

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

Vol. XV, No. 50. } POONA—THURSDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1932.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	509
ARTICLES :—	
War Debts.	512
Unity Conference.	513
Bidi Factories in Madras.	514
OUR GENEVA LETTER.	515
OUR LONDON LETTER.	517
REVIEWS :—	
Problem of Indian States. By M. B. Samarth.	518
Australian Impressions. By S. G. Sastry.	520
SHORT NOTICE.	520
BOOKS RECEIVED.	520

Topics of the Week.

R. T. C.—Fourth Week.

THE Conference has now entered upon the most difficult part of its work, and although for the best part of the week a feeling of despondency prevailed in the advanced section of the Indian delegation it seems now to have given place to a moderate degree of hopefulness.

On the question of federal finance a compromise has been reached. The income-tax, which the British Government and the States wanted to be wholly federalised and British India to be wholly provincialised, is now proposed to be split up, the corporation tax and the tax on Government of India securities being assigned to the federal Government and the rest to the provincial Governments. This will leave the former in deficit, which is to be made up by contributions for an unspecified period from the latter. It is understood that a proposal is made for a subvention being given by the Central Government to Sind.

The question of financial safeguards was discussed by the Conference with the authorities of the Bank of England who, dissociating themselves from politics, argued that purely on economic grounds it was necessary that the Indian Reserve Bank should be under the control of the Bank of England. They also maintained that the Secretary of State must hold himself responsible, even in the new polity, for the service of existing debts, future debts being contracted by the federal Government on whatever terms it chose. Sir Samuel Hoare, however, to the agreeable surprise of the Indian delegates, took up a more

reasonable attitude. He saw no reason why the Reserve Bank should be made subordinate to the Bank of England; it would be enough if it was under non-political control in India itself. He also undertook to accumulate gold reserves enough to make its establishment possible early enough and promised to have necessary legislation taken in hand almost immediately. Sir Samuel urged that it was necessary to provide that all currency and coinage legislation of the future should require the previous assent of the Governor-General. The scheme for the appointment of a financial adviser to advise the Finance Minister was again broached, and on that point it was agreed by Sir Samuel that the adviser should be appointed, not by the Secretary of State, but by the Governor-General in consultation with the Cabinet.

A discussion on fundamental rights was also started, but it is reported that Sir John Simon was able to queer the pitch for the British Indian delegation by pointing out that fundamental rights in any constitution had necessarily to be framed in such general terms and hedged about in such a way as to deprive them, from the legal point of view, of all practical utility.

An agreement seems to have been reached on the question of residuary jurisdiction, for it is reported that Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru expressed his willingness to accept the British delegation's suggestion that on any doubtful point that might arise after an exhaustive enumeration as possible of both federal and local subjects the Governor-General's opinion should be taken as decisive.

On the question of the education of Anglo-Indians and domiciled Europeans it was agreed that this subject should be left to the provincial Governments to deal with, subject, however, to the reservation that, except with the consent of a three-fourths majority in a provincial legislature, the present scale of grants-in-aid for Anglo-Indian education could not be reduced unless the general scale suffers a similar reduction. The existing privileged position of Anglo-Indian education will therefore be maintained, according to the unanimous report of a committee of which Mr. Jayakar was a member.

* * *

Berar.

SPEAKING at the complimentary dinner that the Hyderabad Delegation to the Round Table Conference gave in his honour last week in London, the Secretary of State for India referred to the fact

that he and Sir Akbar Hydari had discussions regarding the future status of the province of Berar and hoped that complete success would attend the negotiations of a more detailed nature which he foreshadowed would soon take place in India. It is unnecessary to delve deep into the past history of Berar. It is enough to note that the province still nominally belongs to the State of Hyderabad but has for over seventy-five years been administered by the Government of India. Though in 1902 the then Nizam gave a permanent lease of the province to the Government of India in return for an annual income of Rs. 25 lakhs, neither he nor his successor was reconciled to the loss of the province. The present Nizam made persistent efforts to get back the province, but so far in vain. It appears now from Sir Samuel Hoare's speech that there is some prospect of his wish being gratified, though Sir Samuel has given no indication of the nature of the negotiations that have taken place and are to take place.

Desperately depending as he does on Muslim support for the continuance of the British hold on India, it must be a sore temptation to Sir Samuel Hoare to strike the imagination of the Indian Muslims as well as secure the loyal and enthusiastic support of the Muslim State of Hyderabad, the most conservative Indian State in India, for his own conservative and reactionary policies by handing over to the Nizam the predominantly Hindu province of Berar. But that will be unfair to the people of Berar, who, it must be remembered, have been for over three-quarters of a century under British administration, which, notwithstanding its defects and failings, is still infinitely superior to that of Hyderabad. To the people of Berar the change will be for the worse. But even if it were for the better, it is very necessary that the people affected should be consulted before their destinies are transferred to other hands. We hope the people of Berar will not only be consulted but given the determining voice before any change is made in their status. Their case is analogous to that of the people of Burma who were given an opportunity of expressing their view on the question of separation from India.

It is up to the people of Berar to bestir themselves betimes and make their voice heard and in an unequivocal manner. Some politicians of the Congress persuasion in the recent past felt it very awkward to have to confess openly their preference for British rule over the indigenous rule of Hyderabad because of their unreserved condemnation of the former as "Satanic" and so they felt constrained to maintain a discreet silence. But the situation has now changed. Since provincial autonomy is assured at all events, their choice now is between provincial autonomy for Berar as part of the Central Provinces and under a liberalised Central Government, and "responsible government" promised by the Nizam and under his suzerainty. The promise of "responsible government" for Berar by the Nizam is utterly valueless inasmuch as he does not believe in such a form of government and does not propose to establish it in his whole

State; it is a bribe to the people of Berar and illusory at that. Under the circumstances, the sensitive politicians of Berar need feel no constraint in making their choice. The die is being cast and it would be suicidal for them to hang back and express no opinion on the subject.

* * *

Princes and Safeguards.

IN his speech at the Hyderabad dinner the Secretary of State said that the contributions of British India and the Indian States to the future federation of India would be complementary to each other. In the world of tomorrow, he is reported to have said, there should be neither whirlpools of democratic license nor backwaters of reactionary stagnation. It was for British India and Indian India to ensure the steady flow of unruffled progress with, he believed, British help. The contribution he expects of each is obvious. To make his meaning clearer still, he said that, being a Conservative, he believed in almost everything they (the Indian States) stood for: tradition, heredity and strong government. Even the British Liberal Delegation to the R. T. C. under Lord Reading made the federation of Indian India with British India the condition precedent for the grant of responsible government at the Centre, just to obviate the prospect of the "whirlpool of democratic license" they feared from the inevitable ascendancy of the Congress in British Indian politics. The Princes would contribute the element of "reactionary stagnation" and stabilise the government. If that is the case, was there need for further "safeguards" to be inserted in the constitution? Was it necessary for these safeguards to be vested in the representatives of the British Government? The Princes are more conservative than the British Conservatives. Could not the British interests trust the Princes to defend their rights against unfair treatment? The Princes would, even under the new constitution, be dependent on the pleasure of the British Government in matters of paramountcy; to that extent they will be amenable to British pressure. And for that reason they will perhaps be far more zealous of these interests than the British themselves may openly confess to be.

From the Princes' point of view, is it compatible with their claims of "sovereignty" that their conservative wisdom and judgment should be doubted by the British and that they too should be subjected to "safeguards" in the matter of finance, defence, etc.?

* * *

Untouchability.

