

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. ~~45~~ } POONA—THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1931. { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	549
ARTICLES :—	
Mahatma and Paramountcy.	552
Labour in India.—XII. By P. G. Kanekar.	553
OUR EUROPEAN LETTERS.	
The Future of Iraq.	554
The Hoover-Laval Conversations.	555
REVIEWS :—	
Education in Russia. By S. R. Venkata Raman.	556
Great Britain's National Capital. By V. N. Godbole.	557
Rural Economies. By S. G. Puranik.	557
SHORT NOTICES.	558
MISCELLANEOUS :—	
Central Responsibility—Mr. Joshi's Speech in F. S. Committee.	559
BOOKS RECEIVED.	560

Topics of the Week.

R. F. C.

HAPPILY, the threat held out by the Mahomedans of blocking the discussion of the question of responsibility in the Central Government till they have received satisfaction on their community's claims in the matter of representation, has been averted by the persuasion of the British representatives. Last year the Mahomedan delegates not only allowed the discussion to take place, but they took part in it themselves, making quite a valuable contribution to the provisional decisions then arrived at. They of course safeguarded their position by making it clear that their support to the federal scheme then evolved would be forthcoming only in the event of a communal settlement acceptable to them. A similar statement now would surely have answered their purpose but apparently they felt that their hands were tied by the mandate of the Muslim Conference which bade them abstain from discussions of the transfer of power at the centre unless their communal claims were agreed to. They would have cut a very sorry figure indeed by this exhibition of fanaticism, which would have prevented the British Government from showing its hand on the main subject which has taken all Indian delegates, Mahomedan as well as other, to London. But all's well that ends well. Discussion on central responsibility is proceeding, and we are having the benefit of expressions of views held in different quarters on this subject. The communal settlement however is as far as ever from being reached and in fact everyone has now despaired of ever reaching it by the unaided efforts of Indians. The arbitration of the Prime Minister appears to be the only resource available to us now of cutting the Gordian knot, and we hope nobody will allow loss of "face" to come in the way of our taking advantage of it.

A Stable Ministry.

ALL the devices which were proposed at the R.T.C. last year calculated to make the Ministry stable were repeated this year, though these devices have evoked almost unanimous condemnation in the country. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru expressly referred to this condemnation, but proudly declared that his withers were unwrung. "I am perfectly well aware," he said, "that this latter part of my suggestion (a special majority in a joint session being required to make a no-confidence vote effective) has been very strongly criticised, and by none more than by the Indian Liberals. Well, so far as I am concerned, I am unrepentant." And he went on to emphasize the need for requiring a two-thirds or three-quarters majority in the legislature for the Ministry to be unseated.

* * *

More Royal than the King.

ANOTHER criticism which was levelled against the Federal Structure Committee's Report of last year was that the representatives of Indian States would take part in all matters affecting the life of the Ministry, although such matters might relate solely to British India. Sir Tej Bahadur was asked to modify the scheme in such a way that if the no-confidence motion arose on a purely British Indian subject, the States' representatives might, at any rate by convention, abstain from voting on it. He was however not prepared to meet the criticism in any way. On the criticism itself he poured contempt as proceeding from hide-bound "constitutional purists." In this, surely, Sir Tej Bahadur was more royal than the King. For Sir Akbar Hydari himself had said last year :

"The usual course with regard to turning out a Government would be that there should be a requisition from a particular number of people for a vote of no-confidence. It rests with the requisitionists whether they will requisition for a vote of no-confidence in the Law and Order Member, in which case his being turned out must depend entirely on the votes of the British India representatives only, or whether the requisition is for a vote of no-confidence in the Federal Cabinet, in which case the requisitionists will take upon themselves the responsibility of seeking the opinion of the Federal Legislature as a whole and obtaining the vote of that body. In that case if the vote is adverse the whole Cabinet will go out, and if it is not adverse they will remain, it may be with the support of the Indian States. But it would not then be open to British Indian representatives to say that the Indian States had helped to keep a Cabinet in office on an issue in which they had no part."

And the Nawab of Bhopal said this year :

"We realise the difficulty regarding the vote of no-confidence resulting in the resignation of the Federal Executive, and I do hope that some solution of this problem will be found which will avoid the necessity of our having to interfere in any matter whatsoever with what may be

purely British Indian affairs. As long as this is not done, I think we shall probably take a holiday on these occasions" (i. e. abstain from voting).

One might have thought after such expressions of opinion on the part of the States' representatives, Sir Tej would, so to speak, bow himself out and allow no-confidence motions on subjects previously ascertained to be wholly British Indian to be voted upon only by British Indian members of the legislature, but no, he would not.

The Free Hand Policy.

MR. ZAFRULLAH KHAN, whose speeches in the Federal Structure Committee have been uniformly marked by great ability, thus expressed his respectful but emphatic dissent from the "free hand" policy adopted by Mahatma Gandhi towards the Indian States on the questions of election and fundamental rights:—

Now, no doubt, their Highnesses have insisted, and certain of my friends of the British India Delegation have agreed, that the question of selecting their representatives to both Chambers is a matter to be left entirely to the States themselves. To a slight extent I beg to differ from this view. We are sitting here round this Table without any desire on any side to dictate to anybody, but with the fullest desire to put forward our views with regard to matters which have been assumed to be matters of common interest. Yesterday afternoon His Highness of Bikaner was pleased to remark that even if they agreed to certain matters with regard to the selection of their representatives, it would not be possible for them to enforce that agreement with regard to all the States. Well, of course, that is perfectly true. Even with regard to coming into the federation, any kind of agreement arrived at here would not be binding upon any State. It is open to any State, after looking at the completed picture, as it were, to see whether it is feasible for it to come into the federation or not. Their Highnesses cannot guarantee that any rules laid down with regard to the selection of their representatives will be agreed to by other States, but no more can they guarantee that any other States will agree to make federal those subjects which Their Highnesses here agree to make federal. Nevertheless, a certain amount of agreement has to be arrived at on these matters before the thing can be put on a working basis.

Absence of an Independent Judiciary.

SIR PURSHOTAMDAS THAKURDAS took a very brief but a very important and effective part in the discussions on the Federal Court in the Federal Structure Committee, when he urged the States' delegation to accept the Federal Court's appellate jurisdiction even on non-federal matters as British India for her part was prepared to do. For a peg to hang his thoughts upon, he with great skill selected a plaintive passage in the Nawab of Bhopal's memorandum in which the Nawab bewails the backwardness of the States in enterprise and industry. Sir Purshotamdas drew the attention of the States to this passage and said that the chief cause of their backwardness was the absence of an independent judiciary in the States. "In many cases the judges are not of a high order of legal knowledge and experience. In some the Ruling Chiefs do not leave the judges a very free hand. In most cases the prospects of the presiding judge depend on the sweet will of the Ruling Chief." And, to make matters worse, "there is no recourse to any tribunal beyond the State's own court". "I know," said Sir Purshotamdas, "that this is one of the several reasons why people from British India, and, if I may say so, even people from the Indian States fight shy of commercial or industrial enterprises on a scale bigger than the most modest. I know of many instances of this handicap." "I would therefore ask

Their Highnesses of the Indian States to consider if they will not help themselves by removing this one handicap, which may be one of many others, on the development of Indian States' areas by agreeing to the right of appeal in non-federal matters from Indian States' Courts to the Supreme Court." And he begged the Committee to consider the suggestion made by Mr. Jayakar that the States should by some kind of convention concede a right of appeal to the Supreme Court. Mr. Jayakar left it to the States to decide whether they would or would not concede this right of appeal, but he said that if the States would not, British India too ought not to accept the Federal Court's jurisdiction. For otherwise the anomaly would result that the Federal Court would exercise a larger jurisdiction over one part of the federation than over another. Mr. Jayakar also pleaded with the States, as did some others, to confer upon their subjects the right to sue the States for the wrong done to them, as British Indians enjoy the right of suing the Secretary of State. Needless to say that on neither of these two points was there any response, either individually or collectively, from the States' delegation.

