

Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO—OFFICE : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S HOME, POONA 4.

VOL. XIII No. 26. }

POONA—THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 1930.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	301
ARTICLES :—	
Indian Franchise in Ceylon. By H. N. Kunzru. ...	304
Simon Recommendations.	306
Eastern Africa.	308
MISCELLANEOUS :—	
"Leave India to Her Fate." By the Rt. Hon. V. S. ...	
Srinivasa Sastri, P. C., C. H.	310
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
"Violence of Non-Violence". By Vaikunth L. ...	
Mehta.	311
BOOKS RECEIVED.	312

Topics of the Week.

Courageous Counsel.

COURAGE and refreshing candour characterised the address that Prof. Brij Narain delivered to the students of Lahore on the 30th of May last. He roundly declared that "Our communal leaders are the worst enemies of swaraj and the greatest friends of foreign domination, and they know it." Defining Swaraj as not merely a transfer of political power from foreign to Indian hands but a fundamental change in the economic organisation of the country, he said that "no swaraj is possible in India until the hold of religion on the masses is weakened": religion which to the vast majority means inhibitions and superstitions and *karma* and *kismet*. There is much constructive work to do before swaraj can be attained, and thereafter sustained. Rationalisation of religion by the spread of science, the displacement of the old religions that separated by the new religion of "Our country" which unites, and the organisation of workers and peasants, the primary producers of wealth, on a better economic basis, these have to be undertaken if swaraj is to be an abiding thing.

Touching upon the current burning topic of boycott of foreign cloth, he declared it unsound and impracticable from an economic point of view and futile from the political. Of the total demand for cloth in 1913-14, 59 per cent was met by imports, 21 per cent by Indian mill industry and 20 per cent by the hand-weaver; while in 1927-28 the proportions respectively were 35, 42 and 23. Imports fell from 59 to 35, Indian mill production rose from 21 to 42, and hand-weaving from 21 to 23. "It is to the mills, or machine production, that we must look for the elimination of foreign cloth from our markets. But the process must be slow and gradual one."

As a means of extracting political concessions boycott was futile. If it was imagined, that the British cloth interests would plead with the British Government, "Grant her (India) independence or the subs-

tance of independence immediately, if you wish to save the British capitalist from ruin and the British worker from starvation", the British Government "would ask them if they were quite sure that India would buy more British goods when the substance of independence was granted to her. * * * The British manufacturer is between the devil and the deep sea. We threaten to boycott British goods in order to enforce our political demands, and if Britain did concede our political demands, we shall buy less British goods than ever."

Britishers in Bombay.

In consequence of the strong feeling in Indian commercial circles regarding the means adopted by the Government to deal with the present agitation, Mr. Husseinbhoj A. Laljee, the President of the Indian Merchants' Chamber, recently addressed a letter to the President of the Bombay Chamber of Commerce to ascertain what the European residents of Bombay felt about the present situation and whether they approved of the means adopted by the Government to deal with it. In this letter Mr. Laljee has frankly stated that the suspicions of Indians in Bombay with regard to the European attitude towards Indian aspirations were raised by the letter written by the committee of the European Association to the Local Government last month. He has further expressed great concern at the growing estrangement of feeling between the Europeans and Indians as evidenced by recent occurrences in the commercial world, and in his opinion nothing but a frank avowal, of their attitude, on the part of the Europeans will remove the estrangement. We are glad to notice that the reply of Mr. Abercrombie, the President of the Chamber of Commerce, has given an assurance that the European Association of Bombay have every sympathy with all the reasonable aspirations of Indians towards responsible government. Speaking on behalf of the Bombay branch of the European Association and the Bombay Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Abercrombie said that he agreed with the conclusions reached by Sir C. H. Setalwad and Sir Cowasji Jehangir in their recent statement, namely, that it behoves both sides to do everything in their power to secure peace with honour and that the civil disobedience movement should be called off simultaneously with the proclamation of general amnesty and the declaration of Dominion Constitution as the agenda of the R. T. Conference. He has, in conclusion, expressed his earnest desire that the cordial relations between Europeans and other communities for which Bombay is specially noted should continue unimpaired. We wonder why there should not be in Mr. Abercrombie's letter a direct denial of the allegation that the Europeans took an active part in proposing some of the measures taken by the Government to suppress the present movement.

The League and the Minorities.

MR. C. A. Macartney has contributed an interesting article, *Post-War Tangles in South-Eastern Europe* in the June issue of *Current History*. Therein he says *inter alia* that South-Eastern Europe to-day is an imbroglia of jealousies, mutual suspicions, and hostilities. Before 1914 the Balkans were proverbial as the storm centres of Europe: to-day the whole of the South-Eastern part of Europe seems to be "Balkanised." Within a few years since the peace settlement was hailed as a victory of democracy and liberty, the newly created boundaries in South-Eastern Europe have added a dozen problems for each one they solved. An efficient and upright, if narrow and clumsy, bureaucracy has given way to political systems marked by ignorance, ineptitude and corruption. Even that special evil of national injustice, oppression of minorities, exists to-day in an aggravated form in almost all the successor States of Austria-Hungary.

With the end of strained relations after the War an increasingly energetic demand for a more conscientious application of the minority treaties was put forward. All the countries of the South-eastern Europe were required under the treaties to guarantee equivalent treatment to all the members of the racial, religious and linguistic minorities within their frontiers in regard to elementary cultural and political rights. It amounted to a safeguard against a forcible denationalization of the minorities.

Those treaties, however, have been honoured very half-heartedly. The Yugoslavs have denied the claims of Bulgaro-feeling Macedonians to form a minority. In Slovenia Germans bearing Slovanic names have been denied the rights of the minority. But the greatest defaulter is Italy. She has ruthlessly carried on a denationalizing process in her Slovenic and Alto Adige territories.

Even where the existence of minorities is admitted, their position is undermined by the closing down of their schools on the slightest pretext, and by manipulating the electoral divisions in such a way as to deprive them of any representation. In fact, barring paper legislation, none of the States which profitted under the peace treaties has stood by them honourably.

Apart from minority problems, the States whose boundaries were widened after the war have been confronted with the problem of reconciling diverse elements in the majority population itself. The Czechoslovakian State has had to solve the problem of the Slovaks, who are racially and linguistically closely related to the Czechs, but economically weaker and distinguished by a thousand years of separate history. The problem is yet to be solved though the tension is much lessened.

In Rumania the problem is fairly on its way to settlement on account of the policy of devolution, as opposed to centralization, followed by the National Peasant Party. In Yugoslavia, on the other hand, the tension is becoming greater. Two conflicting tendencies have been at work there. One which aims at the close federation of the Serbs, Croats and Slovans, and the other which aims at the supremacy of the Serbs over all others. The Slovans have not taken a directly inimical attitude against the Pan-Serb conception but the Croats have. Parliamentary government having proved a failure, King Alexander has proclaimed a dictatorship. Unfortunately he rests his power on a corrupt and despotic military clique. The problem of minorities is, therefore, further from solution than ever before.

* * *

Indian Industrial Progress.

