

# The Servant of India

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

VOL. XIII No. 36. } POONA—THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1930. { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.  
FOREIGN 15s.

## CONTENTS.

	Page.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK. ... ..	421
ARTICLES :—	
Indian States. ... ..	423
Further Changes in the Conference Plans? By D. V. A. ... ..	425
OUR LONDON LETTER :— ... ..	427
REVIEWS :—	
Imperial Banks. By B. Ramachandra Rao. ... ..	427
Marx and Lenin. By J. J. Vakil. ... ..	428
Ceylon. By K. Venugopal Rao. ... ..	429
Sob-Stuff. By S. V. Dandekar. ... ..	429
MISCELLANEOUS :—	
Future Constitution of India. ... ..	429
BOOKS RECEIVED. ... ..	438

## Topics of the Week.

### Bhil Relief.

MR. A. V. THAKKAR, of the Servants of India Society, who is the President of the Bhil Seva Mandal, Dohad, which is engaged in the uplift of the Bhils, a backward community in the Panch Mahals, appeals for the comparatively small sum of Rs. 7,500 to help the Bhils to tide over the distress caused by the almost total failure of their staple crop, maize, due to excessive rains in July last. To relieve the distress the Bhil Seva Mandal has already opened five cheap grain shops, the loss on which amounts to Rs. 42 per day. It is expected that these shops will have to be maintained till the end of February next, and it is estimated that a sum of Rs. 7,560 will be required for the purpose. Notwithstanding the general trade depression and the heavy financial strain due to the civil disobedience movement, we trust that the amount Mr. Thakkar appeals for will be soon forthcoming. On account of their backwardness and helplessness, the Bhils deserve public sympathy in special measure.

### Europeans on the War-Path.

IN his recent Bangalore speech published elsewhere in this issue Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer said that in the India of the future the Europeans in this country should be like other Indian subjects, enjoying their legitimate rights and no more. If the

Europeans were content with this status of equality with others, they would really be no problem. It is because they want to secure themselves in the enjoyment of the special rights and privileges possessed by them so far, that their presence in this country has become a matter of great difficulty. The resolutions passed at a conference recently held in Calcutta of delegates from the different branches of the European Association in India provide proof, if it were needed, of their extreme unwillingness to part with even an iota of their present position of special privilege. They want "adequate and effective representation by separate electorates". This is insisted upon in the case of Mahomedans and other minorities as well, perhaps because they wished their demand not to appear altogether selfish. If they really meant well, they could make a very helpful contribution towards the solution of the problem of special electorates by surrendering them in their own case. If they did so, what a moral influence they would have in asking the Muslims and other minorities to emulate their example! But far from doing that, they want to cling to separate electorates like the very leach. Nay, more. They even demand a return in the matter of criminal justice to the position prevailing before 1923 and are prepared to allow a like concession even to their Indian fellow-subjects! All which conclusively shows that they are yet in no mood, as put by Sir Sivaswamy, to identify themselves with the welfare of this country. It is clear this is nothing to them as compared to their own selfish interest.

Their views on some of the more important proposals of the Simon Report are even more reactionary. Neither they nor the Bombay Europeans, who are generally looked upon as more level-headed than their brothers in Calcutta, can persuade themselves to tolerate the grant of any element of responsibility at the Centre, though, be it remembered, only a brief two months ago the former appeared, from a letter sent on their behalf to the Indian Merchants' Chamber, to be quite favourable to the Round Table Conference evolving a Dominion Constitution for India with safeguards for the transition period. What a change these last two months have brought about in their attitude towards Indian aspirations for which they then professed profuse sympathy! But to go back to the Calcutta resolutions. Law and Order, they say, should not be transferred to a responsible Minister until and unless the legislature concerned demands it by a three-fourths majority, which obviously means that the transfer should be delayed till the Greek Kalends. Their new-found solicitude for the proper representation of rural interests in the futurer legislatures will strike every dispassionate observer as an insidious attempt to set up urban as against rural interests. While the Simon Commission after a very close and careful study has found itself unable to say definitely whether there should or should

not be second chambers in the provinces and wants that question to be more thoroughly gone into, the Europeans in India thought it better to err on the safe side by their unequivocal advocacy of them. But they seem to have altogether taken leave of their sense of proportion when they sat down to make their recommendations with regard to the Government's handling of the present situation. They suggest the suppression of the Congress which, in their opinion, has ceased to be a political body and become a revolutionary one. It should be declared an illegal body throughout India; its property should be forfeited to Government; and similar action should be taken in all the provinces where the Congress has its ramifications. Incredibly simple, is it not? But its suggestion which betrays desperation of the worst type is that whatever the decisions of the Round Table Conference, no change in the present system of the Indian government should be thought of "until seditious propaganda and unconstitutional agitation have been firmly dealt with and the civil disobedience movement is ended." We have not the slightest doubt that the suggestions, if acted upon, will, instead of easing the situation, aggravate it hopelessly. Repressive action on the part of the Government during the last few months cannot be said to have achieved its purpose and has only served to weaken their own position. If they turn a willing ear now to these Europeans, they will have hardly any friends left for them excepting of course those from whom such unwise and mischievous suggestions have emanated.

\* \* \*

#### The Boomerang.

THE statement issued by the Bombay Mill-owners' Association on the consequences of the boycott proclaimed on some fifteen mills in Bombay is indeed disconcerting. It appears that the fifteen mills produce something like 25 per cent. of the total annual production of cotton piecegoods in Bombay, that they have among the shareholders 16,876 Indians, who have invested Rs. 134 lakhs by way of capital and Rs. 10 lakhs in debentures, that 37 directors were Indians against 19 non-Indians, exclusive of ex-officio directors, that the number of non-Indian employees is 22 against 34,000 Indian workers receiving Rs. 146 lakhs per annum in wages, and that the mills consumed 2½ lakhs of bales of cotton per year. The effective boycott of these mills would spell loss and privation to all these interests, cotton-growers, mill-workers, share-holders, the great bulk of whom are Indians. The Association would have done better and driven home the comparison if it had given figures showing the number of non-European shareholders and the investments they hold in the concerns, the number of Indian and non-Indian ex-officio directors, the wages and salaries drawn by the non-Indian employees, and profits shared by the Indian and non-Indian share-holders. But whatever be the relative harm done to non-European interests, it is patent that the loss inflicted on Indians is not insignificant. The unkindest cut of all is the plight of the mill-hands who are thrown out of these mills but are provided with no alternative remunerative work and who have no resources to fall back upon. This infliction of wanton suffering on poor innocent helpless labourers argues complete want of sympathy for the workers and it is a mookery to tell the hungry labourer that his lot will improve after swaraj is attained and in the meanwhile he should be content with joining processions and shouting revolutionary slogans. The wreckers of the lives of other people would have done better if they had arranged for the purchase of the shares of

non-Indians in the mills as they came to the market, and thus driven out the foreign element in the management of the concerns and made them wholly swadeshi or even started other mills to absorb at least the Indian workers. But such constructive work is not to the taste of the boycotters. They know how to inflict suffering but not how to alleviate it. These be the friends of Labour!

