

# The Servant of India

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

VOL. XIII NO. 50. } POONA—THURSDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1930. { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.  
FOREIGN 15s.

## CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK. ... ..	593
ARTICLES :—	
Not Refrains But Parties. ... ..	596
Mr. Montagu's Diary. By Bhishma. ... ..	596
REVIEWS :—	
The Future of Civilisation. By Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri. ... ..	599
Modern Sex Problems. By Brother Saohidnand, C.S.S. ... ..	600
Federal Government. By K. M. P. ... ..	601
Another War Book. By Prof. R. Sadasiva Aiyar. ... ..	601
Introduction to Revolt. By J. J. Vakil. ... ..	602
SHORT NOTICES. ... ..	602
MISCELLANEA :—	
Mr. Sastri's Speech at the R. T. C. ... ..	603
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
Federalism in India. By Sir P. S. Sivaswami Aiyar. ... ..	603
BOOKS RECEIVED. ... ..	604

## Topics of the Week.

### Mr. Thakkar's Discharge.

THE appeal which Mr. A. V. Thakkar preferred against the judgment of the Sessions Judge of Kaira ordering his re-trial was rejected by the Bombay High Court on the 1st inst. On the very same day Mr. Thakkar answered the summons of the Magistrate of Kaira and appeared in his Court to stand his re-trial. He was, however, informed that as the Ordinance No. 5, under which he was charged, had expired on the 29th of November, all cases pending under it lapsed. Thus ends one of the most ill-considered and untenable prosecutions which the authorities in Kaira made themselves responsible for.

\* \* \*

### Terrorist Activities in Bengal.

THE cold-blooded murder of Lt. Col. Norman Skinner Simpson, Inspector-General of Prisons, Bengal, in his office at Calcutta at midday by three Bengali youths will be viewed with horror and indignation. Bengal has been notorious for the cult of the bomb and the activities of the terrorists, which serve no useful purpose. On the other hand, they compel the Government to adopt methods of repression under which both the guilty and the innocent have to suffer. Lately a series of attempts were made on the lives of Government servants. These unhappy and regrettable incidents justify the action of the Government of Bengal in securing the passage through the local Legislature of the Bengal Criminal Law Amendment Bill. At the time of the passage of the Bill the Government urged their knowledge of the existence of anarchist organizations and deep-laid terrorist plots as the justification for

that lawless law and unfortunately the heinous crimes referred to above committed by some misguided and irresponsible youths in Bengal would confirm the Government's contention. The anarchist is no friend of India.

\* \* \*

### Will Benn Excel Montagu ?

ACCORDING to the New Delhi Correspondent of the *Hindu*, there seems to be a proposal to appoint Sir Atul Chatterjee, the Indian High Commissioner in London, to the Governorship of an Indian Province and to make the office of the High Commissioner a stepping stone to an Indian satrapy. While the close connection between the two offices is not obvious, the proposal to appoint Indians to be heads of Governments will be welcomed as a step in the right direction. The first Indian Governor was Lord Sinha, and he was appointed during the Montagu regime. It was Mr. Montagu's courage, statesmanship and burning sympathy for India and Indian aspiration that led him to make some notable appointments. Sir S. P. Sinha was raised to the peerage and given a place in the House of Lords and appointed Under Secretary of State for India, before he was made the Governor of Behar and Orissa. Mr. Montagu had contemplated making Sir S. P. Sinha the Secretary of State in his own place; and he would serve under Sinha as Under-Secretary of State! In his "Indian Diary" he has the following :

If I succeed in getting the Government of India to assent to all this, then, I am going to ask the Prime Minister to relieve me at once of my office, to remove Lord Islington, and to make me Under-Secretary of State for India until such time as the Bill is through Parliament.

This only if he will consent to appoint as my successor Sir S. P. Sinha, giving him a seat in the House of Commons.

It was a great tragedy that the traditions which Mr. Montagu initiated were soon after his dismissal repudiated and abandoned. What was acclaimed as a boon ten years ago will be considered as overdue today. Hereafter India will not be content if Indians are excluded from occupying the positions of Governors and Viceroys, and if Indian opinion is not consulted in making the appointments. The appointment of Sir Isaacs Isaacs to the Governor Generalship of Australia on the advice of the Australian Government is not without its significance to India. We have to wait till responsible government is established in India before we can constitutionally exercise the right to advise the King in such appointments. But there is nothing to prevent the appointment well be consulted in the selection of Indian Governors and also the successor to Lord Irwin in the Viceroyalty.

The presence of a few leading Indians in the House of Lords and the inclusion of some Indians

ment of Indians to the Governorships of Indian provinces at once. The Indian leaders now in London in the British Cabinet for the period the Indian constitution will engage its attention will, besides strengthening the hands of the British Government, make a powerful appeal to Indian sentiment.

\* \* \*

#### Administration of Justice.

The Satyagrahis who decline to defend themselves against police charges or refuse to lay complaints against the police when the latter are guilty of illegal acts are doing a great disservice to the country. Their attitude encourages the police to indulge in excesses and they must share the responsibility for the many acts of doubtful legality and admitted illegality committed by the police with impunity because they were secure from challenge. If the satyagrahis had done the right thing, they would have saved many innocent people from the excesses of the police. If their main idea is to show up the wickedness and Satanic character of the Government, they can do it more effectively by resorting to the courts than by shunning them. When a High Court declares an act of the Executive illegal, it does more to destroy the prestige of the Government and to show up its Satanic character than the quiet submission to police *zoolum* or the acceptance of jail by the satyagrahis themselves.

After all, the satyagrahis themselves will admit that, whatever be the sins of the executive government, the higher judiciary have, on the whole, upheld the highest traditions of judicial independence and impartiality. The boycott of courts is therefore, the least justifiable item in the policy of the satyagrahis.

However regrettable be the attitude of the satyagrahis, the quality of the administration of justice cannot and should not be allowed to degenerate on that account. It is gratifying that the lawyers of Bombay and Ahmedabad have decided to keep a sharp look-out and the Bombay High Court have taken steps to review doubtful cases and vindicate justice.

\* \* \*

#### Muzzling of the Press.

A SERIOUS invasion of the freedom of the press was committed by the Government of Bombay in prosecuting the Editor and publisher of the '*Bombay Chronicle*' for publishing the programme of a function announced by the Bombay Congress Executive Committee. In the opinion of the Presidency Magistrate, who tried the case and convicted both the accused, it constituted an offence under the Criminal Law Amendment Act to give publicity to the programme and news of the activities of the Congress organizations which had been declared unlawful, as the same amounted to assisting the operations of these unlawful associations. It was brought to the notice of the learned Magistrate by the defence counsel that the accused had no intention of assisting the activities of the Congress or any other organization which had been declared illegal but that they had published the programme of the function as an item of news in the usual course of journalism. Side by side with it, they had published also the Police Commissioner's ban on the meeting. If the first item can be construed as assisting the Congress, a body declared illegal, the second may, with equal justice, be construed as assisting the Commissioner, a body not declared illegal! If the first attracted people to the function, the latter kept them away. There was nothing to show that more people attended the meeting because its programme was published in the *Chronicle*. Still the Presidency Magistrate of Bombay was pleased to convict Mr. Brelvi, the Editor, and Mr. Kapadia, the publisher,

of the *Chronicle* and inflict on them vindictive sentences of five months each. By putting Mr. Brelvi in B class the Magistrate has added insult to injury.