SIR ALFRED CHATTERTON'S discourse on the Indian industrial outlook before the East India Association, London, was the subject of a lively discussion setting forth quite opposite points of view. Sir A. Chatterton, while admitting that the industrial output had increased threefold in the last quarter of a century, lamented the fact that even to day only 1 per cent. of the population was engaged in modern industry. Even the area under cultivation had, in his opinion, failed to keep pace with the increase in population. The increase of land values in rural areas prevented a rise in the standard of living. Sir Alfred said that India could not be said to be making satisfactory progress when 80 per cent. of her people were living on the margin of subsistence. These conclusions were not palatable to the school of super-optimists and Sir David Chadwick held that there were many more evidences of general progress than had been allowed for in Sir A. Chatterton's survey, one of which was the enormous growth of the internal markets in India. Sir David, however, admitted that the fiscal policy of Government was open to criticism owing to the small extent of protection given to industries. In his opinion, the income-tax and the supertax were great handicaps to progress owing to their high rate which retarded the investment of money in new concerns. With regard to the generalization that India has great natural wealth Sir A. Chatterton pointed out that less than 30 per cent. of the land surface was suitable for cultivation and the mineral wealth of more than half the country was hidden beneath deep alluvial plains of the river valleys or buried under volcanic outflow. As for labour, although it was abundant it was inefficient owing to malnutrition and tropical diseases. Sir Ness Wadia raised the question of the exchange ratio, but the Chairman, Sir Manekji Dadabhoi, expressed his conviction that the decision about 18d. ratio was wise. In spite of the fact that Lord Lamington and Sir Ernest Low charged the lecturer with pessimism, we believe that the major portion of what the latter said is wholly in consonance with facts as we know them.

* * *

Railway Board and Railwaymen.

IN accordance with the undertaking given by Sir George Rainy, the half-yearly conference between the Railway Board and the All-India Railwaymen's Federation was held last week and it has been very fruitful of results, the most important of which was the creation of a more friendly feeling. Mr. V.V. Giri demanded that the G.I.P. strikers who were taken back in service should be regarded as reinstated and it was compiled with by the Board. The Board also promised to consider sympathetically the cases of those who had not complied with the terms offered in February last, and instruct the Agent of the G. I. P. Railway to give preference to ex-employees, after dealing with the men on the waiting list. With regard to the demand that powers of dismissal should not be delegated to the subordinate staff, the Board agreed to restrict the powers to selected senior subordinates. On the question of block retrenchment the reply of the Board was unsatisfactory since they do not promise anything except to inform the unions of any intention to make a large reduction of jobs. Wholesale reductions cause an amount of misery and the Board ought to give an undertaking not to reduce more than an agreed number of posts at one time as, after all, the interests of the public and those of the employees are in the last analysis identical. The Board admitted that the new leave rules were less liberal than the

Fundamental Rules applicable to Government servants but pleaded that they constituted a great improvement over the old rules, especially by the abrogation of the condition that the grant of leave must not impose any extra cost on the State and by the decision to maintain an adequate relieving staff. Mr. Giri pleaded for various facilities for railway unions with a view to expedite the development of a sound Trade Union movement in the railways and although most of them were refused Mr. Russel on behalf of the Board admitted that the railway administrations had every desire to encourage the growth of trade unionism on sound lines. We hope that instead of indulging in otiose desires the Board will take some practical steps to bring about the required result. The representatives of the Federation appraised the Board of the discontent caused by recent reductions in the rates of wages in some branches and put in a plea for a further improvement in the minimum wages. Mr. Giri deserves to be thanked on behalf of the public for the discreet way in which he has negotiated for the removal of the grievances of railwaymen.

Bihar and Orissa in 1928-29.

THE administration report of the province of Bihar for the year 1928-29 unfolds a tale of steady progress although in certain spheres the speed is decidedly the proverbial snail-speed. The report repeats the usual wail about the permanent settlement depriving the province of an increase in a land-revenue and says that the province is in state of economic anæmia. We find that the local boards spent on education 27 per cent of their revenue and 44 per cent on civil works; this strikes as a topsy-turvy state of things and we endorse the suggestion made in the report that part of the cost of improving communications ought to be raised by a provincial tax on motor vehicles. As in other provinces, we hear of poor account-keeping, lack of supervision over accounts and over-lenience in the collection of taxes in local boards and municipalities. The set-back in the expansion of primary education during the year is marked and ought to be corrected in time. We are glad to note that great progress has been made in recent years in affording medical relief to women, the number of out-patients treated having increased during the last decade by nearly six lakhs. The report shows an appreciation of the more sympathetic outlook on police difficulties shown by the Legislative Council latterly and records a continued improvement in the attitude of the public towards the police force. In ex-aise the Bihar Government have followed the policy of "minimum consumption and maximum revenue" and take credit to themselves for a "remarkably successful policy." We think, however, that the decrease during the last eighteen years of the consumption of country spirit by only 3 lakhs of gallons is hardly one to pride upon and we urge the necessity of vigorous temperance propaganda on a much larger scale than at present. The report complains of the repeated attacks on forest policy made in the Council as if they were fictitious and merely obstructive but has no explanation to give of the various grievances of the public which are the result of an unsympathetic administration. The agricultural department has been carrying on vigorous propaganda by carrying out actual demonstrations on the cultivators' own fields and has been active in supplying improved seeds and implements to the agriculturists. In accordance with the recommendations of the Royal Commission it has been decided to open an Agricultural College in the province and it is worth noting that even cooperative banks are assisting agricultural activities by propaganda and demonstrations. In spite of its meagre

revenue the province shows a remarkable industrial activity in the State department which gives aid to thirteen technical schools and develops cottage industries; during the year it has fitted up 3,248 improved looms in order to develop the hand-weaving industry.

* * *

The Madras Medical Association Protests.

THAT the Madras Medical graduates would meekly submit to the insult recently levelled at Indian Universities by the General Medical Council in England without a vigorous protest was hardly to be expected. We have just received a Memorandum submitted by the Madras Medical Council to the Government of Madras on the subject of the refusal of recognition to Indian medical degrees by the British Medical Council. The Association frankly admits the advantages accruing to Indian graduates from the recognition of Indian degrees by the British Council but it thinks it is its duty to oppose anything that would imperil the dignity of Indian Universities and lower them in the estimation of the academic world. The Association points to the practice in England of appointing inspectors for each one of the three subjects of Medicine, Surgery and Midwifery and on this ground objects to the appointment of a single Commissioner to inspect medical standards as was proposed by the British Medical Council. The Association has quoted in its favour the authority of the Inter-Universities Conference which declared against the appointment of a single Inspector who cannot be in a position to judge the works of experts in all the three subjects. The Association thinks that the appointment of a Board consisting of the Director-General I. M. S. and three Inspectors with British qualifications as proposed by the Government of India ought to furnish the necessary guarantee required by the British Medical Act of 1886, and ought to be acceptable to the British Medical Council, pending the inauguration of an All-India Medical Council.

