

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XV, No. 47. } POONA—THURSDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1932. { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN SUBSN. 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	473
ARTICLES :—	
Save Kelappan	475
Ottawa Committee's Report ...	476
Residuary Powers. By P. Kodanda Rao ...	477
R. T. C.—First Week.	478
How Repression Works.	479
OUR LONDON LETTER.	481
REVIEWS :—	
Indian Co-operative Movement. By S. Gopalswamy	482
Model of A Mother. By M. V. Subrahmanyam ...	483
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
Secession. By Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer, K. C. S. I.	484

Topics of the Week.

Purely Consultative.

IN a speech in the House of Commons last week Mr. Winston Churchill affected to dismiss the third Round Table Conference as of no particular value since he understood that it was to be a "purely consultative" conference without any power to effect and enforce an agreement. The basis for this statement which flies in the face of all the assurances given by Government in the past seems to be (if indeed Mr. Churchill requires any basis in fact at all) the answer given by the Secretary of State to a question asked by Brigadier-General Clifton Brown on 31st October. The question was "whether the calling of another Round Table Conference modifies in any respect the proposed machinery of a Select Committee of both Houses to report on the proposals for a new constitution for India, and whether that Committee will still have free and unfettered powers to record its opinions on all proposals accepted by Government at the Round Table Conferences." To this Sir Samuel Hoare replied that the convening of the third R. T. C. made no difference whatever to the status or powers of the Joint Select Committee. From this answer Mr. Churchill may have hastened to infer that the Joint Select Committee in the first instance and Parliament in the second would be at liberty to upset even such conclusions of the Round Table Conference as may be agreed to by Government. Sir Samuel Hoare might have expressed his answer in language which would have made such a slighting interpretation impossible. No doubt the powers of the Select Committee and Parliament would in theory be absolutely unlimited, but in the event of the agreed proposals being turned down Government itself will have to resign. Mr. Churchill himself will not be sorry if the National Government goes out of office, but its supporters are numerous enough

to see that no harm will come to it or to its measures. It is this pledge of Government that it will not only support the agreed conclusions of the R. T. C. in Parliament but stake its life on their being passed that transforms what would otherwise have been a body of mere academic discussion. A Tory Government of course has the power, by withholding its own consent, of limiting and narrowing the sphere of such agreed conclusions, but there can be no question as to the practical value of whatever is accepted by Government as agreed conclusions.

Ordinance Bills.

ORDINANCE Bills were under consideration last week in four legislatures—the Assembly and the Councils of Punjab, Bengal and Bombay—and in all cases except the last their reference to a Select Committee was not opposed by the Government. Not that this resulted anywhere in any considerable improvement in the Bills, which is not surprising in view of the present personnel of these bodies. Newspaper readers are already aware of the feeling of dissatisfaction aroused in the public mind by the manner in which even reasonable non-official amendments were defeated in the select committee of the Assembly by the casting vote of the official chairman. Greater amicability has apparently marked the proceedings of the other select committees; but this is far from saying that they succeeded to any considerable extent in lessening the rigour of the measure referred to them for consideration. The only change of some importance effected in the all-India measure as a result of its consideration by the select committee was the limitation of its life to three years. With the life of the Bill for which the Central Government were responsible thus limited, it followed, as a matter of course, that provincial bills should not enjoy a longer lease of life, whether the method adopted was to limit their operation to three years outright or, as in Bombay, to provide for its operation for one year in the first instance, empowering Government to extend it for not more than two years, should they find it necessary to do so. Peaceful picketing continues to be under a ban and the liberty of the press very much restricted under the proposed law as under the Ordinances. In short, the transformation of the Ordinances into laws does not in any way mean less serious inroads by the executive on the people's liberties.

It is not intended to notice here the debates that took place on these bills in the different legislatures or to examine the arguments advanced pro and con. For one thing, the full reports of the debates have not yet come to hand and such reports as have appeared in the press are too scrappy. For another, the arguments advanced both by the friends and the opponents of the measures run on lines to which the public has been painfully familiarised during the last eleven

months. While non-officials questioned their need in view of the comprehensive character of the existing laws, Government spokesmen equally strongly contended that the emergency occasioned by the inauguration of the civil disobedience movement at the beginning of the year could not have been satisfactorily dealt with except by resort to the special powers embodied in the Ordinances. The attempt to make the Ordinances a part of the law of the land was sought to be justified by Government's anxiety not to leave their successors weak and bereft of these special powers during the transition period when the transference of power to popular hands was taking place and when, it was pointed out, revolutionary forces usually gather strength. The hollowness of this plea is too obvious to need proving. But the Government had in all cases a clear majority at their command and were easily able to carry the day.

* * *

Calcutta and Communalism.

THE late Sir Surendra Nath Banerjee's Calcutta Municipal Act of 1923 provided that for nine years Mahomedan members of the Calcutta Corporation should be elected by separate Mahomedan electorates, but that after this period joint electorates should be established for them as well as for others. The period will soon expire, and at the next Municipal elections due in April 1933 Mahomedans will have a number of seats reserved for them in joint electorates, and the communal election will have ceased. In order to prevent this two Bills were introduced by two Mahomedan members providing for the continuance of communal election. Fortunately, one of these Bills was withdrawn, and the other was defeated at the introduction stage itself by 38 votes to 32, official and European members remaining neutral. The strength of the oppositionists among Indian non-officials was really greater than appears from these figures, because it is said that some members of the Praja Party who voted for the second Bill at the first reading stage are really in opposition to its principle and would have voted against it at a later stage.

It is not surprising that the general feeling in the Council is decidedly against these Bills, for when communal electorates were introduced in 1923, they were definitely in duration limited to three terms of the municipal council. It was understood that this provision was not to come under revision after nine years, but automatically to cease. Mr. Langford James on whose suggestion this compromise was effected said in the Bengal Council at the time: "I would desire to make it very clear to my Mahomedan friends that the suggestion I am making in no way carries with it the right to a review of their system of election at the end of three years (sic). The privilege merely lapses—it automatically lapses." Sir Surendra Nath Banerjee too, to whom communal electorates were gall and wormwood, accepted the compromise only because the general electorates were to come into operation automatically after nine years. He had originally proposed reservation of seats for Mahomedans in the general electorates. That clause was still maintained in the Act; only its operation was suspended for nine years. He defended the compromise thus:

"The Government have decided to uphold the principle of the general electorate contained in clause 7 of the Bill. That clause remains. But a clause will be added providing for some Mahomedan constituencies for three elections extending over a period of nine years, after which they will automatically disappear. These proposals are transitory and will be described as such in the Bill, and after nine years they will automatically dis-

appear and the machinery of the general electorate will be in operation. Therefore, the position is somewhat as follows. We uphold the principle of a general electorate for Hindus and Mahomedans alike as a permanent feature of the Bill subject to the temporary deviation which I have already referred. The House stands committed to this principle of a general electorate, its operation being suspended for a period of nine years or three elections after which the transitory clause will disappear and the system of the general electorate will come into force."

The then Mahomedan members of the Council accepted communal electorates as a temporary provision to come to an end after a specified period. It was therefore felt that it was bad faith on the part of the present members of the Council to disregard the terms of this compromise and seek to perpetuate communal electorates.