THE Anti-Untouchability Day ordained by Mahatma Gandhi and the Servants of the Untouchables Society was celebrated in many places in India on Sunday last and much good propaganda for the removal of untouchability carried on. There cannot be too much of such propaganda. Both Harijans and caste-Hindus are greatly indebted to the inspiring lead that the Mahatma gave the movement by his single-minded devotion to the cause. It is impossible to exaggerate the significance of the movement. It is perhaps the largest and the most difficult of social reforms ever attempted in the history of the world. Undaunted by the intensity and magnitude of the problem, Mahatma Gandhi has tackled it as he alone can. From the central power house at Yerawada have radiated moral forces which have called forth an amazing volume of energy and enthusiasm in innumerable centres in India for the cause. It is to be hoped that this magnificent attempt at social justice will result in the permanent improvement in the status of the so-called Untouchables and will have beneficial repercussions in other parts of

the world which are also the victims of social injustice.

* * *

Temple Entry.

IN a thoughtful letter to the *Hindu* of Madras, Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastri deals with the legal as with several other aspects of the question of temple-entry by Harijans and, in particular, the entry into the Guruvayur temple, which now overshadows everything else on account of the threat of fasting unto death held out by the Mahatma and Mr. Kelappan. Mr. Sastri is clearly of opinion that even if the Zamorin or for that matter any trustee of any temple, was in favour of temple-entry by Harijans, it was open to any objector to obtain an injunction from the courts against the move, and that, therefore, the only method of securing the desired result was by legislation. Even if the referendum now in progress in Malabar turns out overwhelmingly in favour of the reform, it will not enable the Zamorin to throw open the temple to Harijans, until the law on the subject is amended.

The change in the law will be greatly facilitated by the presence of the Mahatma in Malabar. In this connection Mr. Venkatarama Sastri's observations deserve serious attention :

"I have a feeling that if Mahatma Gandhi came out of the gaol and carried on a personal campaign among the people in favour of temple-entry he will be able to revolutionise their outlook in regard to this question. The advantage of such a revolution in the hearts of the people will be far greater than the assent won by the pressure of threatened starvation and death."

He then proceeds to note that :

"There is growing resentment in the hearts even of those who were till recently very friendly to the Mahatma and his cause because of the attempt to solve problems by the announcement of coercive fasts."

It is worth while paying heed to Mr. Sastri's friendly warning.

* * *

Indian Agency in South Africa.

WRITING on the subject of "Indians in South Africa" in the last issue of the *Indian Social Reformer*, Mr. Manilal Gandhi, the devoted editor of *Indian Opinion*, examined at some length the utility of India maintaining an Indian Agent in South Africa and came to the unfortunate conclusion that, beyond being the means of conveying first-hand information to the Government of India, the office was no good to Indians. In his opinion the office was too expensive for the good it did; in the matter of helping the Indians out of their difficulty, it had "utterly failed"; and it was in some respects "a handicap rather than a help" to them. It is very doubtful if this opinion is widely shared among the Indians in the Union. Our impression is quite to the contrary. Even in the case of Mr. Manilal Gandhi we would believe that his failure to appreciate the utility of the Agency is merely indicative of the depth of his feeling, very natural and not wholly unjustified of the sense of wrong and humiliation felt by Indians in that country. As if to clinch his argument, Mr. Manilal Gandhi mentioned that, while the Durban Town Council gave a free grant of 50 acres of land in the best part of the city for a European College, they most grudgingly gave, not a free grant but, a temporary lease for twenty-five years only of a small piece

of land of about two acres for the Indian College. But Mr. Manilal Gandhi very well knows that but for the Agent's persuasion even that temporary lease of the small bit of land would not have been forthcoming. Again, Mr. Manilal Gandhi will not overlook the comparatively large increase in the Government grant for Indian education in Natal, and that this good turn was in some measure due to the efforts of the Indian Agent. It is true that the Agent has not secured the repeal of all anti-Indian legislation and put Indians on a par with the Europeans, but in several ways, not to be despised, he has helped to improve the position of Indians, at any rate, in Natal.

Apart from the positive good that stands to the credit of the Indian Agency, there is the negative-good that is not to be overlooked. Several measures which would have sorely hit the Indians have either been put off or rendered less harmful, thanks to the intercession of the Indian Agent. To take but one instance, the Asiatic Land Tenure Bill was held up for two years and in the end was made less drastic in its operation than when it was first drafted. It does no good to ignore these positive and negative benefits, simply because all the wrongs that Indians suffer under have not been remedied. The question that may well be considered is whether the position of the Indians would have been better if there was no Agent.

Mr. Manilal wishes the Government of India to put pressure on the Union Government in certain matters. If, as he himself acknowledges, the Agency is useful in keeping the Government of India promptly informed of the happenings in South Africa as they affect Indians, the office is justified. It is interesting to note that the *Kenya Daily Mail*, in its leading article on the 27th November last, lamented the absence of an Indian Agent in East Africa. Referring to the Carter Commission it said: "Had there been an Agent of the Government of India in this country he would have taken the necessary step, and noted what the Commission was doing. In the absence of their Agent and in the absence of a definite invitation from the Indian community of this country for help, the Government of India cannot be expected to do anything for us in the matter." The Agent may not work wonders but without him the Indian community in South Africa would not be better off.

* * *

The "Triveni."

OF really good and ably conducted magazines India has very few; but among these the English bi-monthly *Triveni* edited by Mr. K. Ramakotiwara Rao and issued from Madras will take a high place. That it is playing an important part in public education on sound lines is proved by the inclusion among its contributors of such distinguished persons as Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer and Diwan Bahadur M. Ramohandra Rao. Its advisory board is also composed of eminent Indians like Dr. Sir S. Radhakrishnan, Mr. C. Jinarajadasa and Prof. K. T. Shah, to name only three. All this guarantees the excellence of its writings but not the soundness of its finances. At the same time it cannot be too strongly emphasised that the continuance of the first for any length of time is inextricably bound up with the second and it is up to those who value the good work the magazine has been doing during the last four years and more to do their best to place it on a sound financial footing by helping to enlarge its subscription list as much as possible.

* * *

WAR DEBTS.

PAYMENT by Great Britain of her dues out of the American loan (half year's interest and a year's sinking fund totalling in all \$95,500,000) in case the United States insisted on it, was never in question. She never pleaded in any of her notes to the Hoover administration her physical inability to pay this amount. As a matter of fact, she has £140 millions of gold in the vaults of the Bank of England and as Mr. Amery airily declared in the House of Commons on 23rd November, she could cart away at once to the United States, if necessary, enough gold to meet her liabilities for three years, without her being any the worse for it. Since she had come off the gold standard she did not need all this gold for cover to her currency. Probably, the pound would decline in value still further, but to the British industrialist it would cause no perturbation. He would perhaps like to see it fall to a lower level, say, even to three dollars. Having the wherewithal to pay, England never lacked the will. Her course was made smoother by President Hoover's intimation that future revision of the debt settlement would be facilitated if she made the payment that had fallen due. What the British Government wanted above all to secure was that an opportunity should be given to it before it was too late of convincing the United States that however urgent it might appear to her, in view of her immediate financial difficulties, to recover her loans, a drastic scaling-down, if not a total remission, of them was absolutely essential if the world, including the United States herself, was to make way out of the present economic depression. It had thought that a continuation of the Hoover moratorium would provide the best atmosphere in which negotiations between the United States and the debtor countries (singly or collectively) might take place. But Mr. Hoover thought otherwise, and the British Government for its part was quite ready to accept his view. Without the least hesitation it decided to pay, but subject to a reservation that it would have the right to ask that the sum that it would now pay would be taken into the reckoning when the final adjustment of the debt would take place.

