Registered —B. 838.

The Servant of India

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

VOL. XIII No. 29. | POONA—THURSDAY, JULY 17, 1930. | INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6. FOREIGN 15s.

CONTENTS.

Topics of the Week.

Ceylon Reforms.

ON July 5th was published in Ceylon an Order-in-Council sanctioning the registration of voters for the new constitution to be soon inaugurated. The Ordinance lays down, among others, the qualifications for voters in accordance with the policy recently announced by the British Government. The provision for the production of certificates of permanent settlement by persons not domiciled in Ceylon is retained, in spite of the great objection that India had taken to it. India will not be reconciled to it and must not relax opposition to it. In the reference that the Viceroy made in his speech to the Central Legislature the otherday, he seemed to have acquiesced in this decision of the British Government. We hope every constitutional pressure will be brought to bear on the Government of India against such acquiescence. It is lamentable that a Labour Government should have consented to a trick—for it is nothing but that—deliberately intended to keep out of the voter's register a number of workers. Apart from that, it is a constitutional departure in the wrong direction. As Mr. L. X. Pereira pointed out in his admirable "Memorandum on Franchise to Indians in Ceylon" presented to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, "In no British colony is an immigrant, who is a British subject, required to declare himself to be a permanent resident * * * as a pre-requisite to his being admitted to the franchise for which he is otherwise qualified." If the real objection to enfranchising the Indian coolies on the estates is that in the conditions in which they live they are not in a position to exercise unfettered discretion, the remedy lies in freeing them from the semi-slave conditions and not in denying them the vote.

* * *

The Common Roll.

FROM the full text of the debate in the House of Lords on the 3rd inst. on the East African question, it is evident that the Government policy, particularly with reference to the common roll, has to face great opposition. Lord Cranworth, for instance, challenged to be told if anybody, any Commission or any Governor of Kenya, had preferred the common roll. He asserted that neither the report of Sir Samuel Wilson, of the Hilton Young Commission, of the Ormsby-Gore Commission nor the utterances of Mr. J. H. Thomas, the Secretary of State for the Dominions, nor of any Governor that went out to Kenya ever supported the common roll. Obviously his Lordship did not read the Hilton Young Report. That report definitely preferred the common to the communal roll, and actually recommended that the High Commissioner should make enquires to implement it. Before it there was the Wood-Winterton Agreement. There is, then, the report of the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri and the representations of the Government of India which are entitled to as much, if not more, weight as the other reports. Apart from these recommendations, there is the intrinsic righteousness of the common roll. Lord Plymouth and even the Bishop of Salisbury disapproved of the common roll. Lord Passfield, speaking on behalf of the Government, seemed to be somewhat aplogetic. While he affirmed that Government would not abandon their own responsibility for policy and that on vital matters they must retain freedom to differ from the recommendations that the Joint Committee might make, he said that all that was proposed for the present was the ordering of an enquiry by the High Commissioner. We hope that the question of the common roll is one of the vital matters on which the Government will not compromise even if the High Commissioner's report should be unsatisfactory. We hope the enquiry will not relate to the advisability or unanimous acceptability of the common roll but merely the best means of implimenting it.

* * *

Whites in War Paint.

AS was only to be expected, the British settlers in Kenya are indulging in sabre rattling over the Imperial Government's Eastern African policy. They have opposed the policy in toto and they have promised vigorous action if it was not reversed. They have appealed to South Africa for assistance. They knew where to find sympathy for their preposterous claim of white supremacy over the non-white races of the world. They, no doubt, confidently expect that at the forthcoming Imperial Conference South Africa will throw her full weight in their favour. Besides, they are themselves sending a strong deputation headed by Lord Delamere, the governor who governs the Govern-

ment of Kenya, to England to persuade the Joint Select Committee of Parliament and Parliament itself in the last resort to reverse the policy of the Labour Government. He has declared that only the whites knew how to govern, and that art of governing could not be acquired by others, and that therefore the white settlers in Kenya should be allowed to exercise their exclusive gift of governing the non-whites. Sir Edward Grigg, the Governor of Kenya, had never concealed his ardent belief in Lord Delamere's theories of white domination. He is reported to have betrayed his feelings of bitter chagrin at the decision of His Majesty's Government in his speech in the Kenya Legislative Council. He had avowed his faith in Sir Charles Elliot's policy that "the main object of our policy and legislation would be to found a White colony" and strove hard to consummate it. He has openly thrown the full weight of his authority and influence on the side of the whites in Kenya, and to that extent he has not only ceased to be an impartial Governor but has actually defied the British Government and defeated their policy. With so much added strength to their elbow, the whites are sure to put up a determined fight in London. If the Native and Indian case is not to go by default, it is necessary that an equally determined fight must be put up on their behalf. The Government and people of India, notwithstanding their internal differences and "wars", should keep a vigilant eye on developments in East Africa, South Africa and London, and lose no opportunity of counteracting the opposition of the whites and strengthening the hands of the Labour Government. In his speech to the Central Legislature the Viceroy promised that the Government of India would arrange to give evidence before the Joint Select Committee. We hope the Government will include among its delegation some non-officials as well. The Indians in Kenya should also see to it that a strong and well-equipped delegation proceeds to London in good time.

* * *

Central Legislature at Work.

THANKS to the withdrawal of a number of important members the proceedings of the Assembly at present in session have ceased to arouse much public interest. Its presidential election was not attended with much excitement. There were two candidates, Maulvi Mahmud Yakub and Dr. Nand Lal, of whom the former's success was almost a foregone conclusion. To the Deputy Presidentship, which was till then held by Maulvi Mahmud Yakub, the Assembly elected Sir Hari Singh Gour. The only other business so far done which deserves notice was the debate on Mian Shah Nawaz's cut in the demand for expenses of the Round Table Conference. The debate raged for three days. There was much criticism of the Simon Report; but that was by no means the main issue. The Government, perhaps in the expectation of a favourable vote, refrained from objecting to the Simon issue being brought in indirectly; but we are not sure that they do not now feel that in doing so they miscalculated, for the motion was carried in the teeth of their opposition by 60 votes to 48. The one question that seemed to grip the members was what should be done to ensure the success of the proposed Round Table Conference; and though everybody wanted something done to that end, nobody said what exactly should be done. As Mr. M. R. Jayakar put it, the Conference had come five years too late which had considerably added to the Government's difficulties. Like so many others, he emphasised the need of Congress cooperation for the Conference's success. The occasion was used by popular representatives to give expression to public indignation at the police excesses that occured in the different parts of the country. Mr. K. C. Neogy showed how the Press Ordinance had made it impossible for the non-official committee, presided over by such a level-headed Liberal as Mr. J. N. Basu, which inquired into the Midnapore firing, to get any printing press in Bengal to print its report or any newspaper there to publish the same; such was its deterrent effect. He therefore did the next best thing by using the floor of the Assembly for giving publicity to its contents. It is to be hoped the Government will see the wisdom of repealing that Ordinance.

The constitutional debate in the upper House, was less exciting. Sir P. C. Sethna, who is the President of the Liberal Federation this year, moved a resolution which embodies the Liberal Party's demand for the grant of immediate Dominion status subject to agreed reservations for the transition period. He pointed out that "Mr. Gandhi and Pandit Motilal Nehru had expressed themselves in favour of Dominion Status if it was immediately established" which was hardly distinguishable from the position of the Liberals. He also made it clear that any constitution falling short of Dominion Status "India was in honour bound to reject." As the Viceroy had pointed out, the Simon proposals were still under consideration by Government. Consequently the reply of the Law member was non-committal and did not carry anybody further than the Viceroy's earlier utterance. The resolution was withdrawn.