\* \* \*

#### Indian Voters in Ceylon.

RESTRICTED as is the Indian franchise in Ceylon, there are some Ceylonese who are still not reconciled to it and are hard at work to keep the Indians out of the register of voters. Resolutions have been submitted, according to the *Ceylon Daily News*, to the Lanka Mahajana Sabha to the effect that there was taking place an "indiscriminate registration of immigrant labourers in all planting areas on the same basis as Ceylonese" and that Government should be asked to put an end to it, and that if the Government failed to take immediate action to "prevent wholesale registration of immigrants, as aforesaid, without the certificate of permanent settlement", the new constitution should be boycotted and a campaign of non-co-operation should be launched. On the other hand, it is gratifying that the European planters are giving every encouragement to the labourers on their estates to get themselves registered. The Superintendents of the estates in the electoral area of Talawakelle met the other day and passed a resolution that "estate labourers who can reasonably claim Ceylon domicile, under Section 6 of the Order-in-Council, should be encouraged to do so." The principal speaker said that "it was important that the Indian Tamil should register as many votes as possible." It should be remembered that the Indian who can prove "domicile" is entitled to vote without any of the other special qualifications. It is only those who cannot prove "domicile" that must either have property and education qualifications or obtain certificates of permanent settlement. The planters were concerned primarily with those who could prove domicile and they took up a cautious attitude with regard to the doubtful cases. Mr. Menon, the Agent of the Government of India in Ceylon, attended the meeting and put in a plea for a wider interpretation of "domicile." When an Indian came to Ceylon with his family and dependents and had a garden, etc., in Ceylon he was "effectively resident" in Ceylon. The intention of "permanent" settlement did not necessarily mean that there was no intention whatsoever of returning to India at any time. All that it meant was that he had an intention to stay in the Island for an indefinite period. He, therefore, claimed that the Indian who had been in Ceylon for five or six years could safely claim domicile. He deprecated a suggestion that only the "intelligent" among the Indian labourers should be helped to get on the register, and he refuted some rumours that were set afloat by interested parties that once an Indian gets himself registered, he would not be permitted to go to India, that his wages would be reduced and that he would lose the benefits he enjoyed as an Indian labourer.

The opposition of the Ceylonese to the enfranchisement of the Indian labourers is due to the fear that their votes would be at the disposal of their employers. But this can be only for a time. The Indian labourer will soon learn to use his vote independently. The position is rather piquant in that the European planters are anxious to increase the Indian vote while the Ceylonese, an Asiatic race, with immemorial affinities with Indians, are against it. In other Colonies it is the European who fights the Indian vote and the non-European who stands by it.

In Ceylon economic considerations cut across the racial.

#### Common Roll and Equality in Uganda.

The Committee appointed by the Government of Uganda to make recommendations on local self-government in Uganda have recently reported in favour of a municipality for the township of Kampala. The Municipal Council is to be composed of 19 members, of whom six will be non-officials elected on a common franchise and on a common roll. For the first time in East Africa a Government Committee deliberately proposed the common franchise and the common roll, and as such it is highly significant. Though the qualifications for the municipal franchise seem to be rather high and are likely to keep out of the register a large number of persons, it is a sacrifice worth making in order to secure and safeguard the common roll. The extension of the principle of the common roll from municipalities to the legislative council is but one step and we hope it will soon be taken and that Uganda will have non-officials in its Legislative Council elected on a common roll.

There is however one qualification for councillors which seems to us to be rather uncalled-for. It is laid down that a candidate for election should speak, read and write in the English language to the satisfaction of the officer appointed to receive nomination. A knowledge of English, though a very valuable equipment for municipal work, is not essential for it, and it is imposing an unnecessary hardship on public-spirited citizens to insist on the qualification. It is best not to impose any language qualification on the candidates, particularly as Government does not insist on the English language as the sole medium of Governmental transactions. Secondly, the vesting of discretion in an officer to pronounce on the adequacy of the candidate's knowledge of English is open to grave abuse and is to be strongly deprecated.

#### Indian Women's University.

WE are afraid we cannot say that the fourteenth annual report of the S. N. D. T. Indian Women's University is hope-inspiring. The number of students reading in the three colleges affiliated to the University in the year under report was 83 which gives an average of less than 28 for each college. Why, we wonder, does not the report show these figures separately for the three colleges? It gives the number of those that appeared for and passed the University and college examinations; but what we would have liked to know is how many students were studying in each one of the three colleges. We also observe from the table on p. 5 that the proportion of passes to the appearances at the G. A. examination shows a downward tendency. In 1925, out of 7 that appeared as many as 5 passed, while for 1930 these figures were respectively 8 and 2! Does it indicate deterioration in the quality of teaching or in that of the material itself? Whatever it is, we hope the matter will receive the attention of the authorities of the University. These small numbers are a source of discouragement to us, as doubtless they must be to the organisers; but it is useless to look for any considerable improvement in this direction till the University secures Government recognition. Colour is lent to this view by the fact recorded in the Report that the number in their Normal School is increasing owing to their Primary Teacher's Diploma having received Government recognition. We hope this will be obtained for the University as well at no distant date.

## Articles.

### INDIAN STATES.

**B**ANGALORE was recently the venue of two important Conferences which met to discuss the position of the India States in the future constitution of India. The first was official in the sense that it was convened by Sir Mirza Ismail, the enlightened and patriotic Dewan of Mysore. It included the official representatives of the Governments of the States in South India and besides, certain eminent non-officials specially invited to the Conference. Among such invitees was Sir P. S. Sivaswami Iyer, the veteran statesman of British India, whose masterly speech on the occasion is reproduced elsewhere. Just before the meeting of the Conference Sir M. Visveswarayya, the eminent statesman and maker of modern Mysore, issued a comprehensive statement to the press on the subject of the States. And last week-end there met in Bangalore the South Indian States' People's Conference, an unofficial body, representing the peoples, as distinct from the Governments, of the States. Prof. G. R. Abhyankar, who is among the most ardent and unwearied champions of the interests of the subjects of the Indian States, presided over the Conference and in an exhaustive speech, reviewed the Butler and Simon Reports in their bearing on the status of the peoples of the States.

It will be instructive to compare the views expressed at the Conferences regarding the relations of the Princes to their subjects, to British India and to the Paramount Power. On the first point Sir M. Visveswarayya and Mr. Abhyankar were emphatically of opinion that responsible government should be introduced in the States, and that the Princes should become constitutional monarchs. There was no desire in any quarter to eliminate the Princes; all that was insisted upon was that they should be constitutional heads of responsible governments based on democratic foundations. Sir P. S. Sivaswami Iyer made no reference to the subject in his speech, but his views are well-known. In his book on "Indian Constitutional Problems," he advised the Princes to "set before their eyes the same goal as was announced by Parliament in the famous declaration of August 1917." Sir Mirza Ismail alone seemed to harbour doubts regarding the suitability of democratic institutions in the Indian States. He recalled that western countries themselves were beginning to have doubts about democracy, and he spoke of forms of government "suited to the Indian temperament." Those who speak of the Indian temperament will do well to give some indication as to what it is and what form of government is best suited to it. He went on to say, "it is in the Indian States rather than under the westernised administration of British India, that ancient customs and hallowed traditions can best endure." There are traditions, of the "Patiala" type, which however ancient and hallowed, have no right to endure. And good traditions need have

no fear from democracy. In England under a constitutional monarchy, ancient traditions subsist side by side with modern democracy. It is gratifying, however, that Sir Mirza was not opposed to constitutional monarchy, for he said with approval that "Indian States are developing towards a form of constitutional monarchy"! We wish we could share his optimism that they are developing that way.

With regard to the relations between British India and the Indian States it was admitted that there was identity of interests between the two and that some form of closer union between them was necessary. There was no enthusiasm for the Council of Greater India, which at best would only be tolerated for a time if that was necessary. There was no desire to emphasise the autonomy of the States to the extent of making them independent units which may confer together but which will not necessarily be bound by common decisions. The example of the League of Nations has been abandoned and a closer union advocated. Sir M. Visveswarayya mentioned that some years ago some of the prominent States definitely agreed to come into a federation with British India and that attitude has been reiterated at the official Bangalore Conference. It means that the States are prepared to surrender some of their rights of autonomy and consent to be legislated for by the federal organ. Welcome as is this willing consent to submit to a common legislature and executive, it may be noted that it does not amount to any new departure from existing practice. To-day in several matters the Government of India is legislating for the Indian States, without their consent being sought. For instance, in legislating for its customs and tariff policy, the Government takes no counsel with the Indian States. Under the new arrangement of a federation the states will have a voice in such legislation. They stand to gain by it and it is no sacrifice they are asked to make.

