

The Servant of India

EDITOR ; P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XV, No. 30. }

POONA—THURSDAY, AUGUST 4, 1932.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	265
ARTICLES :—	
Indo-British Financial Disputes.	267
The Davidson Report.	268
Imperial Preference.—II. By D. R. Gadgil.	269
OUR GENEVA LETTER.	271
OUR LONDON LETTER.	272
REVIEWS :—	
Hinduism. By R. Pratapgiri.	273
Industrial Efficiency. By Y. G. Naik.	275
MISCELLANEOUS :—	
Sincerity and Speed. By H. S. L. Polak.	276

Topics of the Week.

Dr. Moonje's Statement.

DR. MOONJE, who like Sardar Ujjat Singh is still holding on to the Consultative Committee with a view, probably, to make the Prime Minister's communal award, rather than Sir Samuel Hoare's abandonment of the Conference method, the occasion for his refusal of co-operation, has now issued a statement in which he recommends the British Government to make a declaration on certain points. He would like, first of all, to be made clear that central responsibility would be conceded irrespective of federation. He is still apprehensive that the Princes may not come in, and therefore wants to make certain that Indian self-government should not be made to hang on the attitude of an external element. Then he would like to set a definite maximum limit of thirty years to the transfer of full control over defence to Indians. He fixes this limit at that point because a former Commander-in-Chief, Lord Rawlinson, himself proposed a scheme for the Indianisation of the officer ranks of the Army within thirty years. Since this is the only impediment in the way of Indians undertaking their own defence at present there is no reason why this consummation should be delayed for more than that period. The duration of financial reservations need not, in his opinion, be so long. It must not extend to more than fifteen years. A novitiate of fifteen years in restricted self-government is enough guarantee "for the maintenance unimpaired of the financial stability and credit" of the country. During the period of transition the reserved departments should still be handed over to men selected from the elected members of the legislature. These are sensible proposals which could best be discussed at the R. T. C., but the

Conference itself being wound up there is no machinery left where such suggestions could be canvassed.

R. T. C. Merchants.

THE representatives of the Indian merchants on the R. T. C. profess their inability to subscribe to the other Round Tablers' pledge for non-co-operation on the ground that their grievance against the Government is deeper than that of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru or Mr. Jayakar. While the latter gentlemen will co-operate if the so-called conference method is restored to their satisfaction, Sir Purshotamdas and Mr. Birla will still feel constrained to stay away—as long as Mahatma Gandhi's co-operation is not forthcoming. It is generally believed that the resolution passed by the Federation of Indian Chambers in March last enjoins non-co-operation upon its delegates until repression is abandoned. This resolution, however, is so elastic that if Sir Purshotamdas likes to walk into the Consultative Committee's meeting when it takes place next time he can do so consistently with this resolution. For what the resolution requires, in order that the Federation's delegates may be in a position to offer co-operation, is not that the Government shall withdraw its repressive measures, but merely that it shall show a genuine desire to do so. All the Ordinances may remain in full force, and yet Mr. Birla and Sir Purshotamdas may detect some signs of a change in Sir Samuel Hoare, and on the basis of these offer to work on the R.T.C. committees.

If our commercial magnates seriously intended to make the termination of the repressive regime a condition precedent to their taking part in the Conference, they could have said so in unmistakable language. They have shown power of precise expression in the past when it suited them to do so. If they are now ambiguous it must be because ambiguity suits them now. Colour is given to this inference by what purports to be a report, published in the *Leader* of 31st July, of a speech made by Sir Purshotamdas to a private meeting of the Federation before the resolution referred to above was adopted. He is said to have addressed the Federation as follows: "If anything, since the Government are preventing the Congressmen working on the Consultative Committee by the policy which they had hatched, it would appear to me to be all the more reason that any person who has your confidence should be asked to go and work there and lodge your protest in that Committee. . . . If you feel that I can do anything at all I have no hesitation in saying that the right policy would be to go there and prevent any wrong being done. . . . In my view the struggle is likely to be a prolonged one and I wonder whether it is not up to us to press our point of view on the powers that be in whatever constitution that may be forced upon us. Are we justified, claiming to repre-

sent the commercial community, in abstaining from any invitation that may be made for the purpose of securing our views?" It is not in the least improbable that Sir Purshotamdas might have actually advanced this argument; he is just the person who would do so. But being defeated, it is possible to have used his influence in so framing the Federation's resolution that although the doors of the Consultative Committee would be shut on him, a window or two might still be left ajar through which he could possibly make his way in. It is not surprising, therefore, that he finds it difficult to put his hand to a paper which would commit him definitely to a course of action not to his liking.

* * *

A Mad Idea.

NEWS was recently cabled to India about the promotion by Mr. Vithalbhaji Patel of an Indo-Irish association, of which the main purpose is, as described by Mr. Sunder Kabadi in the *People* of 31st July, first, to link up the Indian struggle for independence with the Irish struggle for a Republic, and then to use this nucleus for the purpose of bringing other countries like Egypt into the net. Mr. Patel said to Mr. Kabadi in a special interview given to him: Indians and Irishmen

"should form themselves into groups and carry on propaganda in their respective countries for the boycott of British goods and of British concerns until Ireland and India are completely free. The Dublin organisation when actually started might possibly serve as an inspiration to the people in other countries to do likewise. My view is that membership of such organisations should be open only to those persons who are prepared to make a declaration that they will not buy British goods or, directly or indirectly, encourage British concerns until the two countries attain their freedom. Mere lip sympathy cannot carry India or Ireland any further. Time has arrived when those who sincerely believe in the freedom of the two countries must organise themselves and start a sympathetic boycott in their respective countries.

"I have been discussing this plan with friends in different parts and in different countries and I hope it will take a definite shape at no distant date. There is also a view that a struggle of the Egyptian people for the freedom of their country should also be linked up with Indian and Irish struggle. All the three countries are sailing in the same boat and any plan to link up the three struggles for independence is bound to be of great value."

As we showed in a recent issue, Ireland depends for 91.4 per cent. of her exports upon the English market, whereas England does not send more than 6 per cent. of her exports to Ireland. That being the case, who will suffer most by the mutual exclusion policy if it were to be pursued by these countries? Mr. Arthur Griffiths' dying words to his countrymen were: "Hold fast to the Anglo-Irish Treaty. It is Ireland's need and economic salvation." And what is the object for which Ireland is invited to boycott English goods and thus ruin herself economically? For the sake of obtaining that modicum of power which is covered by a Republican form of government and which is not covered by a Dominion form of government, i. e., for the sake of renouncing allegiance to the British Crown? Mr. de Valera may be expected to do many foolish things, but even he will stop at this. And whatever he may do for the emotional satisfaction of preserving Irish honour, does Mr. Patel really think that he will engage in a sympathetic boycott for making India's path towards self-government easier? A madder idea was never broached.