* * *

Indian Delegation to League of Nations.

SIR PHIROZE SETHNA has done well to call upon the Government to take steps to give effect to the recommendations of the last Indian Delegation to the League of Nations. The main recommendations were that India should be given an elected seat on the Council of the League, that the composition of the delegation should be purely Indian, that there should be continuity in its personnel, that permanent representatives should be appointed at Geneva, and that a Standing Advisory Committee of the Legislature should be constituted for considering matters in connection with the membership of the League. Sir B. L. Mitter explained on behalf of Government that with regard to the composition, they were unable to accept the recommendation owing to the Indian States not being represented in the Central Legislature, which consequently could not be entrusted with the control over the delegation. As for representation on the Council of the League he thought that the time was not opportune since India was not yet self-governing. We must say that the reason does not appeal to us since the attainment of complete self-government is not essential for claiming a seat on the Council. If India has status enough to be a member of the League, that status is good enough for a seat in the Council. Sir B. L. Mitter expressed the hope that if they kept up pressure India might be accorded her due with regard to the appointment of Indians in the League Office. On the question of a purely Indian delegation Government would not accept the proposal, since, as Sir B. L. Mitter said, it would be wrong to exclude an Englishman on racial grounds, if he possessed special qualifications making him eligible, for example, a knowledge of international law. He promised, however, to make an attempt to secure one or two delegates from the Central Legislature for this year. Although the Resolution was withdrawn by Sir P. C. Sethna, its importance lies in the fact of its being symptomatic of India's dissatisfaction with having to play second fiddle to Britain and in the sympathetic assurances it has drawn from the Government.

Amendment of the Police Acts.

A Bill to amend the Bombay District Police Act which has been introduced in the Bombay Council is in many ways a very useful measure. Under clauses 10 and 12 of the new Bill the District Magistrate is given power to make rules prescribing the number and position of lights to be used on vehicles in public streets, whereas at present this power is possessed only by the Commissioner of Police in Bombay City. The regulations with regard to the lighting of vehicles are absolutely essential in view of growing traffic all round in the province and the amendment is to be welcomed. According to the present Act no penalty of imprisonment can be imposed on beggars begging importunately for alms so as to make themselves a nuisance to the general public or exhibiting deformities and sores in public places; the amended Act adds this penalty to that of a fine, and we are confident that a few cases under the new section would prove to be more deterrent and succeed in lessening the intensity of the beggar nuisance so well known to every citizen residing in towns. We strongly object however to an amendment of the City of Bombay Police Act which empowers sub-inspectors and sergeants to disperse an unlawful assembly. Even if sergeants and sub-inspectors were supposed to be paragons of good behaviour and conscientiousness it would be absurd to trust them with powers which only magistrates of higher ranks ought to possess. But as it is, knowing as we do of the behaviour of numerous sergeants during the last few weeks, this new investiture of powers will fill every law-abiding citizen with great concern and alarm. It would be the greatest mistake for the Bombay Council to give their assent to clause 5 of the amending bill. The officers of lower rank in the police force can hardly be trusted with powers which are hedged round with all manner of restrictions in all civilized countries. If sergants are made magistrates we have come to the end of the tether.

* * *

Swaraj with a Vengence.

"After disorders involving so great an upheaval of normal conditions such an inquiry as I have just announced is one inevitable consequence", said the Viceroy, Lord Chelmsford, when he announced in the old Imperial Legislative Council on the 3rd September, 1919, the appointment of the Hunter Committee to enquire into the Punjab disorders. The proclamation of martial law is an upheaval of normal conditions and Sholapur suffered martial law. As we have said before, an impartial and public enquiry is an inevitable consequence of it. And yet for a wonder, the Governmet of Bombay took no initiative in the matter and when Rao Bahadur R. R. Kale pleaded for a public enquiry the Government opposed it in the Bombay Legislative Council. It is even more surprising that two members of the Council hailing from Sholapur who got the opportunity of speaking on the motion stoutly opposed the enquiry and assured that the third member from that City was of the same view. Mr. Kale made out an excellent and convincing case for a public enquiry, but the Government would have none of it. The reason urged for it was that it would do no good but would only lead to mutual mud-slinging by the factions and parties in Sholapur—as if that were suffcient justification for refusing an enquiry. The same argument may be advanced against even public trial of cases arising from the troubles in Sholapur. The attitude of the Government, we confess, leaves a bad taste in the mouth and public discomfeiture is complete when it is remembered that the Bombay Cabinet consists of six Indians and one solitary European. It is swaraj with a vengence.

* * *

Local Government in C. P.

THE working of the District Councils in C. P. and Berar reveal the usual sorry state of affairs found in our local institutions. Of the 83 Local Boards fourteen continue to be unrepresented. In some Local Boards certain number of seats still remain unrepresented. The number of habitual absentees remain unchecked as no local board has taken action under Section 17 (2) of the Local Self-Government Act. It seems the Government must make it a statutory obligation as nobody is willing to take the odium of expelling members. Many District Councils have not taken care to close the year with the minimum balance required by law. It seems in certain districts when crop failures are almost regular measures shall have to be taken to subsidise the District Councils, otherwise the primary education and health departments are bound to starve. In the Education Department the tendency to employ trained teachers is evident. Cheap plan dispensaries are also increasing. There is a perceptible fall in the number of successful vaccinations and greater control by the Civil Surgeons is advised. Government has taken substantial steps to increase rural water supply by contributing 67% of the cost.

The most regrettable feature is the increasingly strained relations between some of the District Councils and their local boards. These are often due to personal animosities and undue interference by the superior body. The desire to keep all the power centralised in the district board is a vicious one, bound to do great harm to the progress of decentralization. It is to be regretted that these bodies in whose hands much of the welfare of the rural masses lies should spend a large portion of their time and money in quarrels on petty questions.

* * *

Infant Welfare.

THE fifth report of the Bombay Presidency Baby and Health Week Association which has lately reached us is an interesting record of useful work done in 1929 for the good of our future generations. It appears from the Report that the secretaries, Mr. G. K. Devadhar and Dr. H. V. Tilak, have been responsible for a good deal of propaganda work by means of lectures, demonstrations, exhibitions, etc., and have been energetically helped by a number of ladies and gentlemen, both official and unofficial. It is not our purpose here to make a detailed mention of the activities of the Association. Suffice it to say that the Organisation has kept itself unceasingly busy throughout the year; and that its work has numberless appreciators in all parts of the presidency. That is, however, not to say that there is no scope for the expansion of its very useful and nation-building work. In spite of the energy and enthusiasm it has put into its work, much ignorance and many wrong notions are still found to prevail on the subject of infant welfare. In our villages there is a vast virgin field to which the Association can more and more turn its attention to great public good. We are glad to see from this Report that this matter is not escaping the Association's attention and the exhibition recently arranged at Khed Shivapur in Poona district under its auspices is, we take it, only an earnest of further vigorous efforts in this direction. We heartily endorse the Association's appeal for funds to build up a permanent fund to enable it to carry on its very useful work without financial anxiety.

* * *

Articles.

SECOND THOUGHTS.