As regards the relations between the States and the Central Government, the position is not quite so clear. All were agreed that the Central Government should be a federation. But its full implications and consequences do not seem to have been clearly envisaged by those who advocated it. Sir Sivaswami Iyer drew out the implications, warned British India against them, but acquiesced in them with reference to the States. As he pointed out in his speech, "Real federalism implies division of sovereign powers and weakness at the centre." And yet the universal demand is for a strong central government. Federalism again means that the central government will have no control over the federal units in matters assigned to them. And yet it is universally granted that there are in India some backward provinces and States which have not reached the level of efficiency and progressiveness in the major British Provinces. Is it desired by the federationists that the central government, which is bound to be more enlightened and progressive, should be deprived of its power to control and influence the backward areas, be they Indian Provinces or Indian States? Is it fully realised that "whatever federal government

may mean, it implies complete autonomy of the provinces (and we shall add, Indian States) and non-intervention by the central government in the internal administration of the provinces (and States.)"? And is that result desired? Even when full responsible government is realised in the provinces and the states, will it not be necessary to arm the central government with the power to intervene in case of necessity? Sir M. Visveswarayya is apparently not agreeable to the elimination of paramountcy. Mr. Abhyankar is even more emphatic in his anxiety that the right of intervention of the paramount power should be retained. Sir Mirza, too, does not contemplate the elimination of intervention by the paramount power. Only he thinks, and rightly, that the more enlightened a government the less the occasion there will be for intervention. But intervention and federation do not go together.

The apparent contradictions seem to be due to the rather loose use of the word 'federation.' Since there is a consensus of opinion among all, except perhaps the Indian Princes, that there should be a strong central government and that it should have the power to control and influence the subordinate units of administration and intervene in emergencies, it follows that the central government should have powers of superintendence and control over them; it should exercise the powers of paramountcy both over the Indian States and the British Indian Provinces. In other words, the Government of India should be of the unitary type, holding supreme sway over both the provinces and the states. By federation it is obviously meant large devolution of powers to the constituent units and extensive decentralisation.

This consummation really involves no revolutionary innovation. British India has already a unitary type of Government. As for the Indian States, both theoretically and in practice they were subordinate to the Government of India, which has exercised unrestricted power of intervention in the internal affairs of the States. It has on occasions actually eliminated the ruling prince. Intervention could go no further even if the States were mere provinces under a unitary Government of India. The Government of India has the same power over the States as over the British Indian Provinces, though the intervention and control over the latter has not been of the day to day type as it has been in the latter. As Sir M. Visveswarayya put it, "the Governor General-in-Council at the head of the Government of India has authority over all parts of the sub-continent at the present time." All that is necessary is to retain the paramountcy of the Central Government and make it felt in the day to day administration in the States as well, thereby pulling them up to the level of administration in British India.

Two objections to the retention and strengthening of the unitary system may be considered. It is often said that the control would be vexatious and unintelligent since the central government is out of touch with the conditions of the provinces and states. But, as Sir Sivaswami Iyer pointed out, "a unitary form of government is quite compatible with a very large

devolution of powers to the provincial or state governments. The difference between the unitary and the federal types comes into prominence in regard to the question of residuary powers and to the question of the power of the central government to intervene in emergent or exceptional circumstances calling for guidance or control by the central government."

The second objection was that a province enjoying responsible government would resent the interference of an autocratic central government. That objection will be removed when the central government also becomes responsible. And it is very gratifying to have the support of the Dewan of Mysore to the plea for the introduction of an element of responsibility in the centre. This step will mean a great change in the relations between the centre and the constituent units. The interference of the former will become less unwelcome and will also be less frequent as the administrations in the latter improve. In the words of Sir Mirza, "In practice the degree of autonomy will depend upon the system of administration in the State (and we shall add, the province). The more constitutionally governed it is, the less justification or likelihood there is or will be for any intervention on the part of the paramount power in its domestic concerns."

Sir M. Visveswarayya and Sir P. S. Sivaswami Iyer have suggested that in the federal parliament the representatives of the States should not take part or vote in matters which were of purely British Indian application. That seems to be quite an unnecessary restriction. It is not always easy to determine whether a measure affects purely British India and not the States. Even now the States, by special enactments of their own, have been adopting British Indian legislation. Are the representatives of the Indian States in the Federal Assembly to look on when a piece of legislation, apparently meant for British India, is being passed when they know that the very same law may soon after be adopted by the rulers of their States, and without further discussion? Moreover, once the States are represented in the Federal Assembly, the tendency to bring about uniformity of laws will increasingly manifest itself.

The acceptance of federation by the official Conference necessarily implies the acceptance of its fundamental implication that the people of the Indian States along with the people of the Provinces will be directly represented in the federal Assembly, and the rejection of the proposal of the Simon Commission in favour of indirect representation, which is far too absurd.

#### FURTHER CHANGES IN CONFERENCE PLANS ?

THERE is no disposition yet on the part of the British Press to regard the exclusion of Sir John Simon from the Round Table Conference as a closed issue. For we find British newspapers beating their breasts in mail week over the Government's decision not to have him in the Conference. Writing on Sir John Simon's letter to Sir Austen Chamberlain in which he declared his intention

not to join the Conference if, in the opinion of the Government, he would be an encumbrance rather than a help, the *Manchester Guardian* says:—

"At the same time it is a great pity that the matter should ever have been discussed in Parliament, and for this Sir Austen Chamberlain is largely to blame. For the discussion will be interpreted in India at least as bearing on the mischievous question of whether or not the Simon Report is to be the basis of discussion at the Round Table Conference. It cannot be too often repeated that the Conference is to be an open one whose essential function will be to consider all suggestions as to the form of government most suitable for India in the immediate future. This is its only basis of discussion; there can be no other."

In a leading article headed "Choosing A Team." the *Times* calls upon the three party leaders "to give the proceedings—for which, be it remembered, all of them alike are responsible—such assurance of success as this country can contribute." It wants every British delegate, from whatever party, to "approach his difficult task with the determination to make the best, and not the worst, of it. There will be no room for the cynical or for the fainthearted." Similarly, it rules out people who may be admitted experts "without possessing this capacity for team work." If this description is meant to apply to people like Lord Birkenhead, we must say the *Times* has rendered a service to the Conference. But we do not think we can speak equally approvingly of its plea for "a British policy for the present Indian situation." This goes directly against the assurances given authoritatively times without number that the Conference will be completely open and that every party attending it will come to it with an open mind. If the *Times* suggestion is acted upon, the British delegation at any rate will come to it with their minds already made up on some of the most important subjects that will come up for discussion at the Conference. This is not what has been intended all along. Indeed, the Indian public has been frequently told that the Government would go to the Conference with a perfectly open mind and with no out and dried ideas up their sleeve. If the British delegation is now to attend the Conference with their minds made up on some subjects, it means an important departure from the plans adumbrated for the Conference and one which is sure to arouse much resentment in India. The paper is confident that "once the decision was firmly taken" Indian opinion would, as in the case of the three party representation, eventually acquiesce, though "after some wild preliminary protests." We can only say the *Times* is not in touch with Indian feeling. The *Times* fears that since the Labour Government have after all agreed to include representatives of the Opposition in the Round Table Conference, they might be tempted to leave the debate to the Opposition altogether, "themselves maintaining an Olympian attitude of impartiality between a "British" and an "Indian" view" and warns the Government that such a course would be "disastrous" and render impossible the evolution of a Common British policy. If, as the *Times* suggests, the British delegation is to attend the Conference with a common British policy ready-made in their pockets, the purpose of the Conference will stand

stultified. And as if to force the Government into submission, they are solemnly warned:—

"Moreover the present Government, as no one is better aware than its own members, cannot in the nature of things go on for ever. Nothing, as a matter of fact, is more likely to bring them down than this very problem of India, for here alone we have that curious metamorphosis which has transformed the Liberals from the rearguard to the very van of the attack."