\* \* \*

#### An Indian High Commissioner for South Africa.

HIS Majesty's Government in Great Britain have lost no time in implementing one of the important conclusions of the last Imperial Conference which referred to the "further development of the system of communications and consultations between His Majesty's Governments" in the various Dominions. They have created the post of High Commissioner for the United Kingdom in South Africa and to that office they have appointed Sir Herbert Stanley, the present Governor of Ceylon. India has an Agent in South Africa, but he is not there because of her acknowledged status of a Dominion in external relations but because of the Cape Town Agreement. Following the action taken by Great Britain, it seems very desirable that the status of the Indian Agent in South Africa should be assimilated to that of a High Commissioner. Already in practice the Agent has a status higher than that of an Agent of the Government of India, as, for instance, the Agent in Ceylon or Malaya. It is due not only because of the status of South Africa and India in the Commonwealth but also that of the individuals who occupied that office. In this case the holders of the office have been bigger than the office they held and they have thereby raised the status of the office. As a matter of fact, the Rt. Hon. V. S. Sastri and Sir K. V. Reddi have almost invariably been referred to as the Agent General by South Africans, even at official functions. It seems to be opportune now formally to acknowledge the superior status of India's representative in South Africa and assimilate it to that of a High Commissioner in every respect. Hereafter the Indian High Commissioner would be accredited to the Government of South Africa, not because of the Cape Town Agreement, but in virtue of the Dominion Status that they both have. This step should be followed by the appointment of a South African High Commissioner in India.

\* \* \*

#### Labour and Federation.

ONE of the most cogent and convincing speeches delivered at the second plenary session of the Round Table Conference was the one delivered by Mr. N. M. Joshi on behalf of Indian Labour. The workers of India, he announced, demanded full responsible government for India. They were under no illusion that the millennium would dawn with it, but they would certainly be better off than they have been under the present bureaucratic government which, in practice, was responsible neither to the British Parliament nor to the Indian legislature. The motives of the Government of India for initiating such ameliorative legislation as they did in the early days were not above question. This charge of Mr. Joshi is proved to the hilt by Dr. Rajani Kanta Das in his able review of "Labour Legislation in India" in the *International Labour Review* (November, 1930). Perhaps the very first piece of Labour Legislation undertaken by the Government of India was the Workmen's Breach of Contract Act of 1859, meant to penalise breaches of contract by labourers. The first plantation legislation was passed in 1863 and it was more regulative than ameliorative of the conditions of plantation labour. The first Factories Act was passed in 1881 and the impelling motive for it was not to ameliorate labour conditions in India, but to handicap Bombay in its competition with Lancashire. It was again the agitation of Manchester for the application to Bombay of the recommendations of the first International Labour Conference, Berlin, 1890,

that led to the passing of the second Factories Act of 1891. The rapid progress of the jute industry in India kindled rivalry in Dundee and the Chamber of Commerce of Dundee put pressure on the Government of India. Where there were no foreign British interest to protect against Indian competition, the Government were slow to sympathise with Indian labour, as for instance, in the mining industry. If in later years there has been some remarkable progress, it is due to the pressure of the International Labour Office and the growth of Labour organisations in India.

Mr. Joshi was not asking merely for the transfer of power from British to Indian hands. He wanted constitutional guarantees for safeguarding the interests of labour. He did not ask for separate representation or weightage, but for a charter of rights of labour to be included in the Constitution. But his most important demand was for universal franchise, which would be the best safeguard for labour interests. He met the arguments that are generally advanced against universal franchise. If the constituencies would be too large and unwieldy, they were bound to be so for all time; this difficulty was not likely to disappear at any time, unless adult franchise was ruled out for ever. As for the handicap of illiteracy, the present electorate was not wholly literate. If some illiterates could exercise the franchise to-day, there was no reason why others should not and could not. The superimposition of a property qualification was not likely to mitigate the handicap of illiteracy.

Another safeguard he desired was that labour should be a central subject and he insisted that the power of the central Government to ratify the conventions of the International Labour Conference and to enforce them in the whole of India, British India and the Indian States, should be unimpaired. The States and the provinces have no international status; the central Government of India has and hence that Government, which, in view of its place in the International Labour Conference, is called upon to ratify international conventions, should be in a position to enforce them in all parts of India. Dr. Das has come to the same conclusion. He considers it essential that India should have uniform labour legislation in order to discourage regional rivalry. And for this purpose it is very necessary that Labour should be a central subject.

#### Jamkhandi in 1929-30

It appears from the Jamkhandi State administration report for 1929-30 that the year was characterised by the establishment of a High Court for the State. This consists of the State Karbhari, who has had considerable judicial experience in the Bombay Presidency, and a Chamber Judge, who concerns himself more or less with routine and miscellaneous matters. The State Karbhari used to combine in himself the offices of the Collector and District Magistrate as also that of the District Superintendent of Police; but a new post of Revenue Officer was created and all these executive functions were transferred to him, leaving the Karbhari free for judicial work. This is a step in the right direction. We can also compliment the State on the fact that education is free in all its stages. The State has arrangements for primary and secondary education within its own borders; while under the conditions attached by the Chief to his munificent donation of a lakh of rupees to a College in Poona and the State's yearly contribution of Rs. 5,000 to the coffers of the College for twenty years, 50 *bona fide* Jamkhandi students are entitled to receive free education in that College. As regards the spread of literacy, we find that nearly 6000 pupils are in receipt of instruction, which, we are told, is 6 per cent. of the entire population. While the progress so far is by no means

negligible, the State must put forth more strenuous efforts to bring the whole of its school-age population to school. And with education already free in the State the problem is much less complicated than in British India. We do hope the desirability of going in for compulsion will be soon seriously considered by the State. Then, a glance at the statement of receipts and expenses shows that the Ruler's personal expenses consume a disproportionately large part of the State revenue. In this matter the Chief would do well to follow the example of some bigger members of the princely order who content themselves with a much smaller proportion. The incidence of excise revenue, nearly one rupee per head, is also not a thing of which the State can be proud. It ought to be its ambition to bring about prohibition as soon as possible. The sooner it takes measures to that end, the better. Lastly, the absence of a legislative council for the State marks it down as backward—a stigma which the State should try to remove as soon as possible. For aught we know, the subjects of Jamkhandi might be enjoying all the benefits of good government; but they cannot feel that they are closely associated with the administration unless they can bring public opinion to bear on the administration through their own representatives in the Council.

#### Coorg.

THE Coorg Legislative Council had recently a debate on whether the province was to retain its separate identity or was to merge itself into a bigger one like Madras. The voting was left entirely to nonofficials of whom 7 voted for the *Status quo* and 5 against it. Opinion on the point thus seems to be almost equally divided. It is easy enough to understand the feeling in favour of a separate existence, but there is doubtless considerable force in the arguments put forward on the other side. In the first place, it seems doubtful if with its present finances the province can stand all the costly paraphernalia which a reformed government brings in its train. The only sources of income are Forests, Excise and Land Revenue. There was not much prospect of increase under the last read, as land had been granted under various concessions. As regards Excise, receipts from that source were uncertain, thanks to temperance propaganda, picketing of liquor shops and boycott of auction sales. Forests too do not hold out any very high hopes of increased receipts; on the other hand, as pointed out in the course of the debate, there was every chance of their going down with the depletion of the forests. In these circumstances where was the fun in continuing Coorg as a separate entity and as it were, vegetating? Its limited finances have made even the most urgent administrative reforms impossible. When the Montagu reforms were on the anvil, Coorg was offered the alternative of amalgamation with Madras or the privilege of a legislative council of its own and it elected for the latter alternative. It has virtually reaffirmed its previous decision, though by a narrow majority. The *Statesman* of Calcutta indulges in a cheap sneer at the expense of Coorg when it says that "small provinces, like small men, are apt to take themselves with great seriousness." We think the sneer quite undeserved. If Coorg is not to think about its future at a time when the constitution of the whole country is in the melting pot, when is it to do so? At the same time we think that in considering the political future of Coorg it should be ascertained whether the decision of the Legislative Council truly represents opinion in Coorg in general.