THE full text of the Viceroy's statement to the Central Legislature on the 9th inst. contains much that is satisfactory and was rightly welcomed by the non Congress leaders all over India. The Viceroy frankly acknowledged the rapid and phenomenal development of the national spirit in India, and deplored that this development was not adequately appreciated in Great Britain. It will be remembered that Sir John Simon discountenanced India attempting to follow British constitutional forms and methods. The Viceroy, as it were, repudiated Sir John's theories by acknowledging that it was only right that India should look to constitutional development "along lines that British experience and contact of the political classes with British education and practice naturally suggested." While Sir John deliberately refused to take note of the recent developments in India, the Viceroy stated that he was in consultation with the Indian leaders and would send up recommendations with a full sense of the responsibility attaching to the Government of India. He further categorically stated that the Simon Report would not hamper the freedom of the Round Table Conference. Sir John deliberately avoided the use of the phrase, dominion status, in his Report for he never believed it be to the goal of Indian political evolution. According to him India was to "take her place among the constituent States of the Commonwealth," but not necessarily a place of equality. But the Viceroy recognised that, while it was the prime duty of any Viceroy to retain India within the ambit of the British Commonwealth of Nations, she would not remain within the Commonwealth upon terms which implied "a permanent inferiority of status", and he solemnly repeated the declaration of the British Government that "the attainment of Dominion Status was the natural completion of India's constitutional growth." For all practical purposes, the Simon Report and all that it stands for could not have been repudiated more thoroughly and finally.

Indian leaders had almost unanimously desired that Government should support the demand for a Dominion Status constitution subject to temporary reservations. The Viceroy substantially met it when he said, "I have never concealed my desire to see India in enjoyment of as large a degree of management of her own affairs as could be shown to be compatible with the necessity of making provision for those matters in regard to which India was not yet in a position to assume responsibility." The Indian leaders desired that any agreement that may be reached at the Round Table Conference should form the basis of the Government's proposals to be placed before Parliament. The Viceroy met it when he said, "any such agreement at which the Conference is able to arrive will form the basis of the proposals which His Majesty's Government will later submit to Parliament." He added the further assurance that "His Majesty's Government conceive of it (Conference) not as a meeting for discussion and debate, but as the joint assembly of representatives of both countries on whose agreement the precise proposals to Parliament may be founded." Indian leaders had further desired that there should be no more periodical examinations of India's fitness for self-government. The Viceroy has said that the Conference is intended to make a sustained attempt "to discover once for all the more excellent way in which Great Britain and India, to the benefit of each, can walk together." All this is eminently satisfactory.

It was the wish of many Indian leaders, including the Liberals and non-Congressmen, that the Viceroy's statement might have gone further and had in more unequivocal terms announced that the Round Table Conference would frame a Dominion Status constitution subject to reservations to be mutually agreed upon. Perhaps such an avowal might have been made if the leaders of the British Opposition had consented to it. Apparently they did not and the Labour Government was not sure of retaining office if they on their own account made such a pronouncement. The Indian critics of the Government naturally enquire what chances there are of any agreement, which is satisfactory from the Indian point of view and to which the Labour Government have subscribed, being accepted by the British Parliament if the Liberal and Conservative leaders are opposed to Dominion Status for India. It is merely postponing the evil day. For unless one party at least of the Opposition agrees to Dominion Status or the Labour Party comes to power after a general election with a clear majority there is no prospect of Parliament agreeing to the grant of Dominion status even with reservations. The Labour Government as they stand today cannot deliver the goods. And it is sometimes contended that those in India who are either putting pressure on or embarassing the Government of India have no quarrel with the Labour Government, but that the pressure or embrassment is intended more for the Conservatives and Liberals in England. It is an accident that the Labour Government receives the blows which are really meant for others.

It should, however, be realised that there is great difference between the Labour Government frankly avowing here and now that Dominion Status would be granted to India and the Labour Government facing the British Parliament with the agreement reached at the Round Table Conference. While in the first alternative the announcement is sure to be denounced and the Government thrown out of office, in the second alternative there is every prospect of the agreement being accepted by the British Parliament, however unwillingly. There is the strong tradition of the British Parliamentary system by which an agreement reached by a British Government with others is generally not repudiated. The Conservatives and the Liberals are not likely to take the responsibility of turning down an agreement that

the Labour Government may reach with the Indian representatives at the Conference. That explains their great anxiety to be represented in the Conference, which demand is about to precipitate a Cabinet crisis.

All this presumes the possibility of agreement. What are the chances of it? It will depend to a very large extent on the composition of the Round Table Conference. We confess to grave misgivings on the subject. In his famous statement of November last Lord Irwin used words which unequivocally confined the British representation on the Conference to His Majesty's Government. He said, "His Majesty's Government would meet representatives both of British India and of the States." In his last statement, however, he used words which lend themselves to other interpretations. He referred to "both countries and all parties and interests in them" and to "a joint assembly of representatives of both countries." These words may mean that the British representatives will not necessarily be confined to the Labour Government but may include others, not only representatives of the political parties but also of commercial and other bodies who have interests in India. Any agreement to which the Imperialists and the exploiters of India can be parties will mean precious little to India and even Liberals in India may have to reconsider their attitude.

On the Indian side the Viceroy ardently wished that Mahatma Gandhi and Congress co-operated in the good work of the Conference. More recently the Premier is reported to have remarked at a Labour Rally meeting in Crystal Palace that "men with whom we wish to co-operate have had to be arrested." It is the unanimous wish of everybody that Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress should co-operate. But the Mahatma and the other leaders of the Congress are in jail. It is possible that they have been allowed to read the Viceroy's statement. But they have not been given the chance to meet and discuss between themselves whether they had better call off the civil disobedience campaign and go to the Conference. None of the Congerss leaders that are now outside the jail has the moral authority to reverse the Congress policy, even to suspend the civil disobedience campaign. It is necessary to find ways and means to enable the Congress leaders who can order a change to take a decision and communicate it to their followers. They should be given a chance to take a fresh decision. If the Government themselves feel delicate to negotiate with the Mahatma and Pandit Motilal Nehru, they should at least give every facility to non-officials who undertake to interview the imprisoned leaders. It is in the fitness of things that Mr. M. R. Jayakar should undertake this heavy responsibility.

It is possible, however, that the Government or the Congress leaders may be obstructive. In which case, the Liberals and non-Congressmen have to consider if they should attend the Conference. We have no illusions that their participation will not be a bed of roses for them. It will be an extremely difficult and thankless task. They will be denounced by their compatriots in India and find themselves at a disadvantage at the Conference because they have not the bulk of political Indian behind them. Nevertheless, we are distinctly of opinion that the Liberals and other nationalists should attend the Conference. It is evident that the purely communal bodies have agreed to go. The Liberals are the only nationalists outside the Congress ranks. Their absence will leave the field free for the communalists to overrun the country with their anti-national policies. The Liberals have a double task: to push India along the path of Dominion Status and to hold in check the spread of communalism. It is conceivable that the communalists, whose chosen field is the provincial sphere, might be content to leave the Central Government as it is if they are given a free hand in the provinces. A strong nationalist contingent from India should be there to warn the Conference against the dangers of widening the reign of communalism in India and at the same press for the democratisation of the central Government.

