

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XVI, No. 15. }

POONA—THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 1933.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	169
ARTICLES :—	
The White Paper in the Commons. By the Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, F.C., C.H., LL.D.	172
Civil Disobedience	173
The White Paper and Franchise.—III. By R. R. Bakhale, M.L.C.	175
OUR LONDON LETTER.	178
REVIEW :—	
Sex Equality. By Mrs. Irawati Karve, Ph. D. ...	180
BOOKS RECEIVED.	180

Topics of the Week.

Deccan Sabha on White Paper.

THE Deccan Sabha of Poona has issued a detailed statement of its views on the White Paper, which appear to us to be more radical than the views of any other body that we know of. For the Sabha is not content merely to ask for a larger measure of self-government than is provided for in the White Paper, but it insists that the self-government thus conceded should be really popular government. This result it seeks to secure by providing that the representatives of the Indian States, at any rate in the lower chamber of the central legislature, shall be elected. It is not prepared to leave any discretion in this matter to the Princes, but says, without putting too fine a point on it, that unless this condition is agreed to an All-India Federation must be ruled out.

Another condition which it similarly lays down as an indispensable pre-requisite of an All-India Federation is that all the States should agree to put into the federal list all subjects of national concern, and, by implication, it asks that civil and criminal law should also be given up by the States to the federal government. Anyhow the Deccan Sabha wants to do away with all central subjects, its reasoning being apparently as follows: if there are any matters which are deemed to require uniform management in all British Indian provinces, then they are matters which would require uniform management in the whole federal India too; if on the other hand there are any concerns which it is thought the States may well be left to manage locally, then they are concerns in regard to which diversity in management is not an evil, and if such diversity is permissible in States it ought to be permissible in the provinces as well. The Deccan Sabha obviously regards it as a grave anomaly that the federal government should have jurisdiction over any subjects which are local in a part of the federation. This anomaly is not a mere theoretical

drawback, but is a possible source of serious practical mischief inasmuch as the White Paper does not impose upon the States' representatives the abstention from voting on British Indian matters that was contemplated by the R. T. C. The Deccan Sabha has done well in drawing pointed attention to a defect which only too many of our politicians seem to be willing to wink at.

But what if these essential conditions are not agreed to by the States? To such a question the Deccan Sabha has a twofold answer: in the first place, it believes that, if British India does not herself start with the notion that her demands are excessive and cannot be strongly pressed, some States at least will agree to them; but if no State agrees then an All-India federation must be given up for the time being, and a British India federation alone should be formed. The constitution however will be so framed that without any structural alteration the States will be included as and when they will come in. The Sabha does not regard it as an unmixed evil if the States remain aloof for some time, for, as it says, "if the new constitution is immediately started without any hard and fast requirement about the accession of the States, the Princes will have full opportunity to study the federal government not only on paper but in actual working." Some of the apprehensions which they feel at present will then probably disappear.

Only three other demands that the Deccan Sabha makes in respect to the States need be referred to here. (1) Elementary rights of citizenship must be guaranteed in the constitution to all the citizens of the federation (including the States' people when the States join). (2) The residuary powers of the constitution must be vested, both in British and Indian India, in the federal government. (3) All Ministers must be selected from among the elected members of the legislature, and therefore no representative of the States nominated to the upper chamber (nomination to a lower not being allowed) will be capable of being called upon to assume office.

The Deccan Sabha, in emphasising the need for democratic government, does not neglect self-government either. It asks for a specific limit of time being fixed for the termination of reserve powers of the Governor-General, and asks for relaxation of the safeguards during the time that they remain in operation, e. g., the lower chamber alone having the right of voting supplies; demands for grants for reserved departments being voted upon, though subject to restoration, when rejected, &c. &c. But the improvements it suggests in this connexion need not be set out at length. They follow the familiar line, though in several respects they are more far-reaching than those about which we usually hear.

The Lords Debate.

THE Lords Debate on the White Paper is to the Indian as barren of hope as the Commons. For in the upper chamber as in the lower the Cabinet Ministers addressed themselves to the diehards, defending the scheme against their attacks and almost wholly neglecting the pleas for the improvement and extension of the scheme that proceeded from the Labour benches. If even the speeches of Lords Sankey and Irwin do not encourage the public in India to hope for anything more substantial than that the scheme may not be whittled down still further, the prospect is gloomy indeed, for politicians of even the most modest aspirations in our country at the present moment will not be content with anything like the reforms contained in the White Paper.

Lord Irwin and other spokesmen of Government were at great pains to convince the House that the scheme was so devised as to be almost completely extremist-proof. In the first place "the Central Legislature was so constituted as to enable stable elements to make their voice heard," and in the second place, in addition to the internal checks which would make the application of external checks hardly necessary, the external checks themselves were very effective. Between the Princes and the safeguards the constitution would give all the protection to the Britishers that they would desire.

The criticisms that Government had to meet were to the effect that the balance of power so skilfully designed in the White Paper might be altered by a possible future weakening of the Princes' position, and that the safeguards might either prove futile or if operative would obliterate popular responsibility and engender bitterness of feeling among the mass of people. The first point, urged by Lord Lloyd, was easy to answer. Not only do the Princes occupy a strong position at present, but they are taking good care to see that it will not be weakened at any time in future, for everything in which they are interested will be removed right out of the jurisdiction of the federal legislature and federal government. As to the safeguards, the position of the diehards is unassailable. Responsibility will be wholly nullified by the safeguards if they are to be effective, as they will be.

Just for a moment Lord Irwin condescended to consider the Indian claims, but he had nothing better than a quip to throw at them. "He pointed out that either the safeguards would not be required, in which case responsibility would be unlimited, or they would be required, in which case reasonable people would think it right to have and exercise them." Yes, but His Lordship apparently refuses to contemplate yet another alternative, viz. that of safeguards not being really required, but still being brought into use. It is of this alternative that Indians are thinking all the time. What is the safeguard for them against the so-called safeguards being enforced without warrant? Lord Irwin did not think it necessary to answer the question and of course he could not.

Joint Select Committee.

THE names of members of the Joint Select Committee on the Hoare White Paper have been announced, and both the Houses have approved of the quota to be drawn from them. The Committee is unusually large, consisting as it does of sixteen members from each chamber. With at least two-thirds of this number co-opted from India, the body will be altogether unwieldy for the detailed work that is expected of it. Such large numbers are defended on the ground that otherwise all sections of opinion in both houses would not be adequately represented. It

is the same sort of ground on which the Council of State is to be made too large; in a smaller chamber all Their Highnesses cannot be properly accommodated.

Sir Samuel Hoare claims that the members selected from Parliament give a fair share of representation to every shade of opinion, and that the opponents of the White Paper (both from the Right and the Left) will have as effective a voice as their numbers in Parliament warrant. The claim is not allowed on all hands, but the aim is clear. Although Government itself is committed to implementing the agreed conclusions, it goes out of its way to find places on the Committee for those who do not accept even the basic principles of the White Paper and wish to build anew on a different foundation.

Will the same principle be followed in selecting the personnel of the Indian Auxiliary Committee? Some names have been unofficially published. Even if the list be not complete, there is no hope that those, for instance, who oppose federation itself or support it only on certain conditions not agreed to by the Princes will be selected. Why should not Mr. C. Vijayaraghavachariar to whom federation is anathema or Mr. C. Y. Chintamani who opposes nomination by the Princes as the Deccan Sabha does, be given an opportunity to influence the Joint Select Committee from within, if Mr. Churchill's lieutenants are to be? And why not Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, even if Gandhiji is not to be released? It is certain that the Indian Committee will not be representative of all facets of Indian opinion.