Absence of Rule of Law.

THE attention of the Federal Structure Committee was pointedly drawn by Dr. Shafa'at Ahmad Khan to the absence of the rule of law in the States when he asked for constitutional safeguards for the fundamental rights of citizenship. He himself was exceedingly keen on such safeguards both in British India and the Indian States, and in fact more keen on them in the Indian States because they are more badly needed there than in British India. But he also realised that, in the present mentality of most of the members of the Committee, it would be extremely difficult to obtain such safeguards for the States, and that, if any were obtainable, they would be of an exiguous character. And in order to avoid the fundamental rights of British Indians being whittled away as they would be if they were to conform to the fundamental rights of the Indian States' peoples, Dr. Khan asked for these two classes of fundamental rights to be kept separate, the States' people being given Class B rights (since British Indian leaders would not insist upon any better) but in any case British Indians being given nothing less than Class A rights. He said:

"I have placed these safeguards (i. e. safeguards for the rights of Indian States' people) separately, as I think there is a possibility of these rights falling short of those exercised by or granted to citizens of British India. If they are assimilated to the safeguards granted to the subjects of British India, nobody will be happier than myself. What, however, I should like to avoid is our safeguards being brought down to the level of the safeguards which may be granted to the subjects of the Indian States. My reason for separating these two kinds of safeguards is that if they are mixed up they will become so attenuated, they will be so watered down, as virtually to become inferior, and without any practical use or purpose. . . . My Lord Chancellor, I have made my position clear: I should like all safeguards to be perfectly alike; but if there is a danger of our safeguards being brought down to the level of those rights which may be conferred on subjects of Indian Princes, then I should like to stick to what I have got or what I may get."

And it will be realised at once that this position is not wholly unreasonable when it is borne in mind that even Mahatma Gandhi, under a promise to the people of the States to secure a Bill of Rights for

them, declared himself "TOTALLY UNABLE" to say what rights the Bill should contain.

The Assembly at Work.

SINCE Wednesday last the Assembly has been going through the supplementary Finance Bill clause by clause, but has not been able to effect many changes. This is due to the absence of some members in England on account of the Round Table Conference. But that only partially explains the failure of the non-officials to improve the Bill so as to bring it in line with public sentiment. The fact really is that even the exceptional importance of the present session of the Assembly has not succeeded in attracting all its members who are in India to New Delhi. This argues a deplorable lack of a sense of responsibility on their part to their constituents of which the latter will, we hope, not fail to take note.

But to go back to the criticism of the Bill by the members. Even in the general discussion which took place on the motion for the consideration of the Bill, strong objection was taken to the Finance Member budgeting not for the remaining months of the current year as required by well-known financial canons but for eighteen months and proposing additional taxation on that basis. An attempt was also made at the second reading stage to restrict the life of the Bill to the end of the current official year, but failed.

The only amendments which the Assembly has so far been able to carry against the Government were those designed to exempt machinery from enhanced import duties, to oppose the increased postal rates and to prevent the exemption limit for purposes of income-tax from being brought down from Rs. 2000 to Rs. 1000, as provided for in the Bill. In spite of last year's salt tax agitation the Assembly found itself unable to prevent that necessity of life from being taxed at the increased rate.

Congress withdrawal from Bardoli Inquiry.

THE Congress has withdrawn from the inquiry which is at present being officially conducted under the terms of the Gandhi-Willingdon agreement of August last into the allegations of the use of coercion for the recovery of land dues made by some Bardoli peasants. For the establishment of its case the Congress asked for the production of some Government documents. On the face of it there seems to be nothing particularly unreasonable about the Congress demand. The Inquiry Officer made much of the fact that the only witness the Congress had to put forward on the subject of the "standard" of payment was Mahatma Gandhi who, being away in England, was not available. The obvious insinuation is that the Congress had no other evidence to lead and entered upon the inquiry in a light-hearted fashion. We do not think the charge can be fairly laid at the door of the Congress. The fact that the Congress has so far produced as many as 63 khatedars and 71 witnesses and wanted to produce 51 khatedars and 73 witnesses more for examination before the Inquiry Officer is enough to establish its bona fides in the matter. Even granting however the correctness of the Inquiry Officer's charge against it, it is difficult to appreciate the force of his reasoning which led him to refuse the request of the Congress. The resistance of the Government to the Congress request for the production of certain documents is likely to give ground for the impression that there is something in the Government records which it is in the interests of the Government to keep back from the public or which cannot stand the glare of publicity. The object of the Government in granting such an inquiry as is being conducted by Mr. Gordon at

present and of Mahatma Gandhi in accepting it was clearly the ascertainment of truth. The interests of truth would have been better served by conceding the Congress request and giving it all possible facilities for establishing the veracity of its statements. Its failure even in those circumstances to prove that its allegations were well founded would have undermined its own prestige in proportion as it would have added to that of the Government.

The Situation in Kashmir.

IT has been the boast of administrators of Indian States that however widespread and deep-seated the communal trouble in British India may be they have managed their affairs so that similar trouble is conspicuous by its absence within their limits. So far as Kashmir at any rate is concerned, recent events there do not lend support to such a claim. The State is ruled by a Hindu Maharaja whose subjects consist of 80 per cent. of Mahomedans. Education not having made much headway amongst them they do not seem to get their fair share of the loaves and fishes of office. The result has been a suspicion, how well-grounded nobody can say at present, shared largely by His Highness' Mahomedan subjects that their religious liberty is interfered with in many insidious ways. What terrible havoc this suspicion has played, those who have followed recent happenings in the State need not be told. The situation became unduly complicated by the despatch from British India of groups of young Muslims to practise satyagraha in the State in sympathy with and as a protest against the supposed religious tyranny practised over their co-religionists in Kashmir. The state of affairs in the State consequently assumed such a serious aspect that were it not for the fact that the Government of India went to its rescue by prohibiting by means of a special ordinance the entry into H. H.'s territory of troublesome people from British India and by sending military forces to Kashmir to aid the civil power in the establishment of peaceful conditions of life the consequences would have been disastrous. Conditions in the State are happily returning to the normal, not the least important contributory factor being, we must ungrudgingly recognise, the conciliatory policy followed by the Maharaja during recent months.

He has declared his intention to set up an impartial committee to go into the allegations of interference with religious liberty made by his subjects and has given the assurance that its findings will be followed up by prompt and sympathetic action on his part. Side by side another British officer belonging to the I.C.S. and holding the post of a District Judge in the Punjab will conduct inquiries into the circumstances in which the disturbances of September last took place and whether the firing resorted to in connection therewith was justifiable and restricted to the strictly minimum requirements of the situation. But what strikes us as a really statesmanlike act of the Maharaja relates to his desire to grant full civil rights—to the extent to which they obtain in British India—to his subjects. Civil liberty was heretofore at a discount in Kashmir as in an overwhelming majority of Indian States with the result that public discontent was denied opportunities of finding expression either in the press or on the platform. This state of things is now to stop, which is all to the good. Though it is undeniable that it was nothing but the pressure of circumstances which has induced the Maharaja to grant these concessions to the people of Kashmir, it is to be hoped that they will continue to enjoy them even after the particular circumstances which gave them birth have disappeared. Is there nothing in this from which the other members of the Princely order may take a lesson?