If the Congress should find it impossible to participate in the Conference, we plead with it that it should give the non-Congressmen a chance to do their utmost, by suspending the civil disobedience campaign. If the movement has popular support that is claimed for it, it will not be the loser if it is suspended for a time, to be resumed later if the results of the Conference should turn out to be unsatisfactory. Sir Chimanlal Setalvad has stated that he for one would not give his consent to anything less than Dominion Status subject to temporary reservations. Let those who honestly believe in the Conference method be given every chance to test their faith.

ENGLISH PRESS ON SIMON REPORT

THE English papers received by the last mail give us some idea as to the kind of reception received by the first volume of the Simon Report; it was friendly. That is however not to say that the tendency to be critical was altogether absent. There can be no doubt however that the praise bestowed upon it in some quarters was palpably extravagant. Thus we find the *Saturday Review* comparing it with the Durham Report and delivering itself of the following characteristic judgment:— "While avoiding the fallacies of Montaguism, the Report does not fall into those of O'Dwyerism. It recognises that those who are demanding swaraj are a microscopic minority of the Indian peoples, but it does not fail to notice that the politicians do voice a widespread and growing nationalist sentiment." It is a great relief to turn from this to the *Nation and Athenaeum* which apparently has no intention of accepting everything in the Report as gospel truth. It rightly regards "the extreme caution" of the Report as a result of its unanimity, but recognises at the same time that "the bulk of the volume is occupied by a conventional and very English presentation of the Indian situation." It candidly describes the section in the Report dealing with Hindu Muslim relations as "not very penetrating." In its

opinion, the Commission showed "no appreciation of the many subtle ways in which the system (of separate electorates) corrupts public life, turns democracy into a farce and raises to political leadership the most bitter type of religious fanatic, while leaving no group of impartial voters to be wooed and converted by the candidate. In a country where apostasy is rare and involves social ostracism, the communal system places a smaller religious group in a permanent minority, from which it can only escape by proselytizing amongst its opponents or amongst the few enfranchised outcastes. It is indeed difficult for an Englisman to realise the extent to which this necessity has exacerbated religious feeling. The Commission certainly has failed to do so." Similarly the paper strongly dislikes the Commission's manner of dealing with the question of the relations between Europeans and Indians which was not as thorough as its importance deserved. Its remarks also on what the Report said about the Government's policy in the matter of recruitment to the Indian army show a better appreciation on its part of the nationalist point of view than the Commission's. Lastly, the paper has full justification for saying that "No attempt is made to understand the attitude of the Indian nationalist."

The Spectator writes sympathetically about India in its issue of July 5 under the caption "India Preparing for the Conference." It takes the opportunity to assure Indians that "there is a wider sympathy with their legimate aspirations to freedom and self-government than might be assumed from reading certain popular newspapers" and gives some very commonsense advice to the British people. It says. "In Great Britain we would do well to curtail our references to the right of the British Parliament ultimately to decide India's future. No doubt from the legal and constitutional standpoint we are correct, but, as we wrote on another occasion, it is the psychological factor which must be taken into consideration. To insist on telling the people of India that the members of the British Parliament are the sole arbiters of their destiny only irritates them. Half-truths are dangerous. In the last resort Great Britain can only remain in India if she preserves the goodwill of its people." If only there were a wider realisation of this fact among Britishers, a good deal of the present trouble in India would be avoided. We would particularly draw the attention of the "strong men" in the Indian Government to what it has to say about their repressive policy: "From the standpoint of self interest can it be thought that a policy of repression—even if it were practicable—would help British trade? If a policy of repression were adopted by Great Britain—a possibility which we refuse to entertain—we think that the boycott of British trade would assume proportions undreamt of by its advocates. But we have never approached the Indian question from the standpoint of profit and loss." Let us hope its wholesome advice will have the desired effect in proper quarters. The same issue contains a letter by Sir Francis Younghusband. Therein he puts forward a suggestion which, if accepted, would in his opinion, considerably raise India's "*izzat*." With responsible Government accepted by the British Parliament as the goal of its Indian policy, he suggests it should be left to India to decide whether she wishes to remain "within the Empire." Anyhow he says "It is scarcely courteous to say it ourselves. After what India did for the Empire in the Great War our sense of what is fit and gracious should surely make us leave the word with her. When she is able to govern herself and has responsible Government we would hardly *force* her against her own will to remain within the Empire. Then why not recognise that fact? Why not give up talking of "within the Empire"? He follows this up by the practical suggestion that in the preamble of the new Government of India Act the words "as an integral part of our Empire" be dropped.

D. V. A.

THE I. L. O.

THREE important questions were submitted to the Fourteenth Session of the International Labour Conference with a view to the adoption of international regulations for uniform conditions of work. They were 1. Forced or compulsory labour, 2. The hours of work of salaried employees, and 3. The hours of work in coal mines. Two of these questions, the first and the last, directly touched only a limited number of countries, and it might be remarked at the outset, that the examinatin of matters of this kind was a feature of this year's Conference. As the Deputy-Director of the International Labour Office and the Deputy Secretary General of the Conference, Mr. Butler, observed in his concluding speech, "there is no doubt that in future other questions which concern perhaps one particular industry or one particular group of countries will have to be dealt with in some way or other, and in order that they may be dealt with satisfactorily the machinery of the Organisation will have to be adapted for the purpose. We have made a first step along that road during this Conference. It may not have been completely successful; we might have found other methods; but I am quite certain that one of the problems which is before us is to find the right way of giving sufficient elasticity to the Conference so as to enable it to deal with matters of particular interest, at the same time keeping within the general frame work of the organisation."

HOURS OF WORK IN COAL MINES.

The slight misgiving implied in the above remark was occasioned by the fact that the Draft Convention on the Hours of Work in Coal Mines was not carried in the Conference. The entire procedure in this regard was somewhat exceptional and needs a word of explanation. The position in the mining industry is particularly serious, as is well known, and every attempt to improve it is beset with difficulties of a controversial character. As such international legislation is particularly hard, and yet it would seem that it is the one way of facing the situation. The Governing Body of the International Labour Office placed this question on the agenda of the Conference at the urgent request of the Assembly and the Council of the League of Nations. The Draft Convention had been framed by a preparatory technical conference of experts from the coal producing countries of Europe. Consequently it expressly referred to European countries where the situation is acute.

FORCED OR COMPULSORY LABOUR.

The subject of forced or compulsory labour, on the other hand, largely refers to countries outside Europe, although the Governments of colonial Powers, which are mostly European, are primarily concerned. The Conference adopted the Draft Convention in its final form by 93 votes without opposition. Its general aim is described in the first two paragraphs of Article I: "Each Member of the International Labour Organisation which ratifies this Convention undertakes to suppress the use of forced or compulsory labour in all its forms within the shortest possible period, with a view to its complete suppression. Recourse to forced or compulsory labour may be had during the transitional period for public purposes only and as an exceptional measure subject to the conditions and guarantees hereinafter provided." It is clearly stipulated that during the transitional period forced labour is to be permitted for public purposes only, that able-bodied men alone may be subjected to it, and that school teachers and pupils are exempt from any such obligations. In all cases the rate of payment is to be the same as for voluntary work, conjugal and family ties are to be taken into account as also safeguards concerning health and repatriation, the maximum period of service is not to exceed sixty days a year, the hours of work are to be limited to eight a day, and measures for insurance against illness or accidents are to be established. When the transitional period of five years is over, the Governing Body will review the situation with a view to introducing legislation for complete abolition of this form of labour, universally and unequivocally condemned. Meanwhile, in accordance with the Peace Treaty, the States Members are under obligation to submit annual reports about the working of the Convention if they ratify it. The Convention is accompanied by two Recommendations which are specially concerned with proposals for enforcing its provisions.