The Minister for Local Self-Government, the Hon'ble Mr. Bijoy Prasad Singh Roy, made it easier for the Mahomedan members to defeat this attempt to saddle Calcutta Corporation permanently with communal electorates by increasing the number of seats reserved for Mahomedans in joint electorates from 15 to 19. He will soon introduce a Bill to implement his promise. "We understand that ordinarily Mahomedans would be entitled to 7 seats in the Corporation. If their share is now increased to 19, because of their acceptance of the general electorates, it is by no means a bad bargain for them

* * *

More Opposition to Second Chambers.

TWO more provincial legislatures, viz. those of Bengal and Assam, have expressed their disapproval of the idea to encumber themselves with second chambers, bringing up the total number of those that rejected the idea to 5 out of the 6 that gave the question their attention. Both the Bengal and Assam Governments unmistakably favoured the constitution of upper houses, while a majority of the Assam Franchise Committee was in favour of it and only a minority of the Bengal Provincial Franchise Committee unconditionally supported the proposal. When however the question was raised in the two provincial legislatures or a recent date and its decision left only to non-officials, the provincial councils vetoed the idea. Judging from the figures of voting in the Bengal Legislative Council, viz. 44 to 46, opinion in the province seems to be almost equally divided on the desirability of a second chamber. The division list shows that the advocates of a two-house legislature were mostly the Hindu members who almost always take a progressive view in other matters, the Mahomedans, generally looked upon as backward, being amongst its stoutest opponents. Their opposition appeared however to be prompted not so much by political as communal considerations. Some Mahomedans at any rate read into the proposal sponsored, ironically enough, by a Hindu "Liberal," a subtle move to prevent them from coming into their own under the prospective autonomy for the province. But there were others who looked beyond their own community, and it was certainly refreshing to find one such basing his opposition to the idea on purely political considerations. He explained: "Bengal is pre-eminently an agricultural province, where the interests of the tillers of the soil really constitute the interests of the country. Should anything be done that would jeopardise those interests? Higher franchise for an upper chamber would preclude people of moderate means who form the majority of the intelligentsia from finding a place in the upper chamber and the result would be that measures

beneficial to the aristocratic and capitalistic classes, but detrimental to the masses, would always find ready support."

Indian Wage Reduction in Ceylon.

TO the standard rates of wages fixed for Indian labourers in Ceylon through the exertions of the Government of India's Agent there, the tea planters have never taken very kindly. And time and again one hears about the devices adopted by them to prevent the labourers from reaping full benefit of the fixation by law of the minimum scale of their wages. We had occasion in a recent issue to draw attention to such a subterfuge whereby the labourers were made to purchase their rice requirements from the shops on the tea estates, though they could do so more cheaply elsewhere. News now comes of a more direct attack on the Indian labourer's standard wage. The Ceylon Estates Proprietary Association is reported to have represented to the Ceylon Government within the last few days the desirability of reducing this standard wage and it appears from the *Ceylon Daily News* that the Government have done their best to meet their wishes by notifying suitable reduction for different localities. The demand for reduction is based on the ground that the present slump in prices has hit the estates so hard that at least some of them, far from making any profit, are forced to run at a loss. The plight of the estates is described in their representation as being "very serious" and urgent action in the direction of cutting down the Indian wage is demanded in order to prevent the closing down of the estates working at a loss. A little reflection will however show that the argument is more plausible than convincing. As pointed out with great force by the *Hindu*, the tea estates have to thank none but themselves for their present disheartening condition, for they failed in better times to build up a reserve which could have been used in their present difficulty. It is inexplicable why they failed to follow this course of action dictated by sheer common sense. It is not the part of fairness to stand in the way of poor labourers getting even a living wage, for it is difficult to believe that the standard rates of wages are designed to allow of any considerable saving. But we do not suppose all is lost yet. For we observe that though the reduction proposed by the different Estates Wages Boards have been notified, they will not become effective unless confirmed, one month after their notification, by the Board of Indian Immigrant Labour. The Governor's approval is also a condition precedent to their being made operative, but for obvious reasons this safeguard is more illusory than real. It is to be hoped that the Government of India are being kept closely in touch with the developments in the Indian situation in Ceylon which will lead, if it has not already done so, to suitable representations being made in proper quarters against the proposed action to the detriment of the interests of Indian labourers.

Articles.

SAVE KELAPPAN

IN his latest statement to the press Mahatma Gandhi has clearly stated that he would postpone his fast due on the 2nd January next if a referendum of temple-goers in and about Guruvayur went against temple entry by the Untouchables or if, it being in favour, legal formalities delayed giving effect to it till after the 1st January. This decision will be

much welcomed, inasmuch as it obviates to some extent the necessity for the fast. If the referendum goes against temple-entry, he will not fast; if it is in favour, there may be no need to fast, for public opinion will assert itself, though perhaps not by the 1st January next. The newly-formed All-India Anti-Untouchability Board is best suited to conduct the referendum in Guruvayur, and it is to be hoped that it will soon be taken and that the result will justify the reformers' contention.

The much-desired reform will, we repeat, be best promoted by the presence and exertions of the Mahatma himself at Guruvayur. We would once again strongly urge on the Mahatma the desirability, nay, the vital necessity, of his securing freedom to visit Guruvayur as soon as possible. He has repeatedly emphasised the view that the caste Hindus could not make too great a sacrifice to atone for their past attitude towards the Untouchables. The Mahatma has decided to lay down his life in the cause, if necessary. Will it then be too much to ask him to omit nothing that will enable him to go to Guruvayur and storm the fortress himself? More than once in the past he has on his own initiative formally suspended the civil disobedience movement and turned his undivided attention to constructive work. Here is another call, more insistent than any other and not less deserving.

The Guruvayur question does not concern the life of the Mahatma alone. Mr. Kelappan's life is involved in it and it must be saved, too. While the Mahatma very wisely limited his last fast to a comparatively easily attainable end, viz. the modification of the Government's Communal Award, Mr. Kelappan rashly ventured to challenge Hindu orthodoxy at a very sore point. The Mahatma's intervention saved him. Left to himself, the Mahatma would never have undertaken a fast unto death for getting a temple opened to the Untouchables. He had himself discouraged temple satyagraha, which is a much simpler thing, in the past and advised the Untouchables to trust the reform spirit animating the caste Hindus to bring about temple entry. But now, owing to the action of Mr. Kelappan the Mahatma himself was drawn into temple satyagraha and the lives of the two have been linked together in an enterprise which is not of the first importance for the uplift of the Untouchables. In his first statement the Mahatma gave the impression that his next fast was contingent on Mr. Kelappan resuming his. But in his special interview to the *Hindu*, he seemed to have taken the decision out of the hands of Mr. Kelappan by stating that he would fast even if Mr. Kelappan desisted from it. He went further and pinned down Mr. Kelappan to his rash vow and rendered fairly impossible a retreat by Mr. Kelappan himself from a position which the Mahatma would never have taken. He urged him to death.

Mr. Kelappan's own position is not quite clear, whether he and the Mahatma are acting in concert and whether he accepts the conditions regarding referendum, etc., that the Mahatma has since laid down. If he should insist on the unconditional

opening of the temple before the 1st January then the outlook is dark indeed. We are sure the Mahatma will not allow the sacrifice of the noble young man without doing his utmost to save him either by successfully dissuading him from his fast or by getting the temple opened. We hope the Mahatma

will not allow any consideration of his personal prestige to stand in the way of securing for himself the necessary freedom to visit Guruvayur and to save the life of Mr. Kelappan and at the same time to secure temple-entry to the Untouchables.