## Articles.

### NOT REFREES BUT PARTIES.

FROM the reports of the proceedings of the Round Table Conference that have appeared in the Indian Press it appears that the British delegation have been content to take up an attitude of benevolent neutrality, and have left it to the Indian delegates to arrive at settlements on the questions at issue. This attitude is certainly admirable in many ways. It is gratifying to be informed that the representatives of the Labour Government were most anxious to help and discouraged any attempt on the part of some representatives of the Government of India to create mischief. Mr. F. W. Wilson cabled to say that Mr. Benn had warned certain officials of the Government of India that their mischievous activities would meet with the strongest disapproval of the British Government. Putting down such malignant mischief is itself no small contribution that the Labour Government is making to the success of the Conference. Mr. Wilson makes appreciative reference to the sincerity, enthusiasm and helpfulness of Lord Sankey, the chairman of the most important committee charged with the most difficult task, that of formulating the constitution of the central Government of India. Lord Sankey is reported to have said :

We are very anxious to help you to restore peace and prosperity to India, but it chiefly depends upon you and in the greatest measure of agreement you can get in this sub-committee. We have a great chance, but we shall be able to realise it only if everybody realises you cannot get your own way in everything. We are anxious to help. We will do everything we can.

It is also reported that Mr. Ramsay Macdonald himself would preside over the Minorities sub-committee, and lend the weight of his official position and experience to settle the Hindu Muslim question. It is also understood that Lord Sankey and Mr. Benn were giving all friendly help to both Hindus and Muslims to facilitate agreement, while not taking sides. For all of which they are entitled to the grateful thanks of India.

But is benevolent neutrality enough? It may be humiliating to confess but it is none the less true that India is not meeting the British with an agreed scheme. All efforts to evolve a scheme acceptable to British Indians and the Indian States, to the Nationalists and the communalists, have been unsuccessful. British Indians met often for the purpose but with no final result; Indian Princes refused to meet British Indians. The objective of the three big Indian groups have been and are irreconcilable. While the British Indian Nationalists desire to consolidate the integration of India initiated by the British, and extend the reign of law and democracy all over India, the Muslim Communalists wish to cut up British India into Muslim States and non-Muslim States, which they anticipate would be Hindu States, and the Indian Princes wish to retain Indian India as a separate

entity or entities. If they had their way, India would be cut up into three divisions: Princely India, Muslim India and National India, governed by autocracy, theocracy and democracy respectively. The Princes would retain and further entrench their autocratic rule and the Muslims would have unchallenged and unconcealed Muslim Raj. Muslim majorities in Bengal and the Punjab, the separation of Sind and the introduction of responsible government in the North West Frontier Province are not pressed in the interests of democracy and good government; they are frankly for the purpose of creating Muslim States. This avowed and deliberate motive has naturally alarmed the Hindus in Sind and the Frontier Province and made them feel that they were mere pawns in the game, that they were being sacrificed to placate the Muslim ambition to rule over Hindus. It is a most unfortunate feeling to create and to inaugurate a new constitution with. The desire of the Princes to throw off the supervision of the central Government of India has alarmed the subjects of the States. This demand is not again in the interests of the spread of democracy or the reign of law. The satisfaction of the demands of the Muslims and the Indian Princes are not conducive to the welfare of India. Nevertheless, if the Indian delegates are left to arrive at a settlement, it is bound to be a patch-work compromise of conflicting and incompatible schemes. Is the Labour Government really going to give legislative effect to such a settlement, which will undo the work of the British in India and on the top of it, make the development of democracy in India an impossibility and enthrone theocracy and autocracy?

The British delegation is not there merely to safeguard British interests in the narrower sense—British capital and British commerce. They must take an active hand in shaping the conclusions of the Conference, and do their level best to see that they are in the interest of national progress of India. It is not for them to put their seal to an unworthy compromise between democracy, theocracy and autocracy; they are not mere witness to testify to the genuineness of a compromise reached by others, but to testify to its merits. They are not neutrals in a conflict between others, but parties to it. It is up to them to see that they pull their full weight on the side of the right solution. More than once in the past the Britisher has unwillingly put his hand to a policy he abhorred: Lord Morley and Mr. Montagu accepted communal electorates against their better judgment, with woeful consequences. We trust that a similar grave political blunder will not be repeated, and the British Government will not again become a party to a policy which is the negation of democracy.

### MR. MONTAGU'S DIARY.

AS he himself confessed in the concluding part of the 'Diary' Mr. Montagu was conscious that it often reflected "contradictory moods of days and hours." The 'Diary' requires discriminating reading. It is more valuable for its subjectivity than for its objectivity. It is a vivid picture of his thoughts and

the moods he passed through than an always correct and adequate estimate of things which caused these mental ripples and storms. It reveals his impulsive vehement characteristics, his burning zeal and apostolic fervour in the cause of India's self-respect and self-government, his consciousness of his high mission to deliver the oppressed land. It reveals also the vexations, the mental tortures, that he went through in his almost single-handed fight with the bureaucracy in India, and how he was compelled to make concession after concession to secure the consent, never hearty and at best sullen, of the bureaucracy.

The revelations are not however without their objective interest. His estimates of men and things may have been hasty, and sometime uncharitable. But there are certain ideas that occur again and again, which cannot be dismissed as hasty and ill-considered dicta. For instance, his estimate of the British Government in India. The most striking feature is the almost absolute identity between his outlook and that of the Indian nationalist regarding the system of government in India. Before he became the Secretary of State for India he had described it in his famous speech in the House of Commons as "wooden and anti-diluvian." In the "Diary" he says:

I have everything to loose by differing from Chelmsford, but I cannot leave the Government of India untouched. It is not because I said that I believed it was bad; it is because I felt it was bad. I felt it before I came out; I feel it more so now I am here. The dead hand of the Government of India is over everything, blighting it.

Again and again he animadverts on the aloofness of the governing class in India, its abhorrence of intimate relations with Indian publicists and its preference to govern by files and rules. On one occasion he says:

I had a long talk with Maffey, as we were very frank with one another. I told him that in my opinion the root cause of the whole trouble was the profound distrust, which may or may not be justified, shown by the civil servants of India and the Indian of the civil servant. The consequence is that in making any proposal or in carrying out anything, the civil servant, rather than trust to his own authority and to the righteousness of his own cause, ties himself up and everybody else with what he calls safeguards—rules, regulations and statutes. The Indian then sees that he is not trusted, and uses his powers quite irresponsibly, knowing that the Civil Service has guarded itself by its regulations. On the other hand, the Indian, irritated by this, demands powers over the bureaucracy which he does not really require, simply in order to get rid of these difficulties. ... The Indian problem is very much complicated by the fact that it is atmosphere, social and political, rather than anything definite which we have to cope with.

In another place he observes:

Informal discussions, informal conversation, they do not know. Political instinct they have none. The wooing of constituents is beneath their idea; the coaxing of the Press is not their *métier*. Nothing is required of them but to get through their files, and carry on social work according to rule. ... There is no such thing as an informal conversation, so much so that the Government never does anything except by message, resolution or Bill, and advice is never given by the non-official or the people of the country until it is asked for—and it is never asked for.

I wish I had time to elaborate what I mean, but I still say that the social side of the question is at the bottom of the political mess in which we have landed ourselves.

... Certainly that social relationship which the English people seem to find so difficult comes very easy to me; and we shall go from bad to worse, until we are hounded out of India, unless something is done to correct this sort of thing.

Before he left India he pleaded with Lord Chelmsford for a change in the angle of vision in the government of India:

I told him earnestly that he had got to govern India in the next few months not as if the report was already carried out but as a country for which he wished the report to be carried out.

He bitterly lamented and resented racial humiliation and segregation of Indians by the Britishers in India.

Here, again, with our customary folly in these days we are laying up trouble for ourselves. The Baden-Powell organisation absolutely refuses to have Indians in it. ... At the moment when we are complaining of the divorce between the two races; at the moment when we have a chance, by proper organisation, to keep the future generations together, we are making it impossible. By these absurd segregations we are losing the chance of bringing the boys together.