There is no doubt that the United States finances are in a very bad way. A recent estimate by Senator Glass put her current year's deficit at a billion dollars at the least and it may easily be a billion and a half dollars. Even at the smaller figure it would be equivalent to £300 millions. In this age of almost universal deficits the U. S. Government's prospective deficit is larger than that of most other countries. The French Government's deficit would be about one-third of this (eight milliard francs), the Italian Government's £20 millions (1,400 million lire), and the German Government's £60 millions (800 million reichsmarks) at the current rate of exchange. The annuity that Great Britain is due to pay next year is \$184 millions or £38 millions gold, or some £50 millions at the current rate of exchange. If she paid the whole of this herself without receiv-

ing any annuities from her own debtors, even then this would amount, the U. S. Government is entitled to argue, to only about one-sixth of the deficit it is faced with in the current year. It is no use minimising the financial difficulties of the U. S. Government. The American Treasury has in any case to pay the Liberty Bonds issued by it for the conduct of the war, whether America's debtors pay or not, and if it is unable to collect these debts it will naturally have to collect larger sums from the American taxpayer than would otherwise be the case. It is all very well for England to make a seemingly generous gesture of cancellation of reparations from Germany and debts from France and Italy provided she herself was excused the payment of her debt to the United States. Because in that case the United States will be the ultimate loser and the American taxpayer will have to shoulder the burden of a general renunciation of reparation payments by the European Governments.

All this is perfectly true. The moral as well as the legal right of the United States to receive the war debt payments is unquestioned. And yet the logic of facts will very soon drive her to remit, if not the whole, at any rate a large part of them. The debtor countries can in the final analysis pay only by exporting goods and services, but as a recent study of this question by Mr. Harold G. Moulton and Mr. Leo Pasvolosky on behalf of the Brookings Institution in the United States has put it, her financial and trade policies "have been in fundamental conflict." She refuses to have debt-service receipts in goods or services from her debtors. Her commercial policy since 1921 has been one of continuous restriction of imports from European countries. Before the war Europe supplied 50 per cent. of the total imports into the United States. This percentage has been reduced to 30 since the United States began to build a tariff wall. In 1929 the U. S. imported goods worth \$1,332,630,000 from Europe; last year her imports from that quarter were reduced to \$640,096,000. And as a whole Europe is a net importer in the trade with the United States; in 1931 the purchases of the European countries in the U. S. market was 1.80 times the purchases of the U. S. in the European market. Similarly, by subsidising her mercantile marine, the United States is making it difficult for countries like England to redress the balance of payments by extending their shipping services. England is the United States' second best customer, her purchases in the last six months being £44 millions. In the same period however she could export to the United States goods worth only £8¾ millions. This adverse balance has to be made good by shipping and other invisible exports, but the United States' policy effectually prevents it. The balance is therefore redressed by trade with other countries. In this way all the debtor countries find it impossible to make payment in the form of goods and services, which is the normal way of business,

even assuming that all of them can have an adequate export surplus.

In 1931 the European Governments paid to the United States \$112,570,000 on account of war debts. In order that this payment might take place in the normal way, the U. S. must have an import surplus and the European countries must be allowed to have a corresponding export surplus. On the contrary in that year the U. S. exports to Europe exceeded European imports into that country by \$547,000,000 in value. It is clear that in such a situation equilibrium could be maintained only by the United States making fresh loans to the European continent year after year. This was in fact the case till the end of 1929. Europe provided till then the largest field of external investment for American capital. At the end of 1931 total U. S. investments amounted to \$15.51 billions of which \$4.78 billions were invested in Europe (and \$1.42 billions in Germany). But after the collapse of the stock market in Wall Street in November 1929 the stream of investments from the U. S. to Europe practically ceased. Germany and other countries which till then paid their obligations to the United States only by re-borrowing from her have now to make a choice between wilful default and involuntary failure to pay. The choice is inexorably limited to these two alternatives—unless the United States herself, seeing far into the future, revises her debt policy.

Such revision in the sense of cancellation of war-debts would be far less injurious to her national interests than sticking out for her pound of flesh and thus dislocating the entire economic system of the world. Europe's purchases in the U. S. market have been reduced to half since 1929 (from \$2,341 millions in 1929 to \$1,186 millions in 1931); even so they form 48.7 per cent. of the total merchandise exports from the United States. The United States is thus interested, even from her own point of view, in keeping the purchasing power of the European countries unimpaired. Coming down to certain important commodities, we find that Europe took in 1929 as much as four-fifths of the U. S. exports of cotton and copper, and two-thirds of her exports of tobacco, wheat, and petroleum; and the United States cannot in her own interest afford to lose foreign markets in these products. The Brookings Institution's monograph referred to above says on this subject: "The loss of foreign markets would, in fact, lead to a shrinkage in the domestic market. If the cotton, tobacco, or wheat-producing areas are seriously depressed as a result of the loss of foreign markets, the purchasing power among vast sections of our population is curtailed, and, in consequence, their ability to purchase goods in the domestic market is lessened. . . . There never was a more complete economic fallacy than the one now prevalent that this country can turn its back on Europe and prosper for so doing." On the other hand, the monograph continues, "the losses to the Treasury from a remission of the debts would undoubtedly be greatly outweighed by the gains which would accrue to the Treasury with the recovery of business activity. Given prosperous

cotton, tobacco, and wheat areas and thriving industries, the American tax problem will take care of itself, as it did during the period from 1925 to 1929." The United States must therefore so shape her war-debt and tariff policies as to help the world emerge out of depression. In that way will she help herself best.

UNITY CONFERENCE.

THE Unity Conference is dragging its weary length at Allahabad with none too bright prospects of a successful issue. The committee of the Conference which was able to arrive at unanimous conclusions last month finds itself flooded with amendments from every quarter suggesting substantial alterations in the position reached and upsetting the nice balance of power proposed by it. It had hoped to put finishing touches on its agreement in one day and to submit it to the entire Conference the following day, seeking its ratification by the All-Parties Conference the day after. But a week has passed and the committee or rather, its sub-committee is still considering the modifications proposed.

Assam.—With regard to Assam, it appears, the sub-committee has agreed to make a unanimous proposal to the committee. The Premier's decision on the composition of the Assam Legislative Council was that it should consist of 108 members, of whom 48 should be returned by the general territorial constituencies and the depressed classes; 34 by Muslims; 1 by Indian Christians; 1 by Europeans; 11 by Commerce etc.; 4 by Labour; and 9 by backward areas. The sub-committee proposes to increase the number of seats from 108 to 116 and allot them as follows:—Hindus 61; Muslims 43; Indian Christians 2; Commerce etc. 6; and tribal people 4. Labour is to be given no special representation, or perhaps its representation is included in the communal quotas given above. What exactly the intention is we are not told. The commercial and planting interests will have a reduced representation, 6 instead of 11; so also the tribal classes 4 instead of 9; and the balance is to be distributed between Hindus and Muslims (the proportion as amongst each other being maintained). This will be the net effect of the proposal.

Bengal.—The solution proposed by the Unity Conference's committee for Bengal allotted 51 per cent. of the seats in the Legislative Council to Muslims and 44.7 per cent. to Hindus. But this proportion can be obtained only by reducing the quota of the Europeans (to whom the communal award gives 11 on the communal basis and a share in the 19 seats allotted to the commercial community). At the Muslim All-Parties Conference in Lucknow the question was raised as to what was to happen if the European quota was not sufficiently reduced. In accordance with the mandate of the Conference it was proposed by Muslim members in the sub-committee that 51 per cent. of the seats should be allotted unconditionally to Muslims by statute, and that Hindus should reduce their proportion if the European share could not be curtailed. Hindus refused to take less than 44.7 per

cent. in any case and asked in addition that as in the Punjab "at least one Sikh" is to be included in the Cabinet, so shall one Hindu be always included in the Ministry in Bengal. It appears that if Europeans are adamant Hindus will have to surrender two seats to Muslims in order to meet their demand. A deputation headed by Mr. C. Vijayaraghavachariar went to Bengal in order to persuade Hindus of that province to agree to this sacrifice in the national interest, but they met with stout resistance in that quarter. An impasse has therefore been reached on this issue.

