

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

. VOL. XVI, No. 6. } POONA—THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1933. { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	61
ARTICLES :—	
The Results of the R. T. C. By the Right Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P.C., C.E., LL. D.	64
The Biggest Safeguard. By Observer.	66
The Round Table Scheme.—I. By Prof. D. G. Karve, M. A.	68
Economics of Retrenchments and Hartals. By Prof. B. P. Adarkar.	69
OUR LONDON LETTER.	71
REVIEW :—	
Science and Religion. By Prof. R. N. Joshi, M. A.	71
BOOKS RECEIVED.	72

Topics of the Week.

Lord Willingdon's Address.

THE Viceroy's address to the Assembly on Wednesday before last touched upon a number of important topics; but in regard to none of them did he add to our knowledge. In his remarks on the constitutional question, which naturally continues to be the centre of public interest, Lord Willingdon does nothing more than dot the i's and cross the t's of Sir Samuel Hoare's concluding address to the last Round Table Conference. Thus we are assured that the project of introducing provincial autonomy unaccompanied by central responsibility has been given up. This is all right so far as it goes. But what the public would have welcomed is some light on the composition of the Joint Select Parliamentary Committee to which the White Paper embodying the British Government's proposals in regard to the Indian constitutional advance are to be remitted for consideration and the probable date when the new Reforms Act would be enacted. He might also have given us some idea as to the steps the Government intended to take in fulfilment of their promise to accelerate the inauguration of the Indian Federation by inducing the requisite number of States to join it. The Viceroy has chosen to be silent on these points, perhaps because Sir Samuel Hoare has yet to make up his mind about them. We are however asked to expect the Government's proposals for the setting up of the Reserve Bank to be made public before the end

of the present session of the Assembly, that is to say before the end of March about which time the White Paper too might see the light of day. Seeing that Federation is made to hang upon the establishment of the Reserve Bank in addition to the entry of half the Indian States into it, it is gratifying to note that the details of its constitution are under the serious consideration of the Government.

The speech is sure to create widespread disappointment as failing to hold out any hope of an early release of Mahatma Gandhi and other civil disobedience prisoners for which Sir Samuel Hoare's speech to the Round Table Conference on Dec. 24 last in a way prepared the public. Lord Willingdon might have usefully told us how the hitch occurred which led to the Home Government's plans in that respect miscarrying. We wish those who stood in the way of the release of Congress prisoners had an adequate realisation of how they are endangering the chances of the successful working of the constitution now in the making. To refuse to place the most numerous and best organised political party in a position to offer its co-operation in working out the details of the future Indian constitution is not only unwise but suicidal. Even yet it is not too late for the Government to see the short-sightedness of its policy and to set Congressmen free.

* * *

The Salaries Cut.

IN our last issue appeared an extract from the *Statesman* of Calcutta which pleaded for simultaneous relief to the tax-payer and the services as a result of the reported improvement in the finances of the Government of India. It has since been announced that the 10 per cent. cut in the salaries of their employees would be halved with effect from the commencement of the next official year. We are not yet told to what extent the burden of general taxation will be lightened. We must wait for information on the point till the Budget is introduced in the Assembly. But it is to be earnestly hoped that Sir George Schuster's budget proposals will not fail to satisfy the unanimous public demand for reduction in taxation which is at present almost unbearably high.

As will be remembered, the 10 per cent. cut formed part of the special measures adopted by Government in September 1931 with a view to meeting a crisis in their finances due to the generally prevail-

ing economic depression and did not exclude from its operation even services recruited directly by the Secretary of State. Its effectuation in their case, however, necessitated Parliamentary sanction which was subsequently embodied in a special Act authorising the payment of reduced salaries to the services concerned only till the end of the official year 1932-33. The retention of the 5 per cent. cut after that period will also similarly require the approval of Parliament which may be expected in due course. Fairness requires us to add that while the original cut carried with it exemption from the payment of income-tax at the rates specially increased in 1931 as part of the Government's emergency measures, the present 5 per cent. cut is shorn of this concession. The loss to the public exchequer will thus be not the full 5 per cent. of the salaries disbursed by the Central Government but a little less.

* * *

Wish-thinking.

United India and Indian States, the able champion of the States' rights, writing on the memorandum of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar, says that, in view of the readiness of more than 75 per cent. of the States to join federation, it was unnecessary for these leaders to suggest what should be done if, on account of the unwillingness of the Princes, a federation were not to come about. In any case, the journal says, central responsibility for British India alone cannot be demanded, as is demanded in the memorandum, as a result of the Round Table Conference, which proceeded on the basis of a federation. It will in that case "mean the reopening of the whole question." The journal then adverts to the divergence of view between the authors of the Nehru Report and the authors of the above memorandum as to the indispensable necessity of a federal constitution if India is ever to be endowed with an appreciable amount of responsibility at the centre. As Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru is a common author of these documents, the divergence is somewhat striking and *United India* explains it by saying that, at the time he drafted the Nehru Report, he had not "given due consideration to the view-point of the Indian Princes." This of course is a possible explanation, but we had ruled it out because we never thought that constitutional theories could be altered to suit the wishes even of our Princes.

But if it be not a question of wish-thinking, it does seem a little odd that so elementary a proposition as this should have escaped all the legal talent available in our country. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer, Pandit Motilal Nehru, Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar, Mr. C. R. Das—all of them are (or were) eminent lawyers who applied their minds industriously to the formulation of a self-governing constitution of India, and yet it dawned upon none of them that not only full self-government, but any self-government worth speaking of was sheerly impossible unless British India entered into a federation with the States. One would have thought that these men possessed the legal acumen to find out for themselves, on an examination of the legal position, that federation was inevitable if it were so, but we know for a fact that federation did not lie within the perspective of any one of them. To all of them perhaps it seemed a desirable development for the future; but with none of them it was an antecedent condition to central responsibility. For all of them have framed constitutions which envisage the attainment by British India alone of self-government and even independence. Even the British Government seems to be unaware of this doctrine of inevitability of federation, for they promised dominion status to British India without contemplating a federation with

the States. It may be a true doctrine all the same, but we must confess the thought is somewhat disturbing to us that the truth of it should have come home to our leaders in a flash after it was revealed by Sir Leslie Scott, the distinguished counsel of the Princes.

* * *

Europeans' Counsel of Despair.

If the non-official Europeans in this country are to have their way, Bengal would have to go without any political advance till terrorism is completely banished from the province. This was in effect what Mr. Morgan, Chairman of the Calcutta Branch of the European Association, said on a recent day at its annual meeting and he also made it clear that the opinion he was expressing had the hearty backing of the non-official European community in India. The reasoning by which he reached this conclusion is incredibly simple. Provincial autonomy to be complete must, he said, include the transfer to popular control of all subjects including law and order. But the transfer of law and order to Ministers responsible to the legislature was, according to him, unthinkable in the present state of Bengal. Therefore he jumped to the conclusion that provincial autonomy for Bengal was out of the question. That completes the vicious circle in which the Europeans move on the question of the grant of further reforms to Bengal.

