Candidates for Telegraph and Station Master's Classes. Full particulars and Railway fare Certificate on 2 annas stamp. Apply to:—
IMPERIAL TELEGRAPH COLLEGE, Nai Sarak, Delhi.