OTTAWA COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

AS previously expected, the Assembly Committee has by a majority recommended the adoption of the Ottawa agreement for a period of three years. The conditions under which the Committee was appointed, its composition, and the short time within which it had to report—all made it plain from the beginning that the report of the Committee could hardly be satisfactory. The Committee composed as it was of members of the Assembly representing different parties and sections was not a body particularly fitted to judge of the probable results of the Ottawa agreement. The Committee could examine only a very small number of witnesses and it seems to have attached little value to the opinions expressed by these gentlemen. There is little wonder, therefore that the report of the Assembly Committee should make no advance on the report of the Indian Delegation.

The most notable feature of the report is, in our opinion, the entire omission of any estimate of the loss involved to India by the acceptance of the new policy initiated at Ottawa. The Ottawa delegation in its report had also failed to take any account of this most important aspect of the question. When assessing the gains to India they had compared them with the corresponding gains to Great Britain. This is, however, an utterly irrelevant procedure and equally irrelevant is the oft-repeated argument that the Ottawa agreement must be of some value to India as a number of British interests have been complaining against it. It must be made clear that what concerns us is not whether the United Kingdom gains more or less than we do by the agreement, but whether we gain more than we lose by it. Our opposition to the agreement has been consistently based on the conviction that in all probability the loss involved by the agreement to the general consumer will far outweigh the advantages accruing to particular classes of Indian producers; that while the agreement will not raise in any appreciable measure the prices of Indian exports, it will over a very wide range of commodities increase the prices of imports. It surprises us, therefore, to find the majority of the Committee admitting blindly that there was not sufficient time for it to examine fully that part of the agreement which deals with the preferences on imports into India and yet recommending its acceptance. This is to opine on a bilateral agreement on the knowledge of only one side to it.

Further, the Committee does not seem to have given any consideration to the larger implications of the acceptance of a policy of Imperial Preference by India. Mr. Shanmukham Chetty vociferously de-

clared in the Assembly that Imperial Preference is as dead as Queen Anne and yet the very resolutions passed at Ottawa and the speeches of His Majesty's ministers all over the British Empire belie the statement. The wide range of import preferences indicates nothing but a policy of general preference and Sir Walter Layton has recently made clear the particularistic consequences of the system inaugurated at Ottawa. If the Assembly Committee should have attempted one thing more than any other, it was to elucidate the general consequences resulting from the adoption of this policy. Yet the majority of the Committee pay no attention to these matters.

They concentrate their attention instead on perhaps the least important and certainly the most complicated aspect of the problem, the effect of export preferences on Indian producers. Here, as was inevitable, their advocacy of the agreement leads them to exaggerate the possibilities of extension of trade in a great many directions. While admitting that a wheat preference is of no immediate value they solemnly talk of possible future benefits. Are the lands under the Sukkur Barrage, we wonder, expected to produce any wheat during the next three years? In the same spirit of optimism we are told of the British rice market, a market notoriously too small to absorb even one-fifteenth of the Burma exports in normal years and one in which the consumers' preference is all for qualities totally absent in our export rices; and of teak of which we have a monopoly, and other hardwoods which we produce in insignificant quantities and to increase whose supply even a five-year period would not suffice; of coffee which experience proves has not benefitted from a preference granted over nearly a decade; or again of jute manufactures in the face of Dundee's protestations and the fact of our monopolistic position. Linseed preference which has been to the fore all these months even the majority admit to be of little use. There is, however, no need to enter into these details. For we admit that the question does not allow mathematical calculations of any degree of nicety and are even prepared to give the benefit of doubt to the supporters of the agreement if it is proved that Imperial Preference as a policy is in the larger interests of India and that the import preferences would not impose a burden too grievous for the Indian consumer to bear.

There is lastly one feature of the report on which evidently the Committee prides itself considerably. This is the recommendation to bring the agreement up before the Assembly at the end of a period of three years, and to set up a committee of

the Assembly to watch the working of the agreement in the meanwhile. With the provision of six months' notice in the agreement itself we cannot attach much value to the duration of three years proposed by the Committee. The benefits, if any, of the agreement can only be long-run benefits; as a measure of partially alleviating the depression it is bound to prove a failure. It will, of course, be always open to those supporting it to say that things would have been much worse otherwise. As to the Assembly Committee the idea seems to us to be particularly insane. An entirely inexperienced Assembly Committee will not be able to find out anything other than what the Government experts tell it. But what immensely tickles us is the possibility visualised in the scheme of reporting annually on how the trade has been affected by this single factor now introduced. Economists have wrangled for generations past on the historical effects of tariffs and other such phenomenon on the trend of trade and economic prosperity without attaining to any large degree of agreement. And the thing is infinitely more difficult in the case of contemporary periods than about the

past. If it could be done business forecasting would be mere child's play instead of the almost impossible proposition that it actually is.

We look on the adoption of the Ottawa agreement as a very grave menace to the real economic interests of our country. This is because we feel the loss entailed by the agreement to be grave, but even more so because it leads us to become members of a closed economic society of the British Empire. And lastly and perhaps most important of all is the fear we entertain that this marks a distinct step in the steady weakening of the policy of guarded tariffs that has gone on for some years. Discrimination has been steadily becoming less discriminate in recent years and this particularly indiscriminate adoption of tariff increase may well spell the end of the old system. Are we now on the threshold of an era of indiscriminate, manipulated tariffs; of log-rolling and jobbery; of the domination of the Assembly by commercial interests, alien or indigenous? It is this question that looms most prominently before our eyes.

RESIDUARY POWERS.

IN view of the sharp and deep differences of opinion which have found expression both in Allahabad and in London regarding the location of residuary powers under the new Indian constitution, it is worth while to examine the question in some detail. A federal constitution may define, and thereby limit, the powers of the federation and leave to the units all the rest of governmental powers, which would then form the residuary powers. Or it may define and limit the powers of the units and leave all the undefined powers to the federation, as residuary powers. Or, it may define, as exhaustively as possible, all governmental powers, divide them between the federation and the units, and leave the unforeseen and therefore undefined powers to one or the other. The location of residuary powers loses much of its significance in the last alternative. The more exhaustive the enumeration of such powers, the fewer will be the residuary powers; and their location, whether at the centre or in the units, will be of less consequence. The constitution of the United States defines the powers of the centre, but leaves undefined the powers of the units. The Canadian constitution, on the other hand, defines and restricts the powers of the units, the provinces, and leaves the rest to the centre, though, for the sake of convenience and clarity, it enumerates the latter. In both these instances, the residuary powers form a large and important part of the functions of government, and it is of great consequence where they vest. In India the present constitution has attempted an exhaustive enumeration of governmental functions and has divided them between the centre and the provinces. It may be said that residuary powers, in the sense of unforeseen, and therefore unallocated, functions hardly exist, and it is, therefore, of small consequence where these residuary powers rest.

It has not been seriously proposed that India should now follow the example of the United States or of Canada and define the powers of the federation or the units only and create large residuary powers and allot them either to the centre or the units. And there is no serious proposal that she should depart from the practice, which has already become part of her constitutional tradition, of listing the functions as exhaustively as possible and dividing them between the centre and the units, in which case it does not seem worth while to debate the question much too much.