Such an expression of opinion by a body of persons who have exceptional opportunities of influencing Government's decisions would in the ordinary course of things have been looked upon by the public as giving an indication of how the mind of the Government was moving on the subject. But the speech of the Governor of Bengal on the occasion of the European Association dinner at Calcutta on Saturday last castigating his hosts on their needlessly alarmist view of the situation cautions the public against being unduly perturbed by the views expressed by Mr. Morgan. "I deprecate," said Sir John Anderson, "very much the cry 'breakers ahead.' All experience bears witness to the steadying and sobering effect of responsibility." But he did not stop merely with the condemnation of the unwise attitude adopted by the Europeans on this question, but went further and made out a strong case not only for full autonomy for Bengal in common with other provinces but also for central responsibility. He added that he would consider it "a great misfortune for the province and for all interests connected with it if and when self-government is being conferred on the other provinces of India, Bengal has to be singled out for special treatment," and trusted that the province might be "spared that humiliation and the bitter feeling it would inevitably arouse." This should reassure all concerned about the Europeans' counsel of despair standing no chance of being heeded by the authorities.

* * *

Separation of Burma.

SIR HARI SINGH GOUR and a number of other M.L.A.s have issued a statement on this subject as a result of the Conference between Burmese and Indian leaders. In this statement they ask the British Government not to look upon the resolution passed by the Burma Council as an expression of the Burmans' desire to separate from India, but only to have full and unfettered self-government. On this point there is not the least doubt. But that is a question for the British Government and Burma to settle amongst themselves. India can give little assistance in solving it. What Indians would like to know, however, is whether Burma would stay in the federation

on the same terms as other members or would do so on special terms. Burma still persists in saying, "on special terms": she must be free to walk out. Would Indians agree to it? Sir Hari Singh Gour and his co-signatories are silent on this vital question. They say, "As regards the reservation of the right of secession we can only say that Indian opinion will raise no objection to its exercise *on terms acceptable to the federation.*" This is begging the question. That is no secession which requires the consent of both parties. With mutual consent anything can happen. Federation itself can be abolished. No special provision or understanding need be arrived at for this purpose. The real question is, will Burma be allowed to secede at her own will and without reference to the wishes of the federation? No purpose is served by burking it. The Indian public must face it some day or other. It will also have to answer the question whether the States and British Provinces will be similarly at liberty to withdraw from the federation.

* * *

Late Mr. Arokiaswamy Mudaliar.

THE death of Dewan Bahadur Arokiaswamy Mudaliar at Madras last week is an occurrence which will be deeply mourned not only by Indian Christians of whom he was an acknowledged leader but by Indians generally. For the late Mr. Mudaliar was not a narrow communalist but a broad-minded Indian who identified himself completely with national interests. He served in the Public Works Department where he rose to be Superintending Engineer. After his retirement from Government service the late Mr. Mudaliar interested himself in public affairs and was known to be the supporter of all progressive movements designed to promote the well-being of his province or the country as a whole. He was for some time a Minister to the Madras Government, in which capacity his record of work is reputed to be creditable. Those in touch with contemporary events will remember that he resigned the ministership in protest against the appointment of the Simon Commission from whose personnel Indians were excluded. It is a misfortune that he should have been called away at a time when in view of the constitutional discussions now in progress his guidance to the Indian Christian community with a view to enable it to take its place among the progressive sections of political opinion would have been invaluable. His death is thus a distinct loss to that community in particular and to the country in general.

* * *

Grievances of Political Prisoners.

THE Welfare of India League's recent representation to the Bombay Government draws attention to some of the more important hardships from which political prisoners suffer. Before approaching the local Government, the League did its best to understand the administrative difficulties in the way of the matters being set right by deputing some of its members to interview the Inspector-General of Prisons and the representation now submitted takes into consideration the information so gleaned. One of the grievances referred to is the inconvenience felt by women prisoners compelled to undertake night journeys on their transfer from one jail to another. The inconvenience arises from the fact that during such journeys the male warders accompanying them insist upon travelling with them in the same compartment, leaving no privacy for them. Moreover, as is well known, the class from which these men are drawn, is not given too much to the use of polite or civil language in their dealings with their charges with the result that their company naturally becomes most unwelcome to women prisoners. The League's

suggestion therefore is that if women prisoners must travel in the custody of policemen, they should be accompanied at least by one wardress.

With regard to the accommodation of political prisoners in jails, the League faithfully voices public opinion when it asks that political prisoners who generally belong to a different class in society should not be made to rub shoulders with hardened criminals, as is the case in many jails at present. To this end it recommends that the present classification of political prisoners into three classes should disappear, that all political prisoners should be placed in one class and that they should be separately accommodated from the other criminals. Its demand for ensuring privacy in bath-rooms and lavatories to be used by these prisoners is also reasonable. None of the suggestions put forward in the League's representation are such as, if carried into effect, will result in converting the jails in this presidency into so many paradises so that there need be no fear that people will flock to them in the hope of being able to lead a life of comfort and ease within their precincts. All that the League aims at in making these suggestions is to see that jail-life is not made needlessly irksome to those who out of patriotic motives persuade themselves of the necessity to violate the law and do not shrink from facing the consequences of their action.

* * *

Jamkhandi State Subjects in Conference.

THE proceedings of the Conference of subjects of Jamkhandi State which was held towards the end of last month are important as showing how the intention of the ruler of the State to bring into being a Representative Assembly is viewed by his subjects. The idea has evoked feelings of gratification in them though the delay in carrying it into effect has given rise to dissatisfaction in the public mind. With a view to making the prospective Assembly representative in fact and not only in name of public opinion in the State, it has been suggested that two-thirds of its strength be elective, and that it be empowered to elect its own president and deputy-president. The excessive proportion which the ruler's expenses bear to the State revenue quite naturally occasioned much criticism and it was generally felt that unless these were definitely limited, there was not much hope of progress in the nation-building departments. The Conference did well in asking that the ruler's civil list should not be allowed to exceed a stated proportion of the State revenue. Barring the amount so earmarked for the ruler's private expense, the Conference wants the proposed Assembly to be completely free to discuss any item on the revenue or expenditure side of the State budget. The Conference would appear to many to have been needlessly modest in asking merely for the power of discussing, and not voting upon, the budget. Once certain items of expenditure are withdrawn from the Assembly's purview, there seems no reason why it should not enjoy unrestricted freedom to manage the other State departments in any manner it thinks best. That is the way to train it in the exercise of responsibility and it is to be hoped that when the detailed scheme of the Assembly is ready, it will be found to confer some real power on the popular representatives and not to assign to them the role of mere irresponsible critics. The Conference is to be congratulated upon asking for the abolition of the law prohibiting public meetings and demanding a charter of fundamental rights for the people of the State in their capacity both as State citizens as well as those of Federal India when the federal constitution comes to be promulgated.

* * *

THE RESULTS OF THE R. T. C.

BY THE RT. HON. V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI, P. C., C. H., LL. D.

OUR friends of the Round Table have returned and spoken. We are reassured by their warmth and unanimity in praising Sir Samuel Hoare. The improvement in his attitude towards the close of the Conference is the more gratifying when we remember the bitter disappointment and gloomy anticipations amidst which the proceedings began. Not only was there a marked tone of earnestness and friendliness in his utterances, but he gave definite promises which have revived our hope and brightened our outlook. He would do his best to bring about federation. To this end he would use his good offices with the Princes. He would likewise endeavour to remove the obstacles in the way of establishing a Reserve Bank. The fulfilment of these promises would take us a long way towards the goal. Our satisfaction, however, is only tentative. For its confirmation we must study carefully the tenour and terms of the White Paper, which will be published in a few weeks.

