

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO. OFFICIATING EDITOR : S. G. VAZE.

OFFICE : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S HOME, POONA 4.

VOL. XIV NO. 30. }

POONA—THURSDAY, JULY 30, 1931.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	357
ARTICLES :—	
“Democracy at Other People's Cost.”	359
Retrenchment in Bombay.	359
Labour in India.—II. By P. G. Kanekar.	361
REVIEWS :—	
Life on the Indian Frontier. By Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer, K. C. S. I., C. I. E.	362
Effects of Indian Fiscal Policy. By G. B. J.	363
SHORT NOTICES.	363
MISCELLANEOUS :—	
Indian States' Problems—Mr. A. V. Thakkar's Speech.	363
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
The “National” Language—An Experience. By S. D. N.	368

Topics of the Week.

Violent Crime.

LAST week witnessed two violent outrages on high officials of State. The district judge of Alipore was assassinated and the Acting Governor of Bombay narrowly escaped assassination. The increase in the frequency of such crimes of violence must fill every one with profound concern for the country's future. That these crimes have been occurring after a truce between Government and the party of non-co-operation and on the eve of the latter's participation in a Conference held for the avowed purpose of settling the political destiny of the country furnishes proof of a most disquieting nature that there are more extreme elements in the country than the Congress and that these have to be reckoned with in considering the adequacy of pacificatory measures.

We have no doubt that such manifestations of violence will be unreservedly condemned by all except those who belong to the party of violence. Mahatma Gandhi has denounced the attempt on Sir E. Hotson's life in terms which will be very pleasing to the Acting Governor. He should also be fully satisfied of the earnestness of the authorities of the Fergusson College where the outrage took place in putting down crime and discouraging disorderliness and indiscipline. The College has had a long unbroken tradition in this respect which those who are at present in control are resolute in maintaining at its highest. The Principal soon after the event went round to every class one day and asked the students to signify their assent to an expression of sorrow and abhorrence for the outrage itself and for the unseemly behaviour of some of the students afterwards. They did so without the least hesitation. We cannot but feel that such a hearty assent was due in no small measure to the high esteem and affection in which the students as a

body hold the Principal and his colleagues. Such an unambiguous and unanimous vote is not possible, we are afraid, in many another college and the least of all in Government managed institutions. This does not mean that the generality of students countenance violence or disobedience, but the crowd psychology of the students joined to the genuine admiration which they feel for acts of utter sacrifice and heroism, however misguided, would render it peculiarly hard in any educational institution to get the support of the young men in favour of a resolution such as was passed in the Fergusson College.

The whole Presidency therefore has reason to feel devoutly thankful that the College in these times of stress and strain is being administered by a body of workers in whose firmness and tact entire confidence can be placed. We are sure Sir E. Hotson himself realises this, but if there are any officials who do not and who would take the occasion of this regrettable incident to persecute the College authorities, we wish to give them a warning in our humble way, first, the country is not now in a mood to put up with such undeserved persecution and, secondly, that it would recoil on Government itself inasmuch as it would surely lead to the growth of anarchism in the country beyond the control of any like the Principal and Professors of the Fergusson College who wish peace and order to rule in the country.

* * *

Lord Irwin on India.

SINCE his return to England Lord Irwin has been trying his best to make India better understood there. During the last week he spoke on three occasions on India. As everybody knows, narrow-visioned British Imperialists have taken none too kindly to his agreement with Mahatma Gandhi which restored peaceful conditions in India. Their criticism of the agreement is based mainly on the ground that it concedes freedom to the Indian people to have only such safeguards in future constitutional arrangements as are required in the interests of India alone. Is no consideration to be shown to British interests, they ask. Lord Irwin gently reminded them of the true relationship between England and India, which is that of a trustee towards a ward. When managing the affairs of his ward, the trustee is expected to safeguard the interests of the ward first and last. No decent trustee can therefore complain that while acting as such he was unable to gain any advantage for himself. If a trustee tried to do so, he would suffer in public estimation and would be regarded as taking an undue advantage of his position for his own ends. And yet that is exactly what such Imperialists wish British statesmen to do in their dealings with India when they lash themselves into fury because of the insertion in the agreement of the (to them) hated phrase “in the interests of India.” To such men Lord Irwin gave the much needed warning that apart from the ethics of such an arrangement the policy of safe-

guarding British interests at the cost of the Indian was foredoomed to failure. "Britain's greatest interest was a contented India within the Empire and that could never be permanently secured if Indians had cause to think that Britain was influenced by self-interest rather than the interest of India." The tragedy of the situation is that there still are people in Great Britain whose faith in the big stick as a means of solving the Indian problem is pathetic. The failure of such a policy of repression is to be seen in the estrangement of feeling between the rulers and the ruled to which it inevitably leads. The only manner in which British interests in India can be permanently safeguarded is, as pointed out by Lord Irwin in one of his speeches last week, "on the basis of mutual understanding and consent." To the extent to which this view permeates the British people, to that extent the difficulties before the R. T. C. on the British side will disappear. Recent writings in some of the British journals give ground for the hope that this view is being increasingly appreciated in England. *The Spectator*, e. g., has unequivocally asserted in its issue of July 4 that "the only safeguard which really matters is Indian goodwill,"—a sentiment which finds repeated expression in the course of its article and in fact forms the keystone of all its writings on India in recent months.

Reforms in the N. W. F. P.

THE report of the Committee appointed by the Government of India for the classification of subjects in the N. W. F. Province was published last week and seems to have given general satisfaction in that province. There has all along been an insistent demand from the people of the province that in the coming reforms the province should not be assigned a status in any way inferior to that of any other Indian province. This demand the Committee has found means of satisfying and has classed even law and order among provincial subjects. Owing to their very small proportion in the population the Hindus of the Province have always expressed great misgivings about their safety under an autonomous regime. The Committee's report has only served to make them still more nervous as to their future in the N. W. F. P. and to crystallise their opposition to the grant of any very substantial reforms to that province. So strong is the Hindu feeling on this subject that the only Hindu member from the Province on this Committee carried his opposition to its recommendations to the length of refusal to sign its report, his views being embodied in a lengthy dissenting minute. It is to be hoped that when the Province comes into its own as it is sure to do before very long, the majority will so conduct itself as to make the minority in the Province feel that its nervousness as regards its future was thoroughly misplaced. It will be seen that the recommendations of the Committee generally follow the lines laid down by the N. W. F. P. committee of the Round Table Conference.

The Committee's inquiries into the future financial position of the Province have disclosed the fact that an autonomous N. W. F. P. would not be also self-supporting. With a view to fill the gap between its income and expenditure sides the Committee has suggested a system of subventions from the Central Government. The first subvention has been fixed at Rs. 117 lakhs by the Committee, a figure revisable at the end of every five years commencing from 1933-34. It is not clear from the published summary of the Committee's report how long the Central Government is expected to help the new autonomous province with such financial assistance. We trust the Committee envisages a time, not too far distant, when the Province will be able to stand on its own legs and can do

without this help from the Central Government. For unless this happens, the province cannot be said to be in the enjoyment of real autonomy.

Greater Labour Representation at R. T. C.