Sind.—The fate of the agreement on Sind was no happier. Muslims brought forward amendments watering down the protection proposed to be given to the Hindu minority. They sought to take out of the agreement the provision reserving at least one seat in the Cabinet to a Hindu and to throw open the 37 per cent. of the seats reserved for Hindus to all non-Muslims (including Sikhs who are demanding reservation of 3 per cent. of the seats for themselves, Europeans, &c.). As a counterblast to these amendments Professor Chablani proposed that the whole agreement should be scrapped and that the separation issue itself should not be taken as settled, but should be left to be decided in future on its merits. He also asked that 41 per cent. of the total number of seats (including special seats) shall be reserved for Hindus instead of 37 per cent.; that on the bench of the High Court there shall be one Hindu; &c. In the meanwhile the Working Committee of the Sind Separation Conference consisting of Sir S. N. Bhutto, Khan Bahadur Khuhro and Miran Mahomed Shah has passed a resolution rejecting the Allahabad solution on the ground that it does not declare for an unconditional separation of Sind, irrespective of financial considerations.

The Punjab.—In the agreement arrived at by the Conference committee it was provided that if any measure introduced in the Punjab Council be thought by three-fourths of the members of minority communities to be either discriminatory or prejudicial to their interests the minority communities should have the right to appeal to a tribunal to be set up by the Central Government specially for the purpose. The Muslims, who form the majority community in the province, now wish to have it deleted, but the Sikhs insist upon retaining it. Unless this special protection is given, they will not agree, they say, to a statutory reservation of 51 per cent. of the seats for the Muslims. In the absence of the clause giving this protection the Sikhs maintain that their proportion of seats must be raised from 20 to 30 and the Muslim proportion reduced from 51 to 40. Muslim delegates did not show a disposition to agree to any of these demands, whereupon the Sikh members staged a sensational walk-out. It should be noted that the Hindus of Sind and Bengal also ask for a provision to be inserted in the constitution similar to the one insisted upon by the Sikhs in the Punjab.

Indian Christians.—This community has asked for an increase in the number of seats allotted to it in the communal award: 3 instead of 2 in the Punjab,

and 12 instead of 9 in Madras. In the Central Legislature the sub-committee of the Conference appears to have agreed to reserve 2 per cent. of the seats for Indian Christians.

Cabinets.—The Conference committee agreed to reserve one seat in the Central Cabinet for Sikhs for the first ten years. Muslims have now put forward a demand for a reservation of one-third of the seats in the Central Cabinet for themselves; it is not known whether it is to be for ten years or for an indefinite period. In the Provincial Cabinets all "important Indian minorities" are, under the recommendation of the Conference committee, to have representation by convention. Indian Christians ask that in Madras they shall be regarded as an "important Indian minority" having a claim to representation in the Cabinet of that province.

Other amendments proposed by Muslim delegates were to the effect that their community should have special representation in recruitment to the Army and the Judiciary and in educational grants-in-aid. All these demands met with stout opposition in the sub-committee.

BIDI FACTORIES IN MADRAS.

A non-official bill has been recently introduced in the Madras Legislative Council, which seeks to regulate the conditions of labour in *bidi* ("indigenous cigarette") factories. As is well known, these are not confined only to the Southern Presidency but are to be met with in different parts of the country and provide employment to thousands of people. *Bidi* factories do not however use any steam or other power in the manufacture of their products and are not covered by the Factories Act with the result that the evils consequent upon the exploitation of labour have come to be associated with them. As a matter of fact, the Whitley Commission which inquired into the Indian labour problem record it as their definite belief that *bidi* making is in some places a "sweated" industry. Describing the problem of child labour in these factories, the Commission said: "In many cities large numbers of young boys are employed for long hours and discipline is strict. Indeed there is reason to believe that corporal punishments and disciplinary measures of a reprehensible kind are sometimes resorted to in the case of the smaller children. Workers as young as five years of age may be found in some of these places working without adequate meal intervals or weekly rest days, and often for 10 or 12 hours daily, for sums as low as 2 annas in the case of those of tenderest years." The exact amount of such juvenile labour in these factories could not be ascertained by the Commission but its inquiries were sufficiently thorough to warrant the conviction that the number "is sufficiently large in certain areas to constitute an evil which demands immediate remedy." The Commission's description of the places in which these factories are located is also worthy of note. "Many of these places are small airless boxes, often without any windows, where the workers are crowded so thickly on the ground that there is barely room to squeeze between them. Others are dark semi-basements with damp mud floors unsuitable for manufacturing processes, particularly in an industry where workers sit or squat on the floor throughout the working day. Sanitary conveniences and adequate arrangements for removal of refuse are generally absent."

The Bill referred to is designed to meet some of the evils to which attention was so pointedly drawn by the Commission. To this end it defines "child" as a person below 16 as against 14 in the Factories Act and prohibits altogether the employment of children under 12. Moreover, no child can be made to work for more than seven hours a day without half an hour's interval for rest and meal or can be given corporal punishment for short work, unauthorised absence or for any cause whatever. Nor, it is satisfactory to note, does the Bill fail to deal with women labourers. Their employment before 8 a.m. and after 6 p.m. is forbidden and it has been laid down that at no time during their working time should the number of those simultaneously at work be reduced to less than three. The reasons for this provision will be easily obvious to anybody who knows anything of the conditions of these factories. The Bill seeks to introduce a 60-hour week with a working day of ten hours. A noteworthy feature is the provision for the appointment of non-officials as honorary inspectors to watch its working, which ought to disarm the opposition of Government to the passage of the bill on financial grounds. The Bill contains clauses the enforcement of which will go far to ensure the maintenance of *bidi* factories in a clean and sanitary condition, so that the workers need no longer work in conditions deleterious to their health and safety. The maximum penalty prescribed for offences under this measure is Rs. 100 which may appear to some as not being sufficiently deterrent. While the detailed provisions of the Bill may possibly give rise to a divergence of view, there can hardly be any difference of opinion as to the necessity or desirability of doing something decisive to bring under control some of the evils associated with these factories.

Bidi making was one of the industries in regard to which the Whitley Commission recommended a more thorough and detailed inquiry with a view to finding out whether the setting up of machinery for fixing the minimum wage was necessary. It went further and suggested that suitable legislation should be undertaken in case such need was established. During the interval since the publication of the Commission's report, no such inquiries have apparently been set on foot by any provincial Government. Action intended to check the evil referred to by the Commission is however urgently necessary and it is a matter for satisfaction that the initiative has been taken by a non-official. It is to be hoped that his example will be followed in provinces in which the exploitation of child labour is known to exist.

Our Geneva Letter.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

(BY AIR MAIL.)

Geneva, Dec. 10.

1932.