It may be noted that both the Indian Employers' and Workers' Delegates, besides voting for this measure, also spoke before the Conference warmly supporting it. The one point that came out of their statements was that means must be found to extend the application of this Convention to the Indian States as well as among the backward classes in certain parts of British India. Although the Government of India's representatives lost some amendments they had put forward and refrained from taking part in the voting: it is to be hoped that they would put it into effect in so far as they too have avowed their adherence to the purpose in view.

HOURS OF WORK OF SALARIED EMPLOYEES.

The Draft Convention on the hours of work of salaried employees was adopted in the finalvote by 86 to 31, and the principal point of interest about it arises from the fact that this is the first time that the International Labour Organisation has dealt with the conditions of work of this class of workers. In virtue of this Convention the hours of work of salaried employees in commerce and in offices is limited to 48 hours per week, and, as a rule, to 8 hours per day. The Convention applies to commercial or trading establishments including postal, telegraph, and telephone services, clerks in administrative services, and mixed industrial and commercial establishments, but persons employed in hospitals or similar establishments, in hotels and restaurants, and in theatres and public places of amusement are not included in the scope of the Convention. The Conference adopted three Recommendations with a view to collecting information concerning these latter categories of workers excluded from the scope of the present Convention, and for taking suitable measures within the next four years.

The representatives of the Government of India withheld from any of the deliberations in this connection, taking up the position that in their opinion the question was not ripe for consideration in the conditions prevailing in India. The Indian Employers' representatives put forward the plea that the grounds on which special reservations were made with regard to India in the case of the Washington Hours Convention held good in this instance also and, consequently, the same conditions must be maintained, while the Workers' representative stood for the enforcement of this measure in India without any qualification.

RESOLUTIONS.

The Conference also voted four important resolutions submitted by the French, German, and Japanese Workers' delegates and by the Polish Government Delegate concerning educational facilities for workers, factory inspection, annual holidays, and freedom of association. Rather unexpectedly and to the marked disappointment of any delegates, the Resolution of the Indian Workers' Delegate, Mr. S. C. Joshi, calling upon the Governing Body to undertake preliminary measures for summoning a Conference dealing with questions peculiar to Asia fell through owing to lack of the required quorum of votes. That subject is, however, like the hours of work in coal mines, bound to come up again before the Conference, and the Director's Report shows that he is aware of this possibility.

Our London Letter.

THE SIMON REPORT.

THE second volume of the Simon Report and its recommendations has just been issued—an hour ago. I am writing before any comments have appeared in the British or Indian press, but I fear the recommendations will make the relationships of Britain and India still more difficult.

In India little was expected from the report; even those Moderates who are still prepared to participate in the Round Table Conference joined with the Congress in boycotting the Simon Commission. The effect of the utterly inadequate recommendations will, therefore, not be one of disappointment so much as indignation. But in Great Britain a kind of halo had been created around the head of Sir John Simon and public opinion has been encouraged to regard the Report as sacrosanct. All three political parties have regarded the Commission as a national institution above party criticism. Only the Independent Labour Party and the Communists (the latter insignificant in numbers and influence) have ventured to criticise the new Holy Writ.

At the same time it is difficult to believe that reasonably enlightened opinion in this country can be content with the recommendations. Even the Liberal Press had foreshadowed full self-government in the Provinces. It is a shock to find that official members are to be retained in the Councils. The maintenance of official and nominated members in the Assembly, and the retention of the present proportion of elected members in the Senate, make the proposed new Constitution a much slighter step in advance than were the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms

in 1919. The proposal to remove the Indian Army from the sphere of controversy regarding self-government, by transferring it to the control of the British Military Authorities is so cynical that I am flatly at a loss to comment upon it. There is even to be no acceleration of the Indianisation of the Civil Service.

The Government's policy of repression since the Civil Disobedience Campaign began has progressively persuaded Moderates to throw in their lot with the Congress. These recommendations will probably have the effect of driving the whole of India to an attitude of non-co-operation with the British Government—except the Aga Khan and the Princes. If the Round Table Conference is to proceed, India is likely to be represented by people who reflect ·5 of its population !

It may be that I am writing too bitterly in the mood of disappointment after having just read the Report ; but I have worked so steadily, for so many months, to secure a basis of co-operation between British Representatives (under the more hopeful direction of a Labour Government) and Indian Representatives, seeking a settlement on reasonable lines, that this shattering of one's remaining hopes has made me despair.

Even now there is just a chance that the British Government may so realise the seriousness of the position that it will be prepared to take the bold course of accepting self-government as the basis of the Round Table Conference, granting a political amnesty, and repudiating responsibility for the Simon Commission recommendations. Unless this be done, I see no alternative but intensified resistance in India and intensified repression by the British Authorities, ending in a clash and chaos which I cannot contemplate calmly.

But one thing is certain. Out of it the will to freedom in India will grow, and when that freedom is won it will be valued the more highly and used the more effectively because of the sacrifices and suffering by which it has been secured.

A. FENNER BROCKWAY.

HOUSE OF COMMONS
23rd June 1930.

Reviews.

INDIAN TAXATION.

A HISTORY OF INDIAN TAXATION. BY PRAMATHANATH BANERJEA. (Published for the University of Calcutta by Macmillan Co., London.) 1930. 23 cm. 541 p. 12/6.

"IN the present work an attempt has been made to give a connected historical review of the taxes which are at present levied or have at one time or another been levied since the commencement of the British rule in this country. Particular stress has been laid on the policy underlying the imposition of each tax and its effect on the taxpayer and the community in general." This book contains a number of independent essays, each of which deals with one of the main taxes in India, somewhat loosely together, the thread being supplied by the first of them on "Some features of Indian taxation."

The first essay is as good a survey of the Indian system of taxation as can be made within twenty-seven pages. If the author had amplified this essay alone, he would have turned out a very interesting book. He chose, however, a different plan, which makes it valuable in other ways. Mahatma Gandhi's movement has stimulated inquiry into the soundness of many of the present taxes. Dr. Banerjea's book satisfies the need of the hour, because it takes each tax, one by one, and gives a digest of all that has been said about it at various stages of its evolution from various points of view. It contains chapters on income-tax, customs, salt, opium, excise, and land revenue.

It is interesting to trace the evolution of the Indian income-tax from the crude form in which Mr. Wilson introduced it in 1860, through the halting, hesitating repeals and reintroductions of it, until it took its present form with a nearer approach to equity. And yet the income-tax in India is in its infancy, and in need of far more chiselling and polishing. The recommendations of the Taxation Inquiry Committee, Dr. Banerjea points out, are inadequate. For instance, they refrain from making any recommendations with regard to the highly iniquitous system of exempting incomes derived from land from income-tax. With greater self-government and wider franchise there is no doubt that Indian income-tax will receive greater attention and may undergo sweeping changes. Recently, an increase of the tax on higher incomes was opposed on the ground that it would check enterprise. In a poor country like India, if retrenchment is ruled out, the only alternative to an income-tax is a tax on the poor, in some form or other; and poverty of consumers or inefficiency of labourers and agricultural producers may equally be regarded as a real "check to enterprise."