Carrion-eating.

MAHATMA GANDHI has done well to seek expert scientific advice regarding the consumption of carrion, against which habit among certain classes of Harijans he has been carrying on a campaign with all the moral authority that naturally attaches to anything that he sponsors. In his reply to the Mahatma's enquiry, Dr. G. V. Deshmukh of Bombay stated that there was no chemical or physiological difference between slaughtered meat and carrion, except that carrion retained all the blood of the animal, which slaughtered meat did not, and was in consequence liable to decomposition earlier. Both meats were fit for human consumption equally well. He did not say if decomposition rendered the meat unfit for consumption and was positively harmful. Nor did he say what was the effect of cooking on such meat. He then turned to the tastes of certain people. Some relished carrion better because of its richer blood content. Even persons of superior taste in the West, who had not the excuse of ignorance or poverty, liked decomposing meat.

The question was different with diseased meat, whether of slaughtered animals or of dead animals. Such meat was harmful to human consumption. That was the justification for medical inspection of live-stock before they are slaughtered. The diseases of animals which are dangerous to human consumption are not easily apparent. Slaughtered meat can be as dangerous as carrion if the animal was diseased.

Fitness for human consumption turns, therefore, on the health or disease of the animal and not the method of its death. All that can be said in favour of the prejudice against carrion-eating is the presumption that the death of animals must be due to disease, and slaughtered animals are healthy. In the absence of positive scientific knowledge, it was probably a case of erring on the right side. But today there is no justification for the presumption. There is no justification for prohibiting people from consuming healthy carrion, particularly when there is no scientific evidence to prove that it is harmful and

when the only meat that some of the poverty-stricken Harijans can ever get is an occasional chunk of carrion. There is no proposal to provide them with slaughtered meat in its stead.

It is very surprising that Dr. Deshmukh should, after arguing for carrion, as it were, find for slaughtered meat, and defend his finding on Freudian grounds. If some estimable people dislike carrion-eating and will transfer their dislike of it to the eaters of carrion, it may be an excellent explanation of their antipathy towards carrion-eaters, but it cannot be a justification of it. The world is littered with habits and tastes which some people like and others dislike. Nobody need be compelled to take on a habit which he dislikes but neither should anybody be asked to give up a habit which he likes, as long as it is not clearly proved that it is harmful.

Indians is South Africa.

WHATEVER be the advantages to white South Africa of the coalition of Gen. Hertzog and Gen. Smuts, it forebodes no good to the non-white population of that country. As far as Indians are concerned, there is not much to choose between the two political parties led by these Generals. The exigencies of party politics however acted as some kind of check on the excesses of whoever was in power. The opposition exposed the enormities of the government and stood shocked. The coalition will destroy even that almost illusory protection to the voteless and therefore defenceless non-whites. This development will cast greater responsibility on non-political persons and bodies who have hitherto championed the case of even-handed justice to all communities. The valient Bishop of Johannesburg has promptly sounded a note of protest against the clause in the articles of the Hertzog-Smuts association which said that they would both stand for a white South Africa. "We have no right", he protested in righteous indignation, "to say that we are out for a white South Africa any more than a black South Africa. It may make a telling election cry among the more ignorant, but what nonsense it is."

In an excellent memorandum submitted to the Asiatic Land Tenure Act Commission, the newly formed Transvaal Indian Commercial Association made out a strong and convincing case for not only leaving the *status quo* with regard to Indian occupation of proclaimed land for residence and business unaffected but also for making ample provision for the expanding needs of the Indian population. It did not surrender its right to protest against the oppressive laws operating in the Transvaal, but recognised that the Commission's work was restricted to within the four corners of the Land Tenure Act, and accordingly dealt with the matters of which alone the Commission could take cognisance. The Association has shown how a disturbance of the *status quo* would not only ruin the Indians now employed in trade, but create fresh problems which would have wide and unexpected repercussions on the white people also. The business of the white wholesale merchants would also suffer seriously. Reason and honour and enlightened self-interest should prompt the Commission to take a liberal view of the situation and disturb the existing rights as little as possible.

The Warning from Ceylon.

THE purposes for which the Governor of Ceylon has recently invoked his special powers of certification is not only a scandal in Ceylon, but a warning to India as to what is in store for her. The economic depression and the fall in revenue compelled the Board of Ministers to seek means of retrenchment. They proposed, among other means, the reduction of the salaries and passage and holiday allowances of

public services. A Retrenchment Committee had recommended such reductions. With the consent of the Secretary of State, a graduated levy was made on the salaries. But the Governor resisted the proposal to reduce the allowances with the powers of certification. Whatever be the adversity of the people who have to pay the taxes, the prosperity of the services should not be affected!

But this is not the end of the story. The State Council reduced the salary of the Government Assessor from Rs. 10,200 to Rs. 7,200 on the ground that the present incumbent had not even the minimum qualifications required for the post, and that he was not on the permanent staff. Apart from the merits of the reduction, it is significant that, with the exception of four nominated European members, all the members of the State Council, including the Board of Ministers and the nominated and the elected members, numbering forty, voted for the proposition. The Governor set aside this overwhelming verdict and restored the reduction, on the ground that such restoration was of "paramount importance"! Calious prostitution of power can hardly go further. And it may happen in India!

Purchase of Government Stores.

IT will be remembered that as a result of the recommendations of the Stores Purchase Committee, the Indian Stores Department was created more than ten years ago with a view specially to give encouragement to indigenous industries by purchasing all stores except those of a specially technical nature required by different Government departments. But it appears from a motion recently discussed in the Council of State that the services of this department are not being fully utilised by some departments, the worst offenders being the Army and the Railways, which are the largest consumers of stores. The result is obvious. Whereas at its inception the new department was expected to make purchases worth at least Rs. 8 crores, it has not yet been able to fulfil even half the expectation. The railways which go in for crores and crores worth of stores are found to entrust this department with the purchase of only a very small proportion of the business. This will be seen from the fact, for which the mover vouched, that out of about Rs. 18 crores worth of stores purchased by Indian Railways in 1930-31 the services of the Stores department were utilised for buying only Rs. 1 crore worth of goods. The attitude of the Military department to the Stores department is also equally unsatisfactory with the result that the real purpose, viz. the encouragement of swadeshi, for which the department came into existence is not being adequately served.

To put a stop to this undesirable state of things it was suggested last year by the Stores, Printing and Stationery Sub-Committee of the Retrenchment Advisory Committee presided over by the Hon'ble Mr. G. A. Natesan that an Advisory Committee under the chairmanship of the Member for Industries should be constituted and charged with the duty of reviewing from time to time how far the Government's stores purchase policy is given effect to. But even after the lapse of eight months since it was put forward this recommendation has not yet been translated into action. The motion in question therefore very properly asked that no further time should be lost in setting up such a Committee. We should have expected Government to make some attempt to explain their lack of activity; but the spokesman of Government was conveniently silent on the point. It is however to be hoped that these two requests which have a large volume of public support will be attended to by Government without avoidable delay.

THE WHITE PAPER IN THE COMMONS.

By THE RT. HON. V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI.