It is to be noted that Dr. Cameron, Vice-Chancellor of the Lucknow University, addressed a letter to the British Council advising them to accept the alternative proposals for registration made by the Government of India in view of the serious situation created by the loss of registrable qualifications by Indian Students. With regard to the suggestion made by the British Medical Journal that the decision of the Government of India to appoint a temporary board was governed by political considerations, the Association points to the resolution unanimously adopted by the Inter-Universities Conference, a purely academic body, protesting against the appointment of a single commissioner. As for the bug-bear of inadequate training in Midwifery, the memorandum quotes from an article by Dr. Comyns Berkely disclosing the great laxity that prevails in Great Britain with regard to the observance of the regulations of the British Medical Council and how powerless the Council is to strike a single teaching institution off the list. So the zeal and might of the British Council is displayed only in the case of Indian Universities! Lastly, the Association has drawn attention to the harmful consequences that will ensue with the frequent undermining of the prestige of Indian Universities to Indian degree-holders in continental Europe and other countries. The Association consequently has urged upon the Government the desirability of immediately setting up an All-India Council which will be in a position to deal with other Medical Councils on the strict basis of reciprocity of treatment.

* * *

Articles.

INDIAN FRANCHISE IN CEYLON.

AMONG the most important questions which the Donoughmore Commission on constitutional reforms in Ceylon had to examine was that of the franchise. One of the conclusions which it arrived at on this subject was that the right of voting "should be confined to those who have an abiding interest in the country or who may be regarded as permanently settled in the Island", and proposed that five years' residence in Ceylon should be an indispensable qualification for enrolment as an elector. It observed that "this condition will be of particular importance in its application to the Indian immigrant population." It is thus obvious that the Commission regarded five years' residence as a sufficient restriction and that this qualification had been prescribed with special reference to the Indian immigrant population.

When the Commission carried on its investigations the Legislative Council of Ceylon contained two Indian communal representatives, representing the whole Indian population in Ceylon and not only the immigrant labourers, but supposed "to pay special attention to this section of their fellow-countrymen." In considering what effect the abolition of communal representation would have on the welfare of the Indian labourers the Commission dealt with the question as to how far the two Indian representatives had succeeded in securing improvement in the conditions on the estates and said, "It was, however, fairly clear that one of the strongest influences in securing such new regulations as are contemplated or which have to be put into force has been the pressure of the Indian Government, and, doubtless, this will continue to be exercised." It further observed that a large section of the Indian labourers might be regarded as permanent residents of Ceylon and that "even when there is a necessary five years residential qualification, a considerable number of these people will become entitled to a voice in the election of the territorial representatives, and in that way should be able to secure, perhaps, a more effective expression of their grievances and difficulties in the Legislative Council than under the present arrangement." These observations make it clear that the Commission recommended the abolition of Indian communal representation in the belief that under the residential qualification laid down by it an appreciable number of Indian labourers would be able to acquire the vote and that the Government of India would continue to intervene on their behalf. The Indian Legislative Assembly asked for nothing more when the question of Indian franchise in Ceylon came up before it on the 11th February last. Its demand was confined to the acceptance of the Commission's recommendations and it protested against any departure from them. Yet, the Secretary of State for the Colonies in his recent despatch to the

Ceylon Government asserts that "some of the Indian protests amount in effect to a position of privilege rather than of equality" without offering a title of proof in support of such a charge.

His Majesty's Government deny that the proposals of the Ceylon Government involve any racial discrimination against Indians. Dr. Drummond Shiels took up the same position in replying to Major Graham Pole last month and asserted that the changes suggested by the Ceylon Government "do not involve any differentiation in respect of political status between different classes of British subjects." The London correspondent of the *Ceylon Daily News* in commenting on this reply said, "If his statement is taken at its face value and there is no difference whatever between the political status accorded respectively to the permanent inhabitants of the Island and the immigrants from India, the latter obviously have no grievance, but on the other hand the rest of the community may have something more to say about it." The correspondence between the Ceylon Government and the Colonial Office leaves no doubt in one's mind that it is sought to alter the recommendations of the Commission in order to discriminate against Indians.

The Governor of Ceylon, disagreeing with the Commission, regarded the residential qualification as inadequate to the requirements of the situation. He made two proposals regarding persons not domiciled in Ceylon. One was that the existing qualification which depends on annual income, ownership of immovable property or occupation of a building should be retained. This would enfranchise practically all European residents of British nationality and British Indians of the better class. The other was that an applicant for registration as a voter should, in addition to complying with the residential test, (1) declare that he was permanently settled in Ceylon or intended to do so, (2) refrain from claiming any rights to which members of other races and communities were not entitled, and (3) renounce any claim to protection by any Government other than that of Ceylon. As admitted by the Governor, these conditions, while of a general character, would, in practice, have affected Indian labourers only.

It is clear from his despatch that these conditions were proposed in order to placate the Sinhalese, as Indian labourers, generally speaking, are concentrated in areas which are likely to be included in future Sinhalese constituencies. The ostensible reason given for the imposition of additional tests is that there should be a reasonable certainty that the interests of the immigrants would be identified with those of the permanent inhabitants of Ceylon. The Commission was informed that from 40 to 50 per cent of Indian labourers might be regarded as permanent residents of Ceylon and that a substantial number of the workers on the estates had actually been born in that Island. If the information furnished to the Commission is correct, a large proportion of Indians is already identified with the future fortunes of the country in which they are living. No further test, therefore, seems to be called for. In view of this it seems reasonable to infer that the Governor's propo

sals are meant to bring about a larger reduction in the number of Indian voters than the Commission's proposals would have done. The opposition of the Sinhalese to the enfranchisement of Indians on the terms laid down by the Commission is thoroughly intelligible. They regard the existence of a strong Indian electorate in Sinhalese constituencies as a menace to their predominance, but they forget that an important reason which the Commission urged in favour of the abrogation of Indian communal representation was that under its proposals Indians would be able to exercise influence over the election of members to the Legislative Council in territorial constituencies. The Sinhalese, I fear, have never been very favourably disposed to the immigrant Indian community and the recent differences between them and the Indian Tamils have not tended to improve their attitude towards the Indian worker although it is to him that Ceylon owes its agricultural prosperity.

His Majesty's Government, in response to the pressure of Indian opinion, have modified the Governor's proposals to a certain extent but their decision cannot be regarded as satisfactory. Let us first consider the question on which the Cabinet has apparently yielded completely. The Governor of Ceylon, in making his recommendations, had pointed out that his third proposal might very likely be superfluous, as under the Indian Immigration Act, 1922, an Indian labourer would automatically lose his status as an 'emigrant' and therefore, the protection of the Government of India after five years' residence in Ceylon. His Majesty's Government, agreeing with this interpretation, have decided that the condition in question should be waived as nothing would be gained by its retention and nothing lost by its abandonment. The value of the decision seems to me to have been nullified by the ground on which it is based.

The second proposal is to be retained but in a different form from that recommended by the Governor. No Indian applicant for a vote will be required to renounce explicitly any claim to any rights which the legislature of Ceylon has not conferred on Non-Indians. But the Order in Council will provide that a registered voter shall not be entitled to claim any such rights. H. M.'s Government have, however, stated that there is no intention of altering to the detriment of Indians any laws specially affecting their position, and have decided that any legislation curtailing their existing rights should not be given effect to without the previous sanction of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. They have also declared that the authority of the Agent of the Government of India will continue undiminished. Indians will, therefore, be able to invoke his assistance in future as they have been able to do in the past.

As regards the first proposal it is to remain unaltered both in form and in substance. A certificate of permanent settlement will be insisted on as a necessary qualification to the possession of the vote.