The rates of the tax on salt greatly varied from place to place until 1882, and the systems of organisation of production vary even at present. Dr. Banerjea's book gives a full account of all these. As early as 1776 Philip Francis recorded his opposition to the Government monopoly of salt and the consequent high price of the article to the public. In Bengal and Madras, Government monopoly of salt was established and retained. In Bombay Presidency, however, the excise method has been prevalent. Some of the salt works were the absolute property of the Government, and others were owned by individuals on whom both land rent and excise duty were levied. Similar was the system in Northern India. But the choice between the systems was based solely on the ground of their respective ability to prevent smuggling; and the humanitarian objection to the heavy salt duty remains. Dr. Banerjea quotes the well-known arguments and utterances on both sides of the question, and narrates the rise and fall of the tax till the present day.

The chapter on land revenue is very well written. In it the author takes up, and quotes opinions on the following questions: Is land revenue rent or a tax? Who pays the revenue? Which is the convenient period of settlement? What should be the basis of the amount of the revenue? How far do the canons of taxation apply to the land revenue systems of India? And then the author traces briefly the history of the land revenue systems of different provinces. Mention is made of the Bardoli episode, which brought into discredit the policy regarding revenue settlement. This policy should be brought under greater control of the elected legislatures by drawing up relevant regulations.

The author might have dwelt more on the present position of these taxes, especially in relation to each other and to the total financial resources of central and provincial governments. Those who intend to

make a careful study of taxation problems will find the book very useful; but others will find it necessary to skip over many quotations and documents abundant in some of the chapters.

P. J. JAGIRDAR.

IRISH INDEPENDENCE.

WITH MICHAEL COLLINS IN THE FIGHT FOR IRISH INDEPENDENCE. By BALT O'CONNOR. (Peter Davies, London.) 1929. 19cm. 195p. 6/-.

THE IRISH FUTURE AND THE LORDSHIP OF THE WORLD. (2ND EDN). By C. J. O'DONNEL. (Cecil Palmer, London.) 1930. 22cm. 265p. 5/-.

THESE two books deal with Ireland and the Irish, but while Balt O'Connor confines himself to a mere record of the Irish fight for independence, O'Donnel draws a Lcid picture of the position of the Irish Catholics in Ulster, condemns the 'Quota policy' of Washington and describes the achievements of men of Irish extraction from China to Peru'. Balt O'Connor was the trusted lieutenant of Michael Collins and in his narrative of how Ireland secured her freedom, he gives too much importance to his hero, Michael Collins. Michael Collins was only one of the three great Irish leaders who forced the British Government to come to terms, the other two being De Valera and Arthur Griffiths. Arthur Griffiths thundered forth against British Imperialism in the columns of the *United Irishman* and prepared the country for the fight for freedom. De Valera's rigid and uncompromising adherence to republican principles forced Mr. Lloyd George to yield some more points in the second conference, where Michael Collins and Arthur Griffiths represented Ireland. One would expect in a book on Michael Collins and the Irish struggle for Independence a prominent mention of the achievements of De Valera and Arthur Griffiths. It is unfortunate that the author in his hero-worship has not given the other Irish leaders their due place in the Irish fight for freedom. Barring this defect, the book is a splendid record of the thrilling incidents of Irish history from 1914 to 1922.

'The Irish future and the Lordship of the World' is a collection of essays by O'Donnel who was a member of the British Parliament and who is the brother of that well-known Irish Catholic, Frank Hugh O'Donnel who was such a power in Nationalist politics in the latter half of the 19th century. The learned author is a Catholic of Ulster and his chief object in writing this book is to call attention to the 'degrading thraldom' of Catholics in Ulster, and to call on Irishmen all over the world to take measures to rescue them from that unsatisfactory condition. He does not like the Irish Treaty because of the Partition, nor does he approve of full-fledged independence because it would make Irlend helpless and isolated. He thinks that Ireland's natural home is within the British Empire which is in his view a Celtic Empire. He discusses in Chapter VIII the Anglo-Saxon myth and says that the Celtic element is preponderant over other elements in the existing population of England, and that the British Empire was the work of Irishmen. "India" he says "was the great prize of a Gaelic speaking army, recruited by the East India Company exclusively in Ireland under Irish generals, Gough, Keane, Wellington and Coote...The makers of Canada were, nearly all, Scotchmen, headed by Lords Strathcona and Mountstephen, helped by another Celt Lord O' Shanghnessy. The makers of Australia were mostly Irish." We are afraid that the author has too much of Celtic pride and Catholic zeal in him to see the other side. We are of opinion that it is very difficult to determine which element is preponderant in the British race—the Celtic or the Teutonic, and which part of the British Isles contributed most to the building up of the edifice known as the British Empire.

The author is sorry that "on both sides of the Atlantic, in Ulster, the U. S. A. and Canada, the folly of the bigot is allowed to usurp the role of the statesman", but it is unfortunate that he should himself fall a victim to religious zeal in his estimate of men and things. The author is unduly severe on Parnell probably because the great Irish leader was a Protestant. He says that "Parnell had in the years before 1884 emasculated the Irish party and driven out of it nearly all its members who were cultured and well-born." And yet it was this emasculated party of Parnell that made and unmade ministries and forced Gladstone to introduce remedial measures and in 1884 the home Rule Bill. The author is also unfair to Asquith who, he says, "was entirely incapable of evolving a measure of self-government that would satisfy an Irish nationalist," True Asquith's scheme of Home Rule segregated North-Eastern Ulster and thus divided Ireland. but he had to placate Sir Edward Carson and his fellow Ulsterites. After all compromises and half-way measures are common in politics.

The author's treatment of the "War madness of France" and "How Germany was forced into the war" is brilliant. Since the publication of the works on the origins, of the World War by Professor Sidney Fay, Prof. Gooch and others, no serious minded man or woman ever accepts the myth that Germany alone was responsible for the War as valid, and the book before us thoroughly explodes the myth of Germany's responsibility for the War. In Chapter XII the learned author refutes most brilliantly the many stupid but generally accepted stories about German atrocities at Louvain, Rheims, etc. The array of facts and the opinions of distinguished men collected to prove the truth forcibly arrests one's attention.

The author has also dealt with the Indian question and says that the supreme task of the British Government is the betterment of the villager and farmer.

On the whole, the book is well written and we recommend it to every student of modern history.

M. V. SUBRAHMANYAM.

AMERICAN CONSTITUTION.

DOCUMENTS AND READINGS IN AMERICAN GOVERNMENT, NATIONAL, STATE AND LOCAL. BY JOHN MABRY MATHEWS and CLARENCE ARTHUR BERDAHL. (Macmillan, London.) 1928. 22 cm. 928 p. 14/-

READERS of Lord Bryce's two volumes of American Commonwealth will welcome this new work as a companion volume not only for its subject matter but also for the striking resemblance in general get up which it bears to the classic works of the distinguished British diplomat. The book is entirely a compilation carried out by two professors of the Illinois University. The sources drawn upon by the authors for illustrative text are varied constitutional documents, congressional records, official correspondence, judicial observations, administrative reports, official bulletins, academic journals, newspaper leaders and lastly the recorded opinions of leading statesmen and politicians. Materials culled with discretion and judgment from these manifold sources are pressed into service to elucidate many obscure and debatable points of constitutional law

underlying the national, the state and the municipal governments of the United States. The work is, however, not to be mistaken as a complete exposition of American constitution. Of the broader and the more well-defined aspects of the constitution the compilers naturally take no notice. It is only on the tangled points of law which the instrument of constitution did not sufficiently clarify or did not at all contemplate that the authors have thought fit to focus some critical light from competent sources. In places, the interest of the selections is wider than constitutional, for instance, the Wilson-Lansing episode of which the entire correspondence has been printed. A number of selections also relate to the unfulfilled rather than the actual developments in American government. The message of Prisident Taft, for instance, of Dec. 12, 1912 and the Couzens Bill 1926 indicate the steadily developing tendency of the American national government to approximate to the British parliamentary system. The work, in short, is a rich store-house of documentary information regarding all the tangled points of American governments which the long years of political practice and administration have brought to a head. It will serve admirably as a work of reference for every student of constitution, as it is certain to confuse and disappoint any one trying to formulate his first clear impression about the constitution and working of the Governments of America.