IN one sense, the year 1932 marks a definitive break with the past; in the last twelve months the world has awakened to the reality of the grim struggle before it. At Lausanne the Reparations problem was for all practical purposes settled and at Ottawa a new economic system was created. The British Government's past effort to balance its budget must rank as a contribution to the general improvement of the financial situation of the world. The admission of Iraq into the League marks not only the development of the Mandate system, but along with Turkey's entry into it, the modernisation of the Moslem States of the Near East and their

close association with Western European polity. The vast implications of the Round Table Conference are nowhere deprecated outside India, and the publication of the Lytton Report and even such progress as the Disarmament Conference has made are noteworthy landmarks in the evolution of the League. The summoning of a special International Labour Conference for considering the reduction of hours of work as a solution to the unemployment caused by the economic depression, at the instance of the Italian Government, and the preparation for the World Economic Conference which, it has now become clear, will include the very important subject of war debts, are also noteworthy efforts. None but an impractical visionary, incapable of grasping the inevitability of gradualness, which is of the essence of far-reaching political and economic changes, would be inclined to underrate the profound significance of these various happenings.

Nevertheless, a great deal remains to be done before the present generation can be said to be out of the woods that have grown over the wreckage of the last war, for it will be noticed that important as they are, all these efforts are more or less confined to what may be described as the sphere of Western European influence. It is not enough any longer for the world's security if Western Europe is at peace with itself. It has to make common cause with other powerful political systems, represented principally by Russia and the United States, and in some measure Germany also; this is perhaps the outstanding lesson of the year now drawing to its close and there is more than mere coincidence in the attention of all Europe being directed to the war debts question in the last month of the year. There is no doubt that the necessary adjustments will be made, a new world order evolved and "tasks in hours of insight willed shall be in days of gloom fulfilled"; meanwhile, it is obvious that political security, financial stability and industrial activity, the three legs on which the tripod of the world we have inherited stands, are at present badly in need of repair.

As Lord Reading observed not very long ago, neither financial stability nor industrial activity can be restored in the present condition of the world, despite ingenious schemes and proposals suggestive of evading a frontal attack on the obstacles in the way of the attainment of political tranquillity, until normal international relations are rendered possible once more. It may not be easy to define the term normal in this connection, and in comparison with many a previous period of history our time with its established international institutions, continued international intercourse and democratic control over transactions between States may even appear favoured. But the value of a political system does not, in the last resort, consist in the advantages it has over those which prevailed before it, but in its capacity to fulfil its requirements. There is general agreement that the political development of the world has failed to keep pace with its social, commercial and industrial advancement.

In Geneva attention is still directed to the Manchurian question and the German claim for equality as regards armaments. These, it will be noticed, are not isolated issues, but connected and each a whole complex of international relations. To abdicate the League's authority with regard to Manchuria would be, besides weakening its influence as a bulwark of peace (as the Czecho-slovakian Foreign Minister has pointed out in all frankness in the special Assembly convoked to consider this issue) to expose the whole of the Far East to the risks of an interminable rivalry between Russia, Japan, China and the United States with all its consequences. Already

in the last few days, not only has Japanese diplomacy shown signs of unusual activity in Moscow, and France concluded a treaty with Russia, but there have been persistent rumours of the United States opening relations with the Soviet authorities. The Red Army is potentially as strong a force as any of the Western European armies and, if in addition to the scientific equipment she has recently acquired, Russia also obtains credit facilities, an incalculable factor will have made its appearance in the political world. All signs point to the growing unwillingness of the United States to undertake commitments with regard to Europe and the formidable isolation of the United States and the U. S. S. R. from the political system of Western Europe will be a perpetual menace to its security.

This is a consideration which is all the more important because of Germany's refusal to re-enter the Disarmament Conference until her claim for equality is fully recognised. France, with the devastations of the past hardly covered up as yet, is unwilling to yield to this demand until Germany is securely tied up to the political system to which she belongs, and if recent revelations that have appeared in certain quarters are true, Germany, intent on an independent career of her own, turns not only in the direction of Russia but towards the South over the Tyrol, where Italy is silently maturing her scheme to do away with the network of Versailles. Such are the complexities and ramifications of the political world which the League is called upon to set in order and when to these are added the claims of Great Britain, with a dense population packed into an island, dependent on trade for its very existence and burdened with a vast maritime empire, the difficulties of the Disarmament Conference will be obvious.

Until these difficulties are solved, however, tentatively, there can be no improvement in the financial situation, for capital seeks safe investment. The recognition of this truth probably accounts for Mr. MacDonald's presence in Geneva a week before the appointed day for Great Britain's payment of what may turn out to be the last instalment of her debt to the United States when Trans-Atlantic messages are passing all the time between London and Washington and the whole of Europe is anxiously waiting for President Hoover's last word. The American people, rightly or wrongly, have established a connection between war debts and disarmament and refuse to forego any of their dues until Europe is made safe for commerce, if not for democracy. The experience which has affected them most in their association with Europeans in the fateful years of the war is the national animosities of the latter. The attitude of Americans towards Europe in this respect is not unlike the attitude of Europeans towards India with regard to social abuses. Signs are not lacking that the United States are losing hope and now seek no more from Geneva than a provisional agreement safeguarding the gains so far obtained at the Disarmament Conference. Disappointing as this must seem to those who minimised the difficulties of its task and were perhaps inclined to exaggerate the possibilities of renunciation on the part of the powerful nations of the world, even this result is of great value as a truce in armaments. A tradition has been set up and, for the rest, economic necessity may be expected to complete the work.

Side by side with disarmament all the world, and Europe specially, must laboriously rebuild the financial and industrial system which is now in a state of collapse. With the failure of the Tariff Truce Conference, the hopes of Great Britain leading the movement for the collective regulation of commerce were all but lost and Ottawa definitely put an end to

any such expectations. Commerce, which is the life-blood of finance, must hereafter depend upon an immense network of regional agreements and particular treaties and until the streams of commerce flow fully again, industry will be severely handicapped. This commercial construction will be considerably influenced by political factors (the abandonment of the Austro-German customs union and the erection of the Ottawa system are examples of this) and will, in its turn, determine the new political configuration of the world, for what is now happening is nothing less than a transformation of the distribution of power in the world, effected not by the force of arms, but through the cumulative power of currents of every day trade which, in the last resort, are the decisive influence in the making or the unmaking of nations.

To look, however, to mechanistic factors alone for the revival of industry is a fallacy, common to economic theorists and must be avoided. For, apart from the consideration that in a world overflowing with goods, scientific knowledge and idle hands, hungry men and women will not patiently wait for the symmetry of the economic system to complete itself, in our time, as industry touches the whole of national life, it is as much capable of fashioning national economy as it is moulded by it. Such a constructive effort from industry can, however, be demanded only when labour, which from a human point of view forms a very considerable part of it is educated to be taken into, and accepted in, full partnership with management. The intervention of the State in bringing about this reform is now a matter of more than academic concern, for in the present economic depression employers as well as workers have looked to the State for, and obtained, its aid. This is a field in which democracy has as yet made few inroads. Protection, after all, is only a form of subsidising employers of labour and the State when it is called upon to assume responsibilities in the organisation of national economy can hardly neglect the social aspects of economic planning without detriment to its fundamental function of providing for the well being of every citizen. Everywhere it is now recognised that the existence of a vast industrial proletariat, which in time of crisis finds itself let loose, is an intolerable menace to the State. As part of the political foundation of the new nationalism, an individual urge to promote collective welfare and to share in the responsibilities of corporate life must be found. It would hardly be possible to create this enthusiasm unless the labour displaced by the pace of industrial advancement is absorbed in some productive occupation, and the obvious solution is agricultural and rural development. The reconstruction of industry and agriculture within each national area, without detriment to collective good or scientific improvement, and the contribution of these various economic groups into a large harmonious international system functioning for the profit of all mankind—that is the task with which the world is faced. It appears to have been approached in 1932 more consciously than ever before, since the peace treaty, and the old notion of laissez-faire is being rapidly replaced by the new idea of premeditated construction.