He represented the matter to Lord Chelmsford:

I drove back with Chelmsford and had a row with him about the Boy Scouts. I told Chelmsford that I believed it was not a case in which the Government could wash its hands of the whole matter, that we should regret it in twenty years' time, and that he certainly ought to take steps at once to bring about the reform.

He took up the matter with the Commander in Chief also, whose action in threatening to forbid British military officers from joining a Service Club which had excluded Indian Officers he applauded and said: "that is the spirit in which to tackle the question."

It has been repeated *ad nauseam* that Britishers refused to be led by Indian military officers. Mr. Montagu reports the Commander-in-Chief, Sir Charles Munro, to say that it was untrue.

He is very indignant at the idea that Englishmen will not be led by Indians; he said it is not in the least true.

When he found the C.-in-C. rather stiff on the question of commissions to Indians, he pointed out to him

the difficulty of asking men to come into the Army merely as sepoy, with no prospect of advance. We were not making a similar request to any other part of the Empire.

Of England's mission and its observance in the East he says:

The historic part of Great Britain is to befriend national aspirations. I am not sure that in the East, at any rate, we have not forgotten this, and our policy of disruption and control over Persia must react on Indian opinion.

Of his own mission to India he says soon after he landed in India:

My visit to India means that we are going to do something and something big. I cannot go home and produce a little thing or nothing; it must be epoch-making, or it is a failure; it must be the keystone of the future history of India.

From the very beginning he was assailed by doubts if he would be supported in his large schemes for India, and to this doubt he returns again and again.

I spend my whole time racking my brains as to how I am going to get something which India will accept and the House of Commons will allow me to do without whitening it down. We must wait and see. I wish I could make it clear to those at home that if the results of our

deliberations are either something which India will not accept, or niggling, miserly, grudging safeguard, fiddling with the existing order of things, we shall have defrauded, and defrauded irreparably—for they will never believe us again—a vast continent whose history is our glory, and whose hopes and aspirations, fears and tribulations it is pathetic to see.

The epoch-making change that he ardently wished to introduce was to shift the responsibility for the government of India from England to India.

The main principle, as far as I can see, is that instead of founding the Indian Government on the confidence of the people of England, we are gradually to found it on the confidence of the people of India.

In his efforts to give effect to this principle he met with stout opposition from the British bureaucracy in India, and the bulk of the 'Diary' is the story of the agony of his fight with it. The Government of India's own first proposals were "very, very depressing" and he told the Viceroy that "he really must push his Council infinitely further than he has gone." So early in his mission as the 25th of November, hardly a week since he arrived in India, he had occasion to cry out against the Government of India.

They have either got to take what I want or stew in their own juice when this Mission has failed. God knows, my scheme will be none too popular with the extremists, but I have felt all along that I must try and bring the Government of India with me, for the sake of the Indian Empire, if I can. I myself would go very much further.

The Government of India obstructed him at every turn and had to be driven along with threats and imprecations. On one occasion he had to tell the Government of India that :

they had better make up their minds once and for all that there were only three courses open to them; either to agree to reform the Government of India; to refuse to reform the Government of India, and so differ from me; or to convert me, because, as at present advised, I would not go home without a scheme for reforming the Government of India, which I believed was indefensible in its present form.

At his instance the heads of the provinces were summoned to Delhi to advise on constitutional advance. They gave him no help, only obstruction. Lord Pentland, who, as the senior satrap, presided over the conference, plainly told Mr. Montagu that everything that he (Mr. Montagu) suggested was wrong, and enquired what exactly Mr. Montagu wanted of them. To which he replied :

You are here to suggest the best policy that you can possibly devise. If you do not like my policy and can suggest a better one, tear my schemes up.

To which Lord Pentland replied :

Oh : if that is what you want, you will never get it.

In order to placate them, he yielded up much that he cherished. On one occasion he went so far as to say :

Well, I will drop all talk of lubricants; I will defend the indefensible by seeing that the Civil Service are left with some functions to perform.

Even so, he could not get their cordial approval to the final compromises.

I have come to an agreement with the Government of India which nobody accepts, and that is what I have always feared might be the outcome. You see, there has been nobody that has constructed; they have only acquiesced; and where I fear my own proposals may have

been spoiled is in my desperate endeavour to find compromises at every stage.

The non-cooperation of the bureaucracy Mr. Montagu felt intensely. He felt he was alone in his mighty task. He received but little constructive criticism.

Well, it cannot be helped; I have got to go on alone. It is appalling to have to create one's own schemes, and, not only that, but to create one's criticisms of one's own schemes.

As some compensation for all this Mr. Montagu valued his popularity with Indians.

When I am haunted day and night as to whether my expedition has failed or not, whether my plan will be rejected by the Indians and howled at by the English and laughed to scorn by constitutional historians, I do take satisfaction to myself at finding how excellently I have got on with the Indians, be they the Indian politicians or the Indian princes. The same method is wanted for both—a sympathetic desire to find out what it is they want, and a perfectly frank expression of your own opinion. The terribly strained relations between the Government and the people now seems to me to be due more to the Government always talking to the people with reservations, which show they are founded on distrust than on anything else; and if you do not trust a man, he will not behave as if he ought to be trusted.

Mr. Montagu was dead opposed to repression of public opinion. The heads of the Provincial Governments who assembled in Delhi discussed the methods of dealing with political agitation. Mr. Montagu listened to the debate for over two hours and when he was asked for his views, he records having said :

I told them that I was more depressed than I could say by what they had said; that I did not seem to talk the same language as they did; that I daresay they were right; but if they were right, then our policy was wrong; we need not discuss political reform any further. The announcement of August 20 was wrong; the Morley-Minto reform scheme was wrong, and India ought not to have any political institutions. It was monstrous to say that a man could not make the same speech outside the Council that he could inside; it was monstrous to say that an official must be a politician inside a Council, using his vote and influence in political matters, sitting on Executive Councils which were really Cabinets, and then must take no part in politics outside. Their scheme dated from a day before Parliamentary institutions dawned in India. I heard them say, to my amazement, that it was a most disquieting sign that agitation was spreading to the villages. What was the unfortunate politician in India to do? He was told he could not have self-government because there was no electorate, because only the educated wanted it, because the villagers had no political instincts; and then when he went out into the villages to try and make an electorate, to try and create a political desire, he was told that he was agitating, and that the agitation must be put a stop to. The right answer to agitation was to remove all justifiable causes for it, and then we have a good answer to everything that the agitator said. Agitation should be answered by agitation. We should try and educate the villagers; we should put our case, but to sit quiet whilst an agitator was agitating and then intern him showed that we had no answer.....Disaffection was an excellent thing if it meant that you were teaching a man that he must hope for better things. Our whole policy was to make India a political country, and it was absolutely impossible to associate that with repression.

No Indian Nationalist could have put it more strongly. No wonder the provincial autocrats "looked very gloomy" when they were given this castigation, a unique experience in their careers as Governors.

It is interesting to note that within a month of his arrival in India Mr. Montagu was inclined to give full provincial autonomy to the Indian provinces. Writing on the 4th Dec. he makes two references to it.

I rather think, as I write now, that I am quite prepared to give full responsible government, subject to very little fundamental legislation in the Provinces.....  
As every day goes by I am more inclined to accept complete responsible government for the Provinces.

He struggled hard and fought every inch to give as much of autonomy as possible to the provinces, and his struggles are depicted in the "Diary." One such attempt was to limit the right of the Government of India to interfere with the autonomy of the provinces:

I am perfectly prepared to give the Government of India power to interfere when a Province trespasses on the affairs of other Province or upon the affairs of the Government of India, and I am perfectly prepared to preserve their power of Ordinances. Further than this I do not like to go.