The Allahabad Conference, after much heated discussion, evolved a compromise which is to the effect that residuary powers shall not in advance be allotted either to the centre or to the units, but that as each new question arises it shall be allotted to the one or the other according to its relevancy. In cases of doubt, the decision shall rest with the Supreme Court, pending which the federal government shall take charge of the subject. This is an eminently satisfactory solution inasmuch as it is very seldom likely to be invoked and when invoked, it leaves the decision to the Supreme Court, while not blocking immediate action.

It may be urged that the allocation of a new subject is not a juridical but a political question, and as such, not a matter for the Supreme Court. There is no reason why wider functions should not be assigned to the Supreme Court in India. For one thing, there is no dispute but is susceptible of arbitration by judicial bodies. For another, there is a precedent in the Canadian Constitution, which provides that, if the parties agree, the Supreme Court shall be the tribunal to consider disputes between the Dominion and a province or between two provinces. Thirdly, there is the example of the Permanent Court of International

Justice, which has arbitral functions assigned to it. The Supreme Court in India is likely, in view of the existence of the Indian States, to be endowed with functions of an arbitral character, in addition to the interpretation of the constitutional statute. The problem, therefore, of residuary powers is of small importance in India and the solution offered by Allahabad is good enough and workable.

The Indian Princes have consistently held that they would delegate certain powers to the federation retaining all the rest of undefined governmental powers in their hands. In this case the residuary powers will be large, but their disposition is defined, and creates no problem.

The real difficulty will be, not the disposal of residuary powers, but of the division of powers. Fissiparous and centrifugal forces have always been very pronounced in India. They have to some considerable extent been held in check by the establishment during the last few decades of a strong central government with unlimited powers over not only British India but the Indian States as well, constitutional proprieties notwithstanding, which exerted a powerful unifying influence over the whole of India, welding together such diversified peoples as those of Kashmir and Travancore and Burma and the North West Frontier Province. The purpose of the federation is to maintain and further consolidate this unity. This postulates a strong central government with wide powers of supervision and initiative. The substitution of a federal government with minimum powers delegated to it, as the Princes insist upon, for the present central government with large powers is a step in the wrong direction.

This division is complicated by the fact that during the transition period certain powers will be claimed by Great Britain. The division will be as between Great Britain, the federation and the units.

Even more difficult is the division of functions in such a way that there shall be no overlapping of jurisdictions between the various parties and at the same time no sacrifice of national interests for the particularisms of the units. The Allahabad Conference decided that powers given to the provinces should not be withdrawn by the Indian Government, which means that provincial autonomy should be absolute. In practice this may lead to great inefficiency, deadlocks and confusion, as is the case with the United States, which was more a warning than an example for Canada to follow. The Canadian Constitution which was fashioned in 1867, soon after the American Civil War, therefore, defined and limited the powers of the units and on top of it, gave the Dominion Government a veto over provincial legislation. Even so, the conflicts were so frequent and unexpected that Lord de Villiers, the President of the South Africa Conference, who visited Canada to study its constitution, became a vehement enemy of federation and pressed successfully for the unification of South Africa. In order to eliminate conflicts and safeguard national interests, the German constitution has two lists of federal subjects, one solely in federal hands and the other to be shared with the

units. So long and in so far as the federal government does not make use of its legislative power with reference to the second list, the units are free to legislate, but federal law overrides the state law. It is very desirable that the new Indian constitution should provide that the federal government shall have a veto over the legislation of the units, as in Canada and that it shall have concurrent powers of legislation in certain matters, as in Germany. Such power exists in the present British Indian constitution. It should be retained and extended to the Indian States as well under the new federal constitution.

P. KODANDA RAO.

R. T. C.—FIRST WEEK.

THE R. T. C. opened in its third session on Monday of last week (21st November) in business-like fashion. Without any preliminary speeches even from new members defining their general attitude to the question of reforms, the Conference immediately entered upon a consideration of the Lothian Committee's recommendations (the first item on the agenda paper drawn up by Lord Sankey) in speeches which, we are told, were both brief and to the point.

The general framework in the Lothian Report was adopted, though some members favoured certain departures from it, like adult suffrage within ten years, electoral colleges, group voting and so forth. The chief recommendations in the report round which debate centred, so far as the provinces were concerned, were in regard to the franchise for the depressed classes and women. It was agreed that special provisions were required in the case of both these interests. The recommendation of the Lothian Committee in respect to the depressed classes was that "every effort should be made in all provinces to bring the depressed class electorate up to their population ratio, or in any event as near as possible to 10 per cent. of their population strength except in Bihar and Orissa," and it will be remembered that this recommendation has received endorsement in the Poona Pact. The Conference has agreed to this recommendation, at any rate at its lowest, though apparently not at its highest.

Much opposition was shown to the Lothian recommendation to confer franchise upon women who are literate and women who are the wives of men with the property qualification prescribed for the provincial legislative councils. These additional qualifications were recommended by the Committee in order to bring up the electorate for women to one-fourth of that for men. Mrs. Shah Nawaz was willing to consider any other qualifications provided this proportion was guaranteed. The view that seemed to find most favour was that put forward by Lord Irwin, viz., that the question should be referred to provinces for decision.

In regard to the federal legislature too the main lines of the Lothian Committee's recommendations were followed. For instance, it was agreed that an additional literacy qualification should be allowed in the case of the depressed classes so that their electorate would be 2 per cent. of their population, as against 3 per cent. of the general population. As for the number of seats to be set apart for these classes, reference was made to the Poona Pact under which 18 per cent. of the seats in the general electorate for British India are reserved for them. Special representation for labour, commerce and landlords in the federal Assembly was agreed to, more seats than those allotted to labour (8) and Indian commerce (4) being asked for. The press report says that "it

was generally agreed that special interests should not be represented in the upper house" of the federal legislature. This is likely to convey a wrong impression, for the fact is that since the members of the upper house are to be elected, as proposed in the scheme framed by the Federal Structure Committee and approved by the third R. T. C., by the provincial legislatures by the system of the single transferable vote, it is expected that all the major interests will receive proportionate representation in the Senate without any special provision to that effect. Direct election was approved for the federal Assembly, though before doing so for British India, Mr. Joshi and Sir Parasurama Patro are said to have raised a question as to the mode of selection of the States' representatives. We do not suppose that these members received an assurance that the States' representatives would be elected by the people of the States.

In the discussion of all these questions the representatives of the States in the Conference felt little interest, but when the size of the federal houses came to be considered they took a leading part. Some of these States, and more particularly Hyderabad, want both these houses to be compact bodies consisting mainly of experts in view of the small size and the technical nature of the federal list of subjects. But other States want these to be large bodies, so large that in the Senate each State included in the Chamber of Princes will have individual representation. The Senate will have to consist of some 300 members if it is to satisfy this requirement, and then the federal Assembly, which is supposed to be a popular body, will have to be much larger. The federal legislature, as contemplated by the Lothian Committee, is to be of more modest proportions; that is to say, the Senate is to contain 200 seats (120 British India, 80 Indian States) and the Assembly 450 seats (300 British India, 150 Indian States). The British representatives generally favour small houses; indeed, they do not like as large an Assembly as the Lothian Committee has recommended. No decision has yet been reached on this question.