MAHATMA AND PARAMOUNTCY.

A RMY and Foreign Relations—these two subjects were proposed at the first session of the R.T.C., with the general agreement of the delegates who took part in it, to be reserved to the control of the Governor-General. At the present session, we are told, the Congress delegate is going to take exception to it. Even he does not propose to ask for as full a control of the legislature over these two subjects as over the rest. He will be prepared to agree to certain special qualifications in respect of the administration of these subjects. How much these qualifications will detract from the completeness of self-government, and whether they will detract any less than the reservations that other parties may agree to is not known. For Mahatma Gandhi has not revealed his mind yet either to the Congress or to others on this matter. We shall soon know what his own reservations or "adjustments", as he prefers to call them, amount to.

There is another subject—Paramountcy over the Indian States—in regard to which too his attitude is unknown. The reader will therefore be glad to have an indication of it in the following extract from an article by Mr. Brailsford in the *New Republic* of 21st October:—

"If British Conservatives and the more imperially minded Liberals have consented to Indian self-government, it is only because they are shrewd enough to realize that these Princes will serve in the new India as the Viceroy's bodyguard, a force whose loyalty to the Crown, to British interests and to every conservative cause can be implicitly trusted. At present the bureaucracy retains a measure of control over the elected legislatures through the presence in them of a big, disciplined contingent of nominated officials. These will disappear, but in the Federal Legislature the Princes will take their place. They claim and will receive at least 40 per cent. of the seats in its two Chambers. Their representatives will not be elected: they will be the tame nominees of Princes who rarely respect the civil rights of their subjects, and never yield their political power. With an immovable conservative bloc of this kind, reinforced by the Moslems and other backward groups from British India, the hope of a progressive majority recedes into the region of the impossible. But that is not, as Indians see it, the worst aspect of this arrangement. These Princes, with all their pomp and wealth, are only nominally sovereign. They are tenants-at-will, whom the Viceroy may depose for reasons of which, in the last resort, he is the sole judge. That is the explanation of their celebrated loyalty, which some would call abject subservience. While this princely contingent dominates the Federal Legislature, India will indeed have a dark-skinned government, but she will be subject, as she is today, to the manipulation and wire-pulling of the white bureaucracy.

"All this Indians perceive. The Moderates would bow to it fatalistically, and preferably in silence. That is not Mr. Gandhi's way. He will demand that the relations of the Princes be transferred from the Viceroy's personal control to that of the Indian Ministry. There he will encounter a flat and unyielding refusal. It is too soon to risk a confident prediction, but I for one shall be astonished if this Conference leads to anything happier than a resumption of last year's struggle."

Mr. Brailsford's statement is explicit. It leaves no room whatever for a suitable shifting of the ground as the turn of events may suggest. Unlike the Moderates, who take every evil circumstance with resignation as preordained by fate, Mahatma Gandhi, we are told, is inflexibly determined to resist at all costs, at the cost of federation itself and at the cost of things far more precious than federation, the transfer of Paramountcy to the Viceroy; that he will insist to the end of the chapter upon the retention of Paramountcy in the Government of India where it now resides, so that, with the democratisation of that government, the people of British India and the people of the Indian States together will exercise all the rights which appertain to Paramountcy.

Mr. Brailsford is one of the most eminent journalists in the world to-day. He knows Indian conditions at first hand. He is in intimate touch with Mahatma Gandhi. It is inconceivable that he would have misreported Gandhiji. And yet one's mind is not altogether free from misgivings as to what the Mahatma's intentions may be on this subject. It is exceedingly more difficult to struggle for the retention of Paramountcy in the future Government of India than for the transfer of defence and external relations. These subjects after all, if reserved, will be reserved temporarily; they are eventually to be transferred. But Paramountcy is intended to be permanently reserved to the Viceroy. And a decision has already been taken on the question. For not only does the Sankey Report of last year include Paramountcy among the reserved subjects, but the statement of His Majesty's Government contained in the Premier's speech on 19th January last also mentions Paramountcy as having been decided to be left with the Viceroy. It says: "The connection of the States will remain subject to the basic principle that in regard to all matters not ceded by them to the Federation their relations will be with the Crown acting through the agency of the Viceroy." The policy of reserving Political Relations to the Viceroy's control has been definitively accepted by the British Government and accepted not as a transitional but as a permanent measure.

Is Mahatma Gandhi going to reopen this subject which has been so completely closed and sealed? Of course he *can* insist upon its being thrown open again to discussion, because it is such a vital matter; but we wonder whether he *will*. He is thus in a dilemma; for, unless he asks for the rights of paramountcy being vested in the Government of India, he cannot at all justify his coolness, which has been marked by British observers even more than by Indian, towards election of the States' representatives. Will not these representatives, the puzzled observers ask, be as bad as an official bloc, for they will place themselves at the disposition of the Political Officers even more than of the Princes? Mahatma Gandhi answers, "No"; for the Political Officers themselves are going to be brought under the control of the popular Government of India, which will handle Political Relations

and not the Viceroy. This was the only reply that was open to Gandhiji, and there can be no doubt whatsoever that this is the kind of reply that he made to Mr. Brailsford. That the latter did not misapprehend Mahatmaji's meaning is also shown by the last passage in Mr. Brailsford's interview with the Mahatma (reproduced in *Young India* of 22nd October), in which the Mahatma says:

"Talking of South Africa gives me a precedent for the change that we want to bring about in our relations with the Princes. Swaziland used to be under the control of Downing Street, but when the Union was formed control was transferred to it. In the same way we argue that *the Princes ought to be transferred to the control of the Indian Government*".

The argument is thoroughly sound; we have ourselves argued, the reader will remember, in the same way in our article "Transfer of Overlordship", illustrating the point from the very example of South Africa. But the question now is whether the Mahatma will put forward this argument at the R.T.C. not as a mere matter of form but with his heart in it and seek to disturb the *chose jugée*. Well, we doubt and more than doubt. Of this, however, we may be absolutely certain, that if he were to put it forward he would meet, as Mr. Brailsford says, with a flat and unyielding refusal—first by the Princes and then by the British Government. But will Mahatma Gandhi put it forward at all?

LABOUR IN INDIA.

RESULTS OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION'S ENQUIRY.—XII.*

THE PLANTATIONS.

PLANTATION system is a large scale enterprise in agriculture and has many features in common with industry. About 90% of the plantations in North India and nearly all those in Madras and Burma are controlled and managed by Europeans, the small province of Coorg being the only area where the Indian planters are in the majority. The most important plantation crop in India is tea; next to it, but of much less importance, are coffee and rubber. The system of recruitment for almost all the plantations in the South is through labour suppliers, called *kanganis* or *maistries*, who receive from the planters loans free of interest from which they advance money to individual labourers or families wishing to go to the estates. These advances are debited to the labourers' account and are recovered during the period of their employment. The Madras Planters Act of 1903 introduced the penal contract as a protection for the planter against the loss of the advances made to his workers. This Act remained after the repeal of the Workmen's Breach of Contract Act and was not finally repealed till January 1929. The evidence received by the Commission fully satisfied them that the abolition of penal contract in Madras

had not added to the planters' difficulties; on the other hand it promoted a more regular flow of labour to the plantations. In the North the important planting areas are in the province of Assam, and in Darjeeling, the Terai and the Dooars in Bengal. The tea plantations in Darjeeling and the Terai employ about 60,000 persons, who are mostly the descendants of immigrants from Nepal and Sikkim settled in the district. About 126,000 labourers are employed in the Dooars. Most of them are aboriginals from Chota Nagpur and the Santal Parganas in the province of Bihar and Orissa. The significant feature of recruitment for the Dooars has been the absence of any form of agreement or penal contract, which has been mostly responsible for the comparative absence here of the serious difficulties which have attended recruiting for the neighbouring province of Assam.