Regarding the ultimate constitution of India, Mr. Montagu felt it would be a federation, consisting of Indian States and equally autonomous British Provinces—an anticipation of the Simon Scheme. In the Scheme which he drafted on the 12th Dec. 1917 he proposed that Indian princes should be invited to sit with the Government of India for Imperial purposes, and adds:

This will not appear so strange as it is now, as in groping federation Provincial autonomy becomes more complete, until it is found that nearly, if not all, the functions left to the Government of India concern the Native States, i. e., Customs concern the people of Bikaner when they smoke imported cigars.

Again on the 18th Dec. he defends the creation of a Second Chamber in the Central legislature because

It has the incidental advantage of incorporating into the fabric of the Indian constitution something which ought to spread and extend, and be the machinery for incorporating the princes sooner or latter.

The ultimate federal constitution he thought would be

A sort of Bundesrath containing delegates appointed by each Government (Provincial) and the Native States.

Mr. Montagu was not soft to the Indian princes.

I told Bikaner that although we would always defend the States against interference by British Indians, yet British Indians would be bound to criticise more and more if Indian Native States did not come into line with modern developments. He said he quite agreed, and expected bombs in Native States. I asked how many Native States had separate civil lists, and he said: "Very few."

The whole "Diary" is of absorbing interest of the Indian Nationalist. He will realise how thoroughly and wholly Mr. Montagu was in accord with his own sentiments and policies, notwithstanding that Mr. Montagu was a Britisher and a Secretary of State for India. No Indian Nationalist could excel Mr. Montagu in his devotion to Indian nationalism.

BHISHMA.

## Reviews.

### THE FUTURE OF CIVILISATION.

**OUR CHANGING CIVILIZATION.** By JOHN HERMANN RANDALL. (Allen & Unwin.) 1929. 21cm. 362p. 12/6.

**THE DRIFT OF CIVILIZATION.** By CHARLES C. ABBOT AND OTHERS. (Allen & Unwin.) 1930. 20cm 254p. 7/6.

**THE RENEWAL OF CULTURE.** By LARS RINGBOM. (Allen & Unwin.) 1929. 20cm. 222p. 7/6. The Great War and Spengler have set people thinking on the future of civilisation and we are getting as a result a considerable literature which seeks to analyse and give expression to the hopes and fears of the present generation in Western countries. America is in a material sense much stronger now in relation to Europe than it was before the war, but Americans are not less concerned about the future of their civilisation and culture than Europeans; and what is more interesting, they are concerned about what the older nations of Europe think of them and their new ways. Of the three books mentioned at the head of this review the first is the attempt of an American philosopher to explain how science and the machine are reconstructing modern life; the second is a reprint, slightly altered, of articles contributed, for the most part by European thinkers, to the Fiftieth Anniversary number of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* and the last is an English translation of a Swedish work published five years ago in which Dr. Ringbom sets forth a 'novel and interesting' biological theory of the renewal of culture. All these books are alike in one respect. They are optimistic in outlook; they face the future, not indeed without some anxiety, but with confidence and hope. But their methods of approach differ widely from one another.

Dr. J. H. Randall is strong on the side of history. He states his theme in the form of an antithesis. "There are two worlds apart, that of the (Italian) peasant and that of the German museum. In which are we really living today? In truth, we inhabit both. . . . Our machinery is modern; but our institutions are mediæval." It is our task 'to bring to pass a good life from out its conflicting currents.' He points out that a culture is the resultant of the interaction of three factors: physical environment, human nature and social heritage. He traces the history of western culture in modern times by studying the effects on the advent at first of science, and then of its fruit, machinery, on religion, art and morals. The thoughtful reader will demur to some remarks of the author, but he will on the whole find much that is sound and true. He recognises that so far Americans have done nothing for themselves in culture; we 'have gone farthest in destroying the old civilisation, who just because they are not too deeply entangled in it are most free to take from it only what is really valuable, and build a new structure on the basis of science and the machine, need not too easily despair. They may be fated to be the Athenians of the new world." Dr. Randall does not forget that cultural change 'never follows the course that might have been predicted.' Still he cannot resist the temptation to predict and it is not without interest to see what his vision of the new Athens is like. It will, as our author sees it, be spiritually poorer than the past and economically poorer than the present. "Respect for human personality, freedom for its development, fruitful and harmonious human intercourse, the passion for beauty and the

thirst for truth—these goods we shall strive after, though the ways be strange. The forms they take will differ from the past."

And the author sheds a tear "for the Christian or Jewish household of our youth, that old ideal of the independent home now fading before apartments and cooperative cooking and working wives and our changing sex life." By no means original in its thought or even complete in its analysis, the book is still a valuable record of an American Professor's view of how the present came to be what it is and of what the future may bring forth.

We cannot be too grateful to those who were responsible for the decision to preserve in book form the seventeen short Essays that make up *The Drift of Civilisation*. They are grouped under three heads—the future of man, of science and of America. Each essay gives lucid and powerful expression, often charged with intense emotion, to some vital aspect of modern life and culture. Man, 'the most enigmatic of all creatures inhabiting the earth,' says Maxim Gorky, at the end of the opening essay, "is an adornment of the world and has every reason to be amazed at himself." The essays that follow present the many facts of this fine statement on man's place in the world. It would be invidious to pick out particular essays for commendation from such an excellent collection; but the concluding essay of Stephen Leacock on 'The Future of American Humour' is in its way quite as characteristic of its author as Gorky's on Man. The American joke, says Leacock, 'belongs in the same international class as the British constitution, German metaphysics, and French champagne.' Its spirit of irreverence is only a way of looking for truth; but to-day American humour is being more and more forced to express itself in American wit. 'Humour is a form of thought, with a form of words'—and we all go now too fast to think.

Dr. Ringbom's *Renewal of Culture* is a rather strange mixture of science and race prejudice. It seeks to develop a biological analysis of social development, but it is on a background of Nordic patriotism. The main thesis of the book is that culture is the resultant of the interaction of two modes of social reaction, individualistic and collectivistic. Man is individualistic, woman collectivistic. Some races are individualistic (masculine), others are collectivistic (feminine). The Eastern nations are of course feminine. Scandinavia with its population of Nordic race and Finland would be the first starting point of a new individualism in future. This thesis which has been stated here in a bald outline is presented with great persuasiveness and in an apparently scientific and realistic manner. But the author incidentally touches on important issues like conscription and disarmament, social democracy, education, the crisis in culture today and the symptoms of regeneration. And his sustained and forcible plea for the elimination of the principle of subordination as a social factor, in politics, economic life, education etc. and the substitution in its place of voluntary cooperation points the road to a new freedom and a fresh renewal of culture. At least one reader of the book agrees with Edward Westermarck's just observation on it "that even those who may not always agree with the views expressed in these essays will admit that their author is an original and thoughtful seeker of truth with wide human sympathies, whose arguments are well worth listening to."

K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI.

## MODERN SEX PROBLEMS.

**THE MODERN ATTITUDE TO THE SEX PROBLEM.** By KENNETH INGRAM. (Allen & Unwin.) 1930. 20 cm. 158 p. 5/—

MR. INGRAM is a well-known London journalist and writer on moral and religious issues. A man of ripe experience, he has the happy gift of entering into the minds and problems of the younger generation. He has already written one book on sex, in which one can find the outspoken and fresh treatment which is a quality of the book before us.

Mr. Ingram starts by a fair but hearty attack on what he calls the "Victorian Code." He drives this home by an amusing delineation of a fictitious person, who illustrates his strictures. Similarly in the chapter on Free Love the position is clarified by the introduction of another imaginary person.

Briefly, the position of the Victorians, the advocates of Free Love, and the usual Church mode of approach are all impartially criticised and dismissed—the first as teaching the subservience of women and a double code of morals for men and women, the second because it could not fail to lead to an increasingly sexual atmosphere with an inevitable decline in intellectual pursuits, and the third as virtually teaching that once married a man may do what he likes. We heartily agree with the author that sometimes there is more real immorality and sexual excess among married people than can be justified. Both this attitude and the Victorian attitude are inclined to accept the inferior position of the woman, who also is at times the mere slave of her husband's passion.