* * *

German Election.

AS was anticipated, the Nazis have come at the top of the poll in the General Elections to the Reichstag, but have failed to obtain an absolute majority of seats in the House. The rise of this party to political power is almost miraculous. Even when in September 1930 they increased their number of seats from a bare handful of 12 in the old house to 107 it looked very much like a miracle. Now they have jumped from 107 to 230 seats in two years' time, their poll having increased from 6,401,210 to 13,732,779. In the Reichstag of 1930 the Nazis formed the second largest party: now they form the first, Social Democrats occupying the second position. Indeed, they have made a sweeping progress.

The parties to the Right will command 274 votes, (Nazis 230; Nationalists 37; People's Party 7). Even this Coalition will not however obtain a clear majority, in the house. Therefore, great as the achievement of the Rightist parties is, it falls short of a victory. The parties to the Left will together command 229 votes (Social Democrats 133; Centrists 76; Bavarian People's Party 20). The Communists who will be 89 strong in the new Reichstag will, of course, stand apart. It will be seen that the Nazis by themselves will be as numerous as all the Leftist groups, but they will be unable to govern the country unless they make a temporary alliance with one or more groups to the Left.

However, they will hardly be given an opportunity of entering into alliances. If reports speak true, their hands are already tied. When President Hindenburg dismissed the Bruening Ministry and installed the von Papen Ministry in its place, it is believed that he was given an undertaking that the new Ministry would not be in office only for two months till the new elections took place, but that even if other parties secured a majority they would allow Herr von Papen's men to retain the three key positions in the new Cabinet, viz., of the Interior, Foreign affairs and Defence or Reichswehr, the Prussian Government however being surrendered into the hands of the Nazis. Even if no such understanding was reached when the von Papen Ministry was formed, there is no doubt that the result of the election being what it is, the Ministry will be maintained in power. President von Hindenburg has no doubt been loyal to the Republican constitution; but when by a turn of the wheel the Junkers and militarists have come into power—men with whom his own life has been cast—he is not likely to be in too great a hurry to turn them out. Col. Franz von Papen, Baron Wilhelm von Gayl and, above all, Lieutenant General Kurt von Schleicher may therefore be expected to enjoy power for a long time. The Catholic Centre party, to which Chancellor von Papen professes to belong, but of which the real leader is Dr. Heinrich Bruening, does not seem destined to have much of a chance in the near future.

* * *

India's Share in Debt Cancellation.

A CORRESPONDENT writes: *Indian Finance* recently made a suggestion that India should put in a claim for a remission of her war debts if, in consequence of the abrogation of the reparations payments at Lausanne, the war debts of the European allied powers also come to be cancelled. However, I do not think that a claim need be formally made, for I believe India would automatically share in all the concessions that European countries would get. Last year, as I understand it, she received the benefit of the Hoover moratorium on reparations and war debts; the payment on account of her war gift to England

of £100 million was suspended. From this it follows that when a total cancellation takes effect India will be absolved from the payment of the balance of this gift. This will not however be a very large advantage, for India has already extinguished much of the debt which she incurred in order to meet her liabilities in this connection. Up to the 31st March 1924 she had redeemed £80.73 million, leaving only £19.27 million to be paid. Since then she paid in the next five years £2.55 million and £16.72 million are yet to be paid. But even this would be to India some relief in her present economic situation. In the meanwhile, that is to say, until the war debts are remitted, she will get the benefit of the conversion scheme of Great Britain. For, when she made the contribution of £100 million, she took over the 5 per cent. British War Loan, 1929-47. This is now being converted into 3½ per cents. She will thus effect a saving in the interest charges, which will immediately be £250,000, until the debt itself is wiped off.

Statutory Communal Majority ?

THE *Bombay Chronicle* says: "We are able to state definitely that the Government have no intention of giving the Muslims a statutory majority in the Punjab or in Bengal. The allocation of seats in the Punjab Provincial Legislature has already been decided and will be as follows:— Fifteen per cent. of the seats will be set aside for Zemindars, Commerce and Labour. A similar reservation for these classes has been decided on for Bengal.

"Again, in the Punjab, fifteen per cent. of the seats will be allotted to the Sikhs. This leaves 70 per cent., of which 40 per cent. will go to the Mahomedans, leaving 30 per cent. for the Hindu and the general electorate."

This is good news, for the Sikhs are preparing themselves to resist a Muslim majority, if one is imposed upon the Punjab by the Premier's decision with all the resources at their disposal. On 24th July at Ranjit Singh's mausoleum in Lahore an influential Sikh gathering considered the situation and decided to administer, by means of volunteers whose number one hears has reached a lakh, the following vow to their co-religionists:—

I.....in the presence of Guru Granth Sahib pledge that I shall not tolerate any communal majority granted in any way to any particular community and take a vow that I shall try to fight against this by making every possible sacrifice. I pray He may give me power to fulfil my pledge.

We can well understand what the Sikhs' "fight", though used metaphorically, would mean in actual practice. The *People* is moved by the proceedings of the meeting to say: "While the Muslim communalists have no case worth the name, we do think a warning against tactics that may lead to civil war is badly needed." And it goes on to say: "The immediate issue for India is self-government, and not the communal allotment. This can wait." If the Sikhs feel that they can fight the Muslims backed by the British Government (occasion for fighting would not arise if the Muslims do not receive the British Government's backing), then surely, the *People* argues, there would be no difficulty in tackling the Muslims when the bureaucracy is out of the way under self-government. We hope the Sikh community will heed the warning, considering the source from which it proceeds.

Articles.

INDO-BRITISH FINANCIAL DISPUTES.