The assurance that the existing rights of Indians will be safeguarded and that no law adversely

affecting them will be enforced unless the instructions of the Secretary of State for the Colonies have been previously obtained is of undoubted value, but for the rest, the decision of H. M.'s Government leaves us where we were. It is true that Indian labourers will not be required before being registered as voters to renounce the protection of the Government of India but the ground on which this apparent concession has been made deserves careful examination. H. M.'s Government have not favoured a stipulation of this nature because they take the view that no Indian who has resided five years in Ceylon will, as a matter of fact, be able to claim the protection of the Indian Government. This conclusion appears to be the result of some confusion of thought. The Indian Immigration Act was passed for the special protection of persons emigrating to Ceylon and other countries in which they had lived for less than five years. It conferred a special status on such persons, but it did not derogate from the rights of other persons nor debar the Government of India from making representations on their behalf. If the Act were to be repealed the class of persons now known as 'emigrants' would cease to exist, and if the reasoning employed by H. M.'s Government is sound the Government of India would then have no right to intervene on behalf of Indians who had emigrated to Ceylon or to any other place. It is obvious that this contention cannot be sustained. As a matter of fact, the Government of India has been watching over the interests of the Indians settled in various parts of the British Empire though no special legislation entitles it to do so. It is a serious matter that H. M.'s Government have for the first time propounded a doctrine which, if accepted, will prevent Indians outside their country from appealing to the Government of India and the latter from exerting themselves on their behalf. The Government of India ought to lose no time in having the position cleared up, for, the opinion of which H. M.'s Government has delivered themselves will inevitably lead to an increase of friction between India and other parts of the Empire.

His Majesty's Government have not felt themselves justified in agreeing to the relinquishment of the proposal that an Indian desiring to be registered as a voter should first produce a certificate of permanent settlement. It is not necessary to discuss this question from the constitutional standpoint. So far as can be gathered from Prof. A. B. Keith's "Responsible Government in the Dominions", in no Dominion, except the Irish Free State, has domicile been made the basis of franchise; and the action taken by the Irish Free State in this respect is regarded with disapproval by Prof. Keith. In Ceylon itself nearly all British residents and well-to-do Indians will be able to become voters without becoming permanent residents. In Kenya the Europeans came within an ace of obtaining responsible government in 1923, but it was never proposed to confine the membership of the electorate or the Legislative Council to persons who had made Kenya their home. In India Britishers can elect their representatives to the various legislatures without becoming domiciled in this country.

There seems, therefore, to be no reason why Indians should be discriminated against in this matter in Ceylon. Nobody will be more pleased than the people of India if Indians in Ceylon were allowed to become an integral part of its population and could depend for the protection of their rights on the support and sense of justice of the indigenous communities. Both the Indian people and Government will welcome such a consummation. But the Ceylon Government will not encourage Indians to look to it for protection by warning them that citizenship of Ceylon will mean to them a loss of those rights which have been already secured to them and which are such as should be accorded to all persons in their position but which the Ceylonese have not thought it fit to confer on the labouring classes of their own country. The distinction between Indian and other labourers, which appears invidious to planters in Ceylon according to the Donoughmore Commission, can be better removed not by depressing Indians to the level of Ceylonese labourers but raising the latter to the level of the former.

The assurance of the British Government that the benefits already enjoyed by the Indians will not be taken away from them is satisfactory so far as it goes. But the Order in Council will hang like a Sword of Damocles over Indians who may emigrate to Ceylon in future or who may acquire hereafter the residential qualification necessary to obtain the vote though it will not be easy to put it in motion. The existing laws relating to Indians cannot be altered without giving rise to great dissatisfaction among Indian labourers on the estates. It will scarcely be possible for the Ceylonese to differentiate between Indian labourers with five and more than five years of residence. Any attempt to change the conditions of work to the disadvantage of immigrants who had obtained a certificate of permanent settlement will lead almost certainly to strikes and other manifestations of discontent. It will not only be impracticable to draw any distinction between domiciled and undomiciled Indians as regards existing rights but it will be found necessary to improve the position of the former in proportion as that of the latter is ameliorated under the pressure of the Government of India. For as long as one can see there will continue to be a large immigrant Indian population in Ceylon. Even if the British Government do not modify the views expressed by them in Lord Passfield's despatch, they will not contend that it is not both the right and duty of the Government of India to look after the economic interests of this class. Any advantages secured to it are bound to be claimed by other Indians whatever their technical legal status. While the industries of Ceylon are largely dependent on Indian labour, the conditions of work of domiciled Indian labourers will have to conform to the standard applied to the immigrant population who will be under the watchful care of the Government of India.

The practical difficulties referred to above may render some of the restrictions, the imposition of which on Indians has been approved by His Majesty's

Government, inoperative but it is clear that in the eagerness to secure the adoption of their scheme of constitutional reforms by the Ceylon Legislative Council they were prepared to sacrifice Indian interests. They know how sensitive Indian opinion is on matters touching the status and welfare of Indians abroad, yet the first despatch of Lord Passfield was issued without previous consultation with the Government of India. Had the Government of India been asked beforehand to express their views, a settlement might have been arrived at which would have been as satisfactory as the preliminary decision with regard to East Africa, which presented a much more difficult problem. The Government of India, however, possess ample power to make themselves respected. It is their duty to consider carefully the issues raised by the recent Colonial Office despatch to Ceylon, to enquire fully and immediately to what extent it would affect Indians in Ceylon and to tell us what action they propose to take to safeguard Indian interests.

H. N. KUNZRU.

THE SIMON RECOMMENDATIONS.

THE recommendations of the Simon Commission regarding the reform of the constitution of India are hopelessly out of date and equally disappointing. Though the Report was signed as recently as the 27th of May last, the Commissioners have not taken into account, and of purpose, the recent developments in India and the new orientation that has in consequence become necessary. They proceed, as they were unfortunately bound to, on the basis of the Preamble of the Government of India Act that the British Parliament is to determine the political advance of India; but India has long ago and more emphatically now repudiated that right, except as a concession to constitutional pedantry. India has made up her mind that she shall have the "substance of independence" or Dominion Status and is willing to co-operate with the British Government in settling the details of mutual relations as between two equals. While emphasizing the responsibility of the British Parliament for the determination of the political advancement of India, the Commissioners disapprove its chief implication that Parliament should conduct periodical examinations of the progress made: they suggest that the constitution they propose should provide for automatic development without the intervention of the British Parliament. They avow this principle only to abandon it. While retaining the present "irresponsible" character of the Central Government of India, they give no indication as to how it is to develop automatically into "responsible" government, the accepted goal. The only development they contemplate is that the Governor General may appoint to his Executive Council some from among the elected members of the Legislature, a course of action already open to the Governor General, if he chose. In the Provinces the Legislatures are to have power to recast their representative system in certain respects and under certain circumstances but not their powers. India

demands that the new constitution now to be agreed upon should give her the power to modify it as and when she pleases, without reference to the British Parliament.