The chapter on the views expounded recently by Bertrand Russell is particularly good in that it does not attack free-love by doctrinaire views as to what is or what is not moral, but bases its criticism on the assumption that unlimited intercourse can only lead to a declension in intellectual and mental vigour. It points out that the sex instinct and the love instinct are by no means the same, and that Mr. Russell's plan is retrograde because it allows the sex instinct to predominate. Bernard Shaw is quoted as prophesying the time when sex will be quite subservient to the mind. Then follows a sane and reasonable chapter on the problem of Inversion, in which a careful distinction is made between Homosexuality and the Homogenic temperament. This leads to the concluding chapters wherein the author's most original and somewhat surprising idea is to be found. This is none other than the emergence of a new type of being. Very vividly he suggests this by an imaginary debate or frank analysis of themselves by a group of young men and women.

The argument is perhaps summed up at the end by one of them, a woman, who says "We don't look at sex in the same way as you do. We don't look at it as being sufficiently important to be dreadfully wicked or dreadfully thrilling. Our love affairs are intense friendships—friendships with all sorts of people. It doesn't interest us a bit how much sex comes in or doesn't."

Mr. Ingram then suggests the evolution of a "bisexual" type, based on the fact of the increasing emancipation of woman and her growing likeness to man. Of course he does not mean that distinctions will not remain but artificial barriers will be broken down. Life will no longer be regarded through exclusively sexual spectacles: there is introduced the homogenic attraction. Woman will be regarded as a comrade rather than as a foreign race. Such an elimination of the sex barrier will lead to the primary element in a romantic attachment being affinity of interests, not the mere fact of one party being a



woman; the sexual aspect is made secondary. This is perhaps the real implication of the use of the phrase 'homogenic'. It is the meeting of like with like without any necessary reference to sex at all. There arises the inevitable suspicion of homosexuality in any shape or form, and this is justified in that homogenic attraction is not intended for a sexual channel. Sex arises from dissimilarities, the homogenic side from affinities. Fraternal affection is homogenic, it may be deeply emotional or passionate in nature, but the close affinity prevents the rising of the sex instinct. It is concluded that homogenic attachment does not inevitably lead to sexual expression. The homogenic temperament is virile and balanced, while the inverted temperament is warped and perverted owing to the unnatural repression of the heterosexual side.

It is concluded that the emerging type will be a happy blend of the homogenic and sexual elements in society. Marriage will be based rather on homogenic ties, e. g., intellectual affinity, than on sexual dissimilarity. The effect of this new "bisexual" type will be to lessen the sexual stress of life, and despite occasional disharmonies and moral lapses, will lead to a purer and healthier moral tone. The new type should make an important and beneficial contribution to the society of the human race. The book is not only full of new ideas, racy with modernity, but it gives some commonsense and spiritual advice as to the ordering of life, which all might take to heart. There is nothing in it which can offend, much that will enlighten and give food for thought.

SACHIDANAND, C. S. S.

### FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

**THE FAILURE OF FEDERALISM IN AUSTRALIA.** By A. P. CANAWAY, (Oxford University Press) 1930. 23 cm. 215 p. 12/6.

THE title of this work will arrest much public attention in India today owing to an identical issue being now before the Round Table Conference. The author, who is a lawyer in the State of the New South Wales, puts up a vigorous plea for the revision of the constitution of Australia from the federal to a unitary basis. His principal thesis is that the federal organisation of Australia has proved to be unsatisfactory. It has impaired the efficiency of the governmental instruments which have failed to be true interpreters of national policy. The author cites three outstanding instances where the governmental mechanism failed to give effective expression to the Australian national mind, as he conceives it. In the first place, the unification of railway gauge is a measure of urgent economic reform which has been long overdue. Secondly, the movement of population from the countryside to the city has proceeded at a disquietingly rapid rate in recent years to the great detriment of the vital economic interest of Australia. Against this movement the Governments of the States have failed to apply correctives. Thirdly, the Government have been unable to arrest the rapid growth of public expenditure and reduce it to the economic capacity of the nation even though the need for such reform has been recognised for a number of years. These 'failures', though not many in number, are serious enough, and though the author does not state at length the circumstances under which they have come about, would obviously have his readers believe that they were due to the federal organisation of the instruments of government. Readers who are not readily disposed to fall in with the suggestion of the author or are not predisposed in favour of a unitary system, might

argue that the impotence of the Government to carry out certain policies might be due to reasons other than the federal constitution.

On the whole, the facts that the author marshals in support of his case do not carry conviction. It is the theoretical presentation of his case against federalism as such, irrespective of its Australian application, which is of real interest to the Indian readers. The author devotes three chapters to the three theoretical objections which he advances against federalism as a political system. Firstly, as a result of the division of the field of government and the setting up of multiple institutions, the Government, whether federal or State, cannot take complete stock of a given political situation. Nor can the co-ordination of policy of two Governments be always maintained. Secondly, the multiplication of authorities, each claiming allegiance from the citizen under a federal system, tends to weaken his sense of what may, in the Kantian language, be described as the 'political absolute.' Thirdly, the author suggests that federalism militates against successful working of responsible government. On careful examination it would appear that Mr. Canaway's first proposition is based on a too rigid analogy between the body politic and a higher organism—an analogy which he has worked out at great length to yield his desired conclusion. Moreover, a state of continuous conflict between the two organs of the government has been assumed by the author as inherent in any system of federal organisation. The psychological effect of federalism as assessed by him is more ingenious than real. The inconsistency which the author has laboured to prove between federalism and responsible government is also very much strained. A ministry under parliamentary government has to leave office on some occasions for no valid ground except is remote responsibility for an act of commission or omission which cannot legally be attributed to it. Federal or unitary, such a risk is incidental to responsible government itself and has to be faced under any circumstances. The author, to our mind, has hit on the essence of the problem underlying federalism in page 50 of the book. Its success depends to a very large extent on the judicious division of functions and powers between the Federal and the State Governments. The bulk of Australia's difficulties which the author refers to has originated from the extremely wide, specially the residual, powers enjoyed by the States under the Constitution. In an age when the economic and, for the matter of that, the fundamental interest of every country depends on a careful adjustment of its relations with world economic forces, it is obvious that the largest scope must be given for the free play of co-ordinated national policy. United States happen to be the only country which is very largely independent of other countries for its economic welfare and it is probably the reason why it has not hitherto come to grief for the pronounced chauvinism of its States. But for Australia it was a dangerous model to follow. It must, however, be understood that federalism does not necessarily connote wide and residual powers for the component governments. And India may well embark on a federal career with ample safeguards against difficulties which Australia is suffering from today.

K. M. P.

### ANOTHER WAR-BOOK.

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

THE writer of a War Book has ready to hand, as material, agonies and horrors of a vastness that a sensational novelist of blood and thunder might

envy but cannot invent. He has but to dish up, with naked and unabashed realism, his experiences of sodden trenches, reeking corpses and shrieks of pain, to make his book a roaring "best-seller." Erich Remarque's *All Quiet on the Western Front* is a challenging instance. His aim, and the aim of many others with his intense temperament, is not to regale the reader with the joys of creative art but to transport him in imagination to that Walpurgis night of horrors known as the Great War. Some of these craftsmen committing their war-time experiences to cold print, a decade later, could string together episodes of heart-rending pain and whole-sale murder with the calm leisureliness of a Jane Austen painting in half-inch ivory the elusive little humours and jealousies of sheltered country homes. Mr. Haslam, who began life as a mathematics teacher before he became a Lewis-gunner with a charmed life, and later on a prisoner, is doubtless a "Janeite" with an arch humour and a nonchalant air. In *Cannon Fodder* he elects to tell his story under the fictitious name of Francis Cresswell.