If the League organisation, which, as has already been proved, is well suited, in spite of its restricted character, to bring together the representatives of the various nations and interests all over the world, could promote this intricate process of political, economic and financial reorganisation, by keeping in check, however hesitantly, disastrous explosives that can only make the situation immensely worse, it would deserve well of the world and those who little dreamt of the difficulties of to-day.

when they laid the foundations of a new international order would be regarded as having wrought better than they knew.

Our London Letter.

(From Our Correspondent.)

(BY AIR MAIL.)

LONDON, December 9.

THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE.

THE principal subject discussed in the Conference has been Defence, the special powers of the Viceroy and Governor-General in connection therewith, and Military Finance. The views of the Indian nationalist members, generally spoken of as the non-Mohammedan group, were voiced in a closely reasoned speech, occupying the whole of a Monday morning, by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, who laid down a series of propositions subsequently embodied in a formal Memorandum presented to the Conference by the non-Muslim group. It contains the following propositions:

"The Preamble to the new Act shall contain a declaration to the effect that the defence of India must to an increasing extent be the concern of the Indian people and not of the British Government alone, and the Governor-General, who shall have the control of the Army during the transitional period, shall take all the necessary steps to achieve the Indianization of the Army, so that India may ultimately assume responsibility for its own defence within the shortest period of time consistently with the safety of the country and the efficiency of the Army, and that in consultation with his British and Indian expert advisers he shall prepare a programme for that purpose.

"During the period of transition, defence, that is to say, the entire army organization, shall be under the control of the Governor General. The Army portfolio shall be held by a Minister who shall be appointed by the Governor General from among the members of either House of the Legislature and shall be responsible wholly to the Governor General. The Army Minister shall be treated as a member of the Cabinet, and there shall be joint deliberations between him and the responsible Minister, his responsibility to the Governor General remaining unprejudiced. All questions relating to Army policy shall be discussed in the combined Cabinet, the decision of the Governor General being final on all such questions.

"(a) The Army Budget shall not be put to the vote of the Legislature. (b) The Army Estimate shall first be prepared by the Army Department in consultation with the Finance Department and shall be submitted to a Committee consisting of the Army Member, Commander-in-Chief, Chief of the Staff, Foreign Member, Prime Minister, Finance Minister, and Minister of the Interior (dealing with questions relating to internal security). The conclusions of this Committee shall be submitted to the Governor General, whose decisions shall be final. (c) The Army Budget shall be submitted to the Assembly in appropriate sections for discussion, but shall not be voted upon. No part of the Indian Army shall be employed outside the limits of India without the sanction and approval of the Federal Legislature".

There is an interesting little bit of history associated with the presentation of this Memorandum. On Monday after the Indian members had expressed their views on the various aspects of the Defence problem, the Secretary of State had let it be known on the following day that he would reply, setting forth

the Government's views. On Tuesday morning, however, at the beginning of the proceedings, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru informed the chairman that this Memorandum had been prepared for presentation to the Conference but that copies were not yet available as the manuscript was being typed. Sir Samuel Hoare is understood thereupon to have announced that he would reserve his comments until the following day, and that meanwhile he would open the discussion on Federal Finance, which he proceeded to do. He was noticeably disturbed by the prospect of the presentation of a formal Memorandum, and he and others of the British delegation objected that new matter ought not to be imported into the proceedings at that stage. Sir Tej Bahadur promptly gave the assurance that the Memorandum contained not a syllable that was new, but merely recorded in the form of concise propositions the views that had previously been expressed by himself and his colleagues on this very controversial subject. There the matter seemed to rest for the time being. Sir Samuel Hoare, however, having expressed himself upon the subject of Federal Finance, appeared to change his mind and later announced that after the luncheon interval he would be ready to make a statement on the Defence question on behalf of Government, but he wished to be furnished immediately with a copy of the Memorandum. Thereupon, in order to expedite the matter, Mr. Jayakar is believed to have left the Conference and proceeded to the Dorchester Hotel, in order to obtain a copy of the Memorandum which had not yet arrived at the House of Lords. When the proceedings were resumed after lunch it was obvious to those present that Sir Samuel Hoare was in a very disturbed mood, and he is understood to have opened by objecting to certain members keeping important matters like this up their sleeves, and suddenly thrusting them upon the Conference. This aroused Sir Tej Bahadur and drew an emphatic and angry protest from him. He strongly resented Sir Samuel's ungenerous imputation. It would be clear to any one who read the Memorandum dispassionately that it contained absolutely nothing new but that it merely recorded in a series of formal propositions the views that had been freely canvassed among them the previous day. He then proceeded to carry the attack into the opposite camp. He protested energetically against the habit that had grown up of thrusting upon delegates, who were working already desperately hard, day and night, on their duties at and connected with the Conference, important official Memoranda after eleven o'clock at night, which they were required to digest, and upon which they were expected the following morning to express intelligent opinions. This effective placing of the boot upon the other leg drew a sort of half-hearted expression of regret from Sir Samuel, whose testiness and impatience have been widely commented upon. Sir Tej Bahadur's timely expostulation and the energetic terms in which it had been couched, electrified the somewhat bored Conference, and in the result, although Sir Samuel Hoare's official statement failed to satisfy the Indian delegates, he nevertheless felt it incumbent upon him to add that their views would receive the Government's sympathetic consideration.

The British Indian delegation (with the possible exception of the Muslim delegates) are greatly exercised on a number of important matters. They want to know when the Federation is to come into existence; what is to be the nature, the extent, and the number of safeguards and reservations; and what is to be the extent of the transition period during which these safeguards and reservations, or some of them, are to be maintained. Several of them, including Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Mr. Jayakar, and Sir Cowasji Jehangir have put pointed questions on these subjects to the Government's spokesman. Eleven

British Indian delegates who have been acting as a team have addressed through the Lord Chancellor, an important letter to the Prime Minister the contents of which have not been disclosed, asking for certain information and expressing in precise terms their views on certain matters, and the signatories have reserved to themselves the right, in case of need, and upon a suitable occasion, to publish the letter, in such manner as they may deem fit.

Yesterday the situation seems to have taken a turn for the worse. It was known that this week the serious danger zone would be entered by the Conference, as the important question of the Safeguards and their duration was up for discussion. Temporarily these questions are, so far as the Conference itself is concerned, in abeyance as they have been referred to appropriate Committees for consideration and report. The belief, however, is growing that this may be really a subterfuge in order to avoid further plain speaking and the putting of more pressing questions at the Conference itself. The *Daily Herald* to-day records that shortly after the opening of yesterday morning's proceedings that began late, owing, it is believed, to a meeting of the India Committee of the Cabinet, Lord Sankey, without any explanation, left the meeting with a few words of farewell to one or two of the delegates. From this the paper deduces that a complete deadlock has been reached, that nothing further is to be hoped for from the Conference, and that it will sit no more until it is summoned to receive a farewell address on the last day from the Prime Minister. It is perhaps early to adopt a tone of despondency and though there is a great deal to justify it and to warrant some of the deductions drawn by the paper, sufficient account has not been taken of the ingenuity, determination, and patriotism of some of the leading British Indian delegates, who are not to be expected to take cavalier treatment of the kind said to be contemplated without protest, which may ultimately prove to be much more effective than may at present seem to be probable. Whether or not further meetings of the Conference itself are to be held will depend upon the promptness with which the Committees are ready to report, and the unanimity with which at least the non-Muslim group are prepared to demand opportunities for effective discussion of the reports. There are bound to be, and well-informed persons long ago contemplated that there would be, alarms and excursions of this kind in the latter stages of the proceedings. Pull devil, pull baker is an old experience in the political negotiations between tough adversaries each convinced of the rightness of his own view-point, and there is still a long way to go before the British Indian delegates pack up their bags in dungeon and cast the dust of England from their shoes. When, therefore, some of the delegates leave for India by the *Victoria* on the 29th instant from Genoa, as they have arranged to do, it does not at all follow that their reminiscences of the Third Round Table Conference will be of the undilutedly bitter character that the prophets of evil forecast.