The speeches of nationalist Round Tablers strike a note of subdued satisfaction. So long as the mist of indefiniteness hangs over the proceedings, it is hard to state precisely the positive gains of the third session of the R. T. C. as distinguished from the first and second sessions. The determination of the franchise along the lines of the Lothian Committee's recommendations is a considerable achievement. The discussion of federal finance was no more than the reconnaissance of extremely difficult ground. The army problem was resurveyed with inconsiderable results. The use of Indian troops outside our border for purposes other than those of Indian defence would require the sanction of the legislature and the Viceroy would be directed by the Instrument of Instructions to arrange for a discussion of the military budget by the whole Cabinet. The Instrument of Instructions itself would be clothed with new significance by being mentioned in the statute, besides being approved by Parliament. Apparently this document is to be invested with unusual importance. I shall therefore repeat a suggestion which I put forward at the Conference last year and which received the support, though not in public, of Lords Reading and Lothian. It may reconcile us in slight degree to the numerous special powers that would be placed in the hands of the Governor-General if by an express instruction he should be enjoined to use them only in the interests of India. The Secretary of State undertook to put into the Instrument an instruction on the Indianisation of the army. The Indian public cannot pay too much attention to this matter. It is here that the official view continues in its original rigidity, and the efforts of generations of our leaders have produced but little impression. Sir John Simon's view holds the field more or less. It is time we realised the futility of liberalising and refining the political constitution so long as official opinion in this respect

refuses to evolve. When we talk of Indianisation, we mean the complete Indianisation of the forces in all branches and arms, and demand the fixation of a period for the consummation of the process. The authorities contemplate only an increase in the Indian personnel and, by refusing to consider a period, repudiate the goal of complete Indianisation. The report of the Thomas Committee says that the defence of the country must be to an increasing extent be the concern of the Indian people, and Sir Samuel Hoare in his concluding speech at the Conference remarks that the Indianisation of the army means "the greater participation of Indians themselves in the defence of India." It behoves all parties and all communities in the country to make it clear beyond a doubt that we cannot and will not accept this partial Indianisation. Unfortunately this matter is one of those essentials on which the Princes apparently hang back. Anyhow we may not count on their open support, but cannot afford to abate our demand unless we were prepared to abandon all idea of becoming a Dominion. Side by side with this demand must go one for the extension of recruitment to all provinces and all communities without distinction. The so-called military classes, on whom the burden of defence now mostly falls, would else acquire in a federated and self-governing India a preponderant position, which in the long run might undermine the harmony and therefore the stability of the new constitution. Till these twin claims be unequivocally admitted and started securely on the road to accomplishment, we must resolutely refuse to be turned aside by promises of progress in other directions, however grandiose.

Of nearly equal importance is financial responsibility. We are glad to express our debt of gratitude to the Secretary of State for boldly resisting the preposterous demands of the City, and defining within somewhat precise limits the Viceroy's extraordinary power of controlling our financial policy and measures. Still the vigilance of our representatives cannot be relaxed, for there are pitfalls in the proposals regarding the Reserve Bank and the appointment of a financial adviser to the Governor-General. While on the subject of finance, we must protest against the decision to make Sind and Orissa separate provinces without at the same time casting the financial burden entirely on them. India has to carry the N.-W. F. P. already. But the N.-W. F. P. has long been a province, and its autonomy is only being advanced to maturity. The creation of new provinces is quite a different proposition. Be it remembered that other areas too are clamouring to be made autonomous provinces. It is not fair to the general population, including that of the States, to be taxed in order to maintain those sections who aspire to the luxury of self-government without the capacity to bear their own burdens.

Careful scrutiny should be bestowed on the provision made for expanding and amending the constitution. It would appear that only the franchise and small items are placed in the category of matters which the Indian legislature can alter. The pressure of public opinion must be exercised so as to increase this category and decrease our resort to the British Parliament for the natural development of our polity. Even the Simon Commission admitted the theoretical excellence of this principle. Apart from theory, it is both an inconvenience and a humiliation to accumulate little items without readjusting them as they arise, until the overworked legislature of Britain can be moved to think of India and allot some time to her affairs. Besides, it is human nature all the world over for economic and social questions within the competence of a legislature to be neglected so long as constitutional pin-pricks remind it of its dependence. Is it not deplorable that our minorities, not content with getting safeguards written in our constitution at the start, should insist likewise that they could be changed or abrogated only by the authority of the Imperial Parliament? Cannot expedients be devised for protecting the rights once recognised and at the same time giving the power of amendment and adaptation to the Supreme Court and the legislature? Dominion Status must remain a distant vision if, besides defence, external affairs and paramountcy, a dozen other purely domestic matters are also placed beyond our jurisdiction. The Council of the Secretary of State which, in the new order, will be both an anachronism and an encumbrance, must be abolished. Moreover, so long as India falls far short of Dominion Status, little substantial improvement may be looked for in the treatment accorded to overseas Indians by the Dominions and Colonies of the empire. This view has forced itself on all those who have made a special study of the question of Indians abroad. It is worth while quoting here the opinion of the late Mr. Gokhale:

The root of our present trouble in the Colonies lies in the fact that our status is not what it should be in our own country. Men who have no satisfactory status in their own land, cannot expect to have a satisfactory status elsewhere. Our struggle for equal treatment with Englishmen in the empire must be mainly carried on in India itself.

The Secretary of State mentioned two obstacles to the abridgment of the interval between the grant of provincial autonomy and the establishment of federation. One is the Reserve Bank; the other is the hesitation of the Princes. Sir Samuel Hoare undertook to help us overcome both obstacles. We pray fervently for his success. At the first session of the R.T.C., when the Princes offered of their own accord to join British India, they were acclaimed as saviours. The *daimios* of Japan could not have got more praise for their self-abnegation. St. James' Palace rang with our hallelujahs. The hotels where the Princes stayed reeked with the incense that we burned. To use Lord Beaconsfield's words, we laid it on, not with the spoon, but with the trowel. Like the gods, whose kindred they are, they were greatly pleased; but unlike the gods, their boons

are slow, puny, begrudged. To begin with, they render the dominionhood of India fundamentally defective by looking to the Crown for the maintenance of treaty rights and the exercise of paramountcy. Then they reduce the scope of federation until it is thin and anæmic and many Indian politicians think it is not worth while. They will not allow a federal agency within their territories. They regard themselves as a separate entity collectively and ask for weightage. They cannot tolerate a federal citizenship. They will not hear of fundamental rights. They will nominate their own agents to the legislature. They claim a voice on no-confidence motions against the federal executive even when the ground of accusation concerns only British India. We have met them on most, if not all, of these demands. Yet their utterances are full of the sacrifices they have made for the sake of Mother India. But it is no use being vexed. They have their difficulties and some of these are great. By heredity and by training they abhor democracy and may well have vague fears from association with a big partner long used to the ways of democracy. Long sheltered by the all-powerful British *Raj*, they have remained aloof from the main currents of the world and never felt the real impact of popular movements. Still I pay glad homage to the statesmanship and high courage of many members of the princely order. Mysore and Baroda, Bikaner and Bhopal have been steadfast in the cause of federation and are to-day fighting valiantly for it. Among the smaller Princes also one might readily single out many names for enlightened and progressive ideas. Through these we make one last appeal to the representatives of ancient houses: "Pray, don't hold up things any more, come in and earn undying glory." It is a thousand pities that Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, stout and untiring champion of the States and their rulers, should feel compelled to contemplate the contingency of their final refusal and ask in that event for central responsibility for British India alone.