PUBLIC dissatisfaction at the inadequacy of representation of labour and agricultural interests at the Round Table Conference found expression last week in the Bombay Legislative Council when Mr. Surve brought forward a motion for the presentation of an address to the Governor in order to impress this fact upon him. The occasion was availed of by representatives of different communities to press their own communal claims with the result that the debate soon degenerated into an unseemly communal tangle. Even so the amendment asking for greater Depressed Classes representation secured considerable support, as it deserved to do. What the practical effect of the debate will be, whether the demand made by the Council will be satisfied, is more than one can say. The nominations to the Federal Structure Committee are already out, while those to the Minorities Committee will be known shortly. Will the Prime Minister be induced to add to his list in the light of the recent discussions in the Bombay Council? This seems rather problematical. As a tactical move it would perhaps have been better if the Council instead of speaking with divided voices had concentrated on the demand for enlarged representation only for labour and agricultural interests. That would perhaps have been more effective. But the Council is, as everybody knows, anything but businesslike with the result that sometimes even good causes come to grief in its hands. Let us hope the present will not be among such.

States' Subjects' Representation On Federal Structure Committee.

THE failure on the part of the Prime Minister to include even a single representative of the subjects of Indian States among his latest nominations to the Federal Structure Committee has drawn from the *Indian Social Reformer* the following very pertinent comments:—

It is obvious that the Federal Committee must be gravely handicapped by the absence of any representative to speak for the States' people. Lord Willingdon has shown much insight and foresight in the handling of the political situation during the last three months. It is not, therefore, without some hope that we commend to His Excellency even at this late hour the addition of at least one representative of the States' subjects. It is said that the Princes object to sitting at the Conference with their subjects. But it is not difficult to find men who are not subjects of any of the Princes in the Federal Committee or in the Conference, who are equal in eminence to any of the Ministers who are delegates, and who also enjoy the confidence of the people of the States. Such a one is Sir M. Visvesvaraya whose presence will add to the weight and dignity of the Indian delegation.

The late Mr. E. Norton.

MR. ERDLEY NORTON whose regrettable death occurred recently in England will be remembered by the Indian public more for his part in the old Congress than for his leadership of the Bar in Calcutta or Madras. He belonged to that selfless band of Englishmen who made it a point to understand Indian aspirations in a sympathetic spirit. But he had some achievements of distinction, not the least important of which was his membership of the earliest Congress deputation to England in order to educate British opinion on right lines. In recent years Mr. Norton did not figure very much in the public eye; but that is no reason why praise should be withheld from him for his past services.

“ Democracy at Other People's Cost. ”

THIS striking phrase which occurs in the presidential speech delivered by Mr. Amritalal V. Thakkar of the Servants of India Society to the Punjab States' People's Conference at Simla on Friday last will live in men's memory if they have once heard or read it. And it very well deserves to live in men's memory too. Because it will call up to their minds a fact which, though very relevant to a proper appreciation of the various factors entering into the great question of federation, is too often ignored by the average politician. Any one who pleads for a stand-up fight for the election of the States' representatives in the federal legislature meets with the query: "But is it not an altogether extravagant demand? The Princes are first invited to part with their sovereignty. This in itself is a big enough sacrifice for them to undergo. And if on top of it you ask the rulers who are autocrats every inch of them to introduce democratic institutions at one stroke in their States,—well, that will be a trifle too much. Even in the States' internal affairs there is now no democracy; how then can you expect democracy in federal matters? One who asks for this may ask for anything."

Mr. Thakkar evidently imagines himself to be confronted with such a critic and tries to bring a complete intellectual conviction to his mind that the demand for elective representation of the States is not only not half so outrageous as people take it to be, but on the contrary is such that the Princes will make no sacrifice whatever in complying with it. And we think Mr. Thakkar will meet with eminent success in thus persuading his critic. The latter supposes that the Princes are called upon to make a twofold sacrifice: a sacrifice of sovereignty and a sacrifice of autocracy. The first kind of sacrifice is now admitted by the Princes themselves to be purely imaginary inasmuch as every one of the subjects to be handled by the federal government is already under the control of the Government of India, and so in respect of these subjects the Princes do not possess any sovereignty to give up. It is unnecessary, in view of the admission in the Memorandum of the Princes' Chamber to this effect, to enlarge upon this point. The sacrifice of autocracy involved in the popular election of the States' representatives too is equally illusory. For such democracy as is involved in elective representation is, in the telling words of Mr. Thakkar, "at other people's cost." For the elected representatives will represent the States only in federal matters, which lie, on the Princes' own showing, outside the sphere of their control. So far as matters of domestic concern go, these represen-

tatives will not be competent to deal with them. They will remain, as at present, within the sole jurisdiction of the rulers. That is to say, the autocracy of the Princes will remain intact, its province will not be circumscribed in any way, if in the federal legislature the States are represented by popularly elected members. When democracy is introduced in the central government it will replace the autocracy of the British Government, whether in British India or in Indian States. It will therefore be at the British Government's cost in either case. The Princes will therefore have to surrender no part of the power which they have at present by acceding to the demand of the States' people for elective representation of the States in the federal legislature.

This reasoning will put the whole matter, we daresay, in an entirely new light to most of the casual readers of newspapers. The demand, on this view, does not at all seem like a cry for the moon; it is a demand which there is no earthly reason for the Princes to oppose. And we entirely agree with Mr. Thakkar that the Princes will yield to it if it is pressed with sufficient force. Whatever else may be lacking in the rulers of the States, there is one quality which no one will care to deny to them, viz. a realistic knowledge of where their own interest lies. The Princes know well, infinitely better than any British Indian does, that federation even with election entails no loss of power or dignity upon them. They would of course like to wield themselves through their own nominees, if possible, the new power that would accrue from federation and therefore they would oppose the demand for a long time. But if they find that British India will not agree to federation except on the basis of election they will yield, for even so their gain will be immense. So much seems to us to be clear. But what is involved in the utmost uncertainty is the attitude of the British Indian leaders. At the first R. T. C. they did not raise the question at all in Committee; now it will be raised, but with how much energy is a matter for doubt. They may demand popular election of States' representatives for form's sake or with some show of insistence, just to place themselves right with the public. But this will not have the slightest effect on the Princes, who are expert in driving good bargains. They will yield if yield they must; but till this final point is reached they will not show the least sign of relenting. Will British Indian representatives insist up to this point? We wonder.

RETRENCHMENT IN BOMBAY.

THE ad interim report of the Retrenchment Committee appointed by the Bombay Government was published last week. Faced with a deficit of Rs. 61 lakhs which is stated to have since swelled up to very nearly a crore of rupees and with a legislature unwilling to support any additional taxation the Government had no alternative but to effect all

possible economy in the public expenditure. The Committee's personnel can by no means be said to be the strongest that even the existing Council could have yielded, but with its selection left to the Government nothing better could perhaps be expected. The Committee's task was of two kinds:—(1) to make proposals for immediate retrenchment so as to wipe out or at any rate to reduce the deficit figure already

referred to, and (2) to suggest means of permanent retrenchment. This report confines itself to recommendations coming under the first category and has not much permanent interest. Even were all its proposals carried into effect, the result would be a reduction of the deficit by only about Rs. 28¾ lakhs. But it is equally clear that public opinion would most certainly dislike some of its recommendations being translated into action. The Montagu-Chelmsford reforms were expected to give a great fillip to educational progress. In this respect public opinion has suffered a terrible disappointment, and education is practically making no headway all these years. Any possible reduction in the expenditure on education, specially primary education, would, we are sure, be stoutly resisted by public opinion. Moreover, it is one thing to apply the axe to the educational budget in the last resort after every other means of cutting down expenditure has been tried and quite another to do so before this condition is satisfied. And so long as money is found for the Government's exodus to the hills and for the maintenance of the costly band and bodyguard establishments of the Governor, one cannot say that all possible economy has been practised. On this latter point, we make a present of the opinion expressed by a former Commander-in-Chief, General Sir O'Moore Creagh, in his *Indian Studies*, both to the Government and to the Committee. This is what he says :