Assam is the most important planting area in the whole of India and the tea gardens in the province alone employ more than half the total number of labourers employed on the plantations in British India. The system of recruitment for Assam is governed by the Assam Labour and Emigration Act. Chota Nagpur, the Santal Parganas, Bihar and Orissa, the United Provinces, the northern districts of Madras, the northern and eastern districts of the Central Provinces are the recruiting areas, recruiting being carried on as far away as Bombay. Prior to the war the minimum cost of recruiting a single labourer was Rs. 200/- rising at times to Rs. 500/- or even more. At present the average cost is estimated between Rs. 120/- and Rs. 200/-. Naturally the planter who had to spend such a large sum for securing a labourer was anxious to keep him in his own employment as long as he could. The Government afforded him the protection by adopting special legislation on the principle of indenture. Even the present law contains provisions for indentured labour, which, however, have been rendered inoperative by means of notifications issued under the Act. The final step in the legislative reform in the recruiting system was to prohibit all recruiting except by garden sardars, making it illegal for any one else to assist, induce or even persuade a recruit to go to Assam. Moreover, a body known as the Assam Labour Board was set up with a view to the better control of recruiting. The Board is composed of representatives of the tea industry with an official chairman, and its duties involve the supervision of the machinery regulating recruitment in and emigration from the recruiting provinces. This board, it must be remembered, has no responsibility for labour after it has arrived in Assam. In fact, the Board is a recruiting organisation of the tea industry. The Commission have recommended the abolition of this Board. But on the whole, the Commission's views on Assam labour are far from convincing. The recommendation that the power to prohibit recruitment should be withdrawn immediately and that in future no barriers should be set up to prevent the normal play of social and economic forces in attracting labour from one part of India to another, is not at all in the interest of labour. If 'the normal play of social and economic forces' is to

*Previous articles in this series appeared in our issues of July 23 and 30, August 6, 13 and 27, September 3 and 10, and October 1, 8, 15 and 29.

be allowed without let or hindrance, the purpose for which the Commission was appointed loses all its significance. It may be that the labourers who go to the plantations do so to escape serfdom in their native village and also it may be true to some extent that those who are interested in serfdom do not like that their serfs should leave their villages. But one evil does not justify another. The conditions of plantation labour at present are little better than those of serfdom and it may be reasonably asked whether the labourers even from districts where serfdom prevails do not find themselves out of the frying pan into the fire. It is the Commission's desire that it should not be possible, under a new law, to place restrictions on mere persuasion and propaganda. But 'persuasion' and 'propaganda' are elastic terms. So long as the conditions on the plantations do not include freedom of movement and free bargain it would be criminal on the part of the Government to allow unrestrained propaganda for the recruitment of labour. Especially while serfdom prevails in some districts it would always be easy for the agents of the planters to decoy labour by trading upon the discontent of the village serfs, although the latter might find themselves cruelly disillusioned in the end. The fact is that the planters have never cared to make the conditions of plantation labour sufficiently attractive. The wages are poor, there is little liberty for the worker and once he is employed he finds it difficult to return to his native village. It is stated in the Report itself that on some of the plantations the labour force has settled contentedly and no recruiting has been necessary for many years. But on many of the plantations the labourers have to live like prisoners, they cannot combine for striking a better bargain with their employers, nor can they be approached by persons interested in the labour movement. The present recruiting system is a vicious circle and the evils cannot be eradicated unless the system is abolished. In these days of widespread unemployment it should not be difficult for the planters to obtain labour in sufficient numbers provided the conditions are sufficiently attractive. In the movement of labour distance does not count for much. Thousands of workers migrate from one province to another. The essential thing is freedom. The mystery about the plantation employment has, let the planters remember, created the terrors which prevent the workers from going to the gardens. The mystery is due to advances, obligation to work on particular plantations under particular masters, the segregation from the outer world, the difficulty of return, the absence of protection from tyranny and ill-treatment, the absence of freedom of bargain, and above all, the extra protection afforded to the planters by the Government. Once these causes of mystery are removed, the plantations will not only get labourers in sufficient numbers, but the supply may exceed the demand as it does in other industries. If all the facts stated in the Report itself are put together, the Commission's recommendations will be found to be not only inadequate and unsatisfactory but also reactionary in some important matters.

P. G. KANEKAR.

Our European Letters.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

GENEVA, Nov. 7.

THE FUTURE OF IRAQ

THE mandates for the German colonies in Africa and Polynesia came into operation as early as 1921. But two more years had to pass before the Governments of Syria, Palestine and Iraq were brought under the supervision and control of the League of Nations. Strictly speaking, no mandate was ever issued by the League in the case of Iraq. The Anglo-Iraq Treaties of 1922 and 1926, containing as they did the essential mandate principles of the covenant of the League, received the approval of the Council of the League, and for all practical purposes, Iraq has been treated as a mandated territory of the A class.

The king of Iraq entrusted Great Britain with the task of "educating the Arab people in the school of political understanding and assuring the protection of minorities." As soon as the Labour Government assumed office in 1929, it was made to feel that the growing discontent of the people of Iraq at foreign control and the steady progress already made in the internal administration of that country justified the termination of the mandate in the shortest possible time. Hence the express statement in the preamble to the Anglo-Iraq Treaty of 1930 that the British mandate over the Arab kingdom would be abandoned as soon as it had been admitted to the membership of the League and that His Majesty's Government would give its unreserved support to the candidature of Iraq.

On November 2, 1931, the Permanent Mandates Commission examined in private the annual report of the Mandatory for Iraq. Sir Francis Humphrys, British High Commissioner in that territory, was present on the occasion. He produced abundant documentary and other evidence to satisfy the Commissioners in respect of certain conditions which every Mandated territory must fulfil before being granted an independent status. According to him, the budgetary position of Iraq was such as to provide regularly adequate financial resources for normal Government requirements. Iraq's army was not large. But it was well organised and efficient, and, in conjunction with the police, was capable of preserving the public peace throughout the whole territory. Friendly relations had been established with neighbouring countries and with the assistance of such allies Iraq would maintain her territorial integrity and political independence. As regards the treatment of minorities, much had already been done to reassure the Kurds of the intentions of the Iraqi Government towards them. Steps had also been taken to settle landless Assyrians on vacant lands in the Baradost area; and the Yazidis had been helped in the creation of a communal council to control their affairs. There had been so far no instances of religious persecution in Iraq. The history of the country had been one of religious tolerance; Moslems, Jews and Christians had lived together amicably in the same villages for centuries. It was, therefore, unfair to presume that the withdrawal of the British protection would cause damage to the interests of the minorities.