IT is not safe to judge speeches made in England by the summaries cabled to this country. With this caution one may note a significant feature. Neither the Secretary nor the Under-Secretary of State for India used the phrase 'Dominion Status.' Conservative mentality has no patience with it. A community of Hindus in South India cannot bring themselves to utter the word Narayana lightly. That sacred name, sure bringer of salvation, must be spoken in the ear of a dying person so that it may be the very last thing he hears. So morbid is the care taken in this regard that it is always uttered *after* the last breath has left the body. "Is it time to say *that word*?" is the hushed inquiry that passes round in the room of death. Something of that horror seems to possess the orthodox official of the India Office when the expression 'Dominion Status for India' would occur naturally to the Liberal or Labour politician. Perhaps he fears that it may cause the British Commonwealth to expire. True, too true, it was a Halifax who first let the fatal syllables profane his lips. But was he not then in the service of those enemies of the empire, the blaspheming socialists?

Sir Samuel Hoare warned his hearers solemnly to remember that year after year British statesmen had led India "to believe in the continuous bestowal of new instalments of constitutional progress." Even while stating the demand made by Indians, he would not use their polluting vocabulary. He asked, paraphrasing their language, "Is it a wonder, with all this ferment in Asia, that India should be raising its voice for recognition and demanding a greater share in its own government?" Mr. Butler's turn came much later in the debate when the Conservatives had been fully awakened to the situation. He thought they could stand a slightly stiffer dose of the dread truth. So he ventured to mention "the idea of evolution of self-government towards ultimate political responsibility." But he shrank from saying *that word*. Once more it was these quixotic Labour men that perpetrated the enormity.

No attempt was made during the debate to explain or defend the breach of faith on the subject of safeguards. The Labour Government had promised that they should be in the interests of India. They are now designed largely in the interests of Britain. The fiction that they are in the common interests of the two countries only aggravates the wrong. Sir Samuel asserts that the Irish treaty broke down for lack of safeguards. The truth probably is that with safeguards no treaty could have been made and that, if a treaty had been made, it would have broken down much earlier. Some time ago the people of India were admonished that they need have no misgivings from the existence of safeguards, that the Governor-General and Governors would be exceptional men endowed with an exceptional degree of common sense and goodwill, and that they would use their

powers of intervention only on rare occasions. In reassuring the unprogressive majority of the Commons, the Secretary of State declared the other day that the safeguards were not paper safeguards, but, if necessary, could be carried into full effect. Now these positions are not logically irreconcilable; but they tend in opposite directions and indicate, every time a safeguard is invoked, a state of mutual hostility between the agent of the imperial power and the representatives of the people. We must hang down our heads in shame when we remember that our own people asked for certain safeguards. The Secretary of State made a damaging use of this circumstance when he told the House: "Indeed one of the most significant facts of the proceedings of the R. T. C. in December was the demand by Indians themselves for safeguards. In the R. T. C., day after day, were Hindus or Sikhs in the Punjab demanding safeguards for their communities, were Moslems demanding safeguards in Hindu provinces, and were depressed classes demanding safeguards in provinces where there were members of their classes." But there are many safeguards in the proposed constitution other than those for the benefit of minorities, and our complaint is that they eat up a great part of the power transferred to the legislatures and ministries. What shall we say now after the Princes have put forward their demand for eighteen safeguards? Eighteen is the present figure, but an apocryphal demand for twenty-four safeguards has been mentioned, and we should be prepared to see some of these adopted into the canonical list. The men most to be pitied are the ministers of the new regime; they would be hagridden for thought of the numerous and undefined safeguards strewn all along their path and the scores of persons jealously on the watch to invoke the Governor-General's intervention.

Do we frighten ourselves by an exaggerated estimate of the special powers that would be given to the Governor-General and the Governors and by a corresponding under-estimate of the quantum of responsibility in the transferred sphere? Apart from the statement made by the Secretary of State that no imperial or British interests would be imperilled, we had Lord Reading's assurance to his countrymen that the Governor-General's powers would remain intact. The Viceroy, ex-Viceroy and several Governors whom Sir Samuel Hoare consulted, took the view that on the whole the responsibilities of the Governor-General were and would be less rather than greater in the future. Considering the uncertainty that still surrounds the constitution, this tentative and undecided view of the experts cannot be allowed to supersede our judgment entirely, and even when we have given it full weight, we are justified in our pessimism and must warn our countrymen that there is little substance in the responsibility at the federal centre which the new order purposes to devolve on our legislatures and ministers. As regards provincial autonomy, it will no doubt have more reality than at present. But it will not be a

matter for unalloyed satisfaction. In the sphere of law and order the scheme of the White Paper will take away with one hand what it gives with the other. The Instrument of Instructions, a more dignified and authoritative document than hitherto, will direct the Governors to bear in mind the intimate connection between the peace and tranquillity of their territories and the internal administration and discipline of the police. If this somewhat roundabout expression be translated into the direct language of actuality, it means that the Governor in each province will really hold the power, while the unhappy minister concerned, being outwardly responsible to the legislature will not know exactly where he stands and will be the object alternately of the pity and contempt of the public. How far the Governors will relish the position is a matter of personal idiosyncrasy. One observation, however, seems called for at this point. The White Paper takes it for granted that twelve admirable men can always be found in Britain to fill the peculiarly difficult posts of Governor-General and Governors. This expectation, however, is too sanguine. Nor can we hope on our side to send our best men to the legislatures and ministries and by that means to mitigate the evils inherent in a badly devised system. The expensiveness of our elections, the unorganized condition of political parties and the illiteracy of the masses cannot conduce to the success in public life of persons of high calibre. Cabinets too cannot acquire coherence or a sense of responsibility so long as their members own allegiance to particular communities, classes, or artificial groups. If on the top of these intrinsic weaknesses the constitution reposes the reality of power in one place and legal responsibility in another, the result will be unseemly wrangles and chronic inefficiency and stagnation of all national work. The fitness of our peoples for maintaining and making use of democratic institutions will be challenged—not altogether without ostensible cause.

The foregoing discussion is based on the assumption that British India and the States are going to federate and be entrusted with a certain amount of responsibility for all-India affairs. This consummation, however, becomes less probable with every week that passes. Not only are we confronted with a staggering schedule of safeguards, but differences in the ranks of Princes are coming into view, and the air is full of rumours of which the general drift is that the Chamber, which has been so far a splendid rallying point for the noble order, may not fulfil that function much longer. If this danger took shape, it would be a first-class disaster and ruin the present political enterprise, which has been gaining painful momentum during the last decade. There are many who fear that no constitution worth having could emerge out of this muddle and that it might be well on the whole to allow the movement to die quietly. This is a pure doctrine of despair. There is a conclusive answer to it. It would take great power of planning, organizing and directing to let the movement die quietly. So many divergent expectations, plans and ambitions have been started and allowed

to grow that no authority could command them to be still. If such an authority did come into being, it could just as easily shape a workable constitution and cause the dawn of a bright era.

Though repulsed again and again, we repeat our appeal to Government for the release of Mahatma Gandhi and his colleagues, so that our plans for the future may have the strong foundation of the goodwill of the entire nation. To Congress leaders we turn next and implore them to do their share of the reconstruction of Indian polity. They must remember that in this sphere there is no standing still; if places are not filled by the right men they will be filled by the wrong men; if things are not done well they will be done badly; if the interests of the nation are neglected those of the minorities and their allies will be consolidated; and every day lost by us will mean a year lost to our children with less and less chance of repair.