A London cable recently foreshadowed Messrs. Baldwin and Lloyd George keeping aloof from the Conference in favour of some less prominent members of their parties. An inkling of this novel move is also found in this article when it is stated that

"Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Lloyd George may or may not serve in the Conference themselves. There are excellent reasons why they may think it unwise to become involved in so engrossing a task. If in the end they should both elect to stand aside, then their decision will certainly not be imputed to any lack of interest in a problem which will tax all the wisdom of the British Empire. But the very fact that their own participation should be a matter of discussion reinforces the argument that eminence, seniority, the experience of certain Cabinet offices, need not be regarded as the sole qualifications for this unprecedented service."

Another subject which received notice from the British Press was the trouble on the Indian North-West Frontier. The trouble has not disturbed the sleep of people near the scene of the Haji of Turangzai's exploits, but so exaggerated importance is attached in die-hard circles in England to the Frontier rising that it is almost regarded as sounding the death-knell of the British power in India. The responsibility for the trouble is of course fixed on the unresisting Congress organisation. As expected, the *Daily Telegraph* also deals with the matter in its usual alarmist style. Mr. J. L. Garvin writing on the matter in the *Observer* gives "The British Going—The Afridis Coming" as the first minor headline to his article which is clear proof of the feeling of utter nervousness by which he and those who think with him have been assailed. Then he turns to the recent Hindu-Muslim trouble at Sukkur. This is how he describes it:

"The Muslims, who, of course, are the large majority at Sukkur, threw themselves on the Hindus, whose dream of coming political ascendancy in all India is too much displayed and never will be fulfilled. Axes and knives were "freely used" in a furious grapple. In the next two days the conflict raged again. Hooligans joined in as usual. Shops were looted and two shopkeepers murdered. Over twenty people altogether were killed and over 300 injured before troops from Karachi restored order under the impartial auspices of what Mr. Gandhi calls our "Satanic Government."

The whole trend of Mr. Garvin's writing is, as can be easily seen, to throw the blame on the Moslems. That may or may not be so. But instead of jumping to conclusion to the detriment of one party or the other, Mr. Garvin would have done well if he had suspended judgment till more definite information was available.

He also shows an amazing ignorance of Indian politics when he says that the Nehrus and Gandhi "have declared for unconditional Independence". And there is really no excuse for his being so ill-informed when in England itself there is Mr. Sri-

nivasa Sastri constantly trying to clear up misconceptions. Speaking on this very point at the Liberal Summer School, Mr. Sastri is reported to have said:—

"Those who are in the vanguard of the political movement there believe that the British connection is providential, that it must be maintained, and that in any arrangements that may now come into existence the British connection must stand. Even those who are making trouble to-day by teaching civil disobedience, even these people have belief in British institutions, and only want to extend and develop them in India. Pandit Motilal Nehru and his Congress followers want nothing more than that the work which you began in 1919 shall be taken another stage, and another stage, until responsible self government is established for India."

In a letter of fair length in the *Manchester Guardian*, Mr. John W. Graham asserted that the Indian demand for swaraj "is a class demand, and the prize is not liberty, but the dominance of the Indian masses by Brahmins, the most terrible priestly tyrants in the world." Which charge Mr. B. P. Sinha writing in the same paper repelled in the follows terms:—

"It is a national demand, and not that of a class. To talk of "the dominance of the Indian masses by Brahmins", as the result of self-government is to talk without knowledge of the India of to-day and the future. The India that the Brahmins could tyrannise is dead. Gandhi has been performing its last rites for a decade or so. The Brahmins and the big landholders in India have now begun to raise the cry for protection."

Dr. Walter Saise asked for a "definite assurance" that the Indian untouchables will be treated as human beings before India can be given self-government. Mr. B. Shiva Rao proceeds to reassure him on the point by drawing his attention to the fact that Mr. Gandhi has for years past placed the removal of untouchability in the forefront of his programme and that several legislatures have used their powers under the Montagu reforms for bettering the lot of the untouchables. Moreover in the Nehru report, points out Mr. Shiva Rao,

"In the elementary rights of citizenship there is specific mention of the use of roads, wells, schools and all public places of resort by members of all classes. This is the most definite guarantee that the untouchables can have that there will be no discrimination of any sort against them under self-government."

In an article contributed to the *Spectator* of August 9 Mr. K. T. Paul who is familiar to the Indian public as the ex-General Secretary of the Indian Y. M. C. A. asks: "How did Sir John miss the Way?" and proceeds to answer it. Referring to Sir John Simon's request to consider his scheme, not in parts, but as a whole, Mr. Paul says that the answer to the question: "As a scheme, how does it look?" is "a universal negative." He explains the reason:

"It is as if one ordered a morning suit from a first-class tailor in London, and that master craftsman, with meticulous care, perfected a dress suit for the patron. Of course the creation may be immaculate and could be worn with great advantage. The only difficulty would be that that was not what was wanted."

Further on he says:

"Cannot the Commission's scheme be taken as a practicable start on the road toward Dominion Status? Apparently India thinks that Sir John missed the way very early in his journey and has arrived at a castle—well battlemented and beautiful, but situated on a totally different road."

But Mr. Paul's remarks about the Simon proposal regarding the Indian army are full of interest to the Indian public :

"The Commission, in seeking a way out of a most complicated problem, has suggested a solution which is perfect in its technical practicability but utterly untenable because it is an anachronism. To accept the Commission scheme would be to place in India an "Army of Occupation." It is just one of those matters which conflict with the Indian sense of honour. From the day that any such thing is done there will be opposition concentrated on it until it is removed. It would be quite a different matter if the Viceroy himself were the Commander-in-Chief, as is the President of the American Republic. His dual capacity would be the saving factor in this matter also. The Army would be the Dominion Army, even though in extreme emergency the Viceroy would have to take his orders only from His Majesty."

There is no doubt that Mr. Paul has correctly voiced Indian feeling on the point.

D. V. A.

## Our London Letter.

LONDON, AUGUST 6.

PARLIAMENT has broken up for a three months' holiday, and the Indian delegates will be on their way to the proposed Round Table Conference before it again resumes, but none of us knows who the delegates are to be or what the Government's proposals for the consideration of the Conference are to be. The day before Parliament adjourned we did at last get a discussion on the situation in India. On the Appropriation Bill we are allowed to debate any and every issue relating to Government administration, and following my suspension from the House for a week as a consequence of protesting against Parliamentary silence on the Indian crisis, I secured from the Speaker promise for a good place during the Appropriation Bill proceedings for an Indian debate.

Meanwhile there had been a development which led the Conservative Opposition to ask for the debate also. They were very angry with the decision of the Government not to accept Sir John Simon as one of the British Delegation at the Round Table Conference. Sir Austen Chamberlain's thunder was somewhat weakened by a letter which Sir John Simon sent him asking that his name should not be pressed. When Sir Austen Chamberlain read this letter I was greatly moved by the willingness of Sir John Simon to withdraw his claims rather than prejudice the Conference. It was only when I read the letter in cold print that I realised the subtle irony of it.

The Government has been refusing a debate on India because of the danger of the "delicate situation" being disturbed by "crude, ill-informed, and mischievous speeches." I rather think that I have been one of the fears in their minds, but in last week's debate Mr. Lloyd George was the real mischief-maker. I overlook Sir Charles Oman, the Conservative Member for Oxford University, whose History books we used to read in school thirty years ago! Since I have met him I have wondered why, because he strikes me as being the last man in the House of Commons with an historical type of mind. Some of

the Labour people seemed to be scared that India would take some notice of his foolish opinions. I am quite sure that it is realised in India that Sir Charles Oman's views now carry no weight in the House of Commons or anywhere else.