Besides the regular cavalry, separate detachments are maintained as bodyguards for the Governor-General of India and the Governors of Bombay, Madras and Bengal. They are, respectively, of the strength of about a squadron, and are under the control of those officials. Except perhaps, as a reserve, if those functionaries will spare them when wanted by the military authorities, they are useless as soldiers, being insufficiently trained, as they are used for ceremonial purposes alone. These high officials, in former days, travelled by road through disturbed districts. Nowadays their journeys are mostly confined to the railway. It seems curious, that, when such energetic demands were perpetually made for the reduction of military expenditure, these bodyguards have been allowed to continue. They are magnificently mounted, clothed and housed. The expense of their maintenance is much higher than that of any other Indian cavalry unit. They are not the only pseudo-military bodies attached to the households of these satraps, who also keep up strong bands composed of ex-British soldiers. *This is an extravagance for which there is no excuse*; if these officials require bands and bodyguards for ceremonial occasions, they could get them temporarily, when required, from the nearest garrison.

Let Government first strip off such costly superfluities before it can expect public opinion to view with favour any proposals for reducing its expenditure on education. We do not know if the bodyguard and band establishments of the Governor, having nothing to do for most of the year, at all came under the notice of a Committee out to effect all possible economies in public expenditure. But instead of recommending the abolition of such useless superfluities, the Committee suggest the stoppage of the valuable work that is being carried on for the last few months on the Peshwa's Daftar in Poona. And after all how much is this going to save? A

paltry Rs. 5000 ! True the work is not "essential" as the Committee puts it, but the saving that will be effected by its stoppage is also not going to be very considerable. Why then stop an activity which does not cost much but which is widely appreciated? This view seems to have found expression in the deliberations of the Committee itself, for we find that the proposal has not behind it the unanimous support of the Committee, Mr. Kamat, one of its important members, being opposed to the view of the majority.

The Committee's suggestion for the reduction of the number of members of the executive council and ministers from seven to four appears to us a sound one. The general impression is that none of these functionaries is at present terribly overworked so that the proposed reduction in their number is not likely to add very much to the onerousness of their charge. It would have been better if the Committee had likewise suggested a reduction in their salaries as well. Its predecessor of 1923 had recommended Rs. 3000 as the maximum salary that should be paid to Indian members and ministers. Much has happened since and an expression of opinion by the Committee on this point would have been much appreciated.

With the presidency's salary bill swallowing nearly Rs. 5½ crores, it was only natural that the subject should have received the Committee's attention. On this point the Committee is hopelessly divided with the result that it has been unable to give any very decisive lead to the Government. Three sets of proposals have been sponsored by three sets of members, all of which we do not propose to notice on this occasion. Of these the most equitable however appears to be the proposal which has the support of Messrs. Kamat, Chikodi, Patil and Rahimtoolla. This would exempt from reduction all salaries below Rs. 40 in the mofussil and Rs. 60 in Bombay and would reduce all salaries above that level on the following scale :—

Up to Rs. 199	5 per cent.
From Rs. 200 to Rs. 499	6¼ "
From Rs. 500 to Rs. 999	7½ "
Rs. 1000 and above	10 "

It is true that under this proposal nearly Rs. 2 crores of the total salary bill of the presidency will not come under the axe; but this is as it should be. The class of Government employees in receipt of a salary of Rs. 60 or less in Bombay and Rs. 40 or less elsewhere is either the clerk or the peon. Their present salaries cannot be regarded as being too liberal. Even the slightest reduction of their salary is sure to inflict hardship upon them which should be avoided, if possible. It is because this proposal avoids this contingency that it appeals to us as we are sure it will do to the general public.

This is the second inquiry of its kind during the last ten years. The 1923 Committee had made proposals which if carried out would have reduced expenditure to the tune of Rs. 87¾ lakhs. But for reasons best known to themselves Government found themselves unable to give effect to some of its ir-

portant proposals. By far the most important proposal of the Sathé Committee was for the amalgamation of the posts of Commissioners with those of Secretaries to Government. When the final report of the Committee comes before the public, the present Committee too will be found to have put forward the same proposal, though perhaps in a different garb. It is to be hoped that the recommendations of the Vakil Committee, i.e. the present Committee, intended to effect permanent retrenchment will receive better consideration at the hands of Government. This is essential as much on financial grounds as on those of expediency.

LABOUR IN INDIA.

RESULTS OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION'S ENQUIRY.

II

MIGRATION FROM RURAL AREAS.

WHEN a comparison has to be made between the Indian factory workers and the corresponding class in the West, the most fundamental difference that strikes one at first sight is that the factory labour in India is drawn from rural areas, and, as often as not from areas at long distances from the factories, while that in the West is drawn mainly from persons brought up in the towns and partly from those who have left the countryside for good for the towns. This difference, no doubt, renders many a measure copied from the West for the improvement of the condition of labour in this country, impracticable or unsuited without the necessary modifications. There is a tendency, however, to make much of this difference and to attribute all sorts of things to it, and also to bring it forth as an excuse against carrying out each and every sort of reform. That the Indian factory worker has his one foot in the town and the other in his native village is a common saying and not a little mischief is due to the faith which is entertained by a majority of the people, who care to think about the matter, in the literal sense of that saying. The Whitley Commission have, therefore, done well in devoting a chapter in their report to this subject. The reading of this chapter should dispel many a misconception underlying the objection that is often raised against proposals for bettering the lot of Indian workers and increasing their efficiency.

Superficial onlookers and students unfamiliar with the facts are likely to suppose that the Indian factory worker is essentially an agriculturist and "to picture the main industries of India as manned by a mass of agricultural workers temporarily forsaking the mattock and the plough to add to their income by a brief spell of industrial work in the city." The Commission has shown that this is not an accurate representation of the actual position. In the seasonal industries, dealing largely with the treatment of agricultural products in the raw state after they have been harvested there is an intimate connection between industrial and agricultural work; and in the collieries too there is a substantial class directly interested in agriculture. But in the regular factory industries which offer permanent work,

the employer has, the Commission rightly remarks, generally got past the stage of being compelled to employ those who are prepared to work only for a few months of the year. In the first place, all the factory workers are not drawn from agricultural classes, although they may have come from villages. Owing to the disappearance of village industries and crafts, the hereditary classes of artisans and craftsmen have lost their trades and have to seek employment in factories, mills and workshops. Secondly a few factory workers may have a direct interest in agriculture, but may have only an indirect interest, in that they are members of a joint family or close relatives of persons having agricultural holdings. Occasionally members of the same family relieve each other by turns in factory employment. It is true that most of the factory workers do not lose contact with their native villages, even when these are far away from the places of their employment, but that contact is more or less close, varying according to the circumstances of each individual. The Commission has, therefore, emphasised two points: (1) on the one hand, the factory population, generally speaking, is not divorced from the land, as in the West; (2) on the other hand, it cannot be regarded as composed of a mass of agriculturists serving a short term in industry.