The primary consideration that weighed with the Commissioners is the fundamental unity of India, both British India and the Indian States. The constitution to be newly devised should find a place for both these politically different, but in every other respect similar, groups. Federation is their solution and every proposal they make is governed by and subordinated to that idea. Apparently they disapprove of the present system under which the Government of India is the paramount power controlling both the British Indian Provinces and the Indian States. Without themselves taking evidence on the question of the relations between the Indian Princes and British India, they relied on the *experts* and therefore untenable dictum of the Butler Committee that the relations of the Indian Princes were with the Crown as distinct from the Government of India. Under the circumstances the only relation between the Princes and British India can be one of federation of autonomous groups. This fundamental fallacy corrupts their whole argument. Having made up their mind about federation, they have subordinated every other proposal of theirs to this one governing consideration. British Indian Provinces should have provincial autonomy, with residual powers vested in them, *a la* the Indian States. The end of Indian constitutional evolution is a number of British Indian States, linguistically and otherwise delimited, with residuary powers vested in them and the Indian States,—all held together by a Federal Legislature, a Federal Executive and a Federal Court and an Indian Privy Council with the Viceroy at the apex as the focussing centre. As a preliminary to that consummation is proposed the creation of a Greater India Council for consultation in matters of common interest to British India and the Indian States, on the model of the League of Nations. While the British Indian Provinces are to form the constituent States of the Federation to start with, there is to be a standing invitation to the Indian States, to join the Federation, as and when they choose.

The Commissioners realise that their proposals involve raising the British Indian Provinces to the status of constituent States in the first instance, by releasing them from the control of the Central Government and then immediately thereafter compelling them to form members of a Federation, willy nilly. They realise, too, the need for a strong Central Government. And in order to achieve these two rather conflicting aims, they fall back on compromises and confusions. They dilute the autonomy of the Provinces. Though dyarchy is to be abolished and a unitary form of government introduced, they vest in the Governor much wider powers than are now vested in him to be used ordinarily, apart from the emergency powers. Instead of reducing him to the status of a "constitutional" Governor, he is to be made more of an autocrat than now and brought into line with the Indian Princes! Besides, the previous san-

ction and subsequent assent of the Governor General is retained for provincial legislation. Provincial autonomy is further watered down by the provision that the Security Services should continue to be recruited by the Secretary of State for India on an All-India basis and that the Provincial Governments should be obliged to employ them.

Unitary government with joint responsibility is recommended for the Provinces. But the Governor is free to choose his Ministers either from the majority party in the Council or include officials or non-officials within or without the Council in the Ministry. It is difficult to see how with such heterogeneous composition the Ministry could be jointly responsible.

In the Central Government, as has been pointed out, there is to be no advance towards "responsible" government; it is desired and hoped that the Executive will be more responsive to the wishes of the Legislature. The Lower chamber, the Federal Assembly, is to be much enlarged and the official element greatly reduced. In other respects, there is no change worth noting. This is one of the major defects of the Report, which will be totally unacceptable to the people of India. As the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri is reported to have said in England on the eve of the publication of the Report, representative provincial governments would never tolerate the overriding power of an "irresponsible" Central Government in whom they have no confidence.

The deadlocks in the Central Legislature will be more frequent and more bitter between the irremovable Executive and the elected majority. During the last ten years the deadlocks in the Legislative Assembly have created more political disharmony than all the creakiness of dyarchy in the Provinces. It is extraordinarily unwise to leave the Central Government "irresponsible."

The distrust of the Indians which is at the back of these regrettable proposals for the Central Government comes out in more open and unabashed manner in the proposals of the Commissioners in respect of Defence. Blandly it is asserted and reasserted that control of an Army including a British element cannot be made over to an Indian Legislature and to Indian Ministers. The service of British civilian officers under Indian Ministers is put down not to mercenary motives but to a burning zeal to teach the ignorant Indian Ministers in the ways of responsible government! But British soldiers may not serve under Indians! Therefore, the Army in India should be an Imperial Army under the sole control of the Viceroy and supported by a fixed contribution in normal times from the Indian exchequer. Defence is not to be a function of the Government of India, but of the Imperial Government. It is at the same time maintained that without her own army India cannot be said to be self-governing. And she is offered the choice of creating another army, an Indian army without the British element. The Commissioners themselves fear that with the fixed contribution to the Imperial Army in India and the growing demands of civil expenditure, India will find it difficult to build up a separate Indian

Army. The net result is that in India, with no army of her own, there will be stationed an Imperial Army to overawe the civil government even as foreign troops were stationed in the Rhur! A more reactionary and humiliating proposal it is difficult to imagine. And this step India is asked to take here and now though it is not proposed to introduce an element of "responsibility" in the Government of India and the contingency of Indian Ministers controlling the British Army does not arise. If distrust and racial arrogance are to govern the relations between India and England, India will not agree to stationing a foreign and hostile Army of Occupation in India and pay for it in order that it may overawe her national government, when it comes into being.

In the absence of a fresh agreement between the Hindus and Muslims, the Commissioners fall back on the Lucknow Pact. They offer no fresh solution but make an alternative suggestion that if the Muslims majorities in the Punjab and Bengal accept joint electorates without reservation of seats, they will not cavil at the retention of communal electorates and weightage for Muslims in the other Provinces where they are in a minority. They are impressed by the need for safeguarding the minorities, and the safeguard they propose is the personal intercession of the Governors and the Governor General on whom special obligations in this behalf will be laid. It is only when a Provincial Council proposes to change, by a constitutional resolution, the method of representation of any community, the consent to it of two-thirds of the members representing that community is necessary.

Taking the recommendations as whole, they would have been out of date even five years ago; they are totally unrelated to the needs of today. Considered purely as an academic adventure in constitution-making, the Simon Report is most uninspiring and insipid compared with the Montagu-Chelmsford Report and Lord Durham's Report. It is both doctrinaire and perfunctory. It leaves the impression that its authors knew and realised that they were wasting their time, that their recommendations would be out of date before they were announced, and that they were working under handicaps from the very start that knocked the zest out of their work. The Simon episode is a classic example of the price that British prestige demands. Far from doing any good or leaving things alone, the Simon Report is bound to do much harm to the harmonious relations between India and England and will be the greatest handicap to Lord Irwin, Mr. Wedgwood Benn and the Labour Government.

EASTERN AFRICA.

NATIVE POLICY.

MR. WEDGWOOD BENN'S recent speeches in the House of Commons and at the Imperial Press Conference have in a sense anticipated the findings of the Labour Government on the Eastern African questions and created lively hope in India. The Government's policy since announced is

on the whole a great advance on the existing state of things. On the question of Native policy they have struck the right note: they have reaffirmed the doctrine of the paramountcy of Native interests contained in the Devonshire Memorandum of 1923. But this declaration is to some extent weakened by their adherence to the "dual policy": the trusteeship of the Natives and the development of the country with the help of immigrant communities. They are not inconsistent with each other, assert the Government, "if it (dual policy) is properly understood". That is where the rub is. It has not been "properly" understood in the past. As the Butler Committee said of the relations between the Indian States and the Paramount Power in India, "paramountcy must be paramount". In practice paramountcy of Native interests is inconsistent with the "dual policy". Government might have boldly adopted for East Africa the policy so long in operation and with success in West Africa. Government realise that conflicts might arise not only between Native and European interests but between Native and non-Native other than European, and they lay down that all proposals meant for the promotion of the interests of the non-Natives should in the first instance be examined as to their effect on the Natives and in case of doubt, they should be referred to the Secretary of State for decision.