The exact conditions which the Council of the League would decide to impose upon the admission of Iraq to the membership of the League are expected to assume formal shape early next year. There is no reason to think that King Feisal, who has a reputa-

tion for his progressive outlook and tolerance, will refuse to accept or implement any reasonable safeguards for the protection of the numerous minorities in his territory. The Assyrian refugees and others, who have been driven into Iraq by the Turks or have suffered from persecution in the early days, genuinely fear that the Organic Law of the young Arab State does not provide sufficient protection against injustice. The Iraqi Government does not at present have an adequate number of trained administrators of its own. The Permanent Mandates Commission is in turn anxious that the mandatory should not throw off responsibilities too quickly. There are also the Englishmen who are worried about the future relations between Iraq and England. What those relations will be no one can foretell with confidence. Perhaps a Treaty of Alliance will be concluded between the two powers, providing for consultation in matters of foreign policy which are likely to affect their foreign interests. King Feisal has already declared that "the permanent maintenance and protection of the essential communications of Great Britain is in the common interests of all parties". In the light of the statements made by Sir Francis Humphrys before the Permanent Mandates Commission, the above apprehensions seem to have no real basis. Anyhow, there is no ambiguity as regards the new status which Iraq is aspiring for and which Great Britain has pledged herself to support. The status will be similar to that enjoyed by any of the fully self-governing member states of the League.

The conception of the League of Nations as the trustee of racial, linguistic and religious minorities is by no means restricted to mandated territories which desire to attain independence. At the time of the Peace Conference, the Allied and Associated Powers and Poland entered into certain minorities treaties. Similar treaties were subsequently signed, relating to the kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Czechoslovakia, Roumania and Greece. The general treaties of peace with Austria, Bulgaria, Hungary and Turkey contained special clauses relating to the protection of minorities. The League of Nations, being at once a permanent and international body, was naturally entrusted with the task of supervising the execution of those treaties, and intervening in cases of violation. Thus the League's trust over minorities came to it unsought; and once that trust was created, the Assembly of the League passed resolutions in response to which certain countries, before their admission to membership, undertook to apply to the minorities inhabiting their territories the same principles which were embodied in the minorities treaties already in force.

It should not be imagined for a moment that the League of Nations is a means of stabilising the separatist tendencies in each Nation State. For one thing, it has never undertaken to remedy any and every grievance of a minority community. On the contrary, it has repeatedly discouraged all attempts to secure privileges beyond the right to retain one's own religious customs and habits, the right to receive a certain amount of state help to educate the children in one's own language and the right to nationality, which gives one the protection of the ordinary law of the land without distinction of race, language or religion. In defining those rights which it is prepared to guarantee to minorities, it has always been governed by the principle that it is the duty of a minority community to try its level best to form an integral part of the whole nation and work for the weal of the entire community. In this connection, the observations of the *London Times*, of October 31, are as relevant as they are interesting. Referring to the minorities in Iraq, it says, "it is necessary to warn the champions of minorities, and more particu-

larly the friends of the Christian minorities, against excessive claims on behalf of their protégés. Thus, while it may well be possible to settle some of the Assyrian refugees in mountain villages more salubrious than their present homes, insistence on the formation of a semi-independent All-Assyrian enclave—which can only be effected at the expense of the Kurds—is calculated to arouse Moslem jealousy and official suspicion. Again, while the administration and management of the Christian elementary schools might well be left in the hands of the clergy, assisted by lay councils, it is desirable in the interests of national unity that the Central Government should have some control over higher education and that local particularism should not be encouraged to hinder the teaching of Arabic which is the official language of the country. The same considerations apply to the other minorities. They demand and deserve guarantees of impartial justice and religious liberty. But they will not prosper if they are encouraged to magnify their differences from, and to minimise their points of contact with, their neighbours, nor will they attain political maturity any the sooner for being spoon-fed by benevolent Europeans. Over-solicitude may be as injurious as neglect, to communities as well as to children."

It is indeed astonishing that these observations should be made by one of the most Conservative papers in England. Such sober and progressive views are not uniformly entertained by any considerable section of the British public in regard to every one of their imperial problems. Self-interest drives them to adhere to some particular tenet at one time and to the diametrically opposite tenet at another time. Thus the numerous and complex minorities problems in Iraq do not prevent them from sponsoring the independence of that country. In spite of the persistent demands of the Greeks, who constitute four-fifths of the population, they have no hesitation in tightening their control over Cyprus. All sections of political opinion in India are forced to the desperate belief that the communal problem has been unduly emphasised by the British. There are, however, evident signs to show that these strange contradictions in British Empire policy are increasingly discredited even within Great Britain. And if this tendency does not suffer any serious set-back, the future of Great Britain and the rest of her Empire opens new vistas of interesting possibilities.

GENEVA, NOV. 2.

THE HOOVER-LAVAL CONVERSATIONS.

THE conversations between President Hoover and M. Laval were received with satisfaction in Geneva. It is true that they did not result in binding commitments by either party. But they were by no means intended to produce any such result. Their sole object was to establish the closest possible liaison between Washington and Paris so that the franc and the dollar might be stabilised on a gold standard basis. Incidentally, they provided an opportunity for discussing all those political and economic problems which the world crisis has brought to the forefront. The informal agreements that were arrived at must be examined by the legislatures of the two countries before any action may be undertaken. It is, therefore, too early to pass any decisive judgment on their practical value.

In spite of her vast gold reserves, the American Government was recently faced with the problem of preventing the devaluation of her currency. The abandoning of the gold standard by Great Britain and the huge outflow of gold from America into France severely affected American finance. And it

became obvious that the fate of the dollar was inextricably bound up with French co-operation. Hence the visit of the French Premier to Washington at the invitation of President Hoover.

Both the representatives agreed to use their influence to retain the gold standard. But the suggestion of holding an international conference for discussing the currency problems of the world received an unfavourable verdict from President Hoover. The stabilisation of the sterling received their sympathetic consideration. And now that a strong National Government is in power, they will certainly be willing to give any financial assistance which Great Britain may ask for. The silver problem was lightly touched upon, only to be brushed aside.

While affirming his faith in the policy of progressive limitation and reduction of armaments, President Hoover discountenanced M. Laval's proposal to conclude a mutual security pact between France and America. Such a step implies the preservation of the *status quo* which is so dear to the French but so hateful to the Americans. The revision of the Peace Treaties is, in the opinion of the American President, a purely European problem and must be solved by the European Powers themselves. In addressing a group of American and French journalists, Senator Borah, the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, told in public what President Hoover might have told M. Laval in private. "I am not", he declared, "in favour of any intervention of any kind in any circumstances."

France is thus left with an undisputed control of European problems. The Hoover moratorium period expires by next July and Germany's need for economic relief beyond that period is accepted on all hands. In the absence of American initiative in this matter, M. Laval has undertaken to suggest to Germany to take advantage of the security provided for her by the Young Plan and ask for the appointment of an Allied Commission to investigate her situation. If the Allies accede to that request, President Hoover will move the Congress to consider the reduction of War Debts.

Italy's position is succinctly expressed by Signor Mussolini during his recent tour in Naples. "Is it possible" he said, "that sixty long years must really elapse before the word 'Finis' is written beneath the tragic balance sheets founded upon the blood of ten million young men who will never again see the light of the sun? Can there be said to be juridical equality among nations where on the one hand we have nations armed to the teeth and on the other hand nations condemned to be unarmed? How is it possible to seek reconstruction unless there is modification of certain clauses of certain peace treaties which have driven the world to the brink of material disaster and moral despair?" This speech was followed by the visit of Signor Grandi, the Italian Foreign Minister, to Berlin when he observed that the reconstruction of Germany must be regarded as one of the most important elements in the reconstruction of Europe and the whole world. The volume of opinion in favour of treaty revision is steadily increasing. However eager France may be to stick to the letter of the Treaty of Versailles, she will soon be constrained, in her own interests, to respect other points of view.