Our friends at the Round Table have deserved well at our hands for the way in which they have discharged their duty. They have shown courage, ability, combination, eloquence. The country must respond adequately to the request that they make for support. Much that they pleaded for has been refused or is under consideration. By resolutions at meetings and by memoranda bearing numerous and influential signatures, we must back their efforts and make them fruitful. In this direction our Bombay compatriots have set a commendable example. Their statement on the results of the Round Table Conference is an able, moderately worded document which, if adopted by leading men all over the country, is well calculated to help the cause. Everyone of us cannot approve of everything in it; but that slight individual discomfort is the price that must be paid for united action on a large scale.

In huge national enterprises, leaders are apt every now and then to be dazed and turned aside. It is well for them to be reminded constantly what they set

forth to win, and what exactly they have acquired. On the 31st October 1929, the Viceroy, acting under the orders of His Majesty's Government, declared to the expectant millions of India that in the judgment of that Government *it was implicit in the declaration of August 1917 that the natural issue of India's constitutional progress, as there contemplated, was the attainment of Dominion Status.* Not many months after, once more expressing the mind of the same Government, Lord Irwin used more definite language and promised India *the enjoyment of as large a degree of management of her own affairs as could be shown to be compatible with the necessity of making provision for those matters in regard to which she was not yet in a position to assume responsibility.* It is with these solemn pledges that we must juxtapose the proposals of the forthcoming White Paper. Here is the true standard by which to judge the degree of self-rule proffered by the National-Conservative Government, which inherits the obligations of the Labour Government and professes to fulfil them. Lord Irwin's promise was the maximum self-rule possible and the minimum deductions possible from dominionhood. Mark how Sir Samuel Hoare in his broadcast summary of the work of the R.T.C. waters it down in the style of a homoeopath: "India must have a greater measure of self-government." So we must be content to have some advance on the present state of things! Is this likely to appease the long-suffering patriots of the country? The authors of the Bombay statement have reduced to concrete terms the lowest expectations of India. These are:

(1) full and unfettered responsible government in the provinces; (2) central responsibility, which term is to include (a) control of the purse; (b) the right of the Indian legislature to determine the economic policy including regulation of exchange, currency and industrial

and commercial matters; and (c) an increasing share of responsibility and control in connection with defense and the military; (3) central responsibility to be introduced simultaneously with provincial autonomy; and (4) safeguards to be only for a fixed transitional stage and to be demonstrably in the interests of India.

Remembering that the ideas of the Secretary of State have yet to be formulated in a White Paper, there is good reason for us to be forewarned. Unless materially altered, the resulting scheme "would fall grievously short of these essentials and fail to secure the approval and support of any section of responsible public opinion in India."

One would proclaim with a million tongues a far-seeing appeal which our Round Tablers make in their speeches. It is noteworthy that in this appeal Mr. Kelkar joins. None of them exults over the gains of India at the R.T.C. But we must allow them a sense of relief and satisfaction that worst fears arising from Conservative domination have been dispelled. Are they not entitled to respectful and attentive hearing when they advise that non-co-operation be abandoned? For the finest and most zealous patriots to abstain from the work of legislation and administration is to let it fall into the hands of sections with narrow aims and doom the highest interests and ideals of the nation to a long and disastrous eclipse. The high tasks ahead require all our resources, and the noblest and wisest of India's sons and daughters are not too noble and wise for them. Let us unitedly urge on the Government the immediate and unconditional release of Congress patriots and trust these will use their marvellous organisation to bind up the nation's wounds, restore its morale, and actively help in the fashioning and working of its new constitution.— *The Indian Review.*

THE BIGGEST SAFEGUARD.

The first conception (of the constitution) was a brilliant, if cynical, inspiration. Faced by the unexpected success of the outbreak of civil disobedience in 1930, the best Imperial brains hit upon a sagacious device for conceding national self-government without danger. They brought in the Princes to redress the balance against democracy. So long as the unit for the experiment of responsible parliamentary government was conceived as British India, the elder statesmen might have hesitated to go much farther than Sir John Simon did: they would have conceded provincial autonomy and left 'the Centre' as it is.

The audacious new idea was to bring in the Princes and create a Federation of All-India. This looked more national and more imposing, and it promised to hold the real danger in check. That, from the Imperial standpoint, is Hindu democracy, restless, radical, militant, with the Congress party as its incarnation. The Princes seemed an ideal make-weight. Conservatives by tradition, autocrats in their domains, contemptuous for the most part of the entire liberal philosophy of civil rights and popular representation, they are the disciplined vassals of the Viceroy and the British Crown. They have however, the merit of looking like Indians.

Give them (with no nonsense about popular election) one-third of the seats in the All-India Parliament, assign another third to the Muslims panned off in their separate electorate, make two Houses to check one another, confine the franchise to 13 per cent. of the adult population, and

need one take the danger from the Hindu nationalist democracy very seriously? Had the empire really trusted this cynical invention it might have conceded full responsibility without risk. This ultra-Conservative constitution was all the 'safe-guard' that a shrewd statesmanship need have demanded. Property and order would have been as safe in the hands of this aristocratic assembly as human foresight can ever make them.

The cynics were not bold enough to trust their invention. Not content with creating a Parliament which can, by its composition, do nothing unseemly, they have loaded it with 'safe-guards'. On limbs incapable of motion they must needs hang fetters. The result is that an ingenious simulacrum of national self-government no longer deceives. India thinks with such concentration about her national problem, and is as yet so little aware of her class divisions, that she would have accepted any constitution, however conservative, that seemed to free any sort of brown assembly from white dictation.

IN Mr. Brailsford's opinion, quoted above from the *New Clarion*, the association of the Princes is the worst safeguard in the Round Table constitution. It perhaps makes some sort of national self-government possible; but it ruins popular self-government.

We are not quite sure that some at any rate of the Indian supporters of the constitution do not agree with this verdict. They still support the constitu-

tion because they care more for popular than for national self-government, and they believe that the latter cannot be had unless the former is sacrificed.

Is it a temporary sacrifice that they make? Do they hope that national self-government will enable them eventually to reach popular self-government sooner than direct pursuit of popular self-government would? Is it with them a case of "farthest way round is nearest way home?"

That does not seem to be the case. None of them dare contemplate popular self-government within a measurable distance of time after the attainment of national self-government. They have nothing more to rely upon than the force of time-spirit, which would be on their side even if they were to make a bid for popular self-government. They just resign themselves to fate, hoping for the best. This much at any rate is certain, that among the transitory safeguards which they insist must come to a termination, either automatically after a specified period, or by an easy process of amendment, they take care *not* to include the anti-democratic features of the constitution.

They are so anxious that power should vest in the hands of what look like Indians that they do not mind how seriously, and how indefinitely, they compromise popular government. But they have the saving grace of realising what they are about and not feeling too proud of themselves.

Not so another section of the supporters of the constitution. They do not admit that the constitution they have helped in framing is anti-democratic. They claim that it makes as much for popular as for national self-government. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar belong to this class *par excellence*.