Those who have no village ties and look upon the city as their home form but a small percentage of the total labour force. "In the most industrialised areas such as the Hooghly area and Bombay Island, this class forms a small proportion of the factory employees. It is proportionately most numerous in such centres as Ahmedabad, Nagpur and Madras. Each of these cities has, in its cotton mills particularly, an appreciable number of employees who from part of the permanent urban population. It is worth noting that these are composed largely of classes whose interest in the land was always slight or precarious, namely, Musalman weavers in Ahmedabad (the Commission might have added also the Musalman weavers in Bombay who are known as Zulais), and members of the depressed classes in all three centres... Statistics of this permanent element are not available; but it has been estimated as constituting in Ahmedabad 20 per cent. of the working class population. Elsewhere the figure is generally much smaller."

One sometimes comes across people especially from amongst the landlord class who have to pay higher wages to the labourers in the villages than they would have had to pay if there were no exodus to the industrial towns and cities, attributing love of luxury to those who leave the countryside. But the industrial recruit is not, in the Commission's opinion, prompted by the lure of city life or by any great ambition. The city, as such, has no attraction for him and, when he leaves the village, he has seldom an ambition beyond that of securing the necessities of life. Few industrial workers would remain in industry if they could secure sufficient food and clothing in the village; they are pushed, not pulled, to the city. Almost all old village industries have

been killed. There are few subsidiary industries. In most areas the pressure on the land has been steadily increasing for a long time and there are certain regions in which agricultural income is uncertain owing to frequent failures of rains; many cultivators have small holdings and can have little surplus produce for realising cash to meet other needs. Those who own their holdings have to find cash also for paying the land assessment, and those who are tenants have to pay the landlord's rent either in coin or kind. If the rent is paid in coin brought from outside, the cultivator is able to retain so much more of the agricultural produce for the use of his own family. Agricultural operations and improvements in the land require capital which the cultivator can raise by taking a loan from the village *soucar*, with little hope of repaying the principal and interest in time and at the risk of having to mortgage or sell his piece of land. That the villager who becomes an industrial worker is not prompted by the love of city life is also evidenced by the fact that when the industries of the Hooghly were being built up the economic position of Bengali cultivators was not such as to make the terms offered by industry attractive. In recent years the number of Bengali workers is steadily increasing. Also, in Burma the industrial labour, especially the unskilled labour, was provided by Indians as the Burmese were not available, but this year owing to the economic distress prevailing in that province not only have the Burmese entered into competition with Indian labour, but also resent the presence of the latter in their province.

The employers who complain of the migratory character of labour and assert the desirability of having a permanent factory population are, just as the village landlords, prompted by selfish motives. They talk of efficiency, but forget the fact that efficiency of labour is but one factor in industrial efficiency as a whole. Moreover, the visits which are paid by the workers to their villages annually or every two or three years do not impair their efficiency in that the workers return in a better physical and mental condition to their work in the factories. Really it is inhuman for the employers to expect the workmen to continue in the monotonous work inside the factories and life in the slums, unrelieved by long holidays in their villages. "In sickness and in maternity, in strikes and lock-outs, in unemployment and in old age, the village home is a refuge for many, and the fact that it exists affords a sense of security, even when it is not required." The villages provide insurance for the towns, and the latter in their way provide insurance for the former. Industrial employment has become necessary for supplementing agricultural income and providing against the uncertainties of agriculture.

There may be some disadvantages in the present link with village life among the industrial workers, but they are outweighed by the advantages enumerated above. It is neither desirable nor possible to snap that link. The report states: "The nature and extent of the contact with the villages can be power-

fully affected, both locally and generally, by different policies and it is of importance to have a clear aim." The aim should be to decentralise industry and to make industrial employment available to villagers in the vicinity of their villages. It is possible to start on a small scale various industries except the heavy ones, i. e., those pertaining to iron and steel and a few others. The evils of modern industrialism can be avoided to a great extent by having industrial villages where industries will be conducted on co-operative lines or under communal ownership of a village or a group of villages. Industry and agriculture will thus be able to go hand in hand and support each other. This is, however, an ideal the realisation of which is impossible in a capitalist state.

P. G. KANEKAR.

Reviews.

LIFE ON THE INDIAN FRONTIER.

ON THE FRONTIER AND BEYOND. A RECORD OF THIRTY YEARS' SERVICE. BY FREDERICK O'CONNOR. (Murray.) 1931. 22cm. 355p. 15/-

THIS book is a record of 30 years' service by Sir Frederick O'Connor who served in the Foreign Department of the Government of India from 1895 till his retirement in 1925. Except for a period of seven years, the author's service lay in countries beyond the frontiers of India. For the greater part of it was spent in Tibet, Persia and Nepal. The accident of the author's employment in Darjeeling at the commencement of his career stirred his curiosity in Tibet and created the ambition to explore the little known country on the northern side of the Himalayas. He set himself to acquire a knowledge of the Tibetan language and with his natural linguistic capacity, soon became a Tibetan scholar. His frequent excursions into Sikkim and his surreptitious visits to Tibet enabled him to acquire a local knowledge of Tibet which marked him out for service in the Tibetan expedition. Of all the countries to which his duties took him, Nepal was the one which attracted his affection and he has apparently the most agreeable reminiscences of his service there. Lhasa, Katmandu, and Seistan are not places possessed of any amenities of social intercourse. Many an official would have found service in these places dull and dreary. But the author had no difficulty not merely in making his life in these countries supportable, but even in managing to fill it with interest and enjoyment. Apart from the grandeur of the Himalayan scenery which he had abundant opportunities of witnessing, he sought refreshment and stimulation in his official work, in books and in sport of all kinds. The author disclaims experience of any adventures of an exceptional character denied to other members of the Foreign Department. He does not seek to write the political history of the expedition to Tibet or of the countries to which he was posted. He sets before himself the very modest object of giving an idea of the scope and interest of the work which devolves on the officers of the Foreign Department on and beyond the frontiers of India. He thinks that whatever may be the drawbacks of service in India itself nowadays, life on and beyond the frontiers is as full of interest as ever and offers as much scope for initiative and for an enterprising and adventurous spirit. A hardy

physique, an active mind and body and a taste for languages are the essential equipment for service on the frontier. While the author's dictum that no finer life and profession exist than can be found in service in the Foreign Department is the result of an enthusiasm which may not be shared by all, he has succeeded in showing how it is possible to make the best of life under even uninviting conditions. A love of adventure and sport is one of the qualities essential to happiness under the conditions of service which fell to the lot of the author.

P. S. SIVASWAMY AIYER.

EFFECTS OF INDIAN FISCAL POLICY. PUBLIC FINANCE AND OUR POVERTY. BY

J. C. KUMARAPPA. (Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.) 1930. 21cm. 118p. As. 12/-

THIS little book is a reprint of a number of articles written by the author for *Young India* dealing with the fiscal policy of Government in this country and its economic effects. The thesis of the book is that these effects have been mainly injurious. The author's standard of judgment is expressed in the following words:—

It is no good pleading that a tax or an expenditure is good in itself. What we have to judge by is by the alternative. While there are pressing needs, if the revenue is used for less pressing objects, however important or beneficial these latter may be in themselves, it is wrongly used... It is futile to claim credit for building railways, good roads, etc. We have to take into consideration at what 'alternative cost' these have been built and what use they are being put to and which part of the population benefits by them. If these are for the benefit of the foreign merchant, the plutocrat or the exploiter, to the neglect of the needs of the poor, it is a blot on the administration rather than a matter to be vaunted with legitimate pride.

Nobody can quarrel with the criterion which the author proposes for himself in passing judgment on the financial policy of Government, provided he allows that some of the errors of policy may have been due to the fallibility of human judgment. As it is, however, there is very little in the Government's sins of commission and omission for which he is able to plead any extenuating circumstances. The book is confessedly a polemic though it must be added that it is the polemic of a scholar.