The question of treaty revision will be considerably simplified by tackling the question of Franco-German *rapprochement*. The recent visits of the French ministers to Berlin lead to the establishment of a mixed Franco-German Economic Committee. That precedent suggests the lines of future development. Reports have begun to aver that M. Laval is seriously contemplating erecting a machinery which will harmonise the German need for economic

relief with the French demand for security. But we must take these reports with caution. M. Laval's Government depends for its majority upon some of the most unstable elements in the Chamber of Deputies. The French elections, which will be held next May, provide an additional check to any enthusiasm which M. Laval may evince for the conciliatory policy towards Germany. In these circumstances, one is inclined to think that the immediate future of Europe is anything but bright.

VICTORY OF NATIONAL GOVERNMENT IN ENGLAND.

Amidst this gloom, the unique victory of the National Government in Great Britain fills us with some hope. But the immediate task before British statesmen is to stabilise the pound and balance the budget. In fulfilling that task, they require the cordial co-operation of both France and America. Before launching upon any scheme of protection they must take abundant precautions against alienating the sympathies of those two countries. They may not, at the same time, be willing to indulge in a policy of discrimination which will give certain trade privileges to France or any other country in return for financial assistance. It is suggested that by the adoption of a revenue tariff Great Britain may succeed not only in balancing her budget but also in bringing about a general reduction of tariffs all over the world. But we must not forget that she may thereby provoke the existing economic rivalries between nations to keener competition and her dependence upon America and France for monetary loans eschews the immediate possibility of her assuming leadership in any international projects.

The success of the Conservatives in the recent elections in Great Britain has given a fillip to the cry of Empire Free Trade. Mr. Bennet, the Canadian Prime Minister, hopes that it would be possible to hold the postponed Imperial Economic Conference at Ottawa some time next year. The initiative in this matter must clearly spring from the British Government. Both the Premier and Mr. Baldwin are definitely committed to consider the question of Imperial economic unity. The Dominions, which have been hit hard by the world crisis, may find in that idea the best means of improving their economic position. To abolish all tariffs within the British Empire and encircle it with protective walls against the rest of the world is easier said than done. The reorganisation of the empire on an economic basis will infuse new life into it and make it a tremendous power in world diplomacy. That state of affairs does not, however, exist today and the position of France in Europe is all but supreme.

Reviews.

EDUCATION IN RUSSIA.

SCHOOLS, TEACHERS AND SCHOLARS IN SOVIET RUSSIA. With a Foreword BY W. T. GOODE. (Williams & Norgate.) 1929. 18cm. 82p. 21.

ILLITERACY in Russia, as it now is in India, was most appalling during the Czarist regime. When the working classes came into power after the termination of the absolute rule of the Czar, they addressed themselves, in all earnestness, to effect far-reaching reforms in all walks of national life. Education in Russia was formerly the monopoly and luxury of the privileged classes. The Soviets when they got power made it universal. They believed in the theory that the child belongs to the state and the responsibility of bringing it up, educating it, and

making it a useful citizen, rests entirely with the State.

The book under review deals with the great educational experiments that are now being tried in Russia under the Soviet rule. The British teachers' delegation which visited Russia on invitation has in this book given an account of the theory and practice of the Soviet education. The first chapter deals with social conditions in Russia. It traces the events that led to the Soviet system of government, and shows how the workers freed themselves from the clutches of the capitalists. More and more the workers are now taking to recreation and athletics which were formerly denied to them. The State has withdrawn its support for religion and it is said that freedom of worship is granted. But later events give the lie direct to this statement. An organised war against Christianity and its priesthood is being waged in Russia ending in bloodshed and tyranny. But this is by the way. The average Russian nowadays does not bother himself with religion or philosophy. He is out to break all traditions and authorities, ceremonials and sacraments, and seeks his freedom and happiness by leading an untrammelled life. Credit is taken by the Soviet Government for having improved the social and economic life of the workers. It is said that they get good wages now and are better housed, though statements to the contrary are sometimes made by writers of note.

The second chapter in the book deals with the organisation of education. The component republics of the U.S.S.R. enjoy complete autonomy in educational matters, but are guided in matters of general educational policy by the central authority. The scheme of Soviet education may be briefly stated thus:

1. Pre-school education for children between the ages of three and eight, in kindergartens, nursery schools and creches attached to factories. In 1926, it is said that there were 1629 such institutions with 85,346 infants.

2. Labour schools for pupils between the ages of eight and seventeen where education is imparted in accordance with the fundamental doctrine that labour is the keystone of all educational activity. After finishing this school the pupils take either to professional courses by joining factories or farms or go to the university for higher education.

The other important features of the Russian educational system are: 1. the great fight that is now being waged in order to remove illiteracy among the masses by means of adult education; 2. the provision of museums and art galleries for educating the public; 3. the founding of the state publishing house for publishing suitable text-books and literature for the use of the general public; and lastly the opening of cheap cinemas and theatres, wireless and radio centres, workmen's clubs, reading rooms, libraries, etc.

There are other chapters in the book which deal in detail with the high school and the university curriculum. One special feature of Russian education is that all the schools maintain a close contact with the people and the industries round about, so much so that education is closely related to the daily life of an average Russian. Under this system of education, self-effort, initiative and self-discipline are fostered in every pupil and that after finishing his course he is not put to the necessity of loitering about in search of a job. Though education is not made compulsory it is said that more than 95 per cent. of the Russian population receives in one form or another the benefit of education under the Soviet system.

The book contains a number of illustrations and affords interesting reading.

S. R. VENKATA RAMAN.

GREAT BRITAIN'S NATIONAL CAPITAL.

THE NATIONAL CAPITAL. THE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS OF SIR JOSIAH STAMP.
(Royal Statistical Society, London.) 1930. 31cm.
24p. 1/6.

THIS booklet deals with the very important question of the national capital of Great Britain. This task, as compared with the task of estimating national income, is rendered extremely difficult by recent changes "in the rates of interest and other capitalizing factors"; in spite of these difficulties the author has made a thoroughly reliable estimate of national capital. He has in the beginning set forth the various purposes for which estimates like the one in hand are useful amongst which is included the test of relative prosperity of different nations either as a whole or per head of the population. Discussing the troublesome question of the inclusion of the national debt in the total of national capital, Sir Josiah Stamp reiterates the conclusion he arrived at in writing his volume *British Incomes* in 1914; it is that national debt should not be added to capital "unless the value of all incomes has pro tanto fallen during the period when interest is paid on the national debt."

As his basis of calculation, the author takes the income assessed by the Inland Revenue Department in 1929. For real property he arrives at an estimate £5400 millions total capital, to which he adds £450 millions for farm buildings, etc. For trading profits he takes the commercial and trading profits as given by the *Economist* and applies the multiplier determined by this average of interest on debentures and shares; he gives the capital value of £5700 millions. Adding to this £2400 millions for retail trade and professions the total for trade comes to £8100 millions; to this he adds unrevealed values due to rising public estimation of future capital appreciation to the extent of £575 millions. For Railways he assigns £860 millions, for the capital value of War Securities he assigns £4866 millions and £1290 millions is this estimate for Foreign Securities. It is to be noted that the author does not leave out of account the subtleties of loss and evasion and on this account he raises all income estimates by 5 per cent. in order to arrive at the above figures. For movable property and Government property he has allowed £2400 millions. Out of the grand total of £24945 millions he has deducted income belonging to people abroad equivalent to £500 millions and ultimately arrived at £18,045 millions as the volume of net capital after a further deduction of the interest on national debt.

After thus supplying the broadest lines of such an estimate Sir Josiah Stamp appeals to other persons to deal with the details of this entrancing subject. We trust that his appeal will not be lost on future research workers including the Fellows of the Statistical Society.

V. N. GODBOLE.

RURAL ECONOMICS.