Nomination by the Princes, e. g., is not for them a matter of serious concern. It may be theoretically a defect, but it is a defect of which none but doctrinaire politicians need take note. It will do no practical harm. Nomination by the British Indian Government is bad, terribly bad. What a valiant fight Saprus and Jayakars put up to have it removed! But nomination by the States is good, at any rate not bad enough to worry about.

They may be right. Only the Britishers seem to value federation just because Princes' nomination is a good substitute for the official bloc which is disappearing. See what Sir Hubert Carr says. On the closing day of the Third Round Table Conference, he said:—

"As regards the transfer of responsibility at the Centre, this has been coupled with safeguards and federation, with the purpose of securing stability. With a view to making an early transfer possible the suggestion that seats not filled by federating States should be filled by nomination, commends itself to us, as enabling that earlier transfer which we believe to be necessary for meeting Indian political desire."

If all the States come in, official nomination will be unnecessary. The Princes' nominees will be at least the equivalents of official nominees. The popular element will be more than counterbalanced by them. But if a handful of States come in and their trusty representatives have to encounter an array of

popularly elected representatives from British India, then of course all stability and safety will be gone. No transfer of power on those conditions!

We can now see why Sir Samuel Hoare wants to have at least half the number of States to join in order to form an effective federation, on which power can be safely conferred. He knows that even half of one-third States' representatives will outweigh two-thirds British Indian representatives. They are at least as 4 to 1 in solidity and stability.

No wonder. The nominees of the Government of India in the new order will necessarily be more popular in character than the nominees of the Princes. The Government of India itself will be more or less popular, while the Princes will remain the autocrats that they are. From the point of view of democracy, therefore, official nominees are less open to objection than Princes' nominees.

Saprus and Jayakars, however, only quarrel with the former and accept the latter. British die-hards too are wholly agreeable. They know which is which. Sir Tej Bahadur would be better able to convince the public of the harmlessness of Princes' nomination if he could persuade men like Sir Hubert Carr to hold his peace for a time.

Let us too not dwell on popular self-government. A people gets the constitution it deserves. If the generality of our people want national self-government, as distinguished from popular self-government, why not let them have it and wish them joy of it?

But is it true, as Mr. Brailsford says, that even from the point of view of national self-government the Round Table constitution is in effect no better than the Simon constitution? The die-hards in England, he says, have not changed their mind at all. On the straight path they will not go even now beyond provincial autonomy. If sufficient checks and balances are provided to make central responsibility nugatory in fact, they have no objection to a constitution appearing in outward form to confer central responsibility. Mr. Brailsford says, this is what has happened.

The Princes constitute the strongest safeguards for the Britishers. They nullify central responsibility. See how Sir Hubert Carr brackets safeguards with federation. Federation itself is a safeguard, the best that could be devised.

If this is true then clearly the Round Table constitution does not advance us, but puts us back. The retrogression is not in respect of our present position, but in respect of what it would be without federation. We can measure fairly accurately how much it would be.

The Government of India, in passing on the Simon Report (to use an Americanism), proposed a big advance on the constitution recommended by it. Opinion may perhaps differ as to how big it was, but that it was big cannot be denied. Our retrogression too is then big.

In proportion as the Government of India dispatch constituted an advance on the Simon Report

in that proportion have we retrogressed by adopting federation. The federal constitution of the Round Tablers is equivalent from a realist's point of view to the Simon Report. We have then lost at least as much as we stood to gain by the dispatch. In fact the loss is more, for the dispatch represented Government's own proposals which it is only reasonable to suppose would have undergone some improvement under the pressure of Indian opinion.

This then is the net result of the Round Table's long drawn-out proceedings, if what Mr. Brailsford says is true.

It goes without saying that we will refuse to pay heed to his criticism of the constitution from the democrat's point of view, but how does it look to a nationalist who is intent on real power and is not content with make-believes?

OBSERVER.

THE ROUND TABLE SCHEME.

I.—STATES, PROVINCES AND THE FEDERATION.

THE conclusion of the sessions of the Third Round Table Conference on the eve of Christmas was secured at the cost of adequate discussion and definite agreement. It is not, therefore, surprising to find that most of the delegates to the Conference are themselves in some confusion as to what exactly was achieved as a result of their joint deliberation. Though we will have to wait for a few weeks more for the publication of the White Paper, which will contain the considered decisions of His Majesty's Government on all important matters, the nature of the agreements and disagreements with which the last Round Table Conference ended is already laid bare by the authoritative reports of its proceedings that are just received. Though matters of detail such as franchise or the allocation of a particular subject might be left over for discussion and comment till after the publication of the White Paper the outline of the proposed scheme cannot be too soon brought to the earnest attention of all concerned with the constitutional progress of the country. The respective position of the States, provinces and the federation in the new constitution, federal finance, commercial discrimination and financial safeguards, Indian defence, the position and powers of the Governor General, and the freedom that the future Indian constitution will possess from external interference are all vital features of the Round Table scheme. It is proposed in the present article to review the decisions on the first of these, viz. the relations between States, provinces and the federation.

In describing the new constitution of India as a federation most people have in mind the association of the future central government with the Indian States. The 'federal' element is thus particularly traced in the relation between States and the federation. Now though no two federations are exactly alike, there are some essential features of a federation as distinguished from other mixed government. Of these the first essential is that constituent States enjoy important powers of independent administration. It is equally essential that the common government, to which is left the administration of other important affairs, should possess the constitutional power to make its will effective in these matters in all the constituent parts. Does the Round Table scheme satisfy these conditions? It does, so far as the relation between the provinces and the federal government is concerned; it does not, if we take into account the contemplated position of the States.

It is agreed that there should be a careful listing of the subjects over which the federation is to possess exclusive control and that these powers should be enumerated in the Constitution Act itself. The distribution of the residuary powers is left undecided, but a list of concurrent powers is contemplated. This, however, applies only to the provinces. The States are

free to insist that any topics included in the Act as of exclusive federal concern shall for all or any of them be a matter of domestic concern. Indeed the enjoyment of unchecked control over these non-transferred powers of the States is to be guaranteed by the constitution and is to be enforced by the Governor-General as one of his special responsibilities. There is only an understanding recorded that a State may not so restrict transfer as to render its adherence to the federation ineffective. It will be thus observed that whereas the Constitution Act will provide definitely for certain exclusively federal functions in relation to the provinces the exclusiveness of the powers might be rendered nugatory by a State's refusal to transfer a relevant power to the federal government. There will thus be no uniformity in the matter of exclusive federal functions between the provinces and the States, or between several States themselves. Uniformity in all important matters of federal administration is highly desirable and any exemptions created for a State, or all the states are bound to weaken the hold that the federal government ought to have on the administration of federal subjects in the constituent States. There is no mention of concurrent powers as between the States and the federation, and unless greater definition is imparted to the position in this respect the federation will be deprived of control over many essentially all-India matters.