The author makes some of his points very neatly indeed. For instance, he deals most effectively with the usual argument against reducing the salaries of public servants that this will endanger efficiency:—

It is no argument, says Mr. Kumarappa, to maintain a very highly paid administration to say that it is efficient. Efficiency itself should be gauged, not by the mechanical accuracy with which routine work is carried out, but on the touch-stone of prosperity of the general mass of the people. Mechanical efficiency should be subordinated to the need for imagination in carving out wide channels for the exercise of national talents.

This is a plea for the Indianization of the services as well as for scaling down the salaries. As regards Indianization there is a practical unanimity of opinion that it must be introduced on a wholesale basis in all the Civil Departments. There are also no two opinions as regards the desirability of cutting down the salaries especially in the Imperial services. But Mr. Kumarappa ought to have insisted on the dangers of carrying this process too far. The risk of imperilling efficiency is not wholly imaginary. Nor can it be seriously denied that it is important to keep the services reasonably contented. How to strike the golden mean in this matter between reckless extra-

vagance and suicidal parsimony may not be easy to decide. But in any serious discussion of this problem it is not desirable to encourage the view that the whole duty of Government consists in driving as hard a bargain as possible with its servants. A scientific treatment of the question at the hands of some competent economist is an urgent need of the moment. Mr. Kumarappa's treatment of this as of most other questions is one-sided. We find in the book the usual appeal to a mythical golden past, though it is difficult to say why these unhistorical appeals to a problematic past should be necessary, considering that even without them it is possible to make a strong case against Government. Mr. Kumarappa can also be found often blaming the wrong causes and proposing remedies which must lead to disillusionment. But he writes with evident sincerity and has a happy knack of expressing himself with clearness and force. The book is a political pamphlet written by a very able man out to hammer Government and using any weapon that comes handy for the purpose.

G. B. J.

SHORT NOTICES.

SUBHADRA OR LIFE AFTER DEATH. By V. D. RISHI. (Author, 51, Goverdhandas Building, Girgaum, Bombay.) 19cm. 128p. Rs. 2.

THIS is a book from Indian sources "to convince the people of the truth of spiritualism as any other branch of the recognised science." A world of spirits difficult to be located, their bodies of etheric atoms, ever condescending to help us in all our difficulties—researches on these are to be left to few who have the fad and the leisure for it. Tolstoy's *Fruits of Enlightenment* makes us laugh at Mr. Rishi and men of his ilk, but they are quite serious about it. Thus the book may be interesting reading to those who believe in the subject dealt with therein.

N. S. S.

MARY'S ASSUMPTION. BY RAPHEL V. O'CONNELL. (The America Press, New York.) 1930. 21cm. 166p. \$7-50.

THOUGH we have the utmost veneration for the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Mother of Jesus Christ, we strongly deprecate books of this kind and, what is worse, making pious wishes and desires a matter of infallible doctrine. The attempt to allow our emotions to run away with reason has brought about on the one hand the Scylla of superstition from the masses and on the other the Charybdis of intellectual revulsion from the educated and the ship of deep faith and veneration has been shipwrecked between these straits.

FR. YESUDAS, C. S. S.

Miscellaneous.

INDIAN STATES' PROBLEMS.

MR. A. V. THAKKAR'S SPEECH.

The Conference of the subjects of the Punjab States commenced its deliberations at Simla on the 24th inst. The following is the text of the presidential address delivered by Mr. A. V. Thakkar on the occasion:

The question which is monopolising public attention all over India at the present moment is that of the Federal scheme evolved in London at the Round Table Conference, and you will probably

expect me to address myself first to it in my speech. So far as we, the people in the Indian States, are concerned, however, the scheme needs little elaboration. Our position can be simply described thus: we stand outside the picture altogether. British Indians on the other hand will secure a large constitutional advance: full provincial autonomy and responsibility at the centre over the whole field, excepting defence and foreign affairs and subject to certain reservations. Whether these exceptions, and qualifications make too large a deduction from Swarajya, is a question which is now agitating public opinion in British India. No such disturbing question arises for us, the people in the States. What we have to ask ourselves is not what matters are to be left out of our grasp, but what are to come within it, and we need not tarry long over this question. For, the only answer possible is that the scheme does not propose to give even a jot or tittle of power to the people in the States. Whatever power falls to the share of the States will go to the rulers, and no part of it to the people.

RULERS ALONE ARE BENEFITTED.

The rulers however will make a notable improvement in their position in every way. Federation usually entails some sacrifices on the federating units. They have to part with their independence and sovereign powers over certain matters in favour of a common government which they help to bring into existence by means of federation. They undergo this sacrifice cheerfully, because only in that way can a uniform regulation of certain general concerns which require to be centrally administered be secured. But in the proposed federation between British India and the Indian States no sacrifice on the part of the States is necessary, because the States are not now independent or sovereign. They have already given up the power of administering certain subjects or the power of determining the policy in regard to them, to the Government of India. The States of their own accord have surrendered the power by treaty in some cases, or the Government of India has, as a paramount power, imposed restrictions upon them in the interests of India as a whole. Whatever it be, the fact remains that at the present time the States have no control over certain matters. And these very matters are classed in the new scheme of government as federal subjects under the jurisdiction of the federal government.

NO SACRIFICES FOR THEM.

This is no longer a matter of controversy, for the Memorandum prepared by the Special Organization of the Princes' Chamber admits this in terms. To those Princes who feared lest their joining the federation would involve too heavy a sacrifice of their sovereignty, the Memorandum gives the assurance in private, which however has been made public by an enterprising journal in Bombay, that the federal list of subjects which has been drawn up by the Sankey Committee contains not a single subject over which the States exercise any kind of control at present. The Memorandum therefore says to the ruling Princes in effect: "No doubt we have ourselves indulged in a grouse at the Round Table Conference that the Federation cuts too large a hole in our sovereign powers, but their Exalted and Unexalted Highnesses would be very much mistaken if they took this seriously and refused to come into the Federation. All this lament about sacrifice at the Conference was meant for the consumption of British India, so that British India would not force upon them the democratic ideas which it hugs to its bosom. Our talk served its purpose too; with its aid we were able to resist any

inroads upon our real internal sovereignty which some of the British Indian politicians would otherwise have made, and we shall enter into the Federation now without the least impairment of our powers."

ONLY NEW POWERS.

The federation that is now proposed not only does not make the Princes give up any powers which they possess at present, but makes it possible for them to obtain a share in the control of matters which they have already surrendered to the Government of India for administration. A federation between independent States necessitates a sacrifice of part of their independence; but the proposed federation with Indian States, which have already lost a great part of their independence, only enables them to regain it to a large extent. This would not be a matter for concern to the people in the States, if the new powers secured to the States would be exercised by popular representatives instead of by the autocratic rulers. But both the chambers of the federal legislature are, in so far as the States' representatives are concerned, to be composed of their nominees if the Princes so choose, which means that the Princes and not their subjects will be the beneficiaries of the great improvement that will come about in the position of the States as a result of federation, the people of the States remaining just where they are.

PEOPLE WILL BE WORSE OFF.