Meanwhile, we must rally our forces, sadly demoralised by the White Paper and the Commons debate, and endeavour at the next stage to gain a hearing for our views. The present juncture is forbidding, still we have to do the best in the circumstances. The defects of the scheme are many; the undermentioned are perhaps among the more important items:

1. Defence: i. Indianisation to be completed within a fixed period. ii. Recruitment to be open to all communities and provinces. iii. Preparation during transition period for responsibility.
2. No Governor-General's Act and no Governors' Acts.
3. No special responsibilities and powers to the Governor-General or Governors in the transferred sphere, except for the protection of the interests of minorities or those of a state.
4. Exercise of power of previous sanction (if kept) in matters of currency and exchange to be declared by the Instrument of Instructions to be only in the interests of India.
5. The services to be in future under the control of the federal Government.
6. The Constitution Act to be alterable by the Indian legislature except where Imperial interests are involved.
7. The Railway Board as well as the Reserve Bank to be constituted by Indian legislation.
8. The Secretary of State's Council to be abolished.—*Indian Review.*

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE.

MR. M. S. ANEY has announced his intention to convene a conference of prominent Congressmen who are out of jail in order to review Congress policy. It may be useful at this stage to assess as dispassionately and objectively as possible the results of the current Congress policy of civil disobedience, and enquire if a change is called for. The venerable Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, the President of the last session of the Congress in Calcutta, who was however prevented by the Government from presiding, gave his estimate of the situation in his undeli

vered Presidential Address, extracts from which have since been allowed to be published. The Pandit observed that since the inauguration of the Montagu constitution the Congress demanded central responsibility; and that, the Government having failed to meet it, the Congress declared for independence. In other words, the Congress, having failed to secure half a loaf, namely, Dominion Status, promptly doubled its demand and asked for independence! To secure this new objective, "the national minimum demand," it embarked on civil disobedience. The objective still remained to be achieved and so must the means be persisted in, opined the Pandit. It was true that the Gandhi-Irwin Pact brought about a truce, but soon the Congress, according to the Pandit, had to resort to civil disobedience in defence of the rights of the people which were seriously threatened by the Ordinance regime. The Ordinances have now become the law of the land. The Pandit tacitly recognised that the immediate cause of the civil disobedience campaign of 1932 was no longer there. But he would not, therefore, drop the campaign. For the larger and original cause still remained: independence. "Even if the Congress suspended civil disobedience the present Government in England and in India would still fight the Congress until it agreed to accept the severely limited measure of reform which is all they have decided in their wisdom to concede to India." So far as the Pandit was concerned, he would stick to civil disobedience until independence was won. He then went on to defend the right to civil disobedience, and called upon all Indians to rally to its banner and prosecute it with zeal.

In a sense the Pandit has already queered the pitch for Mr. Aney's conference. And it was one of the most astute moves on the part of the Government to allow the publication of the Pandit's speech and the draft resolutions of the Congress, of which Sir Harry Haig hinted he had earlier knowledge. The speech and the draft resolutions do not add to the reputation of the Pandit or the Congress for political leadership or acumen. They are more brave than wise. They deceive none. It was fruitless to discuss the right to civil disobedience. Sir Harry Haig himself will not question the right of the Congress to fight the Government even with violent weapons and—take the consequences. There is nothing that a subject people may not do to gain their political liberty. Equally so, the dominant people are free to adopt any method in defence of their domination. Success alone justifies a war, violent or non-violent. Success elevates the rebel to the throne; failure drags him to the gallows. World evolution has not yet reached the stage when a cause has only to be righteous to succeed. There is profound political wisdom in the saying, "Trust God but keep your powder dry." It is highly lamentable but none the less true that to embark on a war it is not enough to have a righteous cause but necessary to have adequate power to win. In the case of general political action it is results that justify it and not merely the motive as in the case of exceptional individuals.

What have been the results of the civil disobedience campaign? The heroism, the fortitude and the heavy sacrifices made by thousands of men and women in the cause of civil disobedience cannot be gainsaid; they extort admiration from even the sceptic. But these heroic sacrifices are not a goal in themselves but only a means to a goal. The most relevant question is: Have they achieved their object or at least brought it nearer achievement? Far from the Ordinances being withdrawn, they have now been incorporated into the ordinary law of the land with the help of some non-official elected members of the Assembly, thanks partly to the boycott of the Councils by Congressmen. As for the larger objective of independence, it is no nearer attainment. On the other hand, it has receded farther away than ever. The only result of the campaign has been the stiffening of the attitude of Britain.

The more the Congress persists in talk of civil disobedience, the more Britain insists on tightening the safeguards in her own interests. Civil disobedience has brought us safeguards and not swaraj. In attempting to make the constitution Congress-proof, the Government have been driven more and more into the arms of the communalists and the reactionary Princes. The Congress and the constitutionalists aim at self-determination, self-government and democratic government for India. Thanks to the policy of the Congress, she is getting none of these. The Round Table Conference method was invented in order to satisfy India's desire for self-determination. The new constitution was to be negotiated between the representatives of Britain and India in conference and the results of it were to be ratified, as it were, by the British Parliament. The British Prime Minister even spoke of a "treaty." In such a scheme, the centre of gravity lay in the Conference; decisions were to be reached there, which were binding on both parties to the treaty. There was no place in it for a Joint Select Committee. But now all is changed. The emphasis has shifted to the Joint Select Committee, the British Government and the British Parliament. Far from registering and ratifying the treaty concluded at the Conference, the new constitution of India will be decided upon and imposed by the British Government.

India asked for democratic self-government; she is getting more autocracy: British autocracy combined with the autocracy of the Indian Princes. Great Britain will continue to rule. The large and unconscionable share of power given to the autocratic Princes in the federal government negates the democratic ambitions of India. It may be that these unwanted features would have been there even if the Congress had not persisted in non-cooperation and won such large support for it in India. But as things stand, it has provided Britain with excuses which she is exploiting to the full. The threat of the Congress some years ago to examine the public debt of India and to repudiate that part of it which was not legitimately debitable to India, has, far from reducing the public debt of India, only provoked the British financial interests to insist on

impossible financial "safeguards." It is clear beyond doubt to a dispassionate critic that, whatever be the adventitious advantages, civil disobedience has not only failed in achieving its primary objective, but also made its attainment more difficult.

It was bound to be so. As long as the British Government can find men and money in India to carry on their policies effectively, the Congress can only cause them some annoyance at the utmost and not bring them down on their knees and compel them to surrender. The British Government in India are carrying on: not one of their Indian Executive Councillors, Ministers, Judges, Police officials and the army officers has resigned and declined to loyally carry out the orders of the foreign bureaucracy. Taxes continue to be paid by the peasantry and the capitalists. Government loans continue to be subscribed to and oversubscribed to. Under the circumstances, is there any prospect of beating the Government to their knees? It may be regrettable that nationalism has not developed in India to such an extent as to make the people rise in their millions and throw off the foreign yoke. The Congress has tried non-cooperation for over a decade. The result has not been what it hoped or worked for. Is there any prospect that in the immediate future the response to the Congress call will be larger; large enough to complete the surrender of the Government to the will of the people of India? If not, is it worth while to persist in a course which has only brought "unparalleled repression", as Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya has justly characterised it and made swaraj more difficult of achievement?