But Mr. Lloyd George is in a different category. His opinions cannot yet be ignored, and his entire speech was directed towards destroying the few remaining hopes of a useful Round Table Conference. In effect he said that Sir John Simon ought to be on the British delegation, whatever might be India's opinion of him and his Report. He viciously denounced the Government for having gone the little way it has in declaring for dominion status for India. Mr. Wedgwood Benn who contented himself with a short speech before Mr. Lloyd George rose, in which he expressed due appreciation of the services of Sir John Simon, ridiculed Sir Charles Oman, and was good enough to speak cordially of the spirit of my speech. This made me begin to wonder whether I had succeeded in stating the real situation and the real issue, because there is very little in either which can bring satisfaction to Mr. Wedgwood Benn.

After insisting on the mass character of the civil disobedience campaign, and the unity of religious communities which it was bringing about, and attacking the Government's policy of repression, I urged three things as essential if the Round Table Conference is to be saved. Firstly, the acceptance of self-government as its basis; secondly, an amnesty for political offenders now in prison, and thirdly, adequate representation of the Indian National Congress. Mr. Benn would not go further than to say that the Round Table Conference might be made the occasion for an all round agreement, but he gave no indication as to whether the Government was prepared to go any way in accepting the conditions which alone can secure a representative Conference.

Since the debate the bad news has come of the arrest of Mr. Malaviya. To those who still hoped against hope that the Conference may be of some use this action seems incredible. Indeed the only explanation seems to be that a Bombay official was responsible for the arrest without the knowledge of Simla.

With Mr. Malaviya in prison Indian jails now house the four men who probably represent politically-minded India more than any others—Gandhi, the two Nehru's and Malaviya. A conference without them would clearly have no moral authority or practical power, and would ultimately do more harm than good. It will be the Simon Commission over again.

Can British Statesmen Never Learn??

A. FENNER-BROCKWAY.

## Reviews.

### IMPERIAL BANKS.

THE IMPERIAL BANKS. By A. S. J. BASTER.  
(King, London.) 1929. 22cm. 275 p. 12/6.

THE main theme of this book is the presentation of the history of the London Bank operating in the

different parts of the British Commonwealth. The creation of new "Empire Banks" extending over the whole Empire and their possible attitude towards the Dominion Central Banks if the latter were to be created and such other credit problems with which the British Overseas Banks are confronted are some of the issues discussed in this timely publication. Avoiding throughout a discussion of the internal problems of the credit and currency of the Colonies and Dominions the English point of view as regards the Exchange Bank's position is stated with admirable lucidity.

The earlier portion covering roughly 144 pages and running into 4 chapters deals with the early struggle of the Far Eastern and Indian Exchange Banks. Fresh ground is explored in Chapter two where the Colonial Governments' attitude towards the Chartered Bank is stated. The object of securing the Royal Charter and the way in which it enabled these pioneer banks to conduct almost risky business in the far-off fields are stated clearly. Either the unreliability of local currency or the difficulties of remittance prompted the enterprising capitalists to found banks in the Empire. The competition from the existing local banking institutions strengthened by patronage of local governments obviously made the early years rather anxious ones. But the miracle of the Royal Charter did the necessary spade work for them. The "prestige value" of the Charter and the valuable regulations outlined after the pooling of experience between the Treasury and the Colonial Office saved the Empire Banks from grave disasters and "traces of their influence are still discernible in the banking laws of at least one great Dominion."

The early struggles are outlined in chapter II and more facts are presented to the reader than could generally be obtained from Chalmer's "Colonial Currency", Shortt's "Early History of Canadian Banking" and Cooke's "Banking in India." The conferring of the limited liability privilege by the Act of 1858 soon gave scope to the creation of a new series of Empire Banks based on the principle of limited liability and the old Chartered Banks soon took the earliest opportunity to incorporate themselves on this limited liability basis.

The last two chapters form, really speaking, the author's exposition of the present-day situation arising out of the tendency to centralise banking systems in the different parts of the Commonwealth. How would the powerful English Exchange Banks consent to be controlled by the Central Bank and what other delicate situations would be brought about by the presence of these Empire Banks? are discussed in chapter V. After stating the reasons for starting the Central Banks of Issue in the different parts of the Empire, the difficult position these would have to face in the Dominions is envisaged. Recent history is briefly alluded to and some doubt is expressed as regards the view that "the Central Bank would be a panacea for all financial ills." Not only is such a bank difficult to create but the question of avoiding competition with the Empire Banks can only be secured by a Central Bank of the rigid orthodox type. Recourse to the London Money Market being always possible, and any penalising attempt on the part of the Dominion Central Banks would probably be defeated. The absence of a bill market, the inability to control prices through credit in the case of all agricultural countries and the embryo stage of the short term money market would render it difficult for any Central Bank to use the orthodox weapons of credit control, viz., such as discount rate manipulation, loan rationing, and open market operations. These difficulties would be aggravated by the presence of mammoth Exchange Banks who always consider London as

their monetary centre for securing their supplies of short-term money. Money market control under such conditions would be practically impossible. As these Dominion Central Banks would have to place large resources in the London Money Market to facilitate their remittance business and control exchange rates their policy would indeed be subordinate to that of the Bank of England.

The most stimulating chapter in the book is the final one where the author advocates the furtherance of the integration movement. The policy of acquiring shares in the Colonial Banks has given scope to the "Big Five" to become "world banks." Cheap inter-Empire Finance is the new method of forging lasting economic alliance with the mother-country. Tariff Preference is not the only method to be relied upon to make the Empire one organised economic unit. Thus the union of the Big English Joint-Stock Banks, commonly styled the "Big Five", with the Empire Banks is leading to the forging of close financial ties with London and the concentration of Empire Banking in London is bound to produce useful results provided it is soundly organised. If the "mistake of excessive piling up of funds" in London is avoided by the Dominion Banks and if too great reliance is not placed on London deposits no great difficulties need be experienced by these banks.

While these are the precautions outlined the author does not forget the part that the London Money Market and its controller, the Bank of England, would have to play. Armed with the fiduciary issue of Act 1928 the Bank of England can safely play the role of "the Reserve Bank of the Empire." Nationalist feeling in the Dominions would certainly consider this with grave apprehension but as the other, alternative of creating a Dominion Central Bank to control the Empire Banks is more difficult the author advocates the former alternative in preference to the doubtful and less efficacious one.

The book not only displays wide research on the part of the author but is a frank statement made at a most opportune moment, when the banking systems of Great Britain and the Dominions are being overhauled. It gives evidence of the practical knowledge of the problems of Empire finance and as the literature on this topic is so scanty we welcome this book. The most interesting lesson would be for the Indian Central Banking Committee to consider whether the Central Bank of issue of the orthodox type can indeed prove a panacea for our financial ills. As a comprehensive account of the Colonial and Dominion banking system the book would undoubtedly have its value. It is a source of gratification to the reviewer to find his books quoted in the section on Indian banking.

B. RAMACHANDRA RAO.

## MARX AND LENIN.

### FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS OF MARXISM.

(Marxist Library Series No. 1) By G. PLEKHANOV. (Martin Lawrence.) 1929. 22cm. 145p. 5/-

### SELECTIONS FROM LENIN VOL. II. THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY IN ACTION, 1904-1914.

(Martin Lawrence.) 1929. 20cm. 398p. 3/6.

THE first one of these is a disappointing book to any student of politics or economics, who turns to it for light on the fundamentals of Marx's doctrine. The second contains articles from Lenin's pen on important issues raised in Russia between 1904 and 1914.