The States this week have not been very helpful, owing to their own domestic disputes. Sir Akbar Hydari and Sir Manubhai Mehta have been in open conflict before the Conference, and the former was very severely interrogated by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Sir Cowasji Jehangir on account of his evident desire to withdraw his signature from the Percy Committee's Report. To the amusement of the general body of delegates Sir Tej was understood to have taunted Sir Akbar, who has gone far beyond the position of the Secretary of State, with behaving like the advocate who in court exceeded his client's instructions.

SIR A. WATSON ON THE INDIAN SITUATION.

It is evident from a speech made by Sir Alfred Watson, Editor of *The Statesman*, before the India-Committee of the Conservative Party, at the House of Commons this week, that he has not been embittered by his recent unfortunate experiences in Calcutta, and that he holds a realistic view of the Indian situation. He declared his conviction that the one alternative to a Constitution that would be accepted by a large body of Indians would be a doubled British Army in India, a trebled police, and a trebled Civil Service. For these things India could not pay and Great Britain would have to find the money, and then after twenty years of resolute government she would still be faced with the problem with which she is confronted to-day. The balance of European opinion in India, he said, wanted to be rid of the present conflict, and to settle down to the business which was the main purpose of the Englishman in India. That could be achieved only by enlisting a large body of Indian opinion in support of any new Constitution, for without sympathetic Indians no constitution that could be framed would work. Safeguards there must be, and, while Indian opinion was suspicious of that word, European opinion was doubtful whether safeguards could be made effective. Trust would be necessary on both sides in a great experiment of which no man could see the end. Terrorism must be treated as a police-matter. It was comparatively small in its extent and professedly political in its origin. It would probably have to be dealt with by the new Government as it was now being dealt with. Such sectional manifestations of violence had never been a reason for withholding governing power from a nation. It would be worth some sacrifice to retain a contented India within the Empire, for Indian trade was essential to the Empire. Sir Alfred Watson, having regard to the circumstances and the occasion of his address, is to be congratulated upon having rendered a most valuable service to Indian nationalism. It was a fine piece of intelligent and honest propaganda.

Reviews.

PROBLEM OF INDIAN STATES.

INDIAN STATES AND INDIAN POLITY. By S. R. S. RAGHAVAN. (The Editor, Bangalore City.) 1931. 20cm. 80p. Re. 1.

IN his instructive and informative brochure Mr. Raghavan presents, within a small compass, the problem of Indian States in its important aspects and with its historical background. The scheme of an All-India Federation, as he conceives it, is succinctly detailed and the point of view of the subjects of the States especially elaborated. In the light of later developments, however, the book loses some of its utility and originality.

The proposition that Federalism is the only solution "for the problem of the Indian States with reference to the Indian constitution" (Chap. II, p. 15) which the author attempts to reinforce with extracts from the Montagu-Chelmsford, Simon and Nehru Reports, deserves careful examination. In the first place the connotations of a "Federal Solution", it would appear, are both nebulous and varied. The Montagu-Chelmsford Report envisaged "the external semblance of some form of 'federation' at some distant future. (p. 18) The Simon Commission looked forward to "some sort of federal arrangement" (p. 19). The Nehru Report, which wanted the Princes to realise "the full implications of the Federal idea" (p. 20)

referred to a federation which was something quite different from the federation that the R. T. C. contemplates. The federation that the Princes desire—a federation tending "more towards a Confederation", whatever that may mean if it means anything at all—is yet a different thing altogether. Secondly, the problem of an All-India federation has to be considered in relation to a larger issue—responsible government for India. The advantages of an All-India Federation are undeniable. But federalism can in no event be regarded as *sine qua non* of responsible government nor can it be said "that any federation, be it no better than a confederation, is better than any unitary government, that any price should be paid for it as no price would be too high, that essentials should be surrendered in order that we may get the solace from the word federation." If a *so-called* federation means foregoing the substance of responsible government, "I shall far prefer to wait" observes Mr. Chintamani, "for a true federation in a more propitious time and go forward with my demand for responsible government for British India which is the core and kernel of the whole national movement."

It is to be wished that Mr. Raghavan had dwelt as lucidly and adequately on the basic principles and full implications of a federation as on its outline. He would have, in doing so, made a valuable contribution to the task of dissipating the prevalent hazy and not seldom utterly erroneous notions as to what a federation implies. No Indian State can retain all its present sovereignty, such as it is, and yet federate. Dicey's description of a federation as a "natural constitution for a body of states desiring union and not unity" is remarkable more for its literary flourish than its accuracy of statement. A federal Government is a composite Government. It is not a union of states for certain purposes or for delegated business. A federal state is a real state along with the member-states. Its organs have a direct power over the citizens of those member states, a power which the majority of writers on politics affirm as a characteristic distinction between a federation and a confederation. (Oppenheim's *International Law*, 4th Ed., p. 179). In a confederation, a number of full sovereign states are linked together for certain purposes into a union with organs of its own, which are vested with certain powers over the member-states but not over the citizens of those states. Federation must mean a voluntary but irrevocable surrender of part of the sovereignty of the federating units. It means a division of sovereignty and a divided allegiance. It also implies a federal loyalty and citizenship, a federal executive and legislature and above all a supreme federal judicature. Under a federal constitution a ruler, no less than a subject of an Indian State, will become a citizen of the federal state. At present the subjects of a Prince are not British subjects. The Prince is amenable to no court outside his state. No legislation of the British Parliament or of the British Indian legislature binds him or his subjects, nor can British Indian taxation be imposed upon his state. (Sir Leslie Scott's Letter in the *Law Quarterly Review*, Vol. XLIV, pp. 267-9). On entry into a federation this status will inevitably undergo a change, which the states will have carefully to appraise. On the other hand, distinct and practical advantages will accrue. A federation would make for a more effective and concerted action in matters of common concern. As units of a real federation the states will enjoy a superior status as autonomous units. To-day, in actual practice, they are treated by the Political Department almost as administrative units.

The course of events shows that the representation of states in the federal legislature, to which the

author alludes, (pp. 22-23) has caused considerable difficulty. That the Indian states are an important minority requiring weightage is conceded. None the less, a demand on the part of the states for a representation which amounts to "swamping" will obviously be resisted. Once the cardinal principles of a federal government are grasped, and the states decide to join as component units, the question of representation will reduce itself to a matter of mutual adjustments chiefly—and this, indeed, should not prove to be a matter of insuperable difficulty.