How very important is this uniformity and definition of federal functions *vis-a-vis* all the constituent parts will be apparent from the following provisions in the legislative and the administrative spheres. Railways must undoubtedly be a federal subject. Not only from an economic but also from the military standpoint a uniform law and administration on railways are advantageous, if not essential. According to the Round Table scheme the States accept federal legislative competence in a specific sphere of railway legislation, whereas in the case of provinces no such delimitation is constitutionally provided. Will the weakening of federal control over State railways be a matter of unconcern to the provinces and the common government? Then again in the matter of administrative responsibility of the States for federal subjects. In the case of provinces it is provided that the federal government will be clothed with specific authority to ensure that provincial governments give effect to federal legislation, in so far as action on their part is necessary. With the States, however, matters are differently organised. The rulers of States are to be under a constitutional obligation to give effect to all relevant federal legislation. But the federal government has no assurance that such a co-operation will necessarily be forthcoming. A right of inspection into State administration of federal matters is provided for the Governor-General. This is theoretically wrong and

practically dangerous. The transfer of functions on the part of the States is to the Crown for administration by the federal government. In transferring functions to the federal government the States voluntarily submit themselves to the jurisdiction of a federal government of which they become very important parts. The States cannot eat their cake and have it too. There can be no surrender of functions and the retention of the sovereignty over them possible at one and the same time. In the administration of federal subjects conditions in the States and provinces ought to be identical. It might be considered as of practical advantage to use State machinery for federal administration in the States. But directive and supervisory control in this sphere ought to rest with the federal government and not with the Governor-General. The latter type of arrangement, though familiar to the stage of subordinate sovereignty of the States, is entirely out of accord with the relations between a federal government and its constituent States. In practice the federal government might find itself handicapped for want of direct touch with and control over the relevant State officers. A reform in this respect is highly essential if the federal government, already weak, is not to be reduced to eventual impotence.

The same pressure in the direction of weakening the central government is to be traced in the provisions regarding interference by the federal government in purely provincial subjects. It will be a matter of general agreement that such interference should be reduced to a minimum. But when it is agreed that, for instance, in the matter of law and order, ultimate power for interference should be secured to the centre it is improper to vest the authority in the irresponsible head of the government. The federal government must ultimately possess this authority and even in the transitional stage it must be possible for it, with the co-operation of the Governor-General who controls the army and on whom 'special responsibility' for peace and tranquillity is placed, to take an active part in the formulation and execution of policy.

The provisions devised to resolve conflicts between central and provincial legislation in the sphere of concurrent powers do not appear to be carefully devised. That in case of such a conflict central legislation should prevail over local is eminently in keeping with constitutional propriety. But when the Round Table scheme goes on to provide that where the provincial Act in conflict with the federal law has received the sanction of the Governor-General it should prevail in preference to the latter it is guilty of an unwarranted encroachment on the competence of the federal legislature. The Governor-General would be acting in excess of his executive duty in rendering inoperative a federal law. It is no improvement on an essentially unsound situation when the scheme provides that the validity of the provincial Act should be without prejudice to the power of the federal legislature to legislate subsequently in a contrary sense, subject to the previous assent of the Governor-General. Does not the requirement of previous assent of the Governor-General take away the safeguard against executive mutilation of a legislative Act? And why should a second affirmation of the central will invalidate the decision of the local legislature if a single affirmation is incapable of having that effect? The whole trend of this as of several other parts of the scheme is to weaken the federal government as against the Governor-General and the constituent parts.

A federation may cease to be a federation either because the central government has too much power or too little. The position created for the future federal government is so weak in relation to the

States that it cannot be said to possess adequate control over State subjects to justify its federal sovereignty. The federal government is made too far dependant upon the good offices of the Governor-General to secure obedience from State administrations and provinces. Unless the following reforms, advocated in this article, are introduced in the Round Table scheme the so-called federal government in India will be neither federal nor a government:

1. Residuary powers should be vested in the federal government so far as the provinces are concerned.
2. Exclusively federal subjects and 'concurrent' subjects should be the same for the States as for the provinces.
3. Though it should be open to a State either to join the federation or not, it should not be possible for it to join in respect of some federal functions and not the others.
4. Transfer of a subject must entail transfer of ultimate legislative and administrative control to the federal government.
5. In the field of concurrent powers central legislation should always override provincial.
6. In the administration of federal functions and in the exercise of federal powers the federal government should affect State and provincial action directly and not through the Governor-General.

D. G. KARVE.

ECONOMICS OF RETRENCHMENTS AND HARTALS.

ECONOMISTS in most countries have earned—and quite unjustly too—the reputation of being cranks. Even in the Mother of Parliaments, for instance, the very word "economist" raises a ripple of laughter and "expert opinion" is considered a big joke, good enough for *Punch*. No doubt, the fault in some measure belongs to the economists themselves; for they have a curious knack of emphasising their differences more than their agreements. And yet there is a great number of economic generalisations on which economists have agreed, and will continue to agree, whether or not they succeeded in influencing the course of current economic events. The present world-wide depression is one of the events in regard to which almost all economic prophets have concurred in their predictions. They have not, however, commanded the attention of the rulers of society with any degree of success and their warnings have gone unheeded for the most part. So much has been written about the present slump that by now even a layman ought to know all about it, and I shall be only boring the reader if I enter into a discussion of the now familiar topic of the genesis and development of the depression. The reader's attention may, however, be directed to one or two aspects of the problem so far as it affects India to-day.

EXPANSIONISM AND CONTRACTIONISM.

It is fashionable to draw a broad distinction between the monetary and the non-monetary causes of industrial fluctuations. The distinction is not so clear-cut as it appears, because monetary causes operate through non-monetary phenomena and *vice versa*. But it is a useful distinction in so far as it brings out the fact that industrial fluctuations, i. e., trade depressions and booms, are amenable to conscious control based on a scientific monetary policy. The ends of a sound monetary policy are not served,

however, merely by securing a superficial stability of the price-levels; such a policy implies a relative stability of industry as a whole. The methods available to monetary authorities and to governments aiming at this industrial stability are not confined to the narrower methods of what are commonly known as the manipulations of currency and credit. Both expansion and contraction can take place in various other ways, the responsibility for which does not always belong to the currency authority or the Government, but sometimes to the public as well as the various organisations and corporations which play a part in the economic activity of the country. It is the purpose of this article to show how the activities of the Government on the one hand, and those of the Congress on the other, have led to a rapid contraction of the *débouchés* of production, industry and trade in this country and how neither of them is aware of what damage they are doing to the economic well-being of the people. It is not so much a question of motives. Politically both Congress as well as Government may be justified in pursuing what they believe to be honest means to defined ends. It is from the angle of economic theory that I propose to review the consequences of the actions of both.

RETRENCHMENT AND REDUCTION.

Take, for instance, the retrenchment policy of the Government. During the last few years Government have ruthlessly applied the axe to public expenditure. Higher and lower salaries alike have been reduced and the "cut" has reached to the pockets of the lowest menial no less than to those of the *burra sahib*. Retrenchment has proceeded apace and still there are no signs of the process coming to an end. In fact it appears that retrenchment has been accepted almost as a credo by the Thomas Committee in its recent Report. And yet, although this policy of "cuts" to balance the budgets fulfils all the requirements of "sound" finance on conservative lines, one cannot resist the conclusion that from an ultimate viewpoint, the policy is suicidal and in a period of depression such as the present one, is bound to recoil on those who have adopted it, in somewhat "boomerang" fashion. "Cut your coat according to your cloth" is a sound enough maxim for private finance; but in public finance the interests of a community as a whole are involved and it is not the narrower aspect of the balance of in-comings and out-goings of the government concerned, but the wider one of the balance of total social advantages and disadvantages that must guide the financier in his operations. Applying this test to Government's policy of economy at any cost, one cannot help saying that the Government in this country, as in many others, has erred in supposing that the ultimate ends of economic well-being are best served by a policy of progressive retrenchment.