A PRESS communique of 2nd July informed us that a resolution was adopted on 30th June by both Houses of Parliament giving their formal consent, as required by the Government of India Act, to placing on Indian revenues a charge of £13.6 million incurred by India in 1918-19 on account of the troops sent by her to the scene of the Great War as her contribution to the Empire's war effort. The delay of some twelve years that has occurred in regularising this book-keeping transaction was due, we were told in the communique, to a consideration of the other claims arising out of the war. "These consisted of claims and counter-claims, in many cases of large sums of money, between His Majesty's Government and the Government of India and raised questions of principle which led to a prolonged discussion. A final settlement of these claims and counter-claims has now been reached on the basis of no further payment by either party. This settlement means that the Government of India are now relieved from possible heavy additional claims." It is clear from this that the Government consider this to be a very satisfactory settlement of what Earl Winterton has truly called "a long and stubborn controversy" between the War Office and the India Office. But the grounds for this satisfaction, not being given, we deemed it wise to wait till the text of the Secretary of State's speech in the House of Commons was available.

Our patience, however, has not been too well rewarded. Mr. Attlee congratulated Sir Samuel Hoare "on having described a rather complicated financial problem in a very few words." We are afraid we cannot ladle out such compliments to him; for the brevity of his speech has been secured at the expense of information which not only would have been welcome, but which was absolutely necessary to convince Indians that a fair and just solution had been reached. In fact the meaning of Sir Samuel's words is anything but clear. He says, first, that the rival claims of the two Governments have been adjusted on the clean slate basis; and that the resolution will, once and for all, put an end to this transaction. But later he says, "This sum (£13,600,000) takes no account of additional amounts for which India has accepted liability in order to secure the settlement, but as against these may reasonably be set certain sums accruing to Indian revenues in connection with the war." Now, what are these amounts which India has agreed to pay "in order to secure the settlement"? And if that is so, how can it be said to be an "arrangement of a clean slate"? Anyway information is needed on this subject before we can endorse Mr. Attlee's verdict that it is a "fair settlement." And a final settlement it obviously is not, judging from Sir Samuel Hoare's last words.

This particular transaction of £13.6 million can be easily described. India first agreed to forego the normal charges of the Indian troops employed beyond

her borders with the various expeditionary forces. These amounted to £33.2 million. Then India made a special contribution in a lump sum of £100 million. And finally, as an additional contribution, she offered in September, 1918, to meet certain charges which were calculated to amount, on the basis that the war would last till March 1920, to £40 million. To this contribution certain conditions were attached: if India was faced with a costly war on the frontier or if on account of a currency crisis or a famine or any such thing she was required to undertake heavy burdens which would seriously cripple her financial strength, she would be entitled to reconsider whether the help should be continued or stopped. But in no case was the contribution to be made, after the war had ceased, and in order that this may be automatically brought about it was proposed that, instead of making a lump contribution as in the previous year, India should offer to meet the charges of certain specific war items, so that, as the then Finance Member Sir William Marris explained, "the burden which would fall upon us and the relief afforded to His Majesty's Government will be automatically regulated by the length of the war." It was expected that in 1918-19 the expense on account of these items would be £12.7 million, in 1919-20 £14.7 million and in 1920-21, allowing for the results of gradual demobilization which it was assumed would begin in April 1920, £7.7 million, or £35.1 million in all. To this was to be added £10 million on account of additional pension charges, thus making £45 million in all.

As a matter of fact, not only had India the third Afghan war on her hands but a serious deterioration had taken place in her economic position, thus necessitating reconsideration of the continuance of additional help even if the war had lasted as long as it was expected, but, contrary to all calculations, the war itself "ended almost at once," as Sir Samuel Hoare says, after the Indian Legislature had offered to make the contribution, and yet as much as £13.6 million had already been paid before the year was out. It was found that the pension charges would, under the terms of the offer, amount to thrice as much as they were estimated, and a compromise was arrived at by which these charges were fixed at a figure "which would not largely exceed the figure included on this account in the original calculations." Why then the question of continuing the contribution was raised at all in the following year after the specific pledge given by the Finance Member that it was to be limited to the currency of the war, and how, when the war came to a close within a month after the offer, £13.6 million came to be paid out are questions that cannot but suggest themselves to one who looks critically at this affair. However, these questions cannot be raised now. But we are certainly entitled to ask, in the first place, which of the outstanding financial matters have now been settled, and what are the grounds on which in respect of them His Majesty's Government and the Government of India are declared to be quits.

An idea can be gained of the nature and

magnitude of the questions at issue from the reply of Sir Basil Blackett to an interpellation in the Legislative Assembly on 1st February, 1924. One of the items mentioned in this list is the "pension claim by the War Office against India," amounting to between £25 and £40 million. In Appendix II to the Government of India's Financial Statement for 1920-21, however, we are told that this claim was compounded for a lump sum payment of £9 million, or when spread over 20 years for £13.5 million; and it was taken into account when on 9th March, 1920, the Legislature decided in what manner the terms of India's offer for additional help should be revised. One would have thought that after what was described by the then Finance Member, Sir Malcolm Hailey, as "a settlement" of the claim, this matter in any case would no longer remain in dispute. The other main disputed point relates to the apportionment of expenditure incurred in Persia. There may be good ground for a mutual acquittance on the part of both Governments in respect of all such claims; "each side," as observed by Sir Samuel Hoare, "seeing that there was not much in it between the two washing their claims out." But Indians would like to have more details as to the assessment of each of these claims and counter-claims and would like to be convinced that really "there was not much in it between the two." Earl Winterton took credit in this debate to former Secretaries of State who, he said, had represented India's case to His Majesty's Government as "no ambassador or Foreign Minister could have represented any country's case." This in some cases is undoubtedly true. One would however like to assure oneself from a detailed study of all these transactions that the present Secretary of State has also done the fair thing by India; and it behoves the Government of India to supply all the materials necessary for the formation of a considered opinion on this subject. The general feeling is that these questions should have been referred to arbitration as the question of capitulation charges has been referred to a tribunal of which the chairman is Sir Robert Garran, Solicitor General in Australia, and the Government of India's nominee—an admirable choice—Sir Shadi Lal.

THE DAVIDSON REPORT.

THE Report of the Davidson Committee is a piece of special pleading, unsatisfactory and unconvincing. The Committee was charged with the duty of assessing the "credits and debits," as it were, between British India and the Indian states. Their conclusions were bound to affect the finances, not only of the States, but of British India. British Indians had therefore a vital interest in its deliberations and findings. And yet British Indians were kept at arm's length. The Report contains the conclusions of the all-white Committee arrived at after hearing only the case of the States as expounded by the Princes and their Ministers. The result is that British Indians have been asked to find a subvention of a crore of rupees a year for the benefit of the States. The Committee have not helped to make the

proposal more acceptable to British Indians by sermonising them that the contribution that the Princes were making by agreeing to the federation "is not to be weighed in golden scales."