Connected with this is the more complicated que-

stion of the proportion of seats to be allotted to the States and Mahomedans. The States ask for 40 per cent. in the Assembly and 50 in the Senate. The Federal Structure Committee recommended 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ and 40 per cent. respectively. In the discussions that took place in the Chamber of Princes and other gatherings of States' representatives in March last, it appeared that the States were willing to give up their claim to weightage in the Assembly if in return they received equal or 50 per cent. representation in the Senate. The third R.T.C. did not hear of such a compromise; on the contrary a demand was made again for weightage in the Assembly and equality in the Senate. On the other hand Moslem members opposed any weightage whatever being given to the States, asking however that one-third of the number of seats be guaranteed for themselves not only in British India, but in the Indian States. Since the Unity Conference in Allahabad has agreed to reserve 32 per cent. of the seats in British India for Moslems, this part of their demand is as good as conceded. With regard to the other part of their demand, viz. one-third share in the States' representation, the problem is something like the division of the seats to be allotted to special interests between Hindus and Moslems in Bengal and the Punjab. As the Unity Conference has somehow fixed the Mahomedan quota of these seats, the Moslem representatives ask that their quota of the seats to be given to the States should be fixed, on the basis of a general understanding to that effect. The States seem to be unwilling to do this, and on this question too a solution is yet to be reached.

The last question that the Conference discussed in the first week was one regarding the location of the residual powers of the constitution. On this again no agreement has yet been reached. Some members pressed for these powers being lodged in the federal government and others in the local governments, but there was none who was either indifferent to where they were placed or who would leave the question to be decided as occasion arose in the future. A committee of the Conference has been appointed to consider this question among others.

HOW REPRESSION WORKS.

GOVERNMENT have always claimed that their measures of repression are applied with the greatest discrimination and self-restraint, and that those who hold themselves aloof from disloyal activities have no reason to fear any kind of harassment from their officials. In any case if Government should find that, on account of an error of judgment on their part, any person or institution is unnecessarily involved in a measure which unduly interferes with legitimate activities, they take steps, it is claimed, promptly to withdraw the measure and make proper amends to the person or institution concerned. How unfounded this claim is was shown last week by Mr. R. R. Bakhale in the Bombay Legislative Council, while speaking on the Special Powers Bill, by relating his personal experience in regard to the Bhagini Seva Mandir (Home of Service for Women) of Bombay.

This institution has been doing quiet and unostentatious work of social service among the women of Bombay. Brought into existence in 1929 chiefly by the efforts of a member of the Servants of India Society, Mr. Karsondas J. Chitalia, it attempts to do, speaking broadly, to women what the Servants of

India Society itself does to the public at large—only, unlike the Society, it eschews politics and confines itself to social work. It enrolls women life-workers, gives them training in various aspects of social service and then puts them in the way of doing active work in a spirit of utter self-abnegation. There was no reason at all why this institution, which of set purpose keeps aloof from all politics, not to speak of civil disobedience, should at any time in the course of the present political upheaval have received the attentions of the police, but it did. It happened in this way.

Being still in its infancy, the Bhagini Seva Mandir found that its newly erected building was too large for its own immediate purposes and therefore thought it best to let out part of it on rent for a year to another women's institution of a similar kind—the Hindu Mahilashram. The stipulated period of a year terminated at the close of last year, and the authorities of the Mandir, thinking to expand its work, asked those in charge of the Mahilashram to vacate their premises. The latter, however, delayed doing so, and in the meantime, apparently because the inmates of the Mahilashram took part in Prabhat

Pheries which are associated with the civil disobedience movement, Government came down upon that institution. It was declared an unlawful association and "notified." The part of the building occupied by the Mahilashram with all its effects was taken possession of by Government. The other part of the building which was occupied by the owner, viz. the Bhagini Seva Mandir, was left uninterfered with. But this discrimination, which was but right and proper, was not shown in the Government's order itself under which the Mahilashram was proclaimed. This order declared the "Bhagini Seva Mandir and Hindu Mahilashram" to be "an unlawful association." The Government officials responsible for drafting and issuing the order apparently thought that the two institutions together formed one, though as a matter of fact they are entirely different in every respect. They wanted to take action against the Mahilashram, which they believed was engaged in carrying on unlawful activities, but under a mistaken impression that the Bhagini Seva Mandir also formed part of it, they made the order applicable indifferently to both.

One would have thought that in the circumstances it would be enough for the facts of the case to be brought to the notice of the authorities in order to obtain redress. But in this particular instance frequent representations were made, first to the local officials and then to the headquarters officials, by Mr. Bakhale, who is a member of the Provincial Council, but all to no purpose. None of the officials concerned showed the slightest disposition to admit that a mistake had occurred, and that the Bhagini Seva Mandir which had taken no part in civil disobedience at any time nor intended to do so ought not to have been included in the order. Government themselves had drawn a distinction between the two organisations inasmuch as they had sealed only that part of the premises which was in charge of the Mahilashram and had left the Bhagini Seva Mandir workers free to carry on their work as before in the other part. Why should then Government have ignored this distinction in issuing the order and tarred the Bhagini Seva Mandir too with the brush of disloyalty? All such pleadings went unheeded. It was urged that since the Mandir was the owner of the whole building, that part of it, of which Government had taken possession as being under occupation of the Hindu Mahilashram, should be restored to the Mandir now that the inmates of the Mahilashram had been ejected therefrom. One would think that to such a request Government could raise no conceivable objection. Evidence was adduced to show that for reasons unconnected with Government's order the Mahilashram had been asked to quit and that after Government's order the request was repeated, but all this made no impression on Government.

After months of "anxious and earnest" consideration they came to the conclusion that relief could not be afforded on either of these heads, i. e., in respect of the removal of the ban and the restoration of the building, unless the Mandir authorities gave "a written undertaking to the effect

that the building will not be allowed to be used for disloyal purposes or any activity in furtherance of civil disobedience." An attempt was made to reason with Government, in private interviews and official representations, that the whole order had originated in error and should be withdrawn without imposing any such condition, but it was entirely unsuccessful. Who are the men from whom a written undertaking was demanded? They are: Messrs. G. K. Devadhar, C. I. E., A. V. Thakkar, and K. J. Chitalia, all members of the Servants of India Society, not altogether new to public life. It was explained that the Society as a body was definitely opposed to civil disobedience and that no member could lend his support to it without drawing upon himself the Society's disciplinary action. This ought to be a sufficient guarantee to Government that the three gentlemen from whom an undertaking was required would of their own accord take every possible precaution against the premises being used for the promotion of civil disobedience. They from inmost convictions would ever remain loyal to the British connection, but not wearing loyalty on their sleeves, they would regard it as a humiliation to have to give an undertaking that they would do nothing disloyal. All these considerations were placed before Government, who however proved intractable.

So the ban on the Mandir continues and the part of its building formerly occupied by the Hindu Mahilashram is still in Government's custody. This action of Government is more stupid than anything else. There would be some sense in their regarding the Mandir as a hot-bed of sedition and those who direct its affairs as a set of seditious people. In that case it would be their duty to put a stop to all the activities that are being carried on on those premises and by those people. The splendid work that Srimati Surajben is doing in the locality of the Bhangis at Ville Parle for Bhangi women and children, to which Mahatma Gandhi made a commendatory reference recently, will then become impossible. It would of course be sheer madness for Government to stop this work for the elevation of the untouchables. But even that would be understandable. It would only mean that Government are too suspicious. But to let the Mandir people occupy their old premises and carry on their old work and yet to maintain a legal ban on them and prevent them from re-entering on the other part of the building which belongs to them is simply foolish. What do Government gain by it? They have now to keep some constables there to patrol the place. What is the return to Government for it? What is the mischief that Government think the inmates of the Mandir can make in one part of the building which they cannot make in the other? How is public security ensured by preventing Srimati Surajben from walking from one room into another?