Like all Lenin's writings they contain a vigorous onslaught on all those, whether within or without his Party, who differ from his reading of the particular aspect of the Revolution then existing, or in the enunciation of general policies. A good illustration of this may be found in "Two Tactics" where he attacks Martynov who protested against Lenin's idea "of preparations, of fixing and bringing about popular insurrection". "Social democracy," says Martynov, "has always believed that the date of popular revolutions cannot be artificially fixed beforehand, but that they take place of themselves." "We have to explain to Martynov", replies Lenin, "that insurrection must not be confused with popular revolution... A popular revolution cannot be arranged beforehand, that is true. One cannot but praise Martynov... for possessing this knowledge... But if we have really prepared for the popular rebellion, and if that rebellion is possible because of the changes that have been brought about in social relations, then it is quite possible to fix the time for such a rebellion. We shall try to make this clear by a simple example. Can we make arrangements to bring about a Labour Movement? No, because a Labour Movement consists of a thousand separate acts which arise as the result of changes that have taken place in social relations. Can we arrange a strike? Yes, in spite of the fact—just imagine, comrade Martynov, *in spite of the fact* that each strike is the result of the changes that have taken place in social relations. When is it possible to arrange a strike? When the organisation or group which is arranging the strike has influence among the masses of the workers affected and is able to judge accurately the culminating point of the growing discontent. Do you understand it now, Comrade Martynov? If you understand it now, then please take the trouble" etc. The article against the boycott of the Legislatures at a particular juncture is very illuminating and shows how pliable and supple Lenin's mind was. One does not expect a revolutionary like Lenin to ridicule other revolutionists who press for the boycott of a sham legislature but he is such a great tactician that he never hesitates to adopt the least revolutionary of means if that is what is suggested to him, by his unrivalled power of analysing political situations, as the best move in the game with the entrenched forces of reaction and absolutism. This article together with the one in which he advocates the boycott of the Duma under different circumstances is well worth study. The notes in this edition will help the student to form a fairly good idea of the situation obtaining when these two articles were written.

J. J. VAKIL.

## CEYLON.

**ROMANTIC CEYLON. ITS HISTORY, LEGEND AND STORY.** By R. H. BASSETT. ( Cecil Palmer, London. ) 1929. 23cm. 253p. 7/6.

CEYLON is a bewitching country not the less for the rich treasures of archaeological value as for the beauty of her landscape which inspires that intimate association of people in which "Sinhalese, Tamil, European and Malay mingle indiscriminately." In some respects she claims affinity to India in that there is a mythological link connecting them. With the immigration of Tamil Hindus, the caste system has also flourished in Jafna with the result that there prevails the Brahminical dispensation in which "Brahmins are all priests—and by consent usually placed last, but by no means least useful are the Pariahs." Tradition has it that the race native to the land sprang from the loins of Wijaya "from an extremely beautiful but somewhat indiscriminat-

ing young lady who married a lion." In historic times the Portuguese, the Dutch and the British invaded not only the country but also the isolated, existence of the Sinhalese and left "such distinctive trace upon the original stock, either in language habit or appearance"

History such as Mr. Bassett gathers round Ceylon is thus more often than not stranger than fiction, concerned as it is with the affairs of royal hearts or with the adventures of Portuguese and Dutch soldiers. Folklore is also tastefully woven into it so as to render the enchantment of "romantic Ceylon" complete. Uniformly fascinating though the book is, it will not help a stranger to make his acquaintance with the unvarnished facts of that country. Once he possesses full knowledge of the realities, is it time for him to fly with Mr. Bassett as fancy leads into the realms of romance.

K. VENUGOPAL RAO.

## SOB-STUFF.

**SOBS AND THROBS OR SOME SPIRITUAL SIDELIGHTS.** By ABDUL KAREEM ABDULLA ( Ramjoo. ) ( S. N. Satha, 'Meherbad,' Ahmednagar. ) 1929. 21cm. 169p. Re. 1

THE book under review can be called a report of the spiritual work done by Hazrat Meher Baba in the Meher Ashram at Meherabad in the district of Ahmednagar. The aim of the institution is to impart spiritual education. Yet secular education is not totally neglected. Though the book chiefly records the sobs and throbs, the spiritual experiences of Syed Ali, the book can indeed be regarded as a chronicle of several incidents in the Ashram giving us an insight into the mystical powers possessed by Meher Baba. It appears, he has his own miraculous ways of putting his disciples on the God-ward path. For instance, we are told that while Hazrat Sahib had shut himself up in an underground cell, all the student-inmates of the Ashram were all of a sudden made to cry, sob and throb through love, so that for a time the Ashram assumed the appearance of a hospital for mentally diseased persons. Many such stories are told, which read almost like a miracle. In fact the author himself calls this book "a real romance about the Meherashram institute and the living Miracles of Hazrat Qibla Meher Baba". The book is written by an ardent admirer and a believer in the miraculous powers of the Hazrat Sahib. To us, it appears that non-disciple of the Hazrat Sahib can truly appreciate the importance of the accounts given in the book. In this book, there are many things which a critical intellect will not be prepared to believe. The book only shows the enthusiasm and love of the writer for his Guru. The title is indeed attractive, and the language is quite suited to this enthusiasm of the disciple.

S. V. DANDEKAR.

## Miscellaneous.

## FUTURE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.

Sir P. S. Sivaswami Aiyer, who attended the preliminary Conference held by Sir Mirza Ismail, to discuss problems that are likely to come up for discussion at the Round Table Conference at London, made the following speech on Wednesday the 20th August, advocating the unitary type of Government as the best suited to India:—

I am thankful to the Dewan Sahib for having invited me to be present at this Conference. I am glad to have had the opportunity of listening to the speeches made by the

members of this Conference and learning the views of the people of this State on the subjects which will come up before the Round Table Conference and in which they feel interested. The Dewan Sahab has asked me to express my views on a number of topics which he has noted down. I do not claim to speak on behalf of the people of British India or of any party. I can only claim to represent my own views which I believe are shared by a number of others in British India.

#### THE SIMON COMMISSION REPORT.

Before dealing in detail with the special topics indicated by the Dewan Sahab, I should like to make some observations of a general character explaining why the report of the Simon Commission has been condemned by public opinion in British India. It is not necessary to deal at length with all the matters on which the recommendations of the Simon Commission have met with disapproval. Our condemnation of the report is mainly based upon their proposals with regard to the constitution of the Central Government of British India, their refusal to transfer any responsibility to the Central Legislature and their treatment of the subject of defence. Their proposals with regard to the Central Legislature involve a radical change in its present structure. They say that their proposals have been based upon their conception of the future Government of India. The ideal which they place before themselves is that of a Federal Government of India in which the Indian States will find their proper place. They hold that the ideal is not capable of realisation in the immediate future or for a long time to come. If it cannot be realised except at a remote future date, is it wise to alter the present structure of the Central Legislature? It is conceded by them that the present structure of the Government of British India is of the unitary type, that all Federal Governments exhibit a tendency to greater and greater centralisation and that the federal form of Government is only an intermediate stage between the separate existence of States and the achievement of a unitary form of Government. They wish to reverse the process of evolution which has gone on to break up the present form of Central Government and to divert the machinery of government to entirely new rails. The reason why some of us are strongly convinced that the unitary type of Government is the most suitable to the present condition of British India is that it implies a strong and efficient Central Government capable of checking the disruptive tendencies which have asserted themselves so largely in the past history of India and which cannot be said even at this time of the day to have disappeared. If we have developed a general consciousness of nationality it is due to the unitary form of our Government, to the influence of uniformity of standards of administration, to the uniformity of laws, to western education and to the influence of the English language as a common medium of interchange of thought. Local and communal loyalties have a strong hold upon the minds of our people and it would be a great mistake to do anything which might strengthen the fissiparous tendencies at work and weaken the growing sense of a common nationality. Real federalism implies division of sovereign powers and weakness at the centre. The theory of federal governments is that the central government possesses only such powers as may be granted by the constituent States or Provinces. And that all residuary powers are vested in the States or Provinces. It may perhaps be imagined by some that it is possible to make such a complete division of sovereign powers between the central government and the provincial or State governments that there will be no residue left. Such a mutually exclusive and scientific demarcation of jurisdiction between the central and provincial governments has been found impossible in practice. The United States of America form the earliest and the most important example of a genuine federal type of government. Nevertheless it has been found in practice that there are cases in which concurrent jurisdiction has to be vested both in the provincial and in the central governments. In case where both the central and provincial legislatures have a concurrent jurisdiction and there is a conflict between their respective laws the rule usually adopted is that the legislation of the centra-