It will be recalled that the Federal Finance Committee, presided over by Lord Percy, attempted to draw up a federal budget, and included in the sources of federal revenue Customs, Salt, Railways, Currency and States' Contributions. In respect of these there is at present no uniformity or equality of incidence between British India and the Indian States and the Indian States *inter se*. Some States pay annual cash tributes to British India; some others have in the past commuted their cash payments by the cession of territories to British India; and others make a similar contribution. As between the contributing States the incidence is arbitrary and unequal. On the other hand, some States enjoy immunity from contributing to the federal revenues under salt and customs; others have their own currency and posts and telegraphs, etc. In the matter of these contributions and immunities there have been jealousies between the Princes and grievances against the Political Department. The Committee were told that under an ideal system of federal finance all federal units should contribute on a uniform basis to federal resources, and were asked to suggest ways and means by which the federal finances of India could be made to approximate as near as possible to that ideal.

The Committee classify into seven categories the cash tributes paid by some States to the Government of India: some were pure tributes; others were to cover the cost of stationing British troops in the States for the protection of Rulers; others in lieu of the obligation of the States to maintain troops for the use of the British; and so on. (There are wheels within wheels; a slave of a slave, as the Sanskrit proverb has it. Some States pay tribute to other States, which in turn, pay tribute to the Government of India!) The Committee propose that all the cash payments, except one payment made by Baroda, should be remitted. The proposal was first made at the Round Table Conference, at which it was held that there was no place for contributions of a feudal nature under a federal constitution, and that, therefore, the contributions should go as soon as the finances of the central Government permitted. The Committee are at considerable pains to demonstrate that these payments were not of a feudal nature, and were in some respects quite the contrary. They justify the remission on the "fundamental and equitable principle that contributions to federal resources should be on a uniform basis." All the States do not pay tribute and British Indian Provinces do not pay tribute either, and the States that pay do not pay on a uniform basis. Hence, for the sake of uniformity, the tributes must go with the inauguration of federation.

The Committee have held that they could make no distinction between cash contributions and the cession of territory in commutation thereof. They feel precluded from suggesting the retrocession of ceded territory—the question of Berars was excluded from their purview—and they, therefore, suggest

compensation being paid to the States which had ceded territories. In the case of Baroja, however, they venture on a departure and suggest some districts being handed back to the State.

When however they come to the immunities which some States enjoy the Committee without much ado throw overboard their fundamental principle of equality of contribution to the federal resources and blandly announce that they see no indication that the Princes would agree to their immunities being terminated. Certain States keep to themselves the proceeds of salt tax and customs duties, while other States along with British India contribute them to the federal revenues. But in such cases the Committee do not recommend that these proceeds should be made over to the federal Government and uniformity of obligations secured.

Far from persuading the Princes to give up their immunities for the sake of uniformity, the Committee, though reluctantly, agree to widen the field of inequality. Land customs between units of the federation, for instance, are anti-federal and should disappear when the federation comes into being. Many States have to-day the right to levy land customs duties, but some are prohibited. Far from insisting that under federation no State shall levy land customs duties, the Committee, while conscious of the retrograde and anti-federal nature of the step, agree to the extension of the right. Again, the Committee deplore the demand of certain States for postal autonomy, consider that the extension of the right to States which do not possess it to-day as anti-federal and retrograde and yet are willing to concede it. In short, the Committee have invoked the principle of uniformity of federal obligations whenever it meant an advantage to the Princes and unceremoniously ignored it when it meant no advantage to them. Special contributions of some States to the federal financial resources should be wiped out because British Indian provinces and some Indian States do not share them equally and uniformly; but immunities which certain States enjoy and are not shared equally by British India and all the Indian States should, however, be left untouched, and if, as a result of the adjustment, there is a credit owing to some Indian States, British Indians should find the money. The Committee have not succeeded in securing to any appreciable measure the equality which they set up as their objective. Even under their scheme there is no equality or uniformity between the Indian States themselves, not to speak of British India and the Indian States. They have accentuated the invidious differences, and rendered federation more difficult.

IMPERIAL PREFERENCE.

II

WE may begin the discussion of the economic aspect by indicating at the outset the meaning generally attached to the phrase "Imperial Preference" at the present day. When Joseph Chamberlain first made the idea popular the details of the preference proposals were necessarily left very vague; so vague, indeed, that Lord Curzon's Govern-

these last few days is the translation of Signor Grandi. The Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs has become the Italian Ambassador in London and, although the Duce has explained that the change is insignificant and incidental to the Fascist philosophy of the management of the State, the disappearance of a person of Signor Grandi's eminence from Geneva is much commented upon. It is generally considered to be an outcome of the Lausanne Conference with which the Duce is apparently dissatisfied because Italy got no more out of it than she did at the Peace Conference. The Franco-British understanding would appear to have been particularly distasteful to the Italians, who had from the outset supported the British case for a clean slate and had hoped to make common cause with both Germany and Great Britain as against France. Anyway, dictatorships seem to have at least this advantage: when a foreign policy miscarries nothing more serious results from it than a shuffling of Ministries.

THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE.

The first session of the Disarmament Conference has been concluded. Forty-one States have voted for the Simon-Benes resolution, restricting the number of certain calibres of heavy artillery and leaving the major schemes to be settled by private conferences among Great Powers. In his concluding speech Mr. Henderson has warned them that his services as President would be available only if they were prepared to go farther in the next session. Germany and Russia voted against the resolution and several of the small Powers, including Afghanistan, Turkey and China, abstained from voting. "At Geneva," said the *Manchester Guardian* some time ago, "great mountains are in labour; to-day or tomorrow a small mouse will be born." It is difficult not to agree with this verdict, subject, however, to this reserve that the meeting by this Conference itself is a great achievement which should not be underestimated.

The danger to-day, it must be added, lies in another direction. European disarmament, judging from all that is taking place, is likely to make a marked advance in the coming months. But to an impoverished Europe, sorely tempted by the prevailing depression to keep her factories going, a war in the Far East may not be quite an unwelcome prospect. That is the great issue which the forthcoming Assembly will have to face.

Our London Letter.

(From our Correspondent.)

(BY AIR MAIL.)

LONDON, 23rd July.

LORD IRWIN'S APPOINTMENT.