There is ample evidence to show that even among the Congress leaders there are several who have realised the futility of civil disobedience to achieve its end and who feel that even a good show of it cannot be maintained unless it is personally led and directed by the Mahatma himself. And that is now out of the question. It is a tragedy that a movement which the Mahatma alone can inspire with some zeal is being maintained by his followers in an enfeebled condition out of respect for the Mahatma. Not all the brave words of the Pandit or of the Congress resolutions will deceive anybody and, least of

all, the Government. They can only delude a few of the more credulous and idealistic among our own people.

If the Congress drops formally what has virtually been already abandoned, what is the alternative to civil disobedience? Will constitutional action prove more effective in promoting swaraj? For one thing, it will not entail the unnecessary and wholly futile sacrifices which civil disobedience has entailed. It has not made swaraj more difficult. It has not made an enemy of Britain, which, whether we like it or not, still has a large say in our constitutional development. For another, constitutional action has not been barren of results; at any rate it has shown results far more tangible and impressive than civil disobedience has. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya himself has testified to the achievements of constitutional action. In his undelivered Presidential Address he said, "The most important constitutional and administrative reforms which have taken place during the last half century have all been due to the work or pressure of the Congress." Non-cooperation and civil disobedience are of very recent origin; during the decade that they have been in operation there has hardly been any great constitutional or administrative reform. It is obvious that the great reforms that the Pandit referred to took place in the pre-non-cooperation period. Apart from all that, civil disobedience having been played out, there is nothing else to do but to revert to constitutional action, if violence is to be eschewed, irrespective of whether it pays or not. But it is not so hopeless. Whenever India spoke with one voice, it has produced some effect. For instance, the united voice of India brought about the repudiation by the British Government of the Simon Commission and the convocation of the Round Table Conference. The real problem is one of finding a common platform for as many sections of the people of India as possible. The more united our demand the greater the chances of its being listened to. Congressmen and non-Congressmen will alike do well to seek for this, so far elusive, basis for united action.

THE WHITE PAPER AND FRANCHISE.

III.*

"The present electorate in Indian provinces amounts to less than 3 per cent. of the population of the areas returning members to provincial Councils, and it is obvious that under this limited franchise, the majority of the people and many large and important sections of the community can enjoy no effective representation in the legislatures. In these circumstances, it is clearly necessary so to widen the electorate that the Legislatures to which responsibility is to be entrusted should be representative of the general mass of the population and that no important section of the community may lack the means of expressing its needs and its opinions." Letter from the Prime Minister to the Chairman of the Indian Franchise Committee.

* The first two articles in this series appeared in the issues of 30th March and 6th April.

THIS is an extract taken from the letter written by the Prime Minister to the Chairman of the Indian Franchise Committee and containing its terms of reference. In spite of his poor estimate of the present restricted franchise for the provincial legislatures and their representative character and in spite of his equally strong recommendation to that Committee so to widen the franchise as to make the legislatures representative of the general mass of the population, His Majesty's Government, over which the same Prime Minister presides, have recommended that "the franchise of the Lower Chamber of the Federal Legislature will, for all practical purposes, be the existing franchise for the present Provincial Legislatures." It may be argued that the Prime Minister had in view, when he penned the above sentences, the provincial legislatures and, therefore,

the criticism cannot be applied to the Federal Assembly. The argument is, on the face of it, puerile and cannot be sustained. The point the Premier sought to emphasise was that the legislatures with such low franchise as, for example, obtains, in the case of provincial legislature, could not truly reflect the general mass of the population; and, therefore, he asked the Lothian Committee to widen the franchise for legislatures to which responsibility is to be entrusted, and *not merely* the provincial legislatures. This interpretation cannot be disputed on the further ground that immediately preceding the sentence containing the above direction to the Lothian Committee, he refers to "the principle of a responsible Federal Government, subject to certain reservations and safeguards" which "has been accepted by His Majesty's Government." It is thus clear that His Majesty's Government superseded the wishes of their Chief within a period of fifteen months—a fact which proves that the Chief is merely a figure-head of the so-called National Government and that the Tory Party, of which Sir Samuel Hoare is the great Moghal presiding over the destinies of this unfortunate country, has been leading him by the nose in Indian affairs.

In recommending the existing franchise of the present provincial legislatures for the Lower Chamber of the Federal Legislature, the White Paper has given no reasons. It may, therefore, be assumed that it has accepted the reasoning advanced by the Majority of the Lothian Committee who have made the same recommendation. Before, however, examining the reasoning of the Majority it is necessary to compare the Majority recommendation with that of the White Paper to ascertain the identical character or otherwise between the two. The Majority of the Lothian Committee recommended (1) the adoption as the franchise for the Federal Assembly of the franchise now in force for provincial legislative councils supplemented by an educational qualification for both men and women; (2) that the educational qualification in the case of men should be the possession of the matriculation or school leaving certificate or the equivalent thereof, and in the case of women it should be the attainment of the upper primary standard; (3) that all women enfranchised under the bare literacy qualification for the provincial councils should be added to the first Assembly roll; (4) that the electorate in the Central Provinces and Berar should be double the electorate for the present council; (5) that, in the case of the depressed classes, the bare literacy qualification should be added to the general qualification so as to enable them to be enfranchised to the extent of at least 2 per cent. of their population; and lastly, (6) that provision should be made in the constitution for a reconsideration of the franchise for British India in the case of the Federal Assembly after a definite period. The effect of this recommendation is calculated to have about 5 million voters instead of the present 1,400,000, for the Assembly. The White Paper has accepted only the first recommendation and completely rejected the third and the sixth recommendations. With regard to the second recommendation, it has accepted the educational qualification for men; but for the women, the same high qualification, and not the lower qualification as suggested by the Lothian Committee, has been prescribed. Even with the acceptance of the Committee's recommendation for lower qualification, the proportion of men voters to women voters would have been 13.6 to 1; and therefore it was proposed by the Committee that the women enfranchised under the bare literacy qualification should be added to the roll of the first Assembly so as to make the proportion look respectable. The White Paper has unceremoniously rejected this

fair proposal and threw overboard the Prime Minister's wishes to secure "a more adequate enfranchisement of women." The value of the educational qualification would still further be reduced by a new condition laid down in the White Paper that "for the first two elections under the new constitution, and thereafter unless and until a local Government modifies this requirement in respect of the area under its control, claimants in respect of an educational qualification, or of property held by a husband, will be required to make an application to be entered on the electoral roll to the returning officer." Under this condition which has absolved the Governments of all their responsibility, hardly a fraction of those entitled to franchise under the educational qualification will be enfranchised, and, therefore, the White Paper has taken away by the left hand what it has given by the right. In the Central Provinces, an alternative franchise on "a wider scale," and not double the franchise as recommended by the Lothian Committee, has been suggested. With regard to the depressed classes, while a differential qualification so as to create an electorate of at least 2 per cent. has been hinted, a bare literacy qualification suggested by the Lothian Committee is conspicuous by its absence. Which means that some other qualification may be suggested at a later stage by the local Governments. As I have already stated, an automatic expansion of the franchise recommended by the Indian Franchise Committee has been given a go-bye. This comparison will, I trust, convince anybody that even what has been recommended by Lothian Committee has been only partially accepted by the White Paper and that there is no provision in the White Paper for the automatic expansion of the franchise for the Federal Lower House, which was one of the most important of the Committee's recommendations.