It is not possible to develop here in fulness the argument against retrenchment. We may, however, briefly indicate the main points. Retrenchment, in the first instance, causes a *primary* unemployment in its very adoption. It is not, however, clear to the lay mind that retrenchment as well as reduction of salaries and wages constitutes a kind of indirect contraction. It reduces the purchasing power in the hands of the public and thus brings about a fall in the price-levels. The processes of both contraction and expansion are notoriously cumulative in their operation. Once set in motion, the forces of price-deflation act and react in a continuous, headlong and precipitate manner, thus leading to further, *secondary* unemployment. The fall in prices, the worsening of the depression and further contraction of credit and trade in their turn tell upon the finances of the government, which are intimately bound up with the

conditions of business. This must lead to further budgetary disequilibria and possibly to further retrenchment. It is impossible to say where it would all end. The vicious circle is complete.

The positive side of the argument, as to what *should* be done by a government under conditions of budgetary disequilibrium arising from industrial depressions is not capable of being so precisely formulated. Credit and currency inflation to counteract the forces of deflation—or what is fashionably termed "reflation"—is suggested as a useful remedy. This may be handy in certain cases, but it is full of dangerous potentialities, especially in view of the fact that such "reflation" may easily be founded on unrealities and may develop into an unhealthy business boom followed by a crisis. There is much to be said, however, for the policy of launching public works schemes or even industrial undertakings in times of depression and providing more, not less, employment at public cost. There is nothing wrong in borrowing largely under such circumstances to finance schemes of the kind, especially when interest rates are low and there is a plethora of funds in the market awaiting investment.

THE ECONOMICS OF HARTALS.

The part played by the Congress in the contractionist process in this country cannot be ignored as mere excusable effusion of nationalist sentiment. It is not clear what earthly end is achieved that might be helpful to the national cause by the periodical closing of bazaars and markets. It is beyond one's comprehension how stoppages of work and business *hartals* are going to help us exert pressure on the British Government or win *swaraj* by any other means. On the contrary, Congress is only weakening its own support and alienating the sympathies of its well-wishers when it asks them to undergo needless sacrifice, involving an avoidable waste of money and energy. From the economic view-point there is no justification whatever for *hartals* either as a temporary or a permanent weapon in the service of independence or of the economic uplift of the country. It is like cutting one's nose to spite one's face. *Hartals*, as a means of political demonstration, have a *raison d'être*, if sparingly and judiciously used; but under present conditions, their utility has been completely exhausted. Apart from the uncertainty and doubt prevailing in the days of serial *hartals*, the racial ill-feeling introduced by discriminatory action of Congress organisations and the sinister effects of clandestine dealings, *hartals* in themselves constitute a deflationary force of the first order. There is no knowing how much potential wealth is thrown away in these idle vanities, how much harm done to production and employment.

Admittedly, the present slump in this country is a part of a wider calamity, for which world forces are responsible. But neither Government nor Congress apparently care much for the consequences of their actions. It lies in the hands of both to minimise the misery of the transitional period through which we are passing, without disturbing the rest of the political game on either side. It is not so much, as I said above, a question of motives but one of methodology.

B. P. ADARKAR.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, January 27.

UNTOUCHABILITY.

THE decision of the Government of India in the matter of the Untouchability Bills is no doubt the subject of widespread discussion and dispute in India, but it has not attracted as much attention here as one might have expected. *The Times* certainly had a leaderette on the subject and the Provincial papers have come out with comments. But the great mass of Englishmen cannot understand the intricacy of such questions, and even if they are interested, feel that no one here ought to dogmatise on a problem which is obviously one for settlement by the Hindus themselves. The pro-Government papers naturally support the Viceroy. Other people seem to have rather mixed feelings about it. If Provincial Autonomy is to mean anything in the future, it would seem that the Bills promoted by Mr. Narayan Nambiyar in relation to the disabilities of the Depressed Classes, and the more familiar one sponsored by Dr. Subbarayan, in reference to Temple Entry, are essentially measures upon which the Madras Legislature should have been permitted to pronounce judgment.

On the other hand, it has to be recognised that Hindu opinion is sharply divided on these issues and there appears to be some substance in the official contention that, as the changes proposed affect the religious beliefs and practices of the Hindu community generally, it would be more appropriate to deal with them by all-India legislation instead of upon a Provincial basis.

The Government of India is evidently determined to keep a free hand in reference to this matter. As far as we can judge here from the expressions of public opinion that have manifested themselves in India, feeling is in favour of allowing Madras to legislate as it pleases on the questions raised by the two Bills, and one gathers that there is a large amount of sympathy in other Provinces with the objects sought to be achieved.

British friends of freedom and equality are, of course, entirely in sympathy with every effort to remove disabilities which at present hamper the social and political emancipation of large classes of the Indian population. If this end can be more speedily achieved by the introduction, in the first instance, of a Bill in the Legislative Assembly, all is well. But Indian reformers must be acutely alive to the desirability of getting the Provinces also to move in the matter and not to accept a check to their activities by any so-called Government neutrality. However, a great deal will depend upon the strength of public opinion and the extent to which expression is given to it throughout India. Although the two Madras Bills have been vetoed, there is nothing to prevent the Legislative Council in that Province, for instance, from passing resolutions embodying the principles contained in the measures referred to.

One cannot be too confident that any of the Legislatures, as at present constituted, will come to decisions of which the Government does not approve, but those who think that such questions as untouchability and temple entry are particularly suitable for discussion by the elected representatives of a predominantly Hindu Province ought to have an

early opportunity of showing where they stand on these issues.

SIR ALFRED WATSON ON THE SITUATION.

Sir Alfred Watson is very much in demand for meetings of all kinds. He is a splendid speaker and his personal courage is everywhere justly praised. With his knowledge of India, however, and his undoubtedly progressive sympathies in many directions it is a great pity that he expressed so much cynicism in dealing with India, as he did at the National Liberal Club last Wednesday, in an address he gave there. To speak of Mahatma Gandhi as the greatest reactionary force in the world to-day is obviously false and does not show true vision in dealing with the tremendous change that has come over India during the last twenty years. He has disregarded the growth in consciousness and progressive reform that has been speeded up under the Mahatma's crusade.

Sir Alfred referred to Mr. Gandhi's dream of an India dressed in loin cloth, living on rice and milk and spinning a poor kind of cloth as a harmless foible and then went on to speak of the landowners and millowners, who (according to him) are Gandhi's chief upholders, in terms of disdain and mistrust. The Editor of *The Statesman* tried to make it appear that the Indian leader's principal associates were men whose aim was to rule and exploit their less fortunate countrymen.

The whole tone of the speaker was to be deplored. The problem of India is too vitally important to have it treated with cynicism to an audience such as can be obtained at the Liberal Club, and the remark that "the Governor of a nation could not allow his action to be decided by a consideration of whether Mr. Gandhi would eat his breakfast next morning" was scarcely worthy of a man with the reputation of Sir Alfred Watson.