IT had been generally supposed that the Prime Minister, in filling up the Cabinet vacancy caused by the death of Sir Donald Maclean, President of the Board of Education, would, in order to preserve the balance of the Parties represented in the Government, select a Liberal. The names of Lord Lothian and Mr. Isaac Foot were in many people's mouths. Lord Lothian's distinguished qualities would eminently fit him for Cabinet rank in a Government, of this character. It is to be supposed, however, that his omission is due to the fact that the Prime Minister considered his presence at the India Office of greater importance at the present time. Mr. Foot as Secretary for Mines has made a great reputation for himself, but he is not, therefore, necessarily fitted to become the head of the Education

Department. There was also the further difficulty in selecting a Liberal, that the Liberal Party as such hardly exists. One faction is in opposition under the leadership of Mr. Lloyd George and the Samuel and Simon groups, that vote with or against the Government according to circumstances, and that are represented in the Cabinet, are at daggers drawn with each other. Mr. MacDonald has, therefore, looked about for one of the most liberal-minded men in public life, and has chosen for his new colleague Mr. Baldwin's most intimate friend, the man who is anathema to the Churchillite Tories and none-too-well liked by his fellow Conservatives generally, but of whom the radical "News-Chronicle" writes in terms of the highest esteem. Indeed, I have not observed any hostile criticism but only praise for Mr. MacDonald's choice in the quarters that mostly count in this country.

LORD IRWIN ON INDIA

Lord Irwin's first speech upon appointment to the Cabinet was made during the week-end at Thirsk in Yorkshire, and he took the occasion to declare that he was satisfied that there had been no substantial change in the Government's policy regarding India, or he would never have joined it, and he felt that the Moderate leaders had seriously misunderstood the situation and had therefore withdrawn their co-operation. On the surface Lord Irwin's remarks would appear to mean that he had been won over to Sir Samuel Hoare's viewpoint. I do not think that this is so. Moreover, I am not at all sure that, whatever may have been his original viewpoint, Sir Samuel still holds to it quite as tenaciously as he did. It is one thing to say or to believe that the Moderates hardly count in India; it is another seriously to set about doing without them. I may be wrong in my diagnosis, but I have a very strong suspicion, perhaps amounting even to something more definite than that, that this feeling of doubt as to the practical wisdom, as apart from the theoretical desirability of the new procedure, had already struck Sir Samuel and his colleagues, and was intended to be expressed in the relatively conciliatory language that he employed in his speech on the 13th July and in his invitation to critics, either here or in India, to make concrete proposals that would be more effective and more sympathetic in achieving the purposes that the Government have set before themselves than their own proposals had been considered to be by the critics. No Government ever admits error or change of policy. All is consistency and continuity. If therefore a Government desires to change its policy, and in particular a British Government, it first convinces itself, and then the public, that the change is really no change at all but merely a different expression of the same thing. That is how British revolutions are achieved. We say that that was what we had intended all along, when in fact it is the very thing that we have been for years struggling to resist. People who understand take this for granted. On the other hand, when a Government, and particularly a British Government, finds the need to save its face and to retreat from a step that it has taken or contemplated, it invariably announces that there has been no change of policy in order to cover the retreat from the new position that it had incautiously assumed.

I am seriously inclined to believe that the latter is the true interpretation of Lord Irwin's speech, nor am I alone in this view. Mr. Garvin, in the editorial columns of the "Observer", is often extremely irritating in the manner in which he handles Indian affairs. Nor is he less irritating when he deals with them less formally in the personal column that he writes each Sunday. He has, however, secured the services of a colleague described as the Calcutta

Correspondent of the paper, who in its last two issues has got to the heart of the situation. I venture to hope that his observations last Sunday will be reproduced *in extenso* in your columns. He declares roundly that the Government's present proposals are nothing less than a reversion to the Simon Commission method, to escape which the Round Table Conference procedure had been expressly devised. It is, he says, certain that these proposals will be rejected by the Moderates, who have already refused their collaboration with the Simon Commission, and on exactly the same grounds. The new proposals are therefore to be regarded as still-born, and he points out that far too much has been made in Conservative circles about the paramountcy of Parliament. Everyone knows that Parliament is Parliament, but that if it does not carry out the Government's policy as expressed in an agreed Bill embodying the Heads of Agreement reached between the British and the Indian leaders, the Government will undoubtedly treat such a rejection, as Mr. MacDonald was careful to state in the House on the 2nd December, as a vote of No Confidence and will tender its resignation. I am inclined very strongly to the view that appearances point to the Government holding out an olive branch to the Moderate leaders, and it would do no harm whatever and may help to rebuild the broken bridge, if they assume this to be the position and respond accordingly. I would, however, venture to express the hope that in doing so they go as far as possible to co-ordinate their suggestions in order to make them precise and effective. Nothing could be worse, or less helpful, for varying and perhaps conflicting suggestions being made from different quarters, of which opponents, both in India and here, could take an unfair and improper advantage. I have reason to believe that Mr. Jinnah, who has already expressed his strong dissent from the Government's proposals, would willingly do his part here in that event to help to restore the broken relations.

DICTATORSHIPS.

Whether with the growing power of the Irish Republican Army some form of dictatorship will become necessary in Southern Ireland, in order to prevent an outbreak of civil war or of armed hostilities between the South and the North, remains to be seen. At the moment Mr. de Valera appears to have a substantial amount of support for his defiance of Great Britain and his joining in wholeheartedly in the present economic warfare between the two countries, to the enormous disadvantage of the poor consumer in both.

Dictatorships are on the increase in Europe. Il Duce in Italy has shown his dictatorial powers by dismissing his Cabinet and his Departmental Secretary overnight, and appointing a new Government with himself as Foreign Minister in place of Signor Grandi, for whom it would seem Mahatma Gandhi, until he actually appeared, was mistaken at some places through which he passed through Italy on his way to Brindisi. Signor Grandi is an active, energetic, able dapper young man, and no greater contrast between him and the ascetic Mahatma could be found. He does not appear, however, to have been at all well received by Signor Mussolini upon his return from Lausanne, where he is regarded as having too meekly submitted to a Franco-British hegemony.