To the Bhagini Seva Mandir itself the order is more irritating than harmful. It no doubt makes immediate expansion impossible; but for the rest it does not press too hardly. The label of an unlawful association which attaches to the Mandir would be

damaging if Government were more discriminating in the application of Ordinances. As it is, there is not a man in India, be he the worst loyalist imaginable, who will think any less highly of the Mandir because Government choose to look upon it with displeasure. On the contrary, the man in the street will value it all the more for it, such is the position to which Government have reduced themselves by their action in the past three years. The way in which Government have dealt with the Bhagini Seva Mandir is a standing monument as much to their perversity as to their reckless administration of the repressive regime.

Our London Letter.

(From Our Correspondent.)

(BY AIR MAIL.)

LONDON, November 18.

THE DELEGATES ARRIVE

I TRAVELLED down to Dover last Saturday to meet the advance guard of the delegates to the third Round Table Conference. It was a typical November day, dull, gloomy, and forbidding; not exactly the sort of day for a spontaneous expression of cheerfulness. Nevertheless some of the principal delegates were considerably cheered to see friendly faces immediately upon their arrival here. Sir Akbar and Lady Hydari, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Mr. M. R. Jayakar, Mr. N. C. Kelkar, Dr. Shafa't Ahmad Khan, Sirdar Tara Singh, and Mr. Zafrullah Khan travelled immediately to London by the same boat train that carried Sir Shadi Lal and Sir S. M. Sulaiman who had come to participate in the Army Charges Enquiry. Rao Bahadur Krishnama Chari, Sir Manubhai Mehta and Mr. Rushbrook Williams representing some of the States, the Aga Khan, Sir Henry Gidney, Sir Muhammad Iqbal, and Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliar had already arrived in London. The delegates were met by the usual throng of officials and friends, some of the former representing the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for India, whilst Lord Sankey, accompanied by his sister, attended in person to give a cordial welcome to the new arrivals. There could be no doubt about the warmth and sincerity of his greetings. It was the great friendly gesture that was so much appreciated and that converted a semi-official occasion into an intimate personal affair. Among those that I did not see on the platform was Mr. Jinnah. Due to arrive in London, to-morrow are the remaining States representatives, including Sir Mirza Ismail, and Sir Henry Gidney, Mr. Joshi, Sir A. P. Patro, Dr. Ambedkar, Pundit Nanak Chand, Mr. Ghuznavi, Khan Bahadur Hidayat Hussain, Begum Shah Nawaz, and Sir Purshottamdas Thakurdas. The Raja of Khallicot is not expected to reach here for another fortnight. The delegates are distributed over London, but as was to be expected the Dorchester Hotel, where Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Mr. Jayakar and Sir Cowasji Jehangir are staying, has become a noteworthy centre. I am lost in admiration of the skilful manner in which the Musalman delegates managed to get themselves photographed for Press purposes, posed in close association with whoever may be the most prominent personage present on the British side. I have seen two such Press photographs since their arrival, the one is with the Lord Chancellor as a central figure, and the other with Sir Samuel Hoare. Doubtless the conjunction is intended to serve its own special purposes, but I

have noticed also that with a curious persistency though I am sure it is by way of being a mere coincidence, the venerable-looking Sikh representative Sirdar Tara Singh has managed on each occasion to get into the picture. I am asking myself whether he does not enjoy a quiet sense of humour all his own.

ARRANGEMENTS AND PROCEDURE

It was known beforehand that no actual business would be done in connection with the Conference before yesterday, when Parliament was prorogued after a passing reference in the King's Speech to the Prime Minister's award providing a temporary decision upon the communal question. I take the opportunity here of stating that an exhilarating telegram has been received in Conference and other circles here to-day, announcing the success of the Allahabad Conference, from Malaviyaji, in which he states that complete agreement has been reached in the Committee of the Conference between Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs, and that the text of the relevant resolutions is being telegraphed here for circulation. This is, indeed, the most gratifying news that we have had from India for many a long day, and among those who will be tremendously encouraged by it will be Dr. Ansari and Mr. Sherwani, who have been in London for the last few days, during an interlude in the former's medical treatment. I have had the pleasure of seeing them both in the last few days. Nothing could be less revolutionary or more sensible than their attitude towards India's present problems, especially those of a communal character. Unfortunately the state of Dr. Ansari's health, though it has much improved, has precluded his taking any active part in public work here.

To get back, however, to the Conference. The preliminary meeting was held yesterday in the House of Lords under the chairmanship of Mr. MacDonald. By some freak of fortune the Round Table has never been round. At the first Conference it was oval with a small curved inset. At the second it remained oval, with a larger curved inset. On this occasion there is not a curve to be seen. It is a rectangular parallelogram of a most austere and rigid type. Let us hope that instead of the suggestion of sinuous evasion it holds out the promise of a square deal.

In welcoming the delegates to a familiar scene, the Prime Minister added his sincere hope that the work of the Conference would be fully satisfactory to all. He described the purpose as the continuation of the work of the last two Conferences and particularly to fill in the gaps so far left in the discussion of a Federal Constitution. The delegates were expected not to express general opinions already well known, but to settle down to the consideration of definite details. The Conference was much more in the nature of a Committee than of a formal body and what was wanted was the examination of point by point, in a severely business-like way. If this were the frame of mind he expressed the opinion that there would be ample time between now and Christmas to do the necessary work. As a result, minutes of the proceedings would be brief and to the point, and abbreviated reports would be issued to the Press, in connection with which a small Committee of three was ultimately appointed. The Prime Minister intimated that he did not expect that it would be possible for him to attend the meetings frequently but the delegates might be assured that, upon any occasion upon which it might be found necessary to put forward a definite Government view, it would be the considered view of himself and his colleagues. He assured the Conference that everything that the Government could do to contribute to the success of the work would be done without stint. Sir Akbar

Hydari replied on behalf of the States and the Aga Khan, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Kelkar on behalf of the British Indian delegation. The first named stated that they were out to draw up a constitution that would really work, and at the same time satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the Indian people. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru is understood to have made it clear that only a measure providing for a federal constitution including central responsibility and provincial autonomy almost simultaneously would alone satisfy Indian opinion. Mr. Kelkar referred to the position of Berar, and discussed the question of linguistic provinces

THE AGENDA.

Sir Samuel Hoare in dealing with the agenda explained that its object was to cover questions not yet sufficiently discussed, and to avoid repetition of discussions already held. He said it would be a good thing if the Conference could end about the 26th December, because if they were to get ahead with the Joint Select Committee next session (that opens on Tuesday next) it was essential that the Government should have time to consider its proposals at the earliest possible date. A possible procedure was the allocation of certain days to certain subjects, and as a matter of fact it was proposed, so far as possible, to stick to this arrangement. As a rule it was not desirable to break up into Committees, but in the case of Finance and Commercial Safeguards, it might be desirable to appoint a small Committee to consider these subjects after they had been discussed generally by the Conference.

The Conference thereafter adjourned until Monday to meet then and on each subsequent day, morning and afternoon, with the exception of next Tuesday, when, owing to the State Opening of Parliament, there will be no morning session.

PSYCHOLOGY.