ECONOMIC ORGANISATION OF INDIAN VILLAGES, VOL. II. By N. G. RANGA.
(Taraporewalla, Bombay.) 1929. 21cm. 207p. Rs.2.

THE first volume in this series was devoted to the study of the deltaic villages of the Godavari districts and more especially with the farm costs and family budgets of the peasants therein. The volume under review contains a detailed study of the economic conditions of three dry villages and the possibilities of reconstructing them. But more than this, great importance is attached by the author to the first

part of the inquiry which deals with the problem of internal migration of the ryots from the most congested parts of the Ceded Districts into the underdeveloped or undeveloped parts of the Hyderabad State.

The author points out that the Hyderabad State is much bigger in area than half the Madras Presidency but has only more than one-fourth of the population of the latter. Evidently it is much less thickly populated. Of the total unoccupied land nearly 57.7 per cent. is cultivable and suitable for colonisation. In the Warrangal District alone, there are 1,91,593 acres available for colonisation, out of which 1,57,293 i. e. nearly 80 per cent. are cultivable. It is further pointed out that the Andhras of the Ceded Districts in general and more especially the Kammas, the Reddis and the Telugus who can boast of military traditions, possess an enterprising spirit necessary for colonisation. The thirst for land of an Andhra ryot is insatiable and his keenness to jump at even a flimsy opportunity of securing cheap but fertile land is simply wonderful. But unfortunately the public is too apathetic to encourage him and the Government too are most unwilling to change their laissez faire policy, so that the enterprising Andhra ryots who emigrate to the Nizam's Dominions have to suffer many political disabilities under the "inefficient and autocratic administrative machine" of His Exalted Highness. Instances of bribery and corruption among officials are cited, not by way of criticizing the Nizam's Government, but to show how injustice is generally meted out to the poor peasants. The author therefore pleads for the appointment of an Immigrant Officer by the Government of India in the Hyderabad State to see that the British Indian immigrants are treated properly and given the necessary facilities for securing, developing and retaining land. If the interests of the Indian settlers in South Africa, Brazil, and Ceylon are accepted as legitimate concerns of the Indian Government, it is difficult to see why the interests of the home immigrants should not be so considered. For the development of a sound policy, the author freely mentions the facilities offered by the Governments of U. S. A., Canada and Ceylon. The existing rules of colonisation of the Nizam's Government are printed in the appendix. These are well worth consideration and would not only benefit the poor peasants but add immensely to the wealth and prosperity of the Hyderabad State.

We now come to the second part of the laborious inquiry, an arduous task yet a labour of love to the author, in which the economic conditions of the peasants of three dry villages are presented with full statistical details. It would be exceeding our limits to give here all the constructive proposals of the author and so we would content ourselves with a skeleton sketch.

An accurate picture of the peasant's plight is gleaned through the statistics supplied by the author. The general standard of living is low and the net savings from agricultural operations are practically insignificant. The villages offer employment for 240 days in a year so that the problem of enforced leisure becomes important. To remedy this unemployment and to reduce the pressure of population in congested areas, the author proposes a state subsidized department to organise 'labour exchanges' as in western countries, notably in France. To wipe out the evils of indebtedness, liquidation of prior debts through the cooperative credit societies is accepted as a sound step and further to prevent improvident borrowing, the device of compulsory registration in the village agricultural panchayat is proposed and loans are to be only at authorised rates of interest and payable in suitable instalments. Each village is to have its own panchayat the members of which are to be

electd by lot and not by vote, for, the author thinks, the latter would foment factions. We differ from him in thinking that election by lot would weaken the democratic character of such a body and though there would be factions in the beginning, they would soon harden into a regular party system. The village panchayats are further to be linked into a district federation of agricultural panchayats, which is to work in all matters of policy as an intermediary between the people and the Government. It is expected to function almost like Agricultural Organisation Societies in Ireland or England. There is no doubt a romantic touch in this idea of federation but as these are to be voluntary institutions there would be great difficulties, until the public is convinced of their utility, in the matter of securing the services of good and influential workers. The local Governments also must actively cooperate to inspire confidence in them and to make them a success. A punitive tax is proposed to check absentee landlordism, but it is doubtful how far this would be helpful in compelling the absentee landholders to take to agricultural operations. The evils of excessive fragmentation, deterioration of cattle wealth, defective irrigation and transport facilities also receive proper consideration and remedial measures are suggested on the lines of those in vogue in Denmark, Norway and Sweden. The place of women in the rural economy of our villages does not escape the notice of the author and he proposes schools of domestic agriculture for their education and subsidiary industries for their employment.

It will thus be noted that the book furnishes an ambitious scheme of rural reconstruction, the success of which depends upon the perfect working of the panchayats. It need hardly be emphasized that in a country so overwhelmingly dominated by the agricultural population, agriculture alone holds the key to the prosperity of the teeming millions. Agriculture alone will be the foundation upon which the commercial and business life will be based and the circumstances that affect agriculture would react sensibly through the entire life of the nation. Commissions and committees have submitted their voluminous reports which brim with sympathetic sermons and dignified generalisations. And intensive researches like those conducted by Prof. Ranga are absolutely necessary at least as correctives to their wide conclusions. Prof. Ranga's two volumes are valuable contributions to our rural economic science. No true cooperator or no one interested in rural reconstruction can do without them.

S. G. PURANIK.

SHORT NOTICES.

THE SNAKE-POISON AND VARIOUS OTHER POISONS HOW TREATED. By P. RAMA KURUP. (The Mangalodayam Press, Trichur.) 1931. 20cm. 133p. Re. 1/-.

THE book is written by a person who is neither qualified in Western medicine nor in Ayurveda nor in Unani. He has not cared to refer to medical books on this subject either in the Eastern and Western system of medicine. His blunders in Latin synonyms of plants are unpardonable. He refers to the Ayurvedic system of snake-bite treatment, and gives no reason why he selects only certain parts of it and ignores the rest. He enforces the necessity of knowing the etiology of symptoms—Sapta-Dhatu (?) and quietly ignores his own statement when he passes on to treatment.

He may be pardoned for not knowing the latest literature on snake-bite remedies, &c., but certainly ought to have known of the existence of the experiment-

by Fayrer and others in 1880 and later on wherein many of the drugs he mentions have been proved to be useless. I have myself examined all the snake-bite and scorpion-bite remedies he mentions and had the same experience of them. A few dog-bite remedies have also been tried and found wanting; these results are being published.

K. S. MHASKAR.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ECONOMIC DOCTRINE. By ALEXANDER GRAY. (Longmans, London.) 1931. 20cm. 384p. 5/-.

ENGLISH and Indian Universities have hitherto neglected the study of economic thought. But its value in the proper appreciation of economic principles has now come to be recognised. However with

the exception of Ingram, Haney, Gide and Rist there have been no proper text books which would be suitable to a beginner. The above-mentioned books, though admirably written, are so comprehensive that a beginner is inevitably confused and sometimes gets disgusted. They are indispensable for a specialised study of the history of economic thought. As a useful stepping-stone to them the book of Alexander Gray serves admirably. Though some inspiring names in political economy have been omitted in the interest of simplicity the writer has taken good care to preserve the unity and continuity of the development of economic thought and to distinguish clearly the different schools and types of economic theories and represent them fairly.

K. S. V.

CENTRAL RESPONSIBILITY.

MR. JOSHI'S SPEECH IN F. S. COMMITTEE.