Mr. Haslam Cresswell would himself be amused were he to be told of somebody making a serious comparison between his book and masterpieces like Mr. H. M. Tomlinson's *All Our Yesterdays* and C. E. Montague's *Disenchantment*; the former surveying the War with a telescopic vision, as from the top of Mt. Blanc or Arrarat, and interpreting in superb language its psychology, its causes and consequences with pictorial power and philosophic insight; the latter, written nine years since, a matchless study of pre-war Jingoism and sentimentality shading off into the bitterest of disillusionments, couched in a scholarly prose of exquisite beauty. Nor is *Cannon Fodder* a patch on Mr. Blunden's *Undertones of War* or Mr. Robert Graves' *Goodbye to All That*, with their literary grace never for long playing truant. It is interesting yarn—a curate's egg, if you will, very good in parts—told with a sly humour; though one cannot help wishing now and then that the narrative was less sprawling and inconsequential in its garb.

Mr. Haslam rightly traces the war to fierce international jealousies and aggressions, to commercial rivalries fomented by capitalists and financiers. But we cannot agree with him when he implies that England and Germany were equally to blame for rushing into the mad death-grapple. It is true that pre-War Germany was but desperately trying to overtake England by bettering her example, which after all gave the cue to Pan-Germanism; and true also that Bernhardt, Treitschke and the rest, in forging a philosophy of *machtpolitik*, were merely crystallizing the lessons drawn from British Imperialism so that Germany might not lack for doctrine in her ambition for world-power. But, under William II, Germany, as everyone knows, so far perfected her war-machine and developed her intoxication for power that she began to hunger for the mad plunge. This does not, however, exonerate England from her Germano-phobia, and once the war broke out, of course, the English press was up to any lie—even the gruesome one of a German corpse factory. To quote a sentence of C. E. Montague's, "scrofulous minds at home had long been itching, publicly and in print, to bomb German women and children from aeroplanes, and to 'take it out' of German prisoners of war."

Mr. Haslam is a hearty hater of war, and men like him are the pledge of the future. It is a sad and dear-bought wisdom that escapes from him when he says: "There used to be a close association between honour and duelling. The association between patriotism and the cutting of throats is even closer"—patriotism as commonly understood.

R. SADASIWA AIYAR.

## INTRODUCTION TO REVOLT.

**SPEECHES OF MAXIMILIEN ROBESPIERRE; KARL LIEBKNECHT; LENIN AND EUGENE V. DEBS.** [Voices of Revolt Series]. (International Publishers, New York.) 1927-28. 20cm. pp. 89; 93; 94 and 95. 50 cents each.

BEFORE me are four little books, attractively got up conveying four Voices of Revolt, that of Lenin, Liebknecht, Debs and Robespierre. The voice of the immortal Frenchman whom bourgeois historians of the French Revolution loved once to paint as a monster, recounting tales of unspeakable calumny, thrills us even to-day making real the things of the day before yesterday and battles long ago. Whether he demands the head of the King or identifies himself with French Socialism of the 19th century, his words still sway the heart of men with the fervour and power of an Idea which is moulded as yet imperfectly by the stress of two centuries. Hear him as he discourses on Property in a speech which was a charter to left republicans of 1830, 1848 and 1870. "Property", he says, "has no moral principle in the eyes of all these persons (i. e. aristocrats). Why does your Declaration of the Rights of Man suffer from the same defect? In your defence of liberty, you have stated—and rightly so—that it is limited by the right of one's neighbour; why have you not applied the same principle to property which after all is a social institution? You have increased the number of articles in order to afford the largest possible latitude to the right to one's property, and yet you have not added a word in limitation of this right, with the result that your Declaration of the Rights of Man might make the impression of having been created not for the poor, but for the rich, the speculators, the stock-exchange jobbers." And really it has been so. The name 'Republic' avails the French proletariat nothing.

The booklets on Lenin and Liebknecht—Liebknecht who is one of the few European Socialists for whose sincerity Lenin had great respect—are less satisfactory. The series is no doubt meant to introduce these leaders of revolt to working men and others who do not know anything about them and as it aims at giving both an introduction to their ideas and a selection of their speeches it can hardly be blamed, specially if one looks to the size of the books, but nevertheless one feels that a more judicious selection could have been made from these two latest exponents of the Rights of Man.

This cannot be said about the wholly admirable introduction and selection of speeches in the booklet on Debs who at the age of 65 was cast into prison for incurring the displeasure of American plutocrats, hirers of gunmen, and who, as he went to his cell, flashed the following message to the workers whose minds and hearts were turned to him:—"I enter the prison doors a flaming revolutionist,—my head erect, my spirit untamed and my soul unconquerable".

J. J. VAKIL

## SHORT NOTICES.

**EDUCATION AS SERVICE.** (2nd Edn.) By J. KRISHNAMURTI. (Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar, Madras.) 1930. 20cm. 75p. As. 12.

THE thoughts and suggestions contained in this book are of tremendous importance to all, especially to those who have the privilege and ability to serve their younger brothers.

It is a book full of life which deals with love, discrimination, desirelessness, good conduct; I cannot comprehend a greater service to the world than

to work on these beautiful suggestions which, I sincerely hope, will have a universal appeal.

P. E. M. CRESSWELL.

### RELIGION, COLONISING AND TRADE. THE DRIVING FORCES OF THE OLD EMPIRE.

By SIR CHARLES LUCAS. (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.) 1930. 20cm. 84p. 3/6.

SIR CHARLES LUCAS is a writer of repute and British Empire is his forte. In this small book he examines the three main motives or forces which made or marred the old Empire. Starting from the sixteenth century the learned author proceeds to describe the part played by trade, colonisation and religion in the building of the Old Empire. We need hardly say that Sir Charles' book is interesting even if it adds little to our knowledge of the subject.

M. V. SUBRAHMANYAM.

## Miscellaneous.

### MR. SASTRI'S SPEECH AT THE R. T. C.

The following is the full text of the speech of the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri at the Round Table Conference on Nov. 20.

Prime Minister: Two ideas have emerged from the debates to which we have listened and which now dominate our minds. One is that of Dominion Status for India as the natural outcome of India's constitutional evolution. The other is that of federation as the proper form of the future polity of India, including both British India and the Indian States. This latter idea is comparatively new. We have struggled for Dominion Status for some time, and at last it seems to have found acceptance from the spokesmen to whom we have listened of both the Conservative and the Liberal Parties.

The idea of federation, I must confess, is comparatively new to me. I struggled hard against it until the other day. Now I confess I am a convert. (Applause). I have listened both in private and at this table to the Princes and their spokesmen, and may I say with all due respect to them that they have brought me round to their view both by the sincerity of their declarations as to Dominion Status and by the tone of restraint and moderation in which they have spoken of the terms of federation itself.

It only remains for me to say one word of caution. Great ideas thrown together into the arena of politics sometimes work together and co-operate with each other up to a certain stage, but may tend, when pushed each to its consummation, to collide and even to weaken each other. I do hope that in the deliberations of the committees to which we shall consign these great topics nothing will be done on the side of those who care for federation more than for Dominion Status to weaken the latter, just as nothing should be done on the side of those who care for Dominion Status more than for federation to weaken federation.

Now, Prime Minister, may I address myself to another subject of the greatest importance. The idea of fear which is in the minds of many British people when they contemplate a large advance in constitutional status is that any polity that we may construct here, or that we may lay the foundations of, may pass, as respects its machinery, into the hands of those who now belong to the Indian National Congress Party and who have brought about the serious situation which has led to the summoning of the

Round Table Conference. I do not think that that fear is unreasonable. It is natural. I think we who speak for India are under an obligation to meet that fear in earnest and try to convince the British people that either the fears may be countered by cautionary measures or that the fears have no foundation in fact. Much has been said by my friends who spoke on this side about the very large and considerable sections of the population whom Congress propaganda has not touched so far, who remain loyal to the British connection and who may be trusted, when there is serious danger, to stand by the British flag at all costs.