Indeed the people will not remain where they are, but their position will greatly deteriorate. At the present time in most of the States there is no constitutional check upon the personal rule of the Princes, and the people are making but feeble attempts to bring their autocratic rule under some kind of check. This struggle for a redistribution of power between ruler and ruled is now in its initial stage. If at such a time one of the parties to the struggle, and that too the party that is in a position of unquestioned supremacy, is given additional power, it is obvious that it will make the struggle immensely harder for the other party. In the domestic affairs of the States no change of any sort is contemplated; not even a modicum of popular government is to be insisted upon as an antecedent condition before federation is brought about. The people of the States will in internal administration continue hereafter to be as helpless as before. If in such a situation the Princes are able to win from the British Government an accession to their power can it be doubted that this additional power will be a further handicap, an exceedingly severe handicap, for the people of the States in the constitutional fights which they have to wage with the rulers?

AUTOCRACY WILL BE STRENGTHENED.

I have taken leave to dilate at such length on this point because some British Indian leaders, professing sympathy with the people of States in their demand for elective representation in the federal legislature, but conscious of the fact that the demand will go unheeded, turn round upon us and say, "Well, what even if the States' representatives in the federal legislature are not elected by the people, but nominated by the rulers? That is, no doubt, not a desirable arrangement, but, however undesirable, it would not be a reactionary measure; it would not leave the people of the States any worse. At present they have no direct representation, and this state of things will merely continue under federation. So long as the federal scheme does not propose to deprive the people of any rights which they now enjoy, they have no right to complain and they are not morally entitled to throw any obstacle in the way of the federation coming about." We

have therefore to make it clear to such British Indian friends as are disposed to give us help that, if by their insistence they are unable to secure direct popular elective representation to the States' people the latter will be terribly crippled in the struggle for power which they are bent upon carrying on, but for which they are as it is so poorly equipped. If the leaders in British India, either by active consent or passive acquiescence, will allow the Princes to send their own nominees to the federal legislature, they will be guilty of not merely not lending a helping hand in the cause of freedom, but of consolidating and strengthening the despotism of the Princes and riveting upon us, their subjects, the fetters which we are now wearing.

DEMOCRACY AT OTHER PEOPLE'S COST.

It would be an act of neighbourliness on the part of British Indian leaders if at the Round Table Conference they stood firm like rock on the demand of the States' people that the States' representatives in the Federal Parliament shall be elected instead of nominated. It is after all a modest demand. Only those subjects are being made federal that are, for the States, under the exclusive control of the Government of India at present. The Princes have now no voice in their management. If hereafter these subjects are managed not by the representatives of a bureaucracy, but by the elected representatives of their own subjects, why should the Princes object? Will they suffer a diminution of power in any way? If representative institutions are thus introduced in their States, they will be only in respect of matters over which the rulers have no control. The introduction of democracy will not be at their own cost. Their autocracy will remain intact over the whole of its present sphere. The Princes should, I think, rejoice if they have the rare opportunity of ushering in democracy at other people's cost. British Indian leaders ask us: "How are you worse off because of nomination?" I have tried to answer this question, but they had better address a similar question to the Princes: "how will these be worse off because of election?"

INSIST TO BREAKING POINT.

If the representatives of British India at the Round Table Conference wish to give effective help in establishing democracy in the States, it will not be enough for them merely to demand the election of the States' people, but to insist upon it in an unflinching manner. They must be prepared to insist upon it, if necessary, to the breaking point. That point, I am convinced, will never be reached. The Princes have intelligence enough to know where self-interest lies. If over all the internal affairs of the States their voice continues to be supreme, and if over matters of joint concern they are enabled to exert an indirect influence (for anyone who knows anything about the States knows how the Princes will be able to manage and manipulate elections), there is no reason to fear that the Princes will reject such an arrangement. They will undoubtedly try to take over under their undivided control even matters of joint concern (so far as the States' share in the control is concerned), but anyhow they will think it too good a job to let slip from their hands by too much haggling. Only the British Indian representatives for their part must make up their minds, if the worst comes to the worst, to refuse their consent to federation rather than have one in which it will be possible for all the States' representatives to be the nominees of despotic rulers.

INJURIOUS TO BRITISH INDIA.

I quite grant that no one out of a feeling of neighbourliness alone will refuse to enter a contract

which is of clear benefit to himself, merely because it does not equally benefit his neighbour. I am still persuaded to ask the people of British India, without a moment's hesitation, not to let federation go forward unless and until it is agreed that the States' representatives shall be returned by popular election. For I believe that nomination by the Princes is equally hurtful to the interest of British India. In a sense it is even more hurtful to British India than to the States. We in the States are accustomed to nomination and all the other marks of autocracy. They will be more galling to the national self-respect and democratic instincts of the people in British India than they can ever be to us. I never thought that the great national upheaval now in progress in British India, one of the biggest in the world, was merely intended to wrest political power from the hands of Britishers, irrespective of where it would come to reside afterwards. I have always thought that to British Indians, self-government ever meant popular government; that when they proclaimed "dominion status" or "swaraj" or "independence" as their goal they did not merely aim at getting rid of foreigners (it is impossible to think of any movement inspired by Mahatma Gandhi in that light), but at establishing a democracy, and a democracy is clearly impossible when nearly one-third of the total number of members in both houses of the legislature will be, or can be, the nominees of the autocratic heads of the States.

REJECT IT OUT OF HAND.

It is idle to consider whether the nominees will vote *en bloc* in the legislature or otherwise, as if when the nominees of all the States are not pledged to vote together, nomination would be permissible. Those who reason in this way really imply that in the federal legislature nomination is as good as election. If it were really so, British Indians would not set their face like flint against indirect election in the lower house, or communal election in the upper as well as the lower house. Indirect election or communal election is after all election. If British Indians cannot put up even with these forms of election in British India, it passes my comprehension how they can put up with stark nomination in Indian States. These nominees will after all sit in a legislature which belongs as much to British India as to the States; and so large a nominated element as one-third will destroy the representative character of any popular assembly. Lovers of democracy must reject such a scheme with contumely, regardless of the consequences that will follow.

SUCH A FEDERATION IS VALUELESS.

But will the consequences ensuing from a rejection of the Sankey Scheme be so dire? What will happen if the scheme does not materialise? Of course, federation will not come about. But, soberly speaking, is the federation, as planned at present, of any value? In judging of the real worth of the federal scheme, we must go back to the basic fact, adverted to before, that the list of federal subjects includes only those subjects which in the States are now under the Government of India's control; it includes no subject which has not passed out of the control of the States. This means that under federation there will be no more uniformity of policy or administration than obtains at present. If that is so, what conceivable advantage will federation yield? Federation is to be valued only as a means of securing, on the part of independent states, a uniform regulation of subjects of national concern. This uniform regulation is to a limited extent possible even at the present day. Federation is not necessary to achieve this much uniformity. If uniformity on an extended scale became possible thereby, federation

would be desirable. But if, in formulating the federal scheme, other subjects such as civil and criminal law, in respect of which uniformity of policy is even more desirable and necessary than in respect of some of the subjects included in the federal list, are to be left out of the scope of the federal government, I cannot understand what purpose this kind of federation serves.

PRINCES NULLIFY RESPONSIBILITY AT THE CENTRE.

I do not think British Indians really prize federation for its own sake; they value it rather as a means of converting the die-hard politicians in Great Britain to the introduction of responsibility at the centre. The Princes' adherence to federation brought about, it is said, a mysterious change in the atmosphere of England, whereby those who would not entertain even moderate proposals for reform, somehow expressed their willingness to favour radical schemes of self-government. Is this not a clear proof that what passes for responsible self-government will work in practice under the Sankey Scheme precisely as if no power were transferred? To me there appears to be nothing mysterious in the attitude of the reactionaries in England. The very people who insisted at first upon an irremovable executive later agreed to responsibility, provided federation were agreed to. This condition was laid down because they knew that federation of the type proposed would in practice nullify the formal introduction of responsibility and would yield results not far removed from those expected of an irremovable executive.