The public are already aware that the Lothian Committee were not unanimous on the question of franchise for the Federal Assembly. Two distinguished members of the Committee, Messrs. Tambe and Chintamani, and I recommended in our minute of dissent on this and some other important questions, that the franchise for the Federal Assembly and the future provincial legislative councils should be the same. Mrs. Subbarayan, the only Indian lady member of the Committee, has made the same recommendation in her "minute." Major Milner of the British Labour Party, another prominent member of the Committee, has in his "note" expressed dissatisfaction with "the unduly restricted and differential franchise" for the Federal Assembly. I have reason to believe that one or two other members of the Committee held the same view—in fact, the idea of having the same franchise for the provincial councils and the Assembly originated with one of them; but for reasons best known to themselves, they did not think it convenient to differ openly from Lord Lothian and his majority colleagues. The Majority of the Committee recognized that the common franchise for both provincial councils and Federal Assembly was simple as it involved the preparation of only one electoral roll and that it provided for as fair a distribution of voting power between the various sections of the community as was practical. Simplicity of electoral arrangements and a fair distribution of voting power are the most essential considerations in devising a suitable basis for franchise. The basis of common franchise for the Federal Assembly and the provincial councils fully satisfy, according to the Majority of the Lothian Committee, these two essential considerations. But "on closer consideration," they were driven to reject that basis, for three reasons which deserve equally

closer consideration at the hands of those who had to differ from the majority.

The first reason for rejecting the common franchise is stated to be that "the electorate for the Assembly will be required to deal with problems much more remote from the experience and knowledge of the village voter than the problem which will come before the provincial legislatures." This argument applies with equal force to the enlargement of the electorate from the present 1,140,000 to the future 8,500,000 plus the additional depressed class electors that may be enfranchised under a differential qualification; yet having regard to other important considerations, it did not deter the Majority of the Lothian Committee from recommending the enlarged franchise. The common franchise recommended by the Minority is only a further step in the same direction. Secondly, while it is true that the problems that will be tackled by the Assembly will not be the same which the provincial councils will deal with, it cannot be denied that tariffs, customs and other subjects of which the central legislature will be seized, have a direct bearing on the lives of common people and that army policy and military expenditure which take away a bulk of the central finances, are matters in which the villager is vitally interested. The size of the country has no chance of being reduced at any future date and it will take years and years to remove the illiteracy of all the voters. If illiteracy is not made an excuse for enfranchising 36 millions for the provincial councils, there is no logic in saying that it is a hindrance for enfranchising the very same people for the Assembly. If the 29 millions who are going to be enfranchised for the first time can be trusted to cast an intelligent vote for the provincial councils, they can surely be trusted to cast a similar vote for the Assembly.

The second objection against the common franchise is that as the elections for the provincial and central legislatures take place on the same day, they might cause an administrative breakdown with such enormous increase of voters for both. This is an objection which can be easily removed by having the elections on different days, wherever necessary. It is a purely administrative difficulty which cannot be put forth as a serious argument against withholding the right of vote from millions of people. When the basis of franchise satisfies all the legitimate and reasonable tests, it is foolish to reject it on such ridiculous grounds.

The third and final objection against the common franchise, which the Majority of the Lothian Committee has chosen to characterise as "even more conclusive," is that a candidate will have to cover, in the provinces, for example, of Central Provinces and Bengal, maximum and minimum areas of 5,550 and 1,614 square miles respectively and to approach, in the provinces of Bengal and the Punjab, maximum and minimum of 166,667 and 71,794 voters respectively—areas and voters which are utterly unmanageable by candidates resulting in no real touch being maintained between them and the constituencies. As regards the areas it is quite plain that they are connected with the size of the Assembly and have nothing to do with the franchise. Whatever the franchise may be, they will remain the same. They can be reduced only if the size of the legislature is increased. The comparative tables given in the report of the Lothian Committee (pages 162 and 163) make it clear that with 300 members, the areas remain the same, whether the franchise is what has been recommended by the majority or whether it is what has been recommended by the minority; but they are reduced considerably when the strength of the Assembly is increased from 200 to 300. I, therefore, emphasise the point that the franchise has

no bearing whatever on the areas of the constituencies and that the latter can be reduced only by increasing the size of the Assembly, and not otherwise. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that with 250 seats for British India, the areas will be largely reduced as compared with what they are today; and if His Majesty's Government have a real concern for the difficulties of the candidate, the solution lies in further increasing the size of the Assembly, and not in restricting the franchise.

The number of electors is, I admit, a point which has force and, therefore, deserves to be taken into account. But even under the recommendation of the Majority, the number of electors has been increased to a point at which it is physically impossible for the candidate to approach all of them individually. The use of the party machine and other forms of propaganda which are generally employed in countries where franchise is widely extended, will have to be brought into use for the franchise as recommended by the Majority, restricted though it is. Why should not they be allowed to be used more extensively by widening the franchise? The chief factor is the area of the constituencies; once they are fixed, it is not a great concern whether the candidates approach 27,000 or 95,000 electors *within the same area*. If anything, the task of the candidate will be easier.

As against these objections which, I submit, with all deference to the Majority of the Lothian Committee, are not sound, serious and conclusive, there are weighty considerations in favour of adopting a franchise common to the Federal Assembly and the provincial councils. These considerations are both political and administrative. The preparation of only one electoral roll and a fair distribution of voting strength are points wholly in favour of adopting common franchise, a fact which has been fully recognised by the Majority. Politically, it is of immense importance that the Federal Assembly should be as representative of the general mass of the population as possible, a consideration emphasised by the Prime Minister and accepted in theory by the Majority of the Lothian Committee. As the Minority of the latter have pointed out, "when it is borne in mind that the present Assembly has repeatedly been held up for its unrepresentative character, and that this has been urged as an excuse for the Government's disregard of the views and wishes of that body, and as it is intended that the Assembly of the future should be endowed with some power over the Executive and therefore charged with vastly greater responsibilities, we cannot but think that an electorate which will hardly be five per cent. of the population is utterly inadequate." If the franchise common to the Federal Assembly and the provincial councils is adopted, the former will be representative, under the White Paper proposals for the latter, of at least 14 per cent. of the population. I am afraid that the Assembly to be constituted under the unduly restricted franchise recommended by the White Paper, will fail to carry the weight and authority due to a Federal Lower House, both from the public and Government with the result that on the strength of the enormous powers of the Governor General and with the formidable array of the Princes' nominees, its wishes and decisions will be more often flouted than they are at present. It is, therefore, highly desirable and necessary that strenuous efforts must be made to resist the franchise proposals of His Majesty's Government and to bring them on the same basis as that for the provincial legislative councils.

R. R. BAKHALE.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, March 31.

COMMONS DEBATE ON THE WHITE PAPER.

THE RE were all the evidences of an important occasion when the House of Commons met on Monday afternoon to discuss the White Paper. Sir Samuel Hoare was in his blindest mood. He was quite unmoved at finding himself between two very hot fires. Although he described his position as a very unhappy one, he managed to make some amusing play out of the contradictory denunciations of which he had been the object, and, of course, he made the easy point that his critics might be left to rule out one another.

It was soon discovered, however, which line of criticism he was most concerned about. The defaulters on his own side of the House got by far the larger share of his attention, and he was obviously directing his remarks particularly to those Conservatives whose point of view was expressed by Sir Robert Horne on the following day, that is to say, those of the middle section who do not like to oppose the Government, but who are profoundly disturbed by many of the White Paper proposals.