The political development of the Natives the Government propose to promote by the development of Native councils, and not directly by their participation in the Legislative Councils. A beginning may, however, well be made for direct participation by nominated Natives. This defect may yet be remedied by the Joint Select Committee. Government have laid down that the education of the Natives shall be comprehensive and not merely confined to making them good labourers in the service of non-Native masters. The economic position and freedom of the Natives are to be secured by the allocation of land adequate for their present and future needs, the abolition of all laws that savour of compulsory labour, by the removal of restrictions on the choice of crops that the Natives may grow and by grading of taxation according to the ability to pay.

These excellent principles are not new: so the Government admit. The whole trouble lay in their defeat in practice. To secure greater conformity of principle with practice Government propose to appoint a High Commissioner for the three territories of Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika, who shall be the Chief Adviser to the Secretary of State on Native affairs and he is to be given extensive powers to safeguard Native interests.

As regards the part to be allotted to the immigrant communities in the discharge of the trusteeship of the Natives, Government "wish to make it clear that both the Governors and the Councils are regarded by His Majesty's Government as sharing in the responsibility for Native welfare." But they at the same time take care to affirm that "whatever the composition of the Councils they would consider it essential that the Governors should have overriding powers in case they should find it necessary to differ

from their Councils, and in such an event the Governors as representatives of His Majesty would exercise those overriding powers. Without such a safeguard, His Majesty's Government could not ensure the maintenance of the trusteeship for which they themselves must continue essentially and irrevocably responsible." Excellent as is this reiteration of policy, the difficulty in the past has been that these sharers, by courtesy, in the responsibility of trusteeship have been allowed to become the dominant partners. Only vigilant public opinion in East Africa-England and India and the personal qualities and sympathies of the High Commissioner can ensure the carrying out of the policy.

An honest and loyal interpretation of the Native policy now reaffirmed would involve the abrogation of certain laws and restrictions against Natives now in force in Kenya. The Native reserves will have to be considerably enlarged and those among the European planters who have grabbed larger tracts of land than they can make use of must be asked to disgorge their unused acres and further alienation of land should be checked. Native taxation must abandon the motive of driving the Natives to work on European plantations; Government officials must give up "encouraging" Natives to work on European plantations; and several other steps taken in Kenya to enslave and exploit the Natives must be retraced. In short, Kenya Native Policy should be brought into line with that which obtains in Tanganyika.

CLOSER UNION.

In pursuance of the recommendations of the Closer Union Commission, Government have decided on the appointment of a High Commissioner to bring about closer union between the three territories. As Chief Adviser to the Secretary of State in matters of Native policy he is to be given extensive powers over the Governments of the three territories. He can require them to do or refrain from doing certain things, make enquiries of his own or order enquiries to be made for him by the local Governments. But he cannot himself legislate in matters of Native policy; he is just an adviser to the Secretary of State but with executive powers over the local Governments. He works without a Council in this respect.

While the High Commissioner is to act as the co-ordinating agent in matters of Native policy, he, with the assistance of a Central Legislative Council, acts as a Government in the sphere of economic interests common to the three territories. He and his Council are to administer and legislate in respect of certain "transferred" services, like railways, customs, defence, etc. Exclusive of three members of his own staff, his Council will consist of twenty-one nominated members, seven from each territory, four officials and three non-officials. The High Commissioner is required to have regard, as far as possible, to the representation of racial interests. Past experience of nominations by Governors has not always given satisfaction to Indians for the reason that due regard was not paid to their numbers, interests, and contribution to taxation. As the Rt.

Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri rightly maintained, Indians in Uganda any day were entitled to larger representation than Europeans. Yet it has invariably been the case that more representation was accorded to Europeans than to Indians. In the present instance Government have laid down the obligation that racial interests should be considered, but there is no guarantee that they will be given adequate consideration. It is provided that any three members of the High Commissioner's Council may require a decision of the Council to be transmitted to the Secretary of State and that gives the Indian representatives a valuable safeguard against racial discrimination by the Council.

Co-ordination of economic services was *per se* welcomed in all quarters, but the Indians in Tanganyika were apprehensive that it would be the thin end of the wedge for political union under which they were sure to suffer in their status. The German Government are protesting against even the partial union now under contemplation. There were considerable doubts if co-ordination of Native policy was practicable, though the Hilton Young Commission suggested closer union primarily to put down the Kenya spirit and vindicate the Tanganyika spirit. The Government have acted on the recommendations of the Commission in laying stress on the co-ordination of Native policy.

KENYA.

With regard to Kenya Government have turned down the reactionary proposals both of the Hilton Young Commission and Sir Samuel Wilson, and in the main agreed with the Indian contention. "The goal of constitutional evolution in Kenya as elsewhere is admittedly responsible government by a Ministry representing an electorate in which every section of the population finds an effective and adequate voice. But the goal cannot be reached at an early date in a community where it has so far been practicable to enfranchise less than one per cent of the population and where the idea of any substantial extension of the franchise finds little support." They have thus rejected the preposterous claim of the handful of white settlers for substantial steps to be taken with a view to the early establishment of responsible government. The claims for elected European majority, or in the alternative, for unofficial majority have likewise been turned down. The official majority is to be retained and there is to be no change in the composition of the Kenya Legislative Council, except that there shall be two representatives, instead of one, of Native interests. This is a move in the right direction. We hope that, failing Natives competent to voice Native interests, one at least of these two seats will be given to an Indian to represent Natives. Indians are to have proportionate share in the personnel of committees of the Council.

The question to which Indians attached the most vital importance and which is the principal bone of contention is the introduction of the common roll for all races as against the communal roll now in force. The Hilton Young Commission accepted it in principle but saw no prospect of its being acce-

pted by Europeans and they considered that European consent was necessary. Now the Labour Government, true to its principles and notwithstanding the trouble that is in store for them from the turbulent and recalcitrant white emigrants in Kenya, have decided that "the establishment of the common roll is the object to be aimed at and attained, with an equal franchise of a civilisation or education character open to all races." This bold declaration of a righteous policy must set at rest all reasonable controversy. The only question now to be considered is how best to implement it. The white settlers will do well to realise that their consent to the common roll has not been considered to be vital. Instead of resenting the decision, they had better set about thinking out how best to carry it out. The enquiry is to be conducted by the High Commissioner as to the means by which this end is to be attained in the "immediate future".

The exclusion of Indians from ownership of land in the highlands has been a sore point with them for these many years: they have never been reconciled to it. In paragraph 3 of the "Memorandum on Native Policy in East Africa" Government have laid down that in the matter, among other things, of the economic development of the country "persons of every race and of every religion, coloured no less than white, have a right to equal treatment in accordance with their several needs." This declaration should do away with the exclusion of Indians from the highlands, from higher services in the State, and with all other *racial* disabilities and discriminations.