May I add another source of comfort—and in saying this I shall perhaps strike a note out of the line of orthodox defence of politics. Prime Minister, who are these people from whom we fear disturbance? No doubt they have caused trouble so far. Are our measures here not designed to conciliate them? Are these not pacificatory steps that we are taking? Are they not calculated to win over once more their hearts to the ways of loyalty and ordered progress?

Believe me, they are not hereditary criminals; they are not savage barbarian hordes; they are not the sworn enemies of Great Britain or of British institutions. They are men of culture, men of honour, most of them, men who have made their mark in the professions. They are our kinsmen both in spirit and by blood. It is a sense of political grievance that has placed them in this position, which we view with so much distrust and so much disapprobation. Remove that discontent and you will find them alongside of you, working the new constitution that we shall frame to its highest issues and drawing from those new institutions that we frame all the benefit of which they are capable. The toils and trials of public life are well-known to us all. I am on the side of law and order. I have never been within proximity of the goal, but I am a political agitator. I know how near I am to those whose methods I join with you in condemning to-day. Often in my life has the Government viewed my activities with suspicion and set its spies upon me. My life has not been one of unalloyed happiness; my way has not been free from thorns—and, Mr. Prime Minister, your experience is not altogether foreign to them!

Let us not be carried away in this matter, then, too much by a sense of self-righteousness. Very little indeed divides those who now champion law and order and those who, impelled by the purest patriotism, have found themselves on the other side. Adopt measures born of conciliation; set the constitution of India in proper order; and we, whom this political difference has unhappily divided, will find ourselves once more co-operators for the welfare and contentment and ordered progress of India. Therein lies the strength of the situation to-day. Our enemies are not bad men; they are good men whom we have alienated by unfortunate political happenings. It is easy to bring them round. Let us make an honest attempt and, by God's grace, our work shall be rewarded both here and in India, and we shall find India once more not only happy within her borders but a contented partner in the British Commonwealth.

## Correspondence.

### FEDERALISM IN INDIA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR.—I read with great interest the article on "Federalism in India" by Professor D. G. Karve in the issue of the "Servant of India" of the 20th of November. In the course of his remarks, he makes a reference to my definition of 'federalism' and considers it un-

necessarily narrow. I do not complain of this criticism; but I should like to explain my reasons for defining a federal government as I did in my book on "Indian Constitutional Problems". I agree that 'federalism' is not a legal term, but is a political fact, or rather, denotes a political fact.

The questions which I put to myself are these: (1) Is there any real distinction between the unitary structure of government and the federal structure? (2) Is it a difference in kind or a difference in degree? (3) If it is a difference in kind, what is the test to be applied for determining whether a constitution belongs to one type or the other?

If the terms 'unitary' and 'federal' denote the same kind of structure, there is hardly any need for two separate terms, unless it be that they express differences of degree like 'heat' and 'cold'. There are many things with regard to which it may be said that, though the difference is one of degree, it is still of importance. Nevertheless, the use of different terms has a tendency to create confusion of ideas. But where the difference is one of kind, it is desirable to have a clear notion of the differential characteristic. There may be cases on the border-line which there may be some difficulty in assigning to one category or the other. But this does not affect the validity of the distinction. I attach some importance to a clear definition of the words and conceptions we deal with, especially where there is a difference in kind. I may perhaps be one of those who, in the opinion of Prof. Sidgwick, attach undue importance to the aim of getting a clear and sharp distinction. I believe, and I am supported in my opinion by Sir John Marriott, that the difference between the federal and the unitary type is one of kind and not merely one of degree.

Examining the various definitions of federal and unitary governments which have been suggested by different writers, I find it difficult to adopt any more vital distinction or clear definition than what I have attempted. Some of the so-called characteristics of federal government relate either to the origin of the structure or the conditions essential to the success of the federal constitution. Differences of origin are comparatively accidental and a federal constitution may succeed even in the absence of some of the conditions considered essential. But a distinction based upon the powers and attributes of the component parts of a federal government cuts more deeply into the essence of things.

I agree with Prof. Karve that the issue as to the seat of the residual authority is not germane to the distinction between unitary and federal. Prof. Karve thinks that the passage regarding the constitution of Croatia, which he extracts from p. 428 of Sidgwick's "Development of European Polity", is opposed to my definition which lays stress upon the power of altering the distribution of powers and functions between the central and provincial governments. I fail to see anything in this passage which militates against my view. The relation between Croatia and Hungary is referred to by Sidgwick as a peculiar kind of federality. So far as I can see, the government of Croatia in 1872 occupied a subordinate position to the kingdom of Hungary. Prof. Karve has italicised the words 'two or more' in my definition as if he took exception to it. If there is only one province in a country, there cannot be a whole and a part and the question of the relations between the central and provincial governments would not arise, unless we choose to call local self-governing bodies provincial governments. Prof. Karve does not give any instance of a federation in which the distribution of powers can be altered

by the central legislature alone or without recourse to extra-ordinary procedure. Prof. Karve thinks that a constitution may be called federal in which the central legislature is competent to alter the distribution of functions between itself and the provincial legislatures. In this case the provincial legislatures would be subordinate to, and dependent upon, the central legislature and would enjoy no constitutional guarantee of their jurisdiction. It would certainly amount to erasing the distinction between the unitary and the federal type. A clear and precise, as well as balanced and stable, constitutional division of governmental functions between the government of the whole and the government of the parts is treated by Prof. Sidgwick as an essential characteristic of the modern idea of a federal State.

Apart from the question of scientific classification and nomenclature, I am glad to express my entire agreement with Prof. Karve in regard to the important attributes of a future constitution of India.

P. S. SIVASWAMY AIYAR.

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

- MARCHING MEN. THE STORY OF WAR. By STANTON A. COBLENTZ. (World To-morrow, New York.) 1927. 24cm 488p. \$3.50.  
 TEN YEARS OF WORLD CO-OPERATION. (League of Nations, Geneva.) 1930. 24cm. 467p. About 10/-  
 A PICTURE OF WORLD ECONOMIC CONDITIONS AT THE BEGINNING OF 1930. (National Industrial Conference Board, New York.) 1930. 23cm. 126p. \$ 2.50.  
 ANNUAL REPORT: INDIAN MERCHANTS' CHAMBER, 1929, Bombay, 1930. 22cm. 677p.  
 THE HISTORY OF JAHANGIR. By FRANCIS GLADWIN. (B. G. PAUL & Co., Madras.) 1930. 22cm. 184p. Rs. 5.

## THE ARYAN PATH

An International Monthly Journal, Non-Political devoted to the dissemination of spiritual, idealistic and humanitarian principles.

### CONTENTS FOR DECEMBER.

- The Cycle for Resolve  
 Plato's View of the Spiritual Life—By E. H. Blakeney.  
 Schopenhauer and The East  
 —By Richard Mueller-Freienfels.  
 The Message of Indian Temples—By S. V. Venkateswara.  
 The Path According to A: Hujwiri—By Margaret Smith.  
 Literature and Life—By A. N. M.  
 Work With A Will—By W. Stede.  
 Drama The Organic Part of Human Life  
 —By Huntly Carter  
 The School of Oriental Studies—By Sir E. Denison Ross.  
 Pongal, the Aryan Christmas—By N. Kasturi Iyer.  
 Race and Culture—By Dr. Kelly Miller.  
 Social Evils of Birth Prevention  
 —By Dr. Halliday Sutherland.  
 Hindu Names—By V. Naraynan.  
 NOTES ON THE ABOVE  
 Moral Audit in Industry—By Jerome Davis.  
 In The Word of Books—By J. D. Beresford and others.  
 CORRESPONDENCE  
 ENDS AND SAYINGS

Annual Subscription: Rs. 10. Single Copy Re. 1.

THEOSOPHY CO., (INDIA) LTD.,  
 51, ESPLANADE ROAD, BOMBAY.