Notwithstanding the appearance of a Republican Democratic Government in Spain Senor Azana is exercising the powers of a Dictator. The movement from dictatorship to constitutionalism in Portugal is proceeding very slowly and none too successfully. In Jugo-Slavia the Dictator is the Ruler himself. In Russia the dictatorship is in theory in the generalised

proletariat. In practice it is exercised vigorously by Stalin with a small Cabinet of Communist commissars. The latest dictatorship is that established nominally by President Hindenburg, but actually by Herr von Papen over the whole of Prussia and Brandenburg, representing two-thirds of Germany. Martial law has been proclaimed in Berlin and the surrounding districts. All this has been done ostensibly on account of Communist agitation and the consequent alleged threat to the security of the Reich. In fact a state of barely suppressed civil war between the Nazi armed formation and their opponents, either Communist or Republican Iron Front rendered the assumption of dictatorial powers almost inevitable and the present situation has for some time been anticipated as a serious probability. The rigorous steps taken in turning out the Prussian Ministry, in imposing Reich officials in their place at the head of the Police and otherwise, may prove to be the only means of avoiding civil war over large parts of Germany. Naturally the German Socialists and the Labour Parties elsewhere tend to regard Herr von Papen's *coup* as being equivalent to the restoration of the Junker power in Germany. This may perhaps be true. It remains to be seen whether it will result in the bringing back of the monarchical system to Germany and the overthrow of the Republican regime. It may well be that the majority of Germans desire this. If they do not, it is difficult to see what can prevent a bitter civil war that will bring about the disruption of the Reich and the disruption for years to come of German economic prosperity upon which so much of that of Central Europe depends.

Reviews.

HINDUISM.

THE IDEALS OF HINDUISM. BY PANDIT KASHI NATH. (Taraporewalla, Bombay) 1932. 24cm. 86 pp. Rs. 4/—

THE "IDEALS OF HINDUISM," by Rai Bahadur Pandit Kashinath M.A., M.B.E., is a publication of Messers D. B. Taraporewala Sons and Co., of Bombay. If externals be the criteria, we must at once concede that the publishers have made the book as attractive as possible. The printing is on very good paper and there are seven coloured pictures. We must, however, form an estimate of the work according as the aims the author sets before himself are realised. Pandit Kashinath is conscious that India is facing a very critical period in her history, and he feels that a vast change is coming over this country. "Things which seemed to stand firm as a mountain even to the other day are disappearing as under a wizard's hand," and more than anything else, it is the internal condition of the people that is changing. This stupendous fact is that the East which is supposed to be static and unchanging is moving at last "gaining momentum and accumulations at every step". Will it be an avalanche, the writer asks, to bring chaos and ruin as its results, or will it result "in the gushing forth of fresh streams to bring fertility and prosperity"? The author's concern is whether India would be able to rise to her opportunities, for, as he truly points out, the chief thing for a nation's growth is character, not "external appendages—political constitutions, trade and industrial revivals, increase of schools and book-learning, accumulations of wealth and property" for "all is not well with these ventures. Political experiments were tried and

failed."* The success of institutions would primarily depend upon a proper ethos and men nurtured in its spirit. All institutions will fail if "the men were not prepared for them." The building up of character, therefore, is a vital concern, and character is based as the writer rightly observes on man's inmost beliefs; and so it is in reality his religion that is the decisive formative influence. For "religion is bound with the deepest springs of human actions." "No man or nation can rise above the concept of its Gods. If the concept is low, then the ideal is degraded and the worshipper is degraded." The history of all religions and sects "shows that the purer the religion, the further is the individual or the nation advanced," for religion "is concerned with the beliefs in the mind of the man which express themselves in all the activities of his life." "The way to raise India, to make it a great and noble nation, to bring success to all the efforts, is to start from the inside, to raise the character of its people and that can be done only by raising high the ideals or to infuse a higher standard in its religion." That is to say, "High ideals must be set clearly before the people and then followed."

Our question, therefore, is how far has the writer succeeded in his aim, in the first instance of evaluating our old ideals with a view to finding out how far they would be the basis for the future. Could those ideals serve just as they stand, or do they need re-interpretation, and re-visualisation? This implies in the writer, even in vague outline, a knowledge of the purpose and destiny of India's future. That is to say, it is the task of the Seer and the Prophet. He must have the insight to grasp the significance of the present and have foresight enough to see ahead into the needs of the future.

And in this task, we sadly confess, the writer has failed. His diagnosis of the present situation in India is superficial, and he only repeats the conventional cant against culture-contact. He is still banking upon India's past, and his aim seems to be to restore Hinduism to its pristine purity and preserve it from the profane contact of disintegrating external forces. "Hinduism laid down" he writes "firm unshakable foundation but it is encumbered with ruins of fallen walls of poor materials, with rubbish brought from outside and dumped on the site, and with a jungle of weeds and wild trees, whilst the whole foundation peep through here and there so that it is a picturesque ruin of an ancient greatness" and if Hinduism must survive, the writer insists it must first clear this rubbish. The question to him is of urgent import for "Western education and contact is wiping of many of the old beliefs and the tragedy of it that no new ones are taking their place. Hinduism in the good old days was based on certain definite beliefs and gave a clear guidance for Hindus. Hindus therefore had character." The writer, therefore, seeks to investigate what these basic ideals and ideas of Hinduism are.

We must admit that the author's attempt is highly interesting and the allegorical explanations which he gives of some of the intriguing conceptions and beliefs widely held by the Hindus are worth considering if for no other reason than that they form a bold attempt to defend superstitious and idolatrous practices as profound philosophical truths and scientific facts. This is not the place to go into a detailed discussion, but just as an illustration we would

* In this review we have not primarily concerned ourselves with peculiarities of style of the writer. The book ought to have been revised carefully before final publication. We draw the attention of the reader to the sentence against which the asterik is placed. It is only one of numerous such sentences in the book.

like to refer to his ingenious exposition of the conception of incarnations, for these incarnations or *avathars* as he maintains gives us the story of evolution of creation. 'It seems' observes the writer, 'that the Brahmanic reorganiser framed their theory of evolution of man and of civilisation and expressed it in the sequence of *avathars*.' Such explanations of Hindu legends and Myths, we are constrained to remark would sometimes be funny if only they were not really dangerous in their results. For to the uncritical mind they appeal with conviction and seem to be indisputable facts. The danger lies essentially in this, that the lie is embedded beneath a mass of scientific truth. It is a question how far we are right in trying to explain ancient things in terms of modern phraseology. The writer's explanation of other ideas are of a similar nature. They are not profound enough and leave vital aspects of Hinduism untouched. In certain places his remarks would perhaps make us believe that he has not even made the attempt to understand the particular conception that he is criticising. For instance, we cannot help saying that he is unparadoxably flippant when he tries to estimate the morality of the Krishna cult. He considers the stories relating to Krishna and Gopis of Brindawan to be immoral and they need only to be stated in plain hard words to show their ridiculousness. The writer, therefore, feels that the idea of Krishna as the lascivious youth must be left out 'in conceiving the real Krishna and in finding his real greatness if any.' The writer we must say rather hastily dismisses this aspect of Krishna and we cannot but feel that he has missed much. This would be pardonable perhaps in a Christian Missionary, but not in an enthusiastic exponent of Hinduism as Pandit Kashinath seems to be. To our mind, there seems to be nothing immoral in Krishna-Gopi concept. The sex love far from being immoral is the very foundation of life and is the basis of continuity. If sexual life is wrong it would necessarily follow that life itself is a mistake. The writer's exposition, again, of the Trinity and Hindu Panthism is very interesting. He is very bold when he comes to discuss the validity of the Vedas. Evidently he has not understood the implications of scriptural validity of the the Vedas or he would not have made the statement that 'mere authority as such is to be repudiated' and 'Vedas have changed and will continue changing with each growth and knowledge.' His exposition of the Vedas is a challenge to the conception of the eternal Validity of the Vedas.