There can be no doubt that this declaration of policy by His Majesty's Government has immense significance. It is a triumph of righteousness, of justice over prejudice, of trusteeship over exploitation of weaker peoples. It is bound to have great influence over the whole of Africa, wherever different races are thrown together. This declaration at the present moment, just a few days before the Simon proposals were due to be published, indicates that, notwithstanding all the anti-British agitation in India, which had its echoes in East Africa as well, notwithstanding the challenge which the Indian Congress has thought fit to fling in the face of the British Government, the Labour Government stood by India in her claims in East Africa and refused to be diverted from their championship of her rights by any feeling of irritation. The Labour Government and Mr. Wedgwood Benn in particular have proved their *bona fides* by India. Our only regret is that this declaration was not made earlier; it might have served to steady confidence in the Labour Government and obviated some of the unhappy happenings of the last few weeks. Mr. Benn deserves the thanks and the confidence of India in full measure. We feel that in the matter of Indian's claims for Dominion Status also Mr. Benn will do the right thing, if he is given the chance. Let India show her appreciation by calling off the unnecessary challenge and the strengthen his hand in his fight for India. Let us not fight friends and weaken them in their championship of our cause.

Miscellaneous.

"LEAVE INDIA TO HER FATE!"

The Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P.C., C.H., contributed the following article under the caption "Leave India to Her Fate" in the *Spectator* of 14th June 1930.

"Leave India to her fate!" This seems to many Britishers, both here and in India, to be the only way out of the tangle. Some days ago it found expression even in the columns of so well-informed a paper as the *Manchester Guardian*. One hears it so often in influential quarters that one must take it seriously.

The sentiment may be taken in two ways. On the lips of some it is perhaps a threat intended to rally those Indians who seem to hesitate without realizing fully the disaster which a sudden withdrawal of the British would mean. Others contemplate it as the inevitable end of a novel upheaval which puzzles their statemanship and subtly undermines their prestige. In so far as it is a threat, it would soon overreach itself. For it will meet on the other side a strong conviction that the salvation of India is not through British help but against British resistance. No fact in the situation is so prominent as that the present generation of Indians have shed their faith in the high mission of the British people in the East. Statesmen here must grasp this truth and another, viz., that the Civil Service in India can no longer hope to come between the *intelligentsia* and the common people of the land. To cherish either of these illusions is to precipitate the catastrophe.

But whence comes the ill-omened defeatism of so many earnest students of affairs? Mr. Gandhi's character and his principle and methods of political agitation are out of the range of common experience. The wonted mode of dealing with rebels will not do. World opinion will not tolerate the continued employment of force against a people who demand what is in reality their own and has been, besides, promised over and over again by solemn engagements. And in spite of advocates of violence here and in India it is perhaps no exaggeration to say that the conscience of the British people will not sanction it. It is no good staying on in an atmosphere of ill-will which seems to admit of no cure. Gather up what you can and retreat. Leave India to her fate.

But what will become of her? What about the trusteeship of civilization and the trusteeship of the dumb, helpless millions of India? Before withdrawing, much must be done to enable India to defend herself. Acute and complicated problems, of which the real magnitude will appear in the pages of the Simon Commission's Report, must be solved or brought within the reach of solution before the country can be handed over to its proper and natural custodians. A period of transition is, therefore, to be provided for. Take only the question of the country's security. The Indianization of the present Army and the preparation of the citizens for the duty of self-defence are processes which require not only time but skill and delicacy of organization. In spite of urgent and repeated entreaties they have received so far nothing but perfunctory treatment. It would be a gross betrayal, nothing short of an infamy, if Britain were to leave India without liquidating this supreme obligation.

The question is asked, Is it right to expect the British soldier to guard India when her internal administration has passed entirely into Indian hands? Knowing the mutual dissensions of the various religions and communities in India, would the Parliament of this country allow the sacrifice of British

lives at the bidding of Ministers who are not its agents and whom it cannot call to account? It is true that India at present pays for her army; but that fact would only reduce the British officer and the British soldier to the status of mercenaries. That is one of the horns of the dilemma. The other horn is the continued maintenance of British control over the policy and the measures of the Government of India even during the period of transition—a course obviously impossible in face of the present posture of Indian nationalism.

Is the first alternative really impossible? Here appears the direct consequence of Great Britain's neglect in the past. The need of Indianization side by side in the civil and military directions, though pointed out again and again, was not attended to. The British Parliament would be precluded by the equity of the case from putting forward the plea of impossibility; even if its correctness were not largely negated by what took place at the time that autonomy was granted to some other dominions. When the actual test comes, it is amazing how people are ready to decline from the exalted region of the moral mission and purpose of the Empire upon its gross material character. When Europeans in India are urged to live up to their own traditions and teach by their example the doctrines of democratic freedom, they turn round impatiently and ask, "Are we here to teach democracy to you? We are here just to make money and guard our rights." The proposition that a British army has no business where there are no British interest and no British lives to protect may be true in the abstract though the implications of the Covenant of the League of Nations cast serious doubts upon it. But the long history of the Indo-British connexion and the responsibilities, still undischarged, arising from it cannot be kept out of the discussion. If they were, the resplendent story of the Empire would have a lame and impotent conclusion. Perish the thought! The united wisdom of Great Britain and India, some of us still hope, will find a way out of the present difficulty of better promise to their honour and prosperity and the benefit of the world at large.

Correspondence.

VIOLENCE OF NON-VIOLENCE.

TO THE EDITOR, "THE SERVANT OF INDIA"

SIR,—As an admirer and humble follower of the Servants of India Society it grieved me very much to see the issue of its organ published on the Silver Jubilee Celebration Day of the Society disfigured by an editorial note which however is bound to be welcomed with glee by all enemies of Indian progress. I admit that the truth must be told whatsoever the consequence but my grievance is that you have departed from the path of truth and shown less than fairness to those of your countrymen who are associated with the present struggle for political freedom in criticizing—I would go further and say reviling them as you have done in your note on the "Violence of Non-violence."

Your sense of fairness is uppermost in the preceding note on "Vindictive Frightfulness" where you make ample allowance for the difficulties of the all-powerful Government and even see some justification for several of its actions. The note I complain of presents a curious study in contrasts, for here in downright fashion you condemn the actions of your countrymen, and even go to the length of throwing suspicion on the bonafides of the satyagraha movement by talking of "a smoke screen of non-violence!"

There may be conflicting views about the wisdom of launching stayagraha at the present moment, there may be differences of opinion regarding the methods adopted in pursuit of the goal, yet any student of this new gospel knows that action like the miscalled "raids" on salt depots is not contrary to the spirit of the movement; and to speak of this aspect of the campaign as a dilution of the policy of non-violence nullifies a great deal of the force of your condemnation of the methods followed by Government in dealing with the situation.

Though I fervently hope I am wrong in my interpretation, you seem to accuse the promoters of the movement—do you realize when you write this that most of the promoters in almost all parts of the country are behind prison bars and hence unable to influence developments?—of deliberate attempts at working up violence to fever pitch and rousing passions they are unable to control. I should like to know what evidence you possess on which you base this allegation except such as is presented in the one-sided and belated versions of disturbances of the peace, here and there, issued by Government or published in the Anglo-Indian press. You surely cannot blame satyagrahis for an odd stone hurled when crowds gather together, though I wish it was fully realized that in Gujarat, the home of the movement, not even a stone or a pebble has hurt the armed and unarmed upholders of law and order. Undoubtedly, the movement has had the effect of tearing the veil of governance by the tacit consent of the people that disguised the true nature of the present system of administration in India. But if you had any first-hand knowledge of the implications or manifestations of the satyagraha campaign you would certainly not have condemned it as striking a mortal blow at the law-abiding instincts of the people and fomenting anarchy. As impartial observers have testified, the satyagrahis are no mobs, no crowds, but they are an organized, disciplined and peaceful army, whose conduct evokes admiration even from some of their opponents. I do not know what researches have led you to the discovery that this movement has been the harbinger of communal discord and internal disunity. All evidence I have seen as a mere student of affairs leads me to a very different conclusion and I must protest against your heaping accusations on a body of national workers who, if not in jail, are too deeply absorbed in this intense struggle for freedom and have neither the time nor the heart to parry words with their own countrymen and rebut vague, if not false, charges based on inaccurate information.