government prevails. I may here point out that a unitary form of government is quite compatible with a very large devolution of powers to the provincial or state governments. The difference between the unitary and the federal types comes into prominence in regard to the question of residuary powers and to the question of the power of the central government to intervene in emergent or exceptional circumstances calling for guidance or control by the central government.

#### FEDERAL AND UNITARY IDEAS.

It is conceded by the Simon Commission that there are backward provinces and areas which have not reached the same level of education or efficiency of administration as the major provinces. This is a circumstance which will point to the necessity for a strong central government and of a unitary type so that the central government may exercise a greater control and influence over the backward provinces and areas for the purpose of raising them to the same level. Whatever else federal government may mean it implies complete autonomy of the provinces or States and non-intervention by the central government in the internal administration of the provinces or States. That the existence of backward provinces and areas should be employed by the Simon Commission as an argument in favour of a federal form of government is the height of absurdity. From the point of view of British India it seems to me essential and necessary that the government should have a unitary structure.

Whether and how far this conclusion should be modified from the point of view of the Indian States is a question to be separately dealt with. How the framework of the Government should be adapted to admit the Indian States, I will deal with later on. This distant ideal of a federal union which the Commission consider to be now impracticable has induced them to suggest the indirect method of election to the central legislature. I will briefly point out why the system of indirect election should be condemned. In the first place, it removes the opportunities for contact between the electors and the members of the central legislature, which the Commission consider to be essential to democratic government. The elector to the provincial legislative councils has only to elect the members of the provincial legislative councils. He is supposed to bear in mind the fact that the members of the provincial legislative councils will be potential electors to the central legislature. He will have no opportunities for being educated and trained to understand issues of All-India concern to realise their significance and form his opinion about them.

#### SYSTEM OF DIRECT ELECTION.

The next objection is that though in every case of federal government of which we are aware there is a bi-cameral legislature in which the lower or popular chamber is constituted on the basis of direct election, the Commission have departed from this principle and are in favour of a uni-cameral central legislature constituted on the principle of indirect election. The Commission do not propose to abolish the Council of State; but if they do so, it is not because they are convinced of its utility and necessity, but because they are prepared to tolerate the existence of a body which has rendered some useful service in the past. Whether the structure of government which commends itself to the Commission should be considered to be uni-cameral or bi-cameral there is no provision by them for the direct representation of the electors in the legislature. This is a feature for which there is absolutely no precedent or analogy in any federal government that we know of and it seems to me to be a *reductio ad absurdum* of the constitution they propose. It is urged by the Commission that the difficulties of applying the system of direct election over constituencies of the size that we have to create in India are unique and immense. It is certainly possible to reduce these difficulties to some extent by an increase in the number of seats and constituencies, say to about double the present number, but the real remedy must be sought in the growth of strong and efficient party organizations. In no large country in the world which possesses a fully democratic constitution is it possible for the candidate to approach all his electors and get into touch with them.

Party organisations are bound to come into existence when the Government becomes responsible and the more they develop the better able will they be to cope with and surmount the electoral difficulties suggested by the Commission. The Commission are of opinion that it is only the ultimate units of federation as they call them that should be represented in the central legislature, that is to say, the provinces or the States will be represented as such and not the peoples at large. Unless the representatives of a State or a province are compelled to record only a single block vote it is difficult to see how this contrivance can abolish differences of opinion even among the representatives of a single province, or State or ultimate unit of federation. Even in the United States of America where the principle of indirect election was adopted with regard to the Senate it has now been abandoned and both chambers are constituted by a system of direct election. The real object of the Commission in proposing the method of indirect election is to take immediate steps to reduce the power, popularity and influence of the central legislature and to shrivel it up as an organ of Government.

The next main ground of criticism against the report of the Simon Commission is that it contains no provision for the introduction of the principle of responsibility in the central government to the legislature. Perhaps the worst feature of the report of the Simon Commission is their proposal with regard to the subject of Defence.

According to their scheme, the defence of India both internal and external will not become the concern of a responsible government of India at any time. I do not contend that the responsibility for the Army can be transferred to the legislature to-day or to-morrow but unless Government will agree to a reasonable time-table for the Indianisation of the commissioned ranks of the Army there is no prospect of India ever undertaking its own defence. Defence may be treated as a reserved subject during the transitional period. But the military estimates must be placed on the votes of the Legislative Assembly and the members of the Assembly must be allowed to vote upon the demands for grants. The Viceroy may be allowed during the transitional period to exercise the power of restoring any grants which may be refused by the Assembly during the transitional period. There is no other way of educating the legislature in the exercise of this responsibility.

#### QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION.

Before I proceed to take up the specific questions put to me by the Dewan I should like to suggest certain fundamental questions to you for the purpose of ascertaining how far we can see eye to eye with each other. I imagine that your answer to the questions I am about to suggest will be practically the same as my own. The prospect of a closer association will depend on your answers to them.

(1) Do you wish to achieve Dominion Status or Responsible Government for India and do you desire that India should stand as a united and strongly consolidated entity in the British Commonwealth?

(2) Is your ideal of responsible government compatible with the control or intervention of a third party as arbiter or umpire or as the guardian of peace and order?

(3) If any disputes or differences arise between the States and British India with regard to the matters of common concern, do you wish to have the right of appeal to the British Crown or the Secretary of State?

(4) Is it desirable and necessary that India should be trained to undertake the burden of her own defence, internal and external, like the Dominions and is it possible to have an Army officered entirely by Indians?

(5) Do you want a British army or an Army under the control of the Crown to protect the rights of the Princes according to the treaties against any uprising by their subjects or internal commotion?

(6) Are you going to contend that there is no legal nexus between the Indian States and the Government of British India but only with the British Crown?

(7) Are you prepared to recognise that there is no federal union in which the principle of a common nationality does not find expression in the popular Chamber?

(8) Are you prepared to recognise that in any federal or other democratic constitution British India cannot be placed on a level of equality as to voting strength but must command a majority?

(9) Are you prepared to recognise the implications of a federal union in regard to a federal executive and the power of the Central government to come in contact directly with the citizen and enforce its legitimate laws and decrees?

(10) Are you prepared to subordinate your provincial and parochial patriotism to an all-India patriotism and to a sense of a common nationality?

If the Princes and the peoples of the Indian States are prepared to answer these questions as I wish and expect there will be no serious difficulty in the way of a closer association with British India.