The Secretary of State did his best to comfort these doubting souls. In that smooth, precise manner of his, he gave them what he thought was ample assurances. He did not succeed in proving that India was about to make much real advance in self-government, he probably knows very well that this cannot be the case unless the White Paper scheme is radically altered. His job evidently was to show his halting friends how, by reason of our solemn pledges, we must give something, and at the same time to reassure them that (from the point of view of British interests) we were doing nothing at which anyone need be alarmed. So, although we were providing for what he called "the fullest possible autonomous development" in India, it would be impossible for the "extremists" to get control of the Federal Centre.

There was throughout Sir Samuel Hoare's speech an assumption of the good things we were supposed to be conferring upon India through the ingenious mechanism the Government have devised, but the underlying theme of his whole discourse was the thoroughness of the safeguards by which the whole scheme was to be conditioned.

The Tory hosts listened very attentively to the Secretary of State's consolatory assurances. Scarcely a cheer or protest was raised to relieve the quietude during the whole of the eighty minutes he was on his feet.

Major Attlee has less of the Parliamentary art than is displayed by other members of the House. His manner also is not convincing, and though he put forward quite clearly the Labour Party's point of view, one almost got the impression that he had been well primed so far as his words were concerned, but that he was not himself satisfied with the wisdom of them. Perhaps he cannot escape from his association with the Simon Commission. If that be so, it was a pity that a more convinced speaker of the Labour Party's proposals for India was not put up first. Even his friends—Mr. Maxton and others of the I. L. P.—were not satisfied with him. Why should all the strength of personality, argument and persuasion be left to the other Parties in the House, and Labour which was supposed to stand for

progress be so ineffective? Yet the speech reads well, and one notes with satisfaction that Major Attlee got to the realities of the case of India, and gave something of the Indian side.

Sir Herbert Samuel's contribution was one of the ablest of the whole debate. His main argument made a case for a degree of Indian self-government far in advance of anything contained in the White Paper which he was ostensibly supporting. On the personal side his encounter with Mr. Churchill was one of the amusing features of a rather heavy day. His description of the Member for Epping, borrowed from Bagehot, tickled the House: "His chaff is excellent, but his wheat is poor stuff."

After Wednesday's performance most of Mr. Churchill's hearers may be of the opinion that this was too great a compliment to pay even to his chaff. This week has witnessed the pricking of the Churchill balloon and its subsequent collapse. Sir Herbert Samuel made some very effective points. His striving to bring to the House the realisation of the importance and magnitude of the task of setting up a satisfactory constitution for two hundred millions of people thousands of miles away was quite impressive. One was also called to face the realities of the present situation when, after dealing with the proposed new Constitution, he said, looking round the House and speaking with dramatic deliberation; "I see the representative for Epping, but who speaks for Bengal?" Sir Samuel also emphasised the point so often apt to be lost sight of that the Government of India could never be carried on without a very large measure of Indian co-operation, a point which was further driven home by Mr. Bernays in his trenchant speech on Tuesday. If the Liberal contingent will give logical effect to this idea in the Joint Committee, they will want to alter many of the proposals in the White Paper.

The diehards got a good look in after the dinner hour but by that time a number of members of the House had retired and feeling had run down. Sir Reginald Craddock in particular droned on to an inordinate length. Mr. Cadogan (a disgruntled member of the Simon Commission) made the ablest speech from that quarter, and Sir Alfred Knox was blustering and militant. A thoughtful exposition of the franchise proposals of the Lothian Committee was given by Miss Pickford, and as good a case as could be made for the Government's scheme from the standpoint of the European commercial community was put up by Mr. Hugh Molson.

THE ATTACK ON THE TORY LEADER.

It was Viscount Wolmer, son of the Earl of Selborne, who began really to stir things up again when he continued his interrupted speech on Tuesday afternoon. In this harangue the House saw the Tory revolt displayed in all its bitterness. The speaker has the gift of a biting tongue which he used mercilessly in denunciation of Mr. Baldwin for having led his Party into this deplorable mess. But the worst epithet which he could find for his whilom leader was that he was at heart 'a sentimental Liberal.' The diehards cheered vociferously as Lord Wolmer went on with his attack and the man against whom it was directed unconcernedly turned the pages of the little book in his hand.

SIR JOHN SIMON'S CONTRIBUTION.

After a brave effort from Mr. Tom Williams from the Labour benches, the next speaker of real importance was Sir John Simon. He, of course, drew one of the biggest audiences seen during the three days, and he treated his hearers to a characteristically adroit explanation of the connection between his own Report and the White Paper, leaving most of us in no doubt that the one developed

very naturally out of the other. Indeed, one might have thought that the main achievement of this day's discussion was to be the rescuing of many of the provisions of the Simon Report. The brilliant advocate was at pains to show how very reasonable and logical his own recommendations were, and how proper it was that the adhesion of the Princes to the principle of Federation should call for such adjustments of the scheme he had devised, as were indicated in the White Paper. The one grew from the other.

Sir John was not at all embarrassed by the preference which had been given to the Round Table alterations, or, anyhow, he gave the impression that he was not. The reactionaries scowled at him, but his clever speech did go a long way to convince an admiring majority that his work, after all, remained one of the most important elements in the present developments.

It must be said in justice to the Foreign Secretary, that he emphasized more than any other speaker the essential unity of the Indian Peninsula. He proved himself to be not a mere provincialist, but one who wanted to see the creation of a greater India superior to all its parts. On the other hand, all this was treated as some far-off achievement which might take a very long time to realise. He made it all depend upon what happened to federation. If this was to materialise in the near future Parliament ought to seize the opportunity of establishing the greater India which might come into being in such circumstances. But if nothing came of Federation the Government would not proceed with the grant of responsibility at the Centre.

This was one of the most direct statements made from the Government bench during the whole debate, and everyone recognized its importance. It really meant that unless the Princes are coming in now to buttress the whole edifice, there will be nothing for British India but provincial autonomy as provided by the Statutory Commission. Central self-government will be put on the shelf for an indefinite period of time.

THE LABOUR PARTY'S AMENDMENT.

After Sir John Simon there was a characteristic explosion from Colonel Wedgwood, who is never afraid to take his own line—and always an eccentric one. Combined with many admirable qualities, this knight-errant of individualism (who was once counted with the Socialists) displays the most paradoxical vagaries. His denunciation of the White Paper as an abdication of Parliamentary control drew cheers from the diehards, who were equally delighted with the strictures he passed upon Indian politicians. They were not so sure of him when he went on to include the Indian Princes and all the propertied classes in his diatribe; neither did they seem particularly interested in his advocacy of universal suffrage. It was hard to tell, in fact, what the honourable and gallant member was really driving at. His speech was a strange mixture of sound sense and wild denunciations, indiscriminately applied.

Nothing of much interest happened after that until the third day, when Mr. Butler, new Under Secretary, resumed the debate in a speech which won encomiums all round. His appeal to the young men of Britain and India to get together behind a constructive policy struck rather a new note.

Mr. Morgan Jones made a good fighting speech in moving the official Labour amendment. This invited the House to declare that India ought to be raised to the status of an equal partner in the British Commonwealth of Nations; that any constitution should command the assent of the people of India, that the representatives to be consulted should be

drawn from all sections of Indian opinion; and that those under arrest for political offences should be released. The arguments in support of these propositions were effectively set out, and subsequent speakers were given a case to answer, which none of them seemed willing to respond to.