The following speech was made by Mr. N. M. Joshi in the Federal Structure Sub-Committee of the Round Table Conference on 28th October :-

LORD Chancellor, I wish to say a few words about the responsibility of the Ministry to the Legislature. The first point to which I wish to refer is the proposal made by Diwan Bahadur Mudaliyar that the Ministry should be responsible to the two Chambers jointly. That proposal does not find favour with me. I feel, Lord Chancellor, that if we are going now to get a responsible government in India, that government should be responsible to the common people of India. Although we may have a Second Chamber in India, properly constituted, nevertheless the Executive Government must remain responsible only to the popular Chamber; otherwise it will not be a government responsible to the common people but it will be a government responsible to some persons who are not really representatives of the people. I consider that the Upper House will not be representative of the people. As a matter of fact there are proposals that in the Upper House there should be 50% of the members who will represent not the people but the Princes; and there are proposals supported by Sir Manekjee Dadabhoj that there should be a large proportion of representatives of the capitalist classes.

Sir Manekjee Dadabhoj: I never said that.

Mr. Joshi: I consider, Lord Chancellor, that a real popular government should be made responsible only to the popular Chamber.

The next point which I wish to touch upon is the question of the majority by which the Executive Government should be turned out. Mr. Mudaliyar proposed that there should be an absolute majority which should compel the Executive Government to resign office. Sir, I quite appreciate the desire of some members to secure the stability of the Executive Government without making very large sacrifices by the devices which they have proposed. If you provide, in order to secure a stable government, that an ordinary majority in the House should not suffice, but you provide that you should have an absolute majority of members voting, I think you may secure stability to some extent, but you will secure the sta-

bility of an Executive Government which will not command the respect of the Legislature or the respect of the country. If a Ministry has not got a majority in the House and cannot get its legislation passed, cannot get its supplies voted, and still remains in power, I do not think it will command the respect of the members of the Legislature; it will not even get the respect of the people in the country. I have myself seen in the present Provincial Legislatures Ministers holding office but not having the respect of the members of the Legislature or of the country. Ministers proclaim in the legislatures their policy. They are defeated on the principles of that policy. In order to keep up their office they bow to the decision of the Legislature. What does that mean? Does it mean that their principles were not very dear to them, that they did not approve of those principles, but that in order to keep their job, if I may say so, or in order to keep in office, to keep up their power, they accepted a principle which only a little time before the discussion they considered to be a wrong principle? I therefore feel, Lord Chancellor, that if we try to secure the stability of the Executive by such devices, we shall not get a Ministry which commands the respect of the country and of the Legislature. I am therefore in favour of the Ministers resigning as soon as they find that they have not the confidence of the members who vote.

Lord Chancellor, while Mr. Mudaliyar was speaking I placed before him certain figures showing the position of certain parties, showing that under certain circumstances a group of members of the Legislature may not vote, and on account of a group of members not voting a smaller group may remain in power. It is quite possible that in India our members of the Legislature may be divided according to some principles; questions regarding tariffs may come forward. Those who are free traders will not like tariffs; those who are in favour of protection will like tariffs; but there may be some people who are indifferent to tariffs. These people may not vote on certain occasions. If because a certain group of members does not vote you keep up a Ministry consisting of a smaller group in the House, in my judg-

ment you are giving away your Executive Government to a smaller group, and it will cease to be a representative government. I was not thinking, when I asked the question, that members may not vote because they are merely indifferent to voting, but that they may be indifferent as to which party should form the Government and in that case may not vote. If you made a rule such as that the majority of members must vote in order to turn out a Ministry, you may keep a smaller group in power.

Chairman: Yes, I see what you mean.

Mr. Joshi: I consider that that is an undesirable thing. In order to avoid what Mr. Mudaliyar called the passing whims and fancies of the members of the Legislature, I am quite prepared to accept some kind of provision which will prevent a vote of non-confidence being moved merely for vexatious purposes. You may make a rule that before a vote of non-confidence is allowed to be moved there should be a certain proportion of members present showing themselves in favour; but even that number must be a small number. Lord Chancellor, the right of moving a vote of non-confidence is utilised not only for turning out a Ministry but as a preliminary measure for discussing measures of policy. You know that in Great Britain votes of non-confidence or motions to that effect are moved, not because the Opposition feels that the Government will be defeated, or that there is the slightest chance of the Government being defeated on that motion, but a vote of non-confidence is moved in order that the Legislature should have an opportunity of discussing the policy of the Government.

Chairman: Yes, that is so.

Mr. Joshi: I therefore feel that if you make a provision that one-third of the members of the Legislature—not even one-third of the members present—must signify their assent to moving a vote of non-confidence, you will deprive the Legislature of a valuable right of discussing the policy of the Government. I would therefore put that number at a very small figure, in order to prevent one, two or three people only taking advantage of their right to move a vote of non-confidence for vexatious purposes. But as soon as you find that there is an appreciable group in the House—it may be a small group but an appreciable group in the House—who want to discuss the policy of the Government on an important measure, the vote of non-confidence should be allowed to be discussed.

Then the question was raised as to the representatives of the States being allowed to take part in a vote of non-confidence on British Indian matters, and it was said that they should be allowed to take part in such a vote. I do not feel that this is the right attitude to adopt. We are anxious that there should be no difference in the Federal Government between Central British Indian matters and Federal matters. I for one am very anxious that all matters which will be within the purview of the Federal

Government shall be Federal matters; but, if the States insist that certain subjects may be made Central so far as British India is concerned but should not be made Federal; then I feel that the States should really have no voice, either by convention or by statute, in discussing votes of no-confidence on the Ministry or British Indian matters, because I feel that by that means the States will be able to control the policy of the Government on matters which are purely British Indian.

The Ministry may refuse to carry out the policy dictated by the Legislature on a Central subject which is purely British Indian, and, if the members of the Legislature do not want an Executive Government which will not carry out their policy, then they have no remedy if the States can take part in the vote of no-confidence and can keep the Ministry in office.

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru said that the reason is obvious, namely, that the States which take part in the Executive Government should have a voice in turning out the Executive Government. The reason is obvious to me so far as Federal matters are concerned, but it is not obvious to me why the States should help in keeping in office a Ministry which refuses to carry out the policy dictated by the Legislature on Central subjects which are of purely British Indian interest.

It is true that the members of the legislature who represent the States will have to resign along with the other members, but, if they are elected members, they will be responsible to their constituencies, and they will be returned again if their constituencies consider their policy to be right. If, on the other hand, they are members who are nominated by the Princes, the Princes may nominate them again. If the next Prime Minister wants the same people as ministers in the next Ministry they may again be taken but the Princes cannot claim to keep a Ministry in power which refuses to carry out the policy dictated by the Legislature on British Indian matters.

I therefore feel that no right should be given to the States to take part in the discussion of a vote of no confidence in a Ministry on a purely British Indian matter.

I do not wish to speak on the other points raised by Diwan Bahadur Mudaliyar in dealing with this subject.

Chairman: Thank you very much, Mr. Joshi; we are very much obliged to you.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- ARTICLES ON R. T. C. AND OTHER ADDRESSES. By C. R. REDDY. (Modern Book Mart, Madras.) 1931. 18cm. 81p.
- A HANDBOOK OF PRACTICAL AND WRITTEN WORK IN ECONOMICS. By E. C. BHATTY. (The Indian Press, Ltd., Allahabad.) 1930. 21cm. 165p.
- MAHATMA GANDHI: THE MAN AND HIS MISSION. (G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras.) 1931. 18cm. 200p. Re. 1.
- LIBRARY HAND-BOOK AND INDEX. By R. G. KANADE. (Author, Servants of India Society, Bombay 4.) 1931. 18cm. 96p. Rs. 2.