His remarks on education gave further evidence of the way in which he misconceives the whole Indian situation. He seemed to be dreadfully afraid that by giving self-government to India we shall only be transferring power to the small and exclusive class of land-holders and manufacturers, which would mean the substitution of a brown bureaucracy for a white bureaucracy. Sir Alfred's fears might be true, but surely the best way to overcome such risks as he refers to is to give real power and to base it upon as wide a franchise as possible. Then perhaps we shall see education carried down to that eighty per cent. of the population which unfortunately still remains illiterate under a white bureaucracy, and the now privileged class will stand a better chance of being put in its proper place.

Review.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

SCIENCE AND HUMAN EXPERIENCE. By HERBERT DINGLE. (Williams & Norgate.) 1931. 22cm. 141p. 6/-

AT present there is a tendency among scientists to write books for the average non-scientific reader, about scientists' outlook of the world. The present book written by Prof. Dingle is one of such books. It is admirably written and the subject is lucidly handled. It starts with the definition and the limits of science and then gives the various landmarks in modern physics, the distinction between abstraction and hypothesis with examples of each, and the relation of science with art, philosophy and religion. Let us examine only one. The definition of science "the recording, augmentation and rational correla-

tion of those elements of our experience which are actually or potentially common to all normal people"—is a very good one. It tells us exactly what is to be included and what must be definitely excluded from science. In the first place, it is the recording of common experience. Individual experiences like religious ecstasy, intuition, etc. have no place in the domain of science. As for the correlation, it could be done in two ways, either by mathematical abstraction from observed facts or by inventing hypotheses. These two are quite distinct. We cannot apply the rules obtained from the results of the one to the results of the other. This the author has clearly shown in discussing the postulates of the new quantum hypothesis, viz. the non-mechanical properties of electrons, protons quanta. He clearly shows the fallacy in the reasoning of those who look aghast at the principle of indeterminacy put forward by Heisenberg. The fault does not lie with the electrons, &c. but with those who think them to be truly material bodies, instead of mere hypothetical ideas, which they really are. Here the author criticises the view regarding the ultimate nature of the world of Sir James Jeans and Sir Arthur Eddington—two prominent scientists of today who have written lucid books on modern science for popular consumption. Here the reader will profit by reading "The Nature of the Physical World" by Eddington and "The Mysterious Universe" by Jeans, together with the present book, as the references to these two books are given here copiously. Moreover they represent the other side of the shield. The author has drawn a clear distinction between the two foremost modern theories in physics, viz. the theory of relativity which is an abstraction from observed facts and the quantum theory which is a pure hypothesis; on the other hand, the ordinary science student regards the former as far away in the air and the latter to be quite commonplace and similar to ordinary experience. The author tries to show that science does not always necessarily deal with things which can be measured with foot rule, but sometimes deals with things which cannot be so measured, e. g., many of the concepts used in psychology.

He also dwells at length on the new light thrown by science on the question of determinism. According to the old theory all the phenomena were causally related, i. e., when certain events take place, some others will always follow as the effects of the first. Now in modern theory there is the indeterminacy principle. Here the author distinguishes between two kinds of indeterminacies, viz. (i) where the event cannot be described in terms of things that have already happened and (ii) where the event cannot be described at all in terms of any other things. The first kind is not really indeterminate because here only the data is insufficient, as something likely to happen in the future exerts an influence on the event, e. g., the approach of an examination urges the student to study. But the second kind is really indeterminate and such is not found in nature. Thus the world in this sense is determinate although we need not necessarily regard one thing as cause of the other.

Arts are later on compared with science and lastly it has been shown what the bearing of science on religion is. Here an attempt has been made to distinguish religion from science. While science is based on common experience, the foundations of religion, viz. the views obtained by saints, intuition, inspiration, &c. are mere individual experiences. Further, they vary so widely with different people

that there is very little common experience as such. Really speaking, the domains of the two are entirely different and there need not be any conflict between them. It is only when religion tries to encroach upon the domain of science that the conflict generally arises. Here the author deals with such religious problems as, e. g., the so-called miracles, the existence of God, immortality of the soul, &c and goes on to show that science in its present stage cannot pronounce any final judgment on these problems and that the future tends to a clearer understanding of and greater accommodation between scientific and religious views on them.

R. N. JOSHI.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- FEDERATIONS. By D. G. KARVE. (Oxford University Press.) 1932. 20cm. 318p. Rs. 3.
- SCIENTIFIC INVESTMENT. By HARGREAVES PARKINSON. (Pitman, London.) 1932. 22cm. 228p. 10/6.
- AS IT LOOKS TO YOUNG CHINA. Ed. By WILLIAM HUNG. (Association Press, Calcutta.) 1932. 18cm. 160p. 2/6.
- GUIDE TO CAREERS FOR GIRLS. By M. C. MOHAN. (Students' Popular Depot, Lahore.) 18cm. 345p. Rs. 3.
- A HISTORY OF INDIA. Part III. British India. By C. S. SRINIVASACHARI and M. S. RAMASWAMI AYYANGAR. (Srinivasachari Varadachari & Co., Madras.) 1932. 22cm. 472p. Rs. 3/8.
- DECLINE AND FALL OF THE LABOUR PARTY. By JOHN SCANLON. (Peter Davies, London.) 21cm. 251p. 7/6.
- AFTER DEMOCRACY. By H. G. WELLS. (Watts & Co., London.) 1932. 21cm. 247p. 7/6.
- SHAKESPEARE THROUGH EASTERN EYES. By RANJEE G. SHAHANI. (Herbert Joseph, London.) 20cm. 100p. 6/-
- SUSIE SORABJI. A Memoir. By CORNELIA SCRABJI. (Oxford University Press.) 1932. 20cm. 71p. 3/6.
- LEAP HOME AND GENTLE BRAWN. By FRIEDA HAUSWIRTH DAS. (J. M. Dent, London.) 1932. 20cm. 260p. 7/6.
- SOCRATES PERSISTS IN INDIA. By F. L. BRAYNE. (Oxford University Press.) 1932. 20cm. 140p. Re. 1/4.
- INDIAN CURRENCY AND EXCHANGE WITH ITS HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT. By S. B. SEN GUPTA. (The Students' Popular Depot, Karachi.)
- RAMDAS. Translation of Mahipati's Santavijaya. By JUSTIN E. ABBOTT. (N. R. Godbole, 627, Sadashiv Peth, Poona 2.) 1932. 20cm. 409p. Rs. 2.
- INDIA'S CASE FOR SWARAJ. By MAHATMA GANDHI. Ed. and comp. WAMAN P. KABADI. (Yeshonand & Co., Bombay.) 1932. 20cm. 416p. Rs. 3.
- THE HERITAGE OF ASIA. By KENNETH SAUNDERS. (Association Press, Calcutta.) 1932. 20cm. 224p. Rs. 2.
- THE WORLD IN AGONY. By ALFRED PLUMMER. (Charles Griffin & Co., London.) 1932. 22cm. 101p. 2/6.
- THE GOLD STANDARD AND THE CRISIS. By C. RALPH CURTIS. (Charles Griffin & Co., London.) 1931. 19cm. 114p. 2/-
- HOW TO COMPETE WITH FOREIGN CLOTH. By M. P. GANDEHI. (The Book Co., Calcutta.) 1931. 25cm. 123p. Rs. 3/3.
- QUEER INDIA. By H. GEORGE FRANKS. (Cassel, London.) 1932. 23cm. 273p. 8/6.