The question of distribution of seats in the Federal legislature among the states *inter se* involves essentially the question of status, an aspect of the problem of federation, which has not been touched by the author and which has been generally and therefore the more unfortunately been ignored. Indian States admit of a classification on the basis of their status *vis-a-vis* the Crown. The process of reading all the treaties with Indian States together and as a whole has been rightly condemned. (The Butler Committee Report, pp. 23, 65). Sovereignty is divided between the Crown and individual States in different proportions. "The reasons which cause these proportions to differ are the different sizes of the States, the stipulations of the Treaties, Engagements, and Sanads, and the operation of usage and sufferance." (Sir W. Holdsworth in *L. Q. R.*, Vol. XLVI, p. 420). In the 18th century many of the treaties were made on a basis of equality. (Nabob of Carnatic *vs.* E. I. Coy. 2 Vest. p. 60). Later treaties evidence a difference in status. (*L. Q. R.*, Vol. XLVI, p. 414). Sir W. Lee-Warner refers to the status, which some of the States, apparently like Hyderabad, Baroda, Gwalior and Indore "in the early years of British Dominion most unquestionably enjoyed to the fullest extent, and which the highest tribunals of British judicature still accord to them in respect of the attributes of sovereignty reserved to them." (*L. Q. R.* Vol. XXVII p. 88). A comprehensive classification, therefore, of the States based on their "varying degree of sovereignty" as also on other factors such as revenue, area, population, salute etc. must be undertaken. The Butler Committee has evaded this vital, even, if rather delicate, issue on the proper appreciation of which hinges the solution of the problem of distribution of seats. As a result of the unsound principles on which the Chamber of Princes was founded and of political practice an illusory equality between the states has been created and fostered. The distinction between the Treaty and other States has been lost sight of. The position of the Treaty States has been impaired and subordinate States have been raised to a status which neither the Treaty, Engagement and Sanad, nor usage warrants. Consequently matters have been unduly complicated, inasmuch as States in subordinate relations with the Government of India—and in some cases with the Provincial Governments—and those who were formerly tributaries of some of Treaty States are clamouring for a representation on a footing of equality with States whose relations with the Crown were those of alliance and cooperation. A uniformity of status for all the States for the purpose of distribution of seats is inconceivable if the broad facts of the history of Indian States have any meaning (vide Haksar and Pannikar: "Federal India," pp. 103-4). Neither justice, reason nor history lends support to the claims of the minor States for an exaggerated status, which, in fact, they never enjoyed. Having regard to the larger interests of India, minor States ought not to be allowed, by virtue of their demand for equality of representation, to imperil the whole scheme of Federation. The only solution for the problem of allotment of seats lies in

devising and utilising some system of classification, grouping and "sub-federation" of States.

The author expounds the question of guarantees to the Princes and Internal Reforms with ability and insight. Whether the statesmanship and patriotism of our Princes will enable them to take a long view of things and realise the merits of a Federation, the future must show. No State can exist in a water-tight compartment. Federation or no Federation, the present absolutism of our States, as Mr. Raghavan indicates, has got to make room for a Constitutional form of Government. The change is inevitable sooner or later. The prophecy is not hazardous that most of us will live to see it too.

M. B. SAMARTH.

AUSTRALIAN IMPRESSIONS.

THE CALL OF THE SOUTHERN CROSS.

By ARDASER SORABJEE N. WADIA. (J. M. Dent, London.) 1932. 20 cm. 6/-

Mr. Wadia is a citizen of the world and has been lucky enough to afford to travel in different climes. He is a sympathetic observer of men and matters and more than anything else, an intense lover of Nature. He writes his tour memoirs with a delightful pen and gently leads his readers from scene to scene in a charming and attractive manner. His descriptions are easy to read and often soar to poetic heights. Witness the following extract:—

But the time I most longingly awaited each day on that endless expanse of watery waste was the hour before turning-in for the night, when on my secluded boat-deck I lay stretched in my deck-chair idly gazing at the myriad eyes of heaven as they twinkled in the mistless vault of blue above. What a sight of ineffable beauty and baffling mystery the stars make on the high seas! How mean and paltry all earthly things appear in comparison, how absurd and insignificant we ourselves feel beside the calm, unruffled majesty of heavenly bodies! And yet, and yet, absurd and insignificant as we may individually and collectively feel beside the crowded immensities of heaven—there is something in the meanest and paltriest of the human fold that lifts him above the gathered force and majestic calm of the entire Universe. For the gathered force is cold and passionless and that majestic calm dead and soulless, while a single human being of the commonest clay and meanest mould has within him a spark of that indefinable, unquenchable fire which can make him feel and will, seek and strive, struggle and suffer, fail and fall and die, leaving a legacy of something attempted, something achieved a thousand times worthier, yea, a million times nobler, than all the pointless movement and soulless regularity of a hundred million stars combined.

Mr. Wadia has imperial instincts in him and would love to be working in amicable contentment under the protecting influence of the Union Jack. Nonetheless, he strongly feels for the position of India. Witness, for example, his description of England as a "slave driver, opium runner, and an economic exploiter, and last but not least, a law and order maniac", quoting the lathi charge incidents in the recent history of India, to illustrate his last description.

"The Call of the Southern Cross" is an altogether delightful book to read and in these days of heated turmoil and passion when there are countless books making overstatements one feels a genuine hour of pleasure in going through its vivid pages.

There is however one thing which requires explanation. While describing his own interview with the Ex-Premier Hughes Mr. Wadia makes the Premier utter the following words:— "But Sastri never told me that." There is an implication here that the Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri might not have conveyed correct impressions of India during his Australian tour—an implication which the Indian public, from its knowledge of Mr. Sastri's character, can have no hesitation in repudiating as being unfounded.

S. G. SASTRY.

SHORT NOTICE.

REVIEW OF RURAL WELFARE ACTIVITIES IN INDIA, 1932. By C. F. STRICKLAND (Oxford University Press.) 1932. 17cm. 58 p. Re. 1.

WITH the formation in 1931 in England of the Indian Village Welfare Association, the need of a handbook giving information about rural welfare work being done in India was apparently very keenly felt. This pamphlet is intended to meet that need; but does by no means claim to be exhaustive. Indeed Sir Francis Younghusband, chairman of the Association, said in his preface that the publication will be improved year by year as more information becomes available. Even so an attempt has been made to include in this first issue a brief account of the more important village uplift activities going on in different parts of India; and there is reason to hope that the publication will be found useful by all those interested in the difficult problem of rural uplift. It is hoped however that rural welfare workers and organisations will co-operate with the Association in making future issues of this little handbook as comprehensive as possible by bringing to its notice any omissions they may have noticed and if possible, by supplying full information about them.

A. M. P.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE REPARATION SETTLEMENT, 1930. By DENYS P. MYERS. (World Peace Foundation, Boston.) 1930, 20cm. 249p. \$2.50.
- CHINA TO-DAY: ECONOMIC. By J. B. CONDLIFFE. (World Peace Foundation, Boston.) 1932. 20cm. 314p. \$2.50.
- A PASSAGE TO INDIA. By E. M. FORSTER. (Edward Arnold, London.) 1932. 20cm. 325p. 3/6.
- SPEECHES AND DOCUMENTS ON THE BRITISH DOMINIONS, 1918-1931. By ARTHUR BERRIEDLE KEITH. (Oxford University Press.) 15cm. 501p. 2/-
- THE MYSTERY OF THE MAHABHARATA, Vol. I. By N. V. THADANI. (Bharat Publishing House, Karachi.) 1931. 24 cm. 432 p. Rs. 12.
- GANDHI THE MAN OF DESTINY. By T. V. THADANI. (Bharat Publishing House, Karachi.) 1930. 23cm. 55p. Rs. 2.
- THE GARDEN OF THE EAST. By N. V. THADANI. (Bharat Publishing House, Karachi.) 1932. 20cm. 127p.
- AN INDIAN PEASANT MYSTIC. By JOHN S. HOYLAND. (H. R. Allen Son, London.) 1932. 13cm. 79p. 1/-
- AN OUTLINE OF ECONOMIC THEORY. By R. M. JOSHI. (Author, Sydenham College of Commerce and Economics, Bombay.) 1932. 18cm. 111p. Re. 1/-
- DISARMAMENT: A DISCUSSION. By ARTHUR POWSONBY. (Hogarth Press, London.) 1932. 18cm. 45p. 1/6.