K. M. P.

Miscellaneous.

A WORD ON THE SIMON REPORT.

The Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P. C., C. H., writes in the *Manchester Guardian* of the 26th June, 1930 :—

THE second volume of the Simon Report avowedly makes no reference to recent events in India. Even the important statement made by the Viceroy on October 31 last, with the consent of the British Cabinet, is not mentioned. The expression "Dominion Status," therefore, does not appear in its pages. On the other hand, the goal of British policy is stated in these words: "India as a whole, not merely British India, will take her place among the constituent States of the Commonwealth of Nations united under the Crown." Whether this place will be one of equality with the constituent States is left in doubt. This is elevated to the rank of a "principle" underlying the recommendations. Apparently this "principle" is to be capable of fulfilment. But no precise measures having this end in view are included in the proposals, while some considerations on which emphasis is laid would appear to show that the "principle" would not be realised within any measurable time.

In the first place, if the whole of India and not merely British India is to be a constituent of the British Commonwealth of Nations we should expect clear suggestions upon which action could immediately be taken for the Indian States to come into the federation. What, however, do we find? The Commissioners endorse the finding of the Butler Committee that nothing should be done in this direction without the consent of the States. Bearing in mind that there are about 600 of these States in India, is a "principle" of any practical value which waits on the consent of 600 separate entities which agree only in a romantic, though pathetic, attachment to their *izzat* (honour) and their subservience to the will of Political officers?

To aggravate the improbability, the Commissioners actually recommend, again in conformity with the Butler Committee's Report, a modification of the present statute by which the place of the Government of India, or the Governor General in Council, in relation to the States, should be taken by the Viceroy acting solely as the representative of the Crown. The natural evolution of historical circumstances has led to the existing relative position of the authorities of British India and those of the States. Any change in derogation thereof would be an additional handicap to a self-governing British India, which would have enormous difficulties of its own.

As if this were not enough to strangle free India at its very birth, an ingenious solution is put forward of the problem of defence which will erect an insuperable obstacle in the way of the country attaining Dominion Status. It is now generally accepted that this status includes the right of secession. No immediate importance need attach to this point, as even advanced Indian politicians recognise that this subject will not for a certain period come within the range of their autonomy. But the Commissioners treat the external defence of India as permanently an Imperial concern. This necessarily means that even at the best Dominion Status would not be the same for India as for the other constituents of the Commonwealth.

Considering all the probabilities of the case it is not unfair to say that the Commissioners pay no more than lip-homage to the goal of British policy in relation to India, even as defined by themselves. The actual proposals in the Report make no pretence at keeping the goal in view. They would leave the Central Government exactly where it is. The main change is the substitution of indirect for direct election to the two Houses of Legislature. The argument is that to a federal parliament it is the constituent administrations that should elect, not the citizens themselves. Precedents, however, do not support the argument conclusively. Would not the demands of a federal system be satisfied by indirect elections to the Upper House? Also, in a country like India, where the Central Government, being at a great distance, is apt to become an abstraction, there is much to be said for allowing people directly to get interested in national politics by being called upon to take part in elections to the popular House. It is certain that the jealous eye of the Indian politician will see in indirect election a distinct mark of retrogression, which the Report repudiates in express terms.

The reasoning of the Report leaves one aghast. The Commissioners are unable to say what form democracy should take in India. In this state of uncertainty they would watch the results of the forward move taken in the provincial sphere which they are careful to describe as an experiment. During the progress of this experiment it is essential, they contend, that the centre should be stable. Their argu-

ments in support of this contention are elaborate. The only defect is that no account is taken of human nature. No arrangement can be stable which confronts incongruous elements. Popular administrations must chafe under bureaucratic superintendence and control. Superintendence and control are necessary, but if they are to be exercised without friction they can only be exercised by a Government more or less similar in composition and outlook to the provincial administrations.

Opinion in India will not agree any longer to entrust powers of guidance and control over the chosen leaders of the people to those who are not such. The matter is not dismissed by calling it an obsession, a dream, or an impossible ambition. It is there, an unalterable fact, and the part of wisdom is to reckon with it and not to ignore it. The time is past when the people of India could be governed against their wishes. Hereafter their consent is necessary.

The Simon Report threatens to raise a wall of misunderstanding between the friends of Britain in India and the friends of India in Britain. To admit that Dominion Status, or full responsible government, is the goal and yet to hesitate because the future is obscure and the line of march not clear is very much like contracting a debt and evading payment. Indians remember a long story of disappointment and deferred hope. Every concession has come in the past after being long over-due, and in the event has abundantly vindicated itself.

Take this simple matter of "the increasing association of Indians with every branch of the Administration." The admission of Indians to every grade of the Civil Service was opposed bitterly by interested parties, but though they have sustained with credit every accession of responsibility, fresh advance is not made without a renewal of dire prognostication and reluctant submission to the inevitable. As to military matters, we are still in the beginning of things, and the Simon Commissioners fight shy of making definite proposals for Indianisation, and content themselves with stating the difficulties in the way of the process, which must take "very many years."

It may be unjust perhaps but, considering all the circumstances, it is not unnatural for the Indian politician to suspect that the delay is caused not so much by a consideration for the welfare of India as by a concern for the interests of Britain. He is reminded again and again of the stern realities that stand in the way of rapid progress. There is no danger of his forgetting them. For the moment, however, the Black Saturday of Bombay is typical of the stern realities that demand attention from British statesmen. If they can be warned there are dark portents enough in the sky.

THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE.

Mr. S. G. Vaze writes in the *Spectator* of 5th July 1930:—

THE two White Papers on East Africa, issued on Friday, June 20th, furnish the evidence which was so much needed in India that the Labour Government is capable of running big risks in order to do justice to oppressed peoples of other races. The wise decisions embodied in these documents give ground for hoping that the Government will show equal courage in dealing with India and will yet find means of bringing into the Round Table Conference leaders of the Congress party, whose abstention would undoubtedly put the success of the Conference in grave peril from the outset. All that is really needed to achieve this end is an official pronouncement to the effect that, so far as concerns its own part in the Conference, the Government does not contemplate just a step in the revision of the constitution, but as great an approximation to full self-government as may be possible in the existing circumstances. That some deductions from Dominion Status will for some time be necessary is admitted by all Indians, not excluding Mr. Gandhi himself. Granted a willingness on the part of the British authorities to take India as far as possible on the road to autonomy, Mr. Gandhi, on his part, would be found eminently reasonable in devising the necessary safeguards for the transitional period. A constitution so framed by all will obviously produce far more contentment in India, and will for that reason work far better than any, however good in itself, which results from a conference in which the most numerous and influential party in India is unable to participate. If it be true, as I believe it is, that the Labour Government is anxious to do its best for India, it would be a tragedy if it were prevented by reasons of prestige from publicly avowing its intentions in advance.