LARGE REFORMS POSSIBLE WITHOUT FEDERATION.

What is really mysterious is the attitude of British Indian leaders who can bring themselves to welcome this kind of federation. Responsibility under this scheme will be found on examination to be on better, if not definitely worse, than the "responsiveness" provided for in the Government of India despatch on the Simon Commission's Report. The despatch embodies the Government of India's proposals made without reference to federation. It cannot be denied that these proposals, though they do not come up to popular expectations, constitute a big enough measure of reform to give the lie direct to the theory sedulously propagated by the Princes that no large constitutional reform is possible except on the basis of federation. And it must not be forgotten that if, on account of an unreasonable attitude on the part of the Princes, federation has to be scrapped, and the reform of British India alone has to be undertaken, the people in British India may expect a good deal of improvement to be effected on the scheme outlined in the Government of India despatch. British India therefore runs no risk in insisting on what it may consider to be essential conditions of federation and in refusing to consider a scheme on the federal basis if those conditions are not fulfilled.

ESSENTIAL CONDITIONS OF FEDERATION.

But we the people of the Indian States do not desire the federal idea to be frustrated. All we desire is that the federation should be of the genuine type;

(1) that it should comprehend not merely subjects which the Princes no longer control, but all subjects of real all-India concern;

(2) that elected representatives of the people should sit in the federal legislature;

(3) that fundamental rights of citizenship should be guaranteed by the federal constitution and should be enforced by the federal judiciary;

(4) that residual powers should vest in the federal government and not in the governments of the provinces and the States; and

(5) that the federal government should exercise rights of paramountcy over the States' governments so long as these are not brought under popular control.

If federation of this character is possible, we would welcome it; but federation of the character proposed is not only of no advantage to us but is positively injurious to our interest. We would beg British Indians to be uncompromising in their insistence upon the essential conditions mentioned above. We do so primarily in our interest; but their interest fortunately is identical with ours. If they insist upon popular election of the States' representatives and such-like things, the Princes will have to yield. If the Princes do not yield, British Indians stand to lose nothing. They will without federation obtain reforms equivalent to what seems possible under federation. If, conscious of their strength, they insist with sufficient tenacity, they will surely succeed. They will then secure establishment of real popular government in British India and will at least prevent the scales being tilted against us in our internal struggles in the States.

RESPONSIBILITY TO PEOPLE.

Having talked to you of the All-India Federation matters, let us now consider matters nearer home, that is, those relating to the internal administration of our States, as it now is. In the Punjab there is hardly a single State where the rule is responsive, much less responsible to the people ruled. There is in none of the 14 salute or 20 non-salute States—from Patiala down to the smallest Hill State of Mangal—a representative Assembly or a Legislative Council of members elected directly by the people, or even nominated, voicing the opinion and grievances of the people of the State. In most of the States even the urban Municipalities are managed as State Departments! Is it not yet time for the formation of even popular Municipal Boards consisting mostly, if not wholly, of elected members, a prerogative which was conferred on British India by Lord Ripon in 1884?

Mysore, Baroda, Travancore and Cochin have their legislative assemblies with rights of interpellation, of moving resolutions on matters of general public interest, and in all of these except Baroda, also of voting on the annual State Budget except for a few items. It is very regrettable that nothing even distantly approaching to this, exists in any one of the Punjab States, either large or small. When the delegation of the Indian Princes at the Round Table Conference are making it a condition with the British Government that they will federate with the British Indian Provinces, only if the Government of India be made responsible to the people of British India, is it not up to them that they should, in their own jurisdictions, be responsible to their own people and be no longer autocratic rulers of their States, so that British India would be willing to federate with them?

But the great desideratum in the States is a check on the finances. At present the rulers consider the State treasury as their private purse, and the State as their estate, being responsible to none to account for the expenses they incur. Many of the rulers are openly accused by their people of wasting the State money not only on their dearly bought luxuries, shikar parties, lavishly entertaining European guests—official and un-official, but on their vices, immoral habits, nautch girls and expensive tours to Europe and America. In several cases 50% and over of the State revenue is spent for the person of the ruler and his family, leaving very little for such nation-building departments as education, medical relief and sanitation. Money taken from the people

as taxes is not returned to them in one form or other, but goes mostly into the pockets of sycophants, hotel-keepers and furniture merchants of London and Paris, and in some cases for buying women for the harem, as in Patiala. In connection with the very luxurious equipment in the palaces of our Princes the late Mr. E. S. Montagu while sitting in a Maharaja's palace writes in his *Indian Diary* as follows:—

Everywhere are cigarette boxes in the form of motor cars or aeroplanes, or a stork to lift the cigarettes out. On the dining table is an electric pump working a fountain. One has often been inclined to wonder what becomes of this sort of ingenuity when one sees them at jewellers or bazars or Maples, or Drews, and so forth, and the answer seems to be that they all go to the Indian Princes.

If by some magic wand the civil list of Princes be fixed by legislation to a reasonable limit of, say, 10% of the State revenue, and if it be strictly enforced by some internal and external checks, and independent audit, half the misrule that obtains in our States will disappear, and the profligacy of the Princes will be greatly reduced. There seems to be no other way than such a one, of reducing debts like the debt of about three crores which the Patiala Durbar is said to have incurred during the last few years.

FORCED LABOUR UNIVERSAL IN STATES.

Begar or forced labour is widely prevalent in all States. It is as if some communities, specially the depressed classes, are ordained from times immemorial for this very purpose. Not only that the whole rural population, including agriculturists, who form 80 to 90% of the population, are subjected to compulsory labour, but the payment is always inadequate in theory, and often refused in practice in toto. Instances are quoted in the "Indiotment of Patiala" of compulsory labour being exacted for Shikar parties, construction and clearance of canals, and for cultivating State gardens, &c. Bullocks and camels are also impressed for transport, and provisions—specially milk and ghee—are exacted with inadequate, probably no payment. This is unfortunately our every-day affair, when either the Prince, or any high or low official, or a part of the State army is on tour. Representatives of the Royal Order sit on Council meetings of the League of Nations, where attempts are being made to put an end to forced labour, but these very representatives do exact forced labour in their own territories without any compunction. Responsibility in the administration can alone end this state of things, and unless that is introduced, this and dozens of other abuses will be continued for, God knows, how long.

ILLITERACY APPALLING.

The amount of money, or percentage of the total revenue of a state, spent for the education of its people, specially elementary or primary education, is a test of its progressive character. States like Baroda, Mysore and Travancore spend as much as 14, 15 and 20 p. c. respectively of their annual revenue but States like Bikaner, Jodhpur and Alwar spend only 1½, 3 and 1 p. c. respectively. Figures of educational expenditure of Patiala, Bahawalpore and Nabha are not available, as their administration reports are not yet public property; but some idea can be formed of the meagre educational facilities provided in these States by the fact that Patiala provides one primary school for every 15 villages in its jurisdiction and that only 1 p. c. of the population is at school against 10 to 12 p. c. in well governed States. Bahawalpore is a little less backward, having one school to every 8 villages, and the figure for Nabha cannot be found from the States Directory. The comparatively small State of Faridkot, however,

provides 54 primary schools for its 167 villages, or one school to every three villages, and the percentage of expenditure on education there is higher than that in any other State in the Punjab. This is due to the State being under a Council of Administration for over 12 years past, and not under a ruler, who is at present a minor. Comparing the figures of literacy of Patiala State with those of the adjacent British Districts of Ambala and Ludhiana, we find that in 1921 among males, there were only 69 literates in the Patiala State as against 95 in Ambala and 113 in Ludhiana per 1000. Among females there were only 5 literates in every 1000 in Patiala State as against 16 in Ambala and 18 in Ludhiana; in other words, the literacy among women in Patiala State is as low as only one-third of that in the adjacent British Districts. But as a large part of the State revenue goes to satisfy the personal whims, luxuries, and in some cases vices of the Princes, how can they spare money for educating the people, thereby fitting them for being real citizens who may demand a due share in the Government of the State in future?