You are wrong in assuming that the Mahatma's mission was one of peace, at any price. If it had been, he need never have left the Satyagraha Ashram on his great march. He deliberately embarked on his campaign as a means for the achievement of political freedom, and his followers and those others who participate in the struggle are prepared to face all suffering meekly and bravely. Of this they have given ample evidence during the last three months. Compared to their suffering the inconveniences and little hardships of those outside their ranks are negligible but, instead of extending your sympathy to the stayagrahis, you magnify the inconveniences and hardships of the general public; and go to the length of holding satyagrahis as practically responsible for all present day evil in India!

Your *Guru* and mine wanted to develop in our country capacity, character and courage: social philosophers in the west have been struggling in vain to devise the moral equivalent of war. The Mahatma's movement has even during these three months, apart from its achievements in the past, developed capacity, character and courage to an extent that

would have gladdened the heart of the noble founder of the Servants of India Society. It has been the source of inspiration for service and self-sacrifice, particularly among women and in rural areas and it alone provides the moral equivalent of war by evoking those qualities which we wish to see established in prominence in the new social order. Rather than defame and deride, let us bow our heads in all humility and reverence that it has been vouchsafed to our generation and to our country to witness so striking a phenomenon in the moral, ethical and spiritual progress of the world!

Andheri
17th June 1930.

VAIKUNTH L. MEHTA.

[The opinions of Mr. Vaikunth L. Mehta are entitled to great respect. Nevertheless we must take leave to hold that salt raids involve a dilution of the policy of non-violence. He has given no reasons for his view, to the contrary which we might attempt to rebut. Mr. Mehta fears that because of our view of salt raids, our condemnation of Government's repressive policy lost much force. We would request him to consider whether, because of our view and the admission of the justification of the use of some force, our condemnation of the excesses has not gained in weight.

We realise only too well that most of the promoters of the campaign are now behind the prison bars and are unable to influence the course of developments. But Mr. Mehta knew as well as the leaders themselves that they would not be long free to direct the campaign and that sooner or later they would be behind the prison bars. As a matter of fact, they liked nothing better and gave no peace to the Government until they were imprisoned. If they realised that they would be unable to direct the course of events for long and that their immediate presence and direction was essential for the non-violent character of the campaign, they might have taken care to call off the movement the moment they were not free to direct it personally. The promoters of the movement knew the inevitable results; they were warned in time by friends, and yet they persisted in their course. We find it hard to believe that devotion to non-violence both in thought and action is the supreme passion with the great bulk of the satyagrahis. Mental violence is even greater violence than the physical.

We will not withhold our admiration for Gujarat, the home of satyagraha. But Gujarat is not India and the campaign was not confined to it and all the leaders are not Mahatma Gandhis. We have admired the orderliness and the discipline among the satyagrahi volunteers. We have admired even more the general orderliness and peacefulness of the crowds at places of pilgrimage and of scouts at jamborees, for instance. The motive for peacefulness and orderliness in these cases was not exactly law-breaking or hatred. It is rather humiliating to be told that anti-British and anti-Government and law-breaking proclivities are needed to instill in our countrymen courage, capacity and character, and that love of our country and our people is not sufficient motive force. The burning down of a town might result in its rebuilding on more modern lines, but it is still better deliberately to rebuild the town without setting fire to it, and causing more destruction than is absolutely necessary. No adventitious advantages will justify the main wrong.

We confess we have no sympathy for the morbid mentality which seeks suffering. It deserves more

pity than sympathy. We would rather bow our heads in admiration to those, who, in spite of all difficulties and discouragements, are striving for peace, for the promotion of peace is a nobler mission than the finding of moral substitutes for war.—Editor.]

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE EVOLUTION OF MODERN MARRIAGE. A SOCIOLOGY OF SEXUAL RELATIONS. By F. MÜLLER-LYER. Translated by ISABELLA C. WIGGLESWORTH. (Allen & Unwin.) 1930. 20cm. 248p. 12/6.
- FRANCO-GERMAN RELATIONS, 1878-1885. By ROBERT H. WIENEFFELD. (The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore.) 1929. 24cm. 200p. \$1.50.
- SOCIAL CHANGES IN 1928. ED. BY WILLIAM F. OGBURN. (University of Chicago Press.) 1929. 24cm. pp. 957-1180.
- THE WORLD IN 2030 A.D. By THE EARL OF BIRKENHEAD. (Hodder & Stoughton.) 1930. 24cm. 215p. 12/6.
- THE PROSPECTS OF DEMOCRACY AND OTHER ESSAYS. By Alfred Zimmermann. (Chatto & Windus.) 1929. 23cm. 375p. 12/6.
- MODERN POLITICAL CONSTITUTIONS. By C. F. STRONG. (Sidgwick & Jackson.) 1930. 23cm. 380p. 12/6.
- LINCOLN. By EMIL LUDWIG. Translated by Eden and Cedar Paul. (Putnams.) 1930. 23cm. 532p. 21/-
- REAL WAGES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1890-1926. By PAUL H. DOUGLAS. (Houghton Mifflin Co., New York.) 1930. 22cm. 682p. \$7.50.
- THE OPEN DOOR AND THE MANDATE SYSTEM. By BENJAMIN GERIG. (Allen & Unwin.) 1930. 22cm. 236p. 10/-.
- MOTHER ENGLAND. A CONTEMPORARY HISTORY. By MARIE C. STOPES. (John Bale.) 1929. 22cm. 206p. 10/6.

True League of Nations is the Inter-national Mind.
It is visualised in

THE ARYAN PATH.

A non-political, International Magazine.

THE FORUM FOR INTELLECTUAL CONTROVERSIES AND SPIRITUAL DISCOVERIES.

Some of the Articles that have already appeared.

Concerning the Title "The Aryan Path"—Prof. A. V. Williams Jackson.

Pseudo Mysticism and Modern Science—John Middleton Murry.

The Constructive Side of Buddhism—M. G. Mori.

Intellectual Integrity—C. E. M. Joad.

Some of the Contents of June & July Numbers.

The Indian Conception of God—Prof. Sten Konow.

Will West Meet East?—Dr. Paul E. Johnson.

On Exercising Evil—J. D. Beresford.

Democracy and Culture—Dr. L. P. Jacks,
(Editor: Hibbert Journal.)

Is A New Religion Emerging?—D. L. Murray.

Price per annum Rs. 10. Or its equivalent.
Single Copy Re. 1.

51, ESPLANADE ROAD, BOMBAY.