There are other minor things which require to be noticed. The writer's study of Hindu Religion and Philosophy seems to be very superficial. He makes statements here and there which would never be by a made careful student. In one place he assumes that Sankhya is atheistic. That is rather a bold statement, for so far as our knowledge goes, atheism as such cannot be predicated of the Sankhya. It is true that the Sankhya is a realistic system postulating an eternal dualism between Purusha and Prakriti and nowhere speaks of Ishwara. The Sankhya Karika says that the existence of God is not proved. 'Ishwara Pramane Nasiddhihi'. This does not, however, amount to the denial of existence of God and further in the whole of Sankhya we have nowhere any animus towards the conception of God as such. The writer in one place maintains that Buddhism is a revolt, but in a different place he admits that 'Buddha himself was a Hindu and his disciples were Hindus, and even up to the time of Asoka, Buddhism was a branch of Hinduism.' All this is only to say that the writer himself is not well informed and so is hazy in his ideas. In one place he says that at

the present day distinctions of caste are fast disappearing and in another place he admits that 'all the other castes are claiming to be really Brahmins and Kshatriyas. He seems not to have understood the nature and implications of caste.

The book, therefore, as a whole must be considered as a failure. The writer has tried to discuss what he calls some ideals of Hinduism. What he has done is to give questionable explanations of some Myths and Legends and of certain characters in the Hindu Pantheon. Of the more vital ideals that do affect the life of the millions of this country he has practically nothing to say. In a book of this kind treating as it does of the ideals of Hinduism we would have expected a discussion of Dharma in its empirical, forms such as Varna Ashrama and Sadharma Dharma. Again the writer has nothing to say about the Hindu conceptions of Karma and Redemption. He might have discussed also the Hindu attitude to life, in terms of human values. The production is a very imperfect one and the writer could have profitably taken more thought and more time.

R. PRATAPAGIRI.

INDUSTRIAL EFFICIENCY.

THE INDUSTRIAL EFFICIENCY OF INDIA.

By RAJANI KANTA DAS. (King.) 1930. 20cm. 212p. 8/6.

IN these days when India is passing through a period of transition, a study of the ways of national reconstruction with a special emphasis on industrial reorganisation, coming as it does from such an active pen as that of Dr. Das, is bound to be a welcome addition to economic thought. In this formative period, when all are anxiously tackling the problem of reorganisation of national life, by vitalising it with the addition and adoption of new methods, measures and machines, a comparative study of the productive capacity of India, comparing it with that of various industrially advanced countries, on the basis of their ability to utilise the natural, human and capital resources, under the modern system of production, is sure to give a great incentive, if not to immediate action, at least to thought.

The author, being "deeply impressed in his early youth with the extreme poverty of the people" decided to inquire into the causes of it. A country is poor either because its resources are not sufficient to support its population or, as Prof. Carver rightly points out, "Communities and nations have remained poor in the midst of rich surroundings and are fallen into decay and poverty in spite of the fertility of the soil and the abundance of their natural resources merely because the human factor was of a poor quality, or allowed to deteriorate, or run to waste." Of these two causes Dr. Das elaborately points out that India does not suffer from the first, for as compared with the resources of other nations India may be ranked, though not as the richest country in the world at least as one of the rich countries. But for the supply of fuel, in the form of coal and oil, as the Industrial Commission observed, "India produces nearly all raw materials necessary for the requirements of modern communities", but the author points out that the drawback mentioned above will be mitigated by water-power "in which India stands second only to United States in potentialities" (p. 167). How very rich its supply of raw materials is can be seen from the following figures. In 1927-28, for instance, India produced all jute which the world requires, over one-fifth of the cotton, about one-fourth of the world's cotton-seed, and about one-tenth of the linseed: as India possesses one-third of the world's cattle, the production of skins and hides, one of the

most important of the raw materials, is considerable while in the case of minerals it enjoys practically a monopoly of mica; the production of manganese in 1927 amounted to over 35 per cent. of the world's total; similarly according to the Geological Survey of India (Vol. 2, Part II pp. 203-12) "the iron-ores of India are not only immense in reserve but also rich in iron contents." "There is little doubt," adds the Director of Geological Survey of India, Sir Edwin Pascoe, "that her vast resources in iron-ores will one day give her an important, if not dominant place, in the steel of the world." In human-power, too, with its 92 millions of adults, between the ages of fifteen and sixty, India is more than sufficiently blessed. Thus, though so very favoured by Nature, the appalling poverty that pervades the masses in India, is as surprising as it is palpable. The *per capita* income, as calculated by different economists, does not rise above Rs. 116, while it is Rs. 294 in Japan, Rs. 351 in Italy, Rs. 357 in Germany, Rs. 741 in France, and Rs. 1,319 in England, and Rs. 1,717 in U.S.A. Judged by another standard, *per capita* foreign trade, though not in itself, as Prof. Marshall has very convincingly shown (Industry and Trade, pp. 14-25) a sure index of a country's poverty, it is sufficient to endorse a fact which is proved by other indices. Though the aggregate volume of India's trade ranks it the fifth among the world's nations, the *per capita* foreign trade ranks it almost at the bottom: in 1925, for instance, the *per capita* trade of Australia was 235 dollars (U. S. A.), of Canada 244 dollars, of the United Kingdom 208 dollars, of Germany 80 dollars, of Japan 33 dollars, and of India 7.3 dollars. Similarly, if judged by the physical condition of the Indian populace, one can realise the same fact, for the physical condition of the people depends, if not entirely, to a great degree on the material welfare. The average longevity in India is only 28.8 years, while it is 51.5 years in England, 50 years in U. S. A. 48.5 years in France, 44.3 years in Japan. So also the *per capita* actual production in India is only half of that in other advanced countries. This, again, is not due so much to the Indian's innate aversion for work, since, as the author has very shrewdly pointed out that, "... where the Indians have had equality of opportunity, to a limited extent, in the farms and orchards of California and lumber mills of Oregon, Washington and British Columbia, the Indians have proved that they were as good as, if not better than, the Chinese, the Japanese, the Canadians and the Americans." (P. 55.)