DESPOTIC RULE.

I take leave to quote the following vivid description of the state of administration in Rajputana States written by my friend Mr. Ramnarayan Chaudhary in the *Modern Review* of Dec. 1928. The same applies equally to all the Punjab States without any substantial difference. He says:—

The system of administration in all the 21 States of Rajputana is hereditary despotism. With the exception of Bikaner no State has a Legislative Council... In all other States there is not even a semblance of legislation by popular consent. The will of the ruler and his executive is law. No distinction is made between executive orders and law. Both have the same force, and are promulgated by the same executive authority without any fuss or form except their publication, in some cases, in the State Gazette, where there is any. A circular or an order issued under the signature of a Maharaja or his Secretary treats a certain act as an offence, determines punishment for the same, and empowers anybody, judicial or otherwise, to exercise that power. Executive orders are issued, taking away certain powers from civil and criminal courts and entrusting them to executive officers... Instances of arbitrary expulsion or confinement, proscription of newspapers and confiscation of property are not very rare.

This antediluvian state of things cannot last long. Even the worm has turned. A determined band of workers has sprung up in almost all the states, in the North, South, East and West, to reform the administration and to awaken the long slumbering and suffering people. The people are, sooner than later, bound to come into their own.

There is a large majority of Princes who fondly imagine that however the administration in British India may change, their people need not and will not be affected. The Maharaja of Bikaner openly declared to people in this country and to the members of the Round Table Conference in London that they may make reforms in their own states in their own time, at their own sweet will and in their own way and that nobody should even throw a hint to them as to how and when they should do it. They forget that the ideas and ideals of government have changed, even in the states, backward as they are, during this twentieth century, that the relations between the rulers and the ruled have considerably changed all over the world, that the theories like the divine right of kings and the ruler being the *muzim*

of his people are gone for good, never to return, and that autocratic rule of the Princes is bound to give place to democratic rule under constitutional monarchs. If they do not take warning before it is too late, they will have to repent. In the words of Mahatma Gandhi, "An undiluted autocracy, however benevolent it may be, and an almost undiluted democracy, are an incompatible mixture bound to result in an explosion." Will the Princes wait for the day of explosion? Let us hope not. If the 270 millions of people in British India will make a solid advance, as they are determined to do, on the path of Swarajya, we, the 80 millions of the states, will not tarry behind. May the Princes and we, their people, co-operate with each other, and not oppose each other, in this onward march to self-government.

I will conclude with the following words addressed to the Princes by no less an eminent person than Sir M. Visveswaraya in his Trivandrum speech in January 1929:—

The world after the War has a new vision of governmental functions. You may conceal modern ideas from the more ignorant subjects for a time, but you cannot prevent their infiltration from all of them for all time. The autocratic form of government is fast getting out of date; safety lies in open dealing and publicity. The Princes should modernise their states, train the talents of their peoples, pour knowledge and skill into them, and raise them, and themselves rise with them.

Correspondence.

THE "NATIONAL" LANGUAGE—AN EXPERIENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—In view of the controversy about Hindustani as the "national" language of India, which recrudesced after the Karachi Congress and is still going on in the press, it will not be inopportune to relate an experience I had about six years ago with a hundred-per-cent. nationalist acquaintance of mine, who would not give the British "devil" his due. The gentleman concerned is essentially a product of the old order of things, though not without a tolerable knowledge of English which he acquired after he had gone through a full course in a Sanskrit *pathasala*. He is also a well-travelled man, having escorted pilgrim parties to Hardwar and Dwarka, to Rameswaram and Puri, on several occasions. At the time I am speaking of, he was employed as a teacher in a "national" school, since closed.

A desultory talk on the political situation had landed us into a discussion of the merits of British rule. I maintained that the British had at least made us Indians, as I put it. He demurred to it, and we were citing history for and against our respective positions in lively fashion, when an idea occurred to me. I had in my hand a one-anna piece, which, like the other, nickel pieces of the Indian coinage, exhibits on the reverse its denomination in four languages and five scripts: viz. (1) Hindustani (Hindi and Urdu), (2) Bengali, (3) Telugu, and (4) English. Handing him the coin, I said: "Why appeal to the dead and the absent? Here is this anna piece. Let me see how you name the different scripts and languages you find on it." My friend studied the coin for a while, and then pointing to the inscriptions one after another, named all of

them *except one* slowly, doubtfully,—and incorrectly; and the one exception was about the English! As he did not at first seem to have any clear notion of the distinction between script and language, I had to emphasise it and warn him to be accurate in that respect. — And the following was the result of the "Indianism test" (as I may call it), in presenting which I am relying on my note-book as well as memory.

(Of each of the inscriptions the script and the language were named together, but I am giving the answers separately for script and language.)

AS TO SCRIPT :

1st: The Nagari he named "Marathi", but did so doubtfully, as one of the letters is of the Northern form not in use in Marathi, which he knows.

2nd: The Urdu he named "Persian or Musalmani".

3rd: The Bengali he named "Gujrathi or Marwadi".

4th: The Telugu was for him "some writing of the Madrasis—Tamil or Malyali". He might have named Kannada (Kanarese) among his likely ones, had it not happened to be his own vernacular. He could see that though the writing looked like Kannada, it did not read like Kannada, and I think he said as much.

5th: This, he said, was "English of course". But of course it is not. The right name for the character is Roman or Latin; but the point may be winked at as a scholarly nicety,—though such nicety should not be deemed a superfluous virtue in a schoolmaster.

AS TO LANGUAGE.

1st: (a) The Hindi he doubtfully called "Nagpuri or Malwi".

(b) The Urdu he named "Persian", also doubtfully. Though he could not read it, he might have guessed that as Persian was not an Indian vernacular, nor the language of administration now or for a long time past, it was not likely to have a place on a British Indian piece of recent coinage.

2nd: The Bengali, as above in regard to script.

3rd: The Telugu, do do.

4th: It was "English of course". And that of course was the one hit achieved among those nine or ten shots aimed, all of them at things Indian, by a hundred-per-cent. nationalist who denied that we owed our Indian national feeling to English education.

The moral was plain, and I guess it went home to my friend. We however continued to argue for some time more—but with far less vehemence and cocksureness on his part.

One could not charge him with the 'slave-mentality' said to be engendered in the English schools. His education had been of the purest Swadeshi type, and what he had of English was acquired by him later under private instruction or through self-help.

I have since taken occasion to set the above test to various other individuals of my acquaintance, and from their various 'reactions' to it, as well as from other indications I have been confirmed in my conclusion that the more our people have of Anglicism (call it Westernism or Modernism, if you like) in their intellectual make-up the better informed, more observant and more enlightened lovers they are of things Indian, and that, on the other hand, where they had little or no Anglicism in their outfit, their knowledge, interest and patriotism are confined to their caste, community or province. Yours, etc.

Karwar, July 23.

S. D. N.