There are two psychological situations at least associated with the third Round Table Conference, and they are closely inter-connected. The first is the British psychology towards the reforms, and the second the Indian. Bearing in mind the endeavour of the reactionary old guard to divert public attention from the many promises and pledges made by and on behalf of responsible authorities in regard to Indian constitutional progress, a collection of extracts from Royal Proclamations, Official Reports and Speeches, illustrative of the policy of Great Britain in India, and the progress of constitutional Reform has been officially issued. It should convince all decent thinking British people that it is far too late to pretend that any other course is open to this country consistently with honour than the advancement of India with the utmost speed towards full Dominion Status, whatever that may mean at any given time. On the Indian side, it is being made gradually clear, even to such a Doubting Thomas as Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, that Mr. Churchill, Lord Lloyd and their associates of the Indian Empire Society, are very far indeed from being in control of the Conservative Party, whether in the present House of Commons or in the House of Lords, or outside Parliament. Many of the Indian delegates, too, are seeking by personal contact with influential political groups to make clear to serious British opinion the real situation in India, the difficulties with which Moderate advisers are faced, the widespread influence of the Congress, notwithstanding the imprisonment of its leaders, the notable changes that have been brought about by Mr. Gandhi's fast, the increasing impatience of the youth of the country, the growing importance of problems affecting Women and Labour, and the dangers of procrastination, insincerity, and delay. An attempt

is being made artificially to create divisions among the delegates into sheep and goats, and even into different strains of sheep and goats, by evilly inspired Press correspondents, among whom figure prominently the Delhi correspondent of the *Morning Post*, whilst the special correspondent India of *The Times* must be biting his nails with annoyance that Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru should have denounced his inaccurate and tendentious endeavour to misrepresent the Indian leader's views. Suggestions have been coming here and are made here that the Princes are holding themselves aloof from the Federation. The best information that I have, is exactly to the contrary. So far from having the key to the situation now, it has passed since the successful Allahabad Conference definitely to the increasing large group led by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, and would not be at all surprising to find a definite breach in the unity of the Moslem delegation. The divisionists and separatists here and elsewhere have received a distinct shock at the news of the results of the Burma elections. It was, of course, assumed that the separatists would win hands down. It is still hoped that with the aid of all their usual paraphernalia and propaganda, official and non-official, on the separatist side, the newly elected Burmese Legislature will vote in favour of separation. All kinds of insinuations and innuendoes are, as is their custom, urged against the anti-separatists, who are derided as weak, ignorant and even feeble creatures. Not a word is heard as to the unsuccessful machinations on the other side. There is not a whisper here of the influence of British vested interests in official and non-official circles. Fortunately everybody is not blind to what has been happening in Burma, and it may be that yet another surprise is in store for the separatists.

Reviews.

INDIAN CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT.

THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT IN INDIA.

By ELEANOR M. HOUGH. (King.) 1932. 22cm. 340p. 15/-

THIS book, being a thesis prepared as part of the work for the degree of Ph. D. from the George Washington University of the U. S. A., represents a critical analysis and review of the co-operative movement in India by a qualified investigator. "It is the result of a very careful study of co-operation and its problems in India not merely by reading a number of books, reports and pamphlets but also by personal discussions with eminent co-operative workers, and by observations made during visits to typical cooperative organisations".

The book opens with a description of the physical, economic and social features of the country and this is followed by a brief explanation of the general principles of co-operation. In this setting, the movement in India is dealt with. This is a clear exposition of the history, development and present position of the different forms of co-operation in the several provinces and States. The nature of the "movement is still predominantly, as it has been from the beginning, a credit movement; still, as at first, chiefly for the benefit of the rural population." Based on a close study of the figures, she concludes that though the growth in the number of societies, membership and capital has proceeded quite steadily as a whole, yet there are indications in some provinces to show the precarious footing of co-operation. She rightly stresses the importance of the primary society as the movement stands or falls by its

soundness. This is endorsed by Prof. Kaji in his foreword when he writes: "co-operation has not so far become the live force in the rural economy of India that it ought to have become and that its sponsors originally hoped it would." Regarding the efforts made to spread the movement, the author observes,

"Sporadic attacks are being made in different provinces and states on all aspects of the gigantic problem, but the relative ineffectiveness of the prevalent scattering of effort is coming to be recognised. The best hope of doing lasting good to the beneficiaries of the movement lies in visualising their problem as a whole and directing the co-operative attack simultaneously on as many fronts as possible."

The chapter on the Evaluation of the Movement is the most instructive portion of the book. It is a very clear analysis of the handicaps, weaknesses and achievements of co-operation in India. Her criticisms are as frank as her conclusions are sound. As pointed out by Sir Horace Plunkett in his introduction, she has placed co-operation in its proper setting, "that is, as one factor of immense present and far greater prospective importance in the national economy of the country." Co-operation in India has not worked the miracle its original sponsors hoped for, but it has taken its place, important now and destined beyond a doubt to become far more so, among the constructive forces working for the economic regeneration of India and the establishment of sound national economy.

The study and investigation of the co-operative movement in India undertaken by students from abroad serve to correct national prejudices. From this point of view it is a welcome sign of the times that outsiders should interest themselves in the study of our movement in India which now stands at the parting of ways. Mistakes, indifference or inertia at this stage would be calamitous indeed. The publication of the results of the study of serious workers like Miss Hough is sure to "prevent further complacent drifting or groping in the dark." And so in the words of Sir Horace Plunkett, "all those who are genuinely concerned for the welfare of India's millions of peasant folk and wish to grasp their baffling economic problems, with due regard to the eternal human factor will do well to follow the trail this enterprising thesis has so finely blazed."

S. GOPALASWAMY.

MODEL OF A MOTHER.

MARGARET OUTRAM, 1778-1863, MOTHER OF THE BAYARD OF INDIA. By MARY FRANCES OUTRAM. (John Murray.) 1932. 23cm. 358p. 15/-

THIS is an excellent biography. Mary Frances Outram narrates the story of her great-grandmother with the help of the letters of Margaret Outram, Sir James Outram, Lady Outram and others, and any one who reads the book will not fail to be struck by the forceful character of Margaret Outram. The career of Margaret Outram awakens interest not merely because it throws new light upon the character of her son, Sir James Outram, but also because it is the career of a high-spirited lady who was widowed at an early age and, left with five children, bravely triumphed over all obstacles.

The book is divided into three parts. The first part is the record of a clouded dawn when Margaret was thwarted by the theories of her learned and pedantic father, Dr. Anderson. The lengthy epistles of Dr. Anderson throw a flood of light on the character and fallings of his vivacious daughter. The clouded dawn is followed by a stormy noon. Marga-

ret married a reputed engineer, Benjamin Outram, whose income was nearly three thousand a year. By the way, it was this Benjamin Outram who has been credited with being the originator of tramways, but Mrs. Outram's papers tell us that her husband never claimed the word 'tram' to have been derived from his own name as has so often been stated, and that Mr. Reynolds of the Coalbrookdale Collieries and Mr. John Curr invented the tram. The authoress, however, points out that though Benjamin was not the actual inventor of the tram-road, he certainly was the first to bring into popular use the particular make of iron-rail which was the forerunner of modern tramways.