It would, however, be well to consider and provide for the contingency of such a declaration not being made and the Congress Party not taking part in the deliberations of the Round Table Conference. In that event the British Government would be exposed to the serious danger of finding itself in the position of a consenting party to several provisions inserted into India's constitution against which its conscience would revolt. The opposition of all but communal and sectional interests in India to the Simon Commission has already driven the Government largely into the arms of the reactionary elements; the exigencies of the present situation would drive it still more. At present only a few progressive groups like the Liberals, Nationalists and Independents have kept out of the civil disobedience campaign; but at the Round Table Conference, without the support of the Congress, they would very likely be unable to hold out against the communal groups. In that case the temptation would be strong for the representatives of the British Government to agree to the proposals of the reactionaries, although on principle they would reject them. I will give here two instances to illustrate the nature of the impending danger. First, communal electorates. The Labour Party's opinion on this subject is common knowledge. It rejects communal and approves of mixed electorates. Will the representatives of the Government voice this view at the Conference? Hard as it always would be for the Labour Party to ignore its past commitments and vote for communal electorates, it would be peculiarly hard now to do so soon after the Labour Government's decision to replace communal by common electorates in two Colonies immediately under its

control—*viz.*, Ceylon and Kenya. In both these Colonies elaborate investigations were made by Commissioners drawn equally from all parties, which ended in a unanimous record of the conclusion that communal electorates are evil and must be scrapped. The Simon Commission, it is true, would very probably recommend their retention in India; but even this Commission has on merits come down emphatically on the side of the common electorates. If its recommendations point in a different direction it is mostly due just to those exigencies of the political situation of which I wish the Labour Party to beware. Any way, it would be a position of surpassing embarrassment to the Government to force common electorates down the throat of the reactionary elements in Kenya and at the same time to force communal electorates down the throat of the advanced groups in India. It may attempt one of these things; it cannot attempt both simultaneously. Then why not establish common electorates throughout and put itself right with its conscience? It has shown great courage in refusing unreasonable demands of the most powerful class in Kenya. It will require much less courage to refuse in India similar demands of a class which perhaps will loom large at the Conference, but which does not count for much in the country at large. Will it show this courage?

Take, for instance, the question of the Indian States. Their relations with the British Government are to form a subject of discussion at the Round Table Conference. This is as it should be; but the Princes alone are to be consulted on behalf of the States. The omission of the subjects of the States from participation in the Conference is an initial mistake which it would be hard to repair. This is not a mere academic point; it is fraught with practical consequences of serious import. To the extent that Princes are made independent of the control of the suzerain power as a result of the negotiations at the Round Table Conference, they become even more autocratic than now. The general idea in the mind of the average Britisher seems to be that when British Indians are being given wider power to manage their own affairs, the liberty which the States enjoy to manage theirs ought to be enlarged as well. This is, of course. a generous sentiment to which no exception can be taken. It should, however, be remembered that when the Government parts with power in British India the beneficiaries are the people; but when it parts with power in Indian States, the beneficiaries are not the people, but the Princes. The political status of the States' people, instead of improving, would become still more depressed by reason of accession of power to the Princes. The Labour Party of all parties can have no desire to strengthen the six hundred odd despotisms that exist in India, but it will be the inevitable consequence of any concession it may decide to make to the Princes unless it stipulates that the extended power it gives to them is given by them in their turn to the people over whom they rule. If the Princes object that the British Government can have no concern with their domestic affairs, that after giving up its own powers it cannot regulate where they shall reside, the British Government's firm answer must be that in that case no new powers shall be given. It is not suggested here that any treaties into which the British Government has entered or any engagements it has made should be abrogated. They ought to be respected in the letter and in the spirit. But where it is a question of the British Government relaxing the control which undoubtedly belongs to it, it ought to do so only on condition that the control passes from its hands into the hands of the States' people. This point of view will, it is hoped, find expression in the Conference, though not so strongly and insistently as if the peoples' representatives were included. It ought to receive support from the representatives of the British Government, who must make future progress in the relations between itself and the States dependent on the growth of popular government in the States.

Next to a declaration of the Government's intention of conferring self-government, nothing will convince Indians, who are now engaged in an agitation against it, of its good will more than the fact of its remaining loyal to its convictions at the Round Table Conference amidst numerous temptations to take a contrary course. Expediency, too, therefore really points in the same direction as principle. Will the Government be guided by this larger expediency at the Round Table Conference?

BOOKS RECEIVED.

GREECE TO-DAY. THE AFTERMATH OF THE REFUGEE IMPACT. By ELIOT GRINNELL MEARS. (Stanford University Press, California.) 1929. 23cm. 336p. 23/

RUSTICUS LOQUITUR OR THE LIGHT AND THE NEW IN THE PUNJAB VILLAGE. By MALCOLM LYALL DARLING. (Oxford University Press.) 1930. 23cm. 400p. Rs. 9.

CANNON FODDER. By A. D. HASLAM. (Hutchinson.) 23cm. 288p. 7/6.

POPULATION PROBLEM OF INDIA. By B. T. RANADIVE. (Studies in Indian Economics Series.) (Longmans, Bombay.) 1930. 22cm. 216 p. Rs. 6.

A BRASS HAT IN NO MAN'S LAND. (4th Impression.) By F. P. CROZIER. (Cape.) 1930. 22cm. 254p. 7/6.

THE FAMOUS CASES OF DR. THORNDYKE. THIRTY-SEVEN OF HIS CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS AS SET DOWN. By R. AUSTIN FREEMAN. (Hodder & Stoughton.) 1929. 20cm. 1080p. 7/6.

THE WORLD OF THE BLIND: A PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY. By PIERCE VILLEY. Translated by ALYS HALLARD. (Duckworth.) 1930. 20cm. 403p. 7/6.

THE INDUSTRIAL EVOLUTION OF INDIA IN RECENT TIMES. (2nd Edn.) By D. R. GADGIL. (Oxford University Press.) 1929. 20cm. Rs. 4/8.

OUT OF BONDAGE: CHRIST AND THE INDIAN VILLAGER. By STEPHEN NEILL. (Edinburgh House Press.) 1930. 18cm. 143p. 2/-

THE FRENCH CONSTITUTION. By HENRY MORRISON. (Allen & Unwin.) 1930. 18cm. 96p. 2/6.

SOME ASPECTS OF HINDU MEDICAL TREATMENT. By DOROTHEA CHAPLIN. (Luzac) 1930. 18cm. 71p. 3/6.

SHIVA OR THE PAST OF INDIA. By ELIZABETH SHARPE. (Luzac.) 1930. 18cm. 38p. 1/6.

THE ROMANCE OF MARRIAGE. By SPENCER H. ELLIOTT. (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.) 1929. 16cm. 78p. 1/-

RUSSIAN CO-OPERATION ABROAD: FOREIGN TRADE. 1918-1928. By N. BAROU. (King.) 1930. 24cm. 95p. 2/6.

Printed and published by Anant Vinayak Patvardhan at the Aryabhushan Press, House No. 936/2 Bhamburda Peth, Poona City, and edited at the "Servant of India" Office, Servants of India Society's Home, Bhamburda, Poona City, by P. Kodanda Rao.