Naturally, therefore, the cause of India's poverty, to take the clue from Prof. Carver, seems to be that either the human factor is a poor quality or it is allowed to deteriorate or to run to waste. We have already seen that the average Indian is by no means of a poor quality as he has proved his metal both in the present and in the past, when congenial circumstances prevailed. Obviously enough, therefore, at present in India the human factor has failed to take the benefit of the blessings which Nature has conferred upon it, mainly because the psycho-physical qualities of the Indian masses, like application, perseverance, skill, ingenuity, speed and precision, are allowed to deteriorate or run to waste. This fact becomes still more obvious if we note that out of 92 millions between the ages of fifteen and sixty, 33.3 are under-employed, 16.1 millions are rendered useless on account of illness and an equal number on account of ignorance. Similarly the author shows that India wastes almost two-thirds of her land and capital resources. This begins the vicious circle: the people are poor because they are not in a position to exploit their resources and because they cannot exploit their resources they are bound to remain poor.

In order to change this of state of things the author strongly advocates a conscious and centralised effort, especially on the part of the Government, for a rapid and intensive industrialisation. For this purpose the attitude of the Government must not only be sympathetic but also actively helpful and stimulating. As yet the policy adopted by the Government, when at its best, is *laissez-faire*, a policy, which, though beneficial and favourable in countries where individualism and private enterprise are more effective than state control, is not suitable for countries like India. It not does appeal to the psychology nor the tradition of the Indian people, for the state used to be the greatest *entrepreneur* in the past history of India. Besides in these days of world competition, in a vast country like India, unless a strong national Government, with a clear cut industrial policy, actively participates in the industrial organisation very little could be achieved. It alone can bring together all the disruptive factors, by improvement in transport and trade, by protective measures like tariff and bounties, and helpful measures like financing and providing commercial intelligence. Again, it alone can mitigate the internal competition between provinces by introducing the principle of specialisation and allocation. In short, the trend of exposition throughout tends to make a fervent appeal for the end of the non-intervention policy and attitude of the Government particularly up to the days of the World War. Dr. Das has very admirably borne out his thesis by the exposition of facts and figures giving evidence for every statement of his. Though some of his statements often show a lack of scholarly caution and academic finish, and though he often shows a tendency towards exaggerating India's assets, it must be admitted that on the whole his book is a sound study and a great addition to economic thought. Many of the ways which the author suggests for the industrial regeneration of India—creation of a board of efficiency is one of them—are practical and are based on the experience gained abroad. They are particularly worthy of consideration as they come from an earnest desire of a patriotic Indian "to spread plenty upon a smiling land."

Y. G. NAIK.

Miscellaneous.

"SINCERITY AND SPEED".

WHAT IS NEEDED IN INDIA.

The following letter appeared in the 'Manchester Guardian' of 15th July.

TO THE EDITOR OF MANCHESTER GUARDIAN.

SIR,—“New India,” in its issue of June 23, contains the following pregnant passage:—

Mr. Wedgwood Benn, the late Secretary of State for India, in one of his speeches in the Commons, postulated two essentials for a successful outcome of the endeavour initiated in his regime to bring about a satisfactory position in India, namely, speed and sincerity. Without sincerity, which, in this context, must mean absence of deception and straightforward conferment on India of the power she seeks to control her own affairs, mere speed in the enactment of a bill

will not solve the problem; it will only hasten the day of judgment.

The fact is, the Government, through the mouth, of the Secretary of State for India, have virtually convinced the Indian Moderates no less than the Congress that, notwithstanding their new-found passion for speed, the essential of sincerity has disappeared. The Moderates now regard the Government's latest declared policy, adopted over their heads and placed before them as a *fait accompli*, with a "take it or leave it" gesture, as the triumph of insincerity and the victory of reaction.

It is not true that the Government as exemplified by the India Office, have changed their policy from a spontaneous recognition of the need for speed. They have succumbed to the inevitable, the recognition of which has been forced upon them by the Moderates, whose thunder they now seek to steal. Similarly, the adoption of the principle of a single bill, covering simultaneously provincial autonomy and federal central responsibility, is no spontaneous act on the part of the Government. They were forced into acceptance of the principle by the insistence of the Moderates that on no other terms would they be prepared to continue their co-operation. And even now, to judge from letters received from some of the leading Moderates, they believe that an important section of Conservative opinion, with allies in the Government, intends to join forces with all those disgruntled or reactionary elements eager to prevent real federal self-government from ever coming into operation. Everything, indeed, that has happened, both here and in India, since the beginning of the year, has made for a disbelief in Moderate circles in Government sincerity.

If, now, your damaging contention be correct, that no British Government really intends, or is able to pass through this Parliament an agreed measure of responsible government, differing from a Dominion Constitution only by reason of the enactment of certain temporary safeguards, accepted primarily in the interests of India, and developing into such a Constitution by the efflux of a minimum period of time and the automatic passage of those temporary conditions for which the safeguards were devised, then what hope is there of converting any section of Indian opinion, Moderate or otherwise, to a belief in the sincerity of British statesmen?

If the Moderates are to be eliminated because they cannot, it is supposed, "deliver the goods," and the Congress are to be bottled up indefinitely, lest they should run away with them, upon whom are the Government to rely to work the rickety Constitution that timid statesmanship may seek to fasten upon India? The communalists, the reactionaries, the time-servers, the self-seekers? For how long, and with what result? Can Sir Samuel Hoare, who has failed so dismally to carry conviction to the Moderates, hope to build Indo-British co-operation on such shoddy material? Is not Indian rejection assumed in advance of a Whitehall-made Constitution, embodying a second-class Imperial citizenship, and offered in a spirit of impatient contempt of Indian demands for a square deal, such as the "white" Dominions, for whom the first-class Commonwealth citizenship has been hitherto reserved, have been accustomed to expect and receive?—Yours, &c.

Hy. S. L. POLAK.

265, Strand,

July 12.