The marriage of Margaret and Benjamin proved a very happy one and five children came quickly in succession to gladden the hearts of their parents—Francis, James, Anna, Margaret and Eliza. But this happiness was cut short by the death of Benjamin Outram. Thrown upon the world with five children, the eldest four years of age, the lot of Margaret, who was only 27, was indeed pitiable. If there is nothing striking in the character of Margaret up to the moment of the death of her husband, the way in which the young widow carried on a heroic struggle with poverty and loneliness alone entitles her to be the subject of a biography. "Misfortune never comes single" is an old adage that was well illustrated in the career of Margaret Outram. Denying herself many conveniences, she managed her household so economically that in course of time her two sons received good education and went to India, the elder as an engineer and the younger as a soldier. But alas! Fate was cruel to her. Eliza, the youngest and best beloved daughter of Margaret, died in 1824 at the age of 19. Then her brilliant son Francis died in Bombay in 1829. Finally her eldest daughter Margaret who had married a Colonel Farquharson in India died near Surat in 1831. Any other woman would have broken down beneath these calamities, but Margaret bore the affliction like a Christian. After these calamities her only hope was James Outram whom she expected to rise to fame to gladden her old age and compensate for the miseries of her youth.

James soon justified the hopes cherished of him by his mother. He rose from post to post and his political and military career was watched with interest by his loving mother. In the midst of his brilliant career James married his cousin, Margaret Anderson, and the marriage proved happy. The book throws a flood of light upon James Outram's character. During the conquest of Sind, James Outram pleaded the cause of the deposed Amirs to the detriment of his own prospects, and refused to touch even a pie of the prize-money taken at the sack of Hyderabad. On the other hand, he distributed £3,000 which fell to his share to various benevolent causes in India. James's noble character was also revealed at the time of the Relief of Lucknow in the course of the Sepoy Mutiny. When James joined his forces to Havelock's and when in virtue of superior rank, he was entitled to take the command he did not do so, and to enable Havelock to win glory took his place there merely in his own civil capacity of Commissioner of Oudh and as a volunteer in his army. The letters show how the chivalrous behaviour of Sir James Outram at the Relief of Lucknow, his noble and generous sentiments displayed throughout his official career, his bright talents, his inflexible integrity and his indomitable energy cheered Margaret Outram in her old age.

Margaret died in 1863 at the age of 85, a few days before the death of her famous son. Her will written five years before her death contains a brief review of her life. "Left a widow at 27 years of

age, and thrown from great opulence and great prospects to poverty and privations, with five orphans to clothe, feed, and educate, a spirit of independence and determination to be under no pecuniary obligations to anyone, enabled me to struggle on without debt or danger. How I did that, and kept out of debt, and kept my place as a gentlewoman, appears wonderful, and only could have been by the blessing of God, Who gave me indeed 'the cruse of oil.' I never wanted, and even was able to help others. Now three of my children are provided for in Heaven" (p. 343).

We have no hesitation in saying that this is an excellent biography. The book is well illustrated.

May we suggest to the publishers that in the biography of Margaret Outram, a picture of the mother would be more appropriate on the title cover of the book than that of the son?

M. V. SUBRAHMANYAM.

Correspondence.

SECESSION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR—With reference to the leading article on the subject of 'Secession' in the last issue of the SERVANT OF INDIA, I wish to make the following observations. The question of the right to secede is likely to arise in India in connection with three classes of cases: (1) Burma, (2) British Indian provinces, (3) the Indian States.

It is not necessary that the question should be decided in all these cases on the same principles. But the danger which may arise from the admission of a right in any one case as a precedent for its extension to other cases has always to be borne in mind. This consideration will have to be kept in view in dealing with the claim of Burma to enter into a federation dissoluble at her will. Much depends upon the position of the different units which join the federation. It is not a question of making a fetish of political theory; nor is it a question of the definition of the concept of federation or a question whether the right of secession can be deduced from the theory of federation by an examination of historical precedents like that of the United States. It is really a question of what is essential to the existence, stability and strength of the composite State. The interests of the federal or composite State must generally weigh in the scales against the interests of the units.

Taking the case of Burma, the circumstances are entirely different (1) from those of British India and (2) from those of the Indian States. Till the annexation of Upper Burma by Lord Dufferin, she had nothing to do with India. The connection of Burma as a whole with India is less than half a century old. Geographically and ethnically, Burma is quite distinct from India; and though there is a strong cultural affinity between Burma and India, we cannot claim a right to hold her against her will. She is misguided and very unwise in asking for separation from us. The object of the authorities who have created and exploited the anti-Indian sentiment is not philanthropic, but to maintain Burma as a preserve for British exploitation. While I am not disinclined to favour a companionate marriage with Burma on condition that the union shall not be dissolved within 20 years (so that we may have sufficient time to trust and appreciate each other and realise the value

of co-operation), I think there is a danger of its being set up as a precedent in the other two classes of cases.

As regards the Indian States, they are all part of India. India is a compact geographical unit, and in various other ways our interests are bound up together. We are all under a central authority. Though the control exercised over the States and provinces is of different degrees, it exists in fact now and is essential to the peace, order, stability and progress of India as a whole. This co-ordinating central authority must continue for all time, according to the Conservatives and Princes, in the hands of the imperial government, but according to nationalist public opinion, in the hands of a responsible government for the whole of India. I am not therefore prepared to concede the right of secession to the States. The Princes may say that they are not bound to enter into an alliance with us, except upon their own terms. But I would not extend the principle of companionate marriage to the States. The growth of nationalism is sure to bring them within the British Indian political system but for the machinations of those who wish to divide and rule. I am willing to put off federation with the Indian States for some time. But I am not prepared to recognise any such right.

As regards British Indian Provinces, the claim of a right to secede would be even more fatal to the integrity and solidarity of India. I would resist it to the last breath and appeal to arms, if necessary.—Yours etc.

P. S. SIVASWAMY AIYER.

Madras, Nov. 27.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- INDIA IN TRANSITION. By D. GRAHAM POLE. (Hogarth Press, London.) 1932. 20cm. 395p. 8/6.
- THE OPEN PAN SYSTEM OF WHITE SUGAR MANUFACTURE. By R. C. SRIVASTAVA. (Government of India Central Publication Branch, Calcutta.) 1932. 25cm. 141p. Rs. 3/2.
- THE MODERN THEME. By JOSE ORTEGA GASSET. (C. W. Daniel, London.) 1932. 21cm. 152p. 6/-
- THE SEX EDUCATION OF CHILDREN. A Book for Parents. By MARY WARE DENNETT. (Routledge, London.) 1932. 20cm. 133p. 3/6.
- DANGER IN INDIA. By GEOFFREY TYSON. (John Murray, London.) 1932. 20cm. 133p. 3/6.
- THE NEW BOER WAR. By LEONARD BARNES. (Hogarth Press, London.) 1932. 20cm. 238p. 7/6.
- THE LAYMAN'S LAW GUIDE. By A. C. SEQUEIRA. (Taraporewalla, Bombay.) 1932. 20cm, 287p. Rs. 3.
- PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE. An Examination of the Tariff Question, with Especial Regard to the Interests of Labour. By HENRY GEORGE. (Doubleday, Doran & Co., New York.) 1931. 20cm. 335p.
- SIGNIFICANT PARAGRAPHS FROM HENRY GEORGE'S PROGRESS AND POVERTY. Selected and Comp. By HARRY GUNNISON BROWN. (Russell Sage Foundation New York.) 1931. 20cm. 582p.
- PROGRESS AND POVERTY. By HENRY GEORGE. (Russell Sage Foundation, New York.) 1931. 20cm. 571p.
- COURSES ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS IN AMERICAN COLLEGES, 1930-31. By FARRELL SYMONS (World Peace Foundation, Boston.) 1931. 25cm. 353p. \$2.00