#### THE STATES AND BRITISH INDIA.

Whatever may be the exact structure of the future Government of India, it must be remembered that if there is to be any organic union between the Indian States and British India there must be a surrender of some of their powers by the Indian States in favour of the common central government. It has been suggested that the type of government which may be evolved for all-India need not necessarily copy any existing model and may be developed along special lines suitable to India. I do not wish to contend that we should be the slaves of any particular model and should not be at liberty to make any suitable modifications in the forms of government which have been evolved in the past. At the same time I think it would be unwise to discard the experience of the past and throw away the lessons of history. The difficulties in the way of an organic association between British India and the Indian States which are nearly 600 in number are undoubtedly serious. But it is quite possible to surmount them if there is a genuine desire for union on the part of the Indian States and a willingness to forego some of their individuality. It is not possible to force any of the Indian States to enter a union. Several of the treaties entered into with them guarantee their internal autonomy and it would not be possible to treat these engagements as mere scraps of paper. The process of union with the Indian States must necessarily take some time. The proper course seems to be not to insist upon all the States entering into a union at one and the same time but to allow such States as are willing to join the union to do so. The Simon Commission have stated that the ultimate form of the Government of India can only be determined by the common decision of the ultimate federal units and that it is not possible for them to formulate any scheme of Government till then. Are we to wait then, until all the States are willing to come in and is there to be no union with any State till then? Is it to be a policy of letting them all come in or none? As a matter of practical politics it would be wise to allow the States to come in as and when they choose instead of putting off the idea of closer association indefinitely. During the period which must elapse before there can be any union of all the Indian States the best plan for drawing them together would be to allow such of the States as are willing to adhere to send representatives to the existing Indian Legislature. The question has been raised whether the States should send representatives to the upper chamber of the Indian Legislature or to the lower chamber or to both or only to the Council for Greater India which has been proposed by the Simon Commission. The Council for Greater India must necessarily be a consultative body as proposed by the Simon Commission. Its conclusions can at best be only recommendations and cannot take effect unless they are accepted and passed by the Indian legislature. In the interests of the States themselves it would be better for them to send representatives to the Indian Legislature. I do not approve of the suggestion that the representatives of the States should take their places only in the Council of State or the upper chamber. The upper chamber must be a revising body and is usually not so important or influential as the lower and popular chamber. It would be neither possible nor desirable to deprive the popular chamber of its just predominance and influence. As I have already pointed out, the legis-

lature must continue to be a bicameral body and in every bi-cameral body the chamber which represents the people at large must necessarily be more influential. The idea that the upper chamber should be encouraged to become the more important body, that the States should send representatives only to that chamber and that the Assembly should be allowed to be atrophied and survive if at all as a biological rudiment is futile and unsound. The proportion of seats to be allotted to the Indian States as a whole should depend upon the ratio of their population to that of British India and the proportion of seats to be allotted to any particular State or group of States should be capable of adjustment on the same principle.

#### REPRESENTATION OF INDIAN STATES.

The question of giving weight to the representation of the Indian States is also one of little practical significance to the Indian States and should not be raised. For with or without weight the States must necessarily occupy the position of a minority and British India must necessarily occupy the position of a predominant majority. What is needed in the case of any minority is the right and the opportunity to press its own views upon the majority and persuade the majority to accept its views. This right and opportunity would be available to the States even without any weightage. I am in favour of allowing the States to come into both the Assembly and the Council of State. It would leave the door open for the principle of representation of the people of the States in the common legislature in future. As to the method by which the States should be sent to the two Houses I would leave it entirely to the decision of the States concerned. Whether the representatives should be nominated by the Government of the particular State or whether they should be nominated by any representative Legislative Council or body in the State or whether they should be selected out of a panel of nominees recommended by such body are all matters of internal concern with which British India need not interfere. If the representatives of the States are to be admitted into the Houses of the Central Indian Legislature the question of their powers and functions becomes important. It is obvious that they should be allowed to take part only in those proceedings of the legislature which are matters of common concern to the States and to British India. They should not be allowed to take part in or vote on matters which concern British India only for if the States' representatives are to meddle in the affairs of British India the representatives of British India will necessarily claim the reciprocal right to take part in matters which concern the Indian States. It is no doubt anomalous that the participation of some of the members of the legislative body should be limited to a particular sphere only but this is the only method of reconciling the different claims and interests of the people of British India and those of the Indian States at the present time and this peculiarity in the constitution of India which is called for by the special conditions of the case. The constitution would be unitary as to British India but federal as to the Indian States and British India. But this feature, anomalous as it may seem at first sight, is not unworkable and would be India's contribution to the science and art of constitutional politics. There might be other matters of common concern to the States alone which do not affect British India. For instance, personal questions affecting the Princes such as their rights of succession, their dignities, ceremonials and matters of that sort might be dealt with by the Viceroy during the transition period or perhaps even afterwards.

If the more important States join British India in the manner suggested, the other States will in course of time be willing to follow suit. Such of them as are willing might send their representatives to the Council for Greater India alone. The Council for Greater India might perform the useful function of focusing the views of the Indian States and promoting contact between the representatives of the States and the

representatives of British India.

#### THE SUPREME COURT.

It has been put to me whether the creation of a Supreme Court is necessary or not. The question is not one of much importance so far as British India alone is concerned. The need for the creation of a Supreme Court would not be so strong as in the case of a federal government. Questions between one State and another, between a State and British India might be referred to the Supreme Court whenever they were of a justiciable character. Questions not of this character must necessarily be dealt with by the Government of India. The procedure for dealing with these matters might be capable of improvement. The statute that would have to be passed to carry out the constitutional reforms should confer power for the creation of a Supreme Court whenever India desires it.

As regards the position of the British community, all their legitimate rights should enjoy the same protection as those of other Indian citizens. There should be no discrimination between the British community in India and the other communities. They should enjoy the same rights and privileges as other Indian citizens. If the British community would only identify themselves with the welfare of India the cause of Indian progress would be greatly advanced. But it is essential that the British community should get rid of their feeling of racial superiority.

I have only to add one or two more remarks. The Simon Commission have referred to the analogy of the League of Nations as possible suggestive of some form of Association between British India and the States. It is an utterly false and misleading, analogy. The League of Nations is not an organic union at all. The resolutions of the League of Nations have no binding effect upon any member State unless they are ratified by that member. That is not the characteristic of any form of corporate union. The analogy of the old German Confederation is also of a misleading character. These false analogies may flatter and appeal to some of the Indian Princes and lure them from the true ideal of organic unity. If the Indian States really desire a united India they must be prepared to fully realise the implications of a federal union.

I must apologise to you for having taken up so much of your time and thank you for the patience with which you have listened to me.

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE INNER GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD. By ANNIE BESANT. (Theosophical Publishing House, Madras.) 1930. 20cm. 82p. As. 12.
- AN HOUR WITH THE MOVIES AND TALKIES. By GILBERT SELDES. (Lippincott, London.) 1929. 20cm. 156p. 4/6.
- AN HOUR OF AMERICAN POETRY. By CHARLES EDWARD RUSSELL. (Lippincott, London.) 1929. 20cm. 165p. 4/6.
- THE AMERICAN NOVEL. By GRANT OVERTON. (Lippincott, London.) 1929. 20cm. 155p. 4/6.
- AN HOUR ON HEALTH. By MORRIS FISBEIN. (Lippincott, London.) 1929. 20cm. 158p. 4/6.
- AN HOUR OF AMERICAN HISTORY. By SAMUEL ELOIT MORISON. (Lippincott, London.) 1929. 20cm. 156p. 4/6.
- THE STORY OF THE JEWS. By LEWIS BROWNE. (The Travellers' Library Series.) (Cape, London.) 1930. 18cm. 319p. 3/6.
- DOMINION AUTONOMY IN PRACTICE. By ARTHUR BERRIEDALE KEITH. (Oxford University Press.) 1929. 20cm. 92p. 3/6.
- SPEECHES OF MAXIMILIEN ROBESPIERRE. Vol. I. (International Publishers, New York.) 1927. 19cm. 93p. 50 cents.
- SPEECHES OF KARL LIEBKNECHT. Vol. IV. (International Publishers, New York.) 1927. 19cm. 93p. 50 cents.