MR. CHURCHILL COMES A CROPPER.

Instead of facing the vital issues raised in the amendment of the official Opposition, the House was led off into the by-ways of internecine controversy by Mr. Winston Churchill. Most members were apparently looking to him to provide entertainment, and, needless to say, they got it. They flocked in from all quarters when he stood up to speak; for his antagonists are always as eager to hear him as his partisans.

Mr. Churchill did not concern himself at all with the case which Mr. Morgan Jones had made in demonstration of India's right to the substantial determination of her own political future. He had other things to say directed mainly against the present leaders of the Conservative Party, with special reference to Mr. Baldwin. In so far as this speech of the diehard chief was an arraignment of political India and a dissection of the White Paper, it contained nothing new, despite the elaborate preparation which had obviously been given to it. Some smart quips and sneers at the outset won laughter and applause, but the real emptiness of the performance became manifest as it proceeded. It soon became evident that the Government had little to fear from the damp squibs of this played-out word-producer. Even his own friends lost the heart to cheer as the tirade went on. Some of them had stated the objections to self-government and federalism much more effectively than he did, and as a critical analysis of the White Paper itself his speech was a lamentable failure.

But the real storm burst—though its interest was mostly domestic—when he suggested that the Government had been doing their best to pack the Indian Services (as they would pack the Joint Committee) with squeezable placemen of their own. This was a piece of folly on the part of Mr. Churchill. It did little to advance his own case, and it angered the supporters of the Government beyond measure, besides alienating some of those who were disposed to take his view on other grounds.

The main problem was forgotten in the recriminations which ensued. For the next half hour there was nothing but a ding-dong of altercation between Mr. Churchill and the supporters of the Government. Sir Wardlaw Milne was accused of "acting the bully" because he asked Mr. Churchill for his authority. The latter's suggestion that he was being bullied by others remembering his own capacity in that direction convulsed the House with laughter, and after that it seemed that the offending chief of the diehards could do nothing to retrieve his position. The attack fizzled out, and Mr. Churchill sank into his corner a spent man. It was somewhat reminiscent of his father's eclipse many years ago. It hardly needed the humour and pointed barbs of Lord Winterton to complete the discomfiture of a crestfallen politician.

All that had just passed was very amusing to the onlookers, but, as Lord Winterton admitted, there was nothing much in it beyond the washing of some dirty Tory linen in public.

When Mr. Lansbury rose in a quiet dignified way, he recalled the House to the real business in hand. He was listened to with sympathetic attention. When he sat down Mr. Baldwin paid a tribute in the name of the whole House to the courage

of Mr. Lansbury in coming and addressing the House that day, the day of his wife's funeral, and offered the profound sympathy of the House to him.

Mr. Maxton had earlier in the afternoon put in an uncompromising case for the complete independence of India, but his was an isolated position. No one took it seriously and one wondered if even the Indian extremist would have accepted the demands for India that Mr. Maxton endeavoured to make. We should all probably look in vain for support for such proposals for India as would "wipe out the rule of their Princes" and to make the fight that of the "common people of India."

Mr. Baldwin in winding up the debate did so in a short but pithy speech. He knew he said, the difficulties ahead, and that upon the Joint Committee which will be set up almost at once would be laid one of the greatest responsibilities ever placed upon a body representing both Houses of Parliament. "Let this work," he said in conclusion, "be taken in hand in a spirit conscious of its responsibility, but determined to do its best for this country, for India and for the Empire."

The voting carried little surprise with it beyond that of seeing that the diehard group had less support than it was anticipated it would have. The Government carried its proposal easily along, and what has become evident as a result of the debate is, that the diehard element has no greater likelihood of success in any obstructionist methods it may put forward in the future.

THE PRESS COMMENTS.

On the whole the Press has been fairly careful in its comments on the debate. A tremendous amount of matter has been poured forth, and no one could plead ignorance of the importance of the Indian question before the country. But only the trained journalist has attempted really to deal with it. The other papers have confined themselves to reports of the speeches and remarks on the speakers.

A criticism worthy of note that has come from many sources is not so much our treatment of India and the White Paper, but one that is fundamental. We have seen democracy, the pride of the West, fail in quite a number of countries during the last few years; even America has now come under a Dictator. How then can a Constitution framed on democratic lines that has failed so often in the countries where it looked most likely to prosper be made to succeed?

But again comes the reply. We must go forward and taking the only path we know, another great experiment in the modern conception of democracy seems likely to be made.

Review.

SEX EQUALITY.

JAMES STANSFELD. By J. L. & B. HAMMOND (Longmans, London.) 1932. 23cm. 312p. 15/-
A VERY readable book, written in a matter-of-fact way without any hero-worship which is generally common to writers of biographies. It gives a picture chiefly of the battle waged against the Contagious Diseases Act by Josephine Butler and James Stansfeld. We are thankful to the authors for having rescued from comparative oblivion a figure which deserves to be honoured as a great idealist. Stansfeld

fought for a cause which was not only distasteful but unfashionable in the prudish society of the Victorian age, which explains the silence of the contemporary chroniclers regarding the fight as well as its leader. Even in our so-called progressive times, there will not be found many politicians of first-rank who are willing to sacrifice their political career, especially after attaining cabinet rank, on account of their idealism. Stansfeld's work both in and out of Parliament finally removed from the statute book the laws which gave unrestricted powers to the police for examination and detention of prostitutes in garrison towns and naval bases in England. Later on the abominable conditions in the Crown Colonies and in the Indian Cantonments drew Stansfeld's attention and it is mostly due to him and his supporters that these have now been greatly modified.

As to the problem raised by the Contagious Diseases Act, it still remains unsolved and social thinkers are still found who think state-regulated and state-recognised prostitution a necessity for social welfare. The problem however has lost most of its difficulties after the discovery of sure means of preventing contagion. If at all the state is conscientious in its desire to safeguard the health of its citizens a large-scale propaganda for the use of preventives for venereal diseases, provision of automatic machines for the sale of the preventives, free treatment in decent hospitals and similar methods are the obvious course. It is however a great pity that a movement started by Stansfeld with his advanced and liberal thinking should now be in the hands of people who have made it today the chief factor against propaganda for the prevention of venereal diseases. That nobody is allowed to sell or advertise a preventive in England, although the same medicine can be sold under its chemical name, is only one example of what Stansfeld's movement has come to.

IRAWATI KARVE.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- BOMBAY AND THE SIDIS.** By D. R. BANAJI (Macmillan, Bombay.) 1932. 25cm.
SOME BENGAL VILLAGES. Ed. By N. C. BHATTACHARYYA and L. A. NATESON (University of Calcutta.) 1932. 25cm. 225p.
BANKING AND CURRENCY. By W. J. WESTON. (University of Tutorial Press.) 1932. 20cm. 295p. 6/6.
THE INTERDEPENDENT WORLD AND ITS PROBLEMS. By RAMSAY MUIR. (Oxford University Press.) 20cm. 203p. 5/-
POLITICAL INDIA. 1832-1932. Ed. By SIR JOHN CUMMING. (Oxford University Press.) 1932. 20cm. 324p. 3/6.
INDIAN WOMEN AND ART IN LIFE. By KANAYALAL H. VAKIL. (Taraporewalla, Bombay.) 1933. 25cm. 24p. Rs. 2.
OLD DIARY LEAVES, The Only Authentic History of the Theosophical Society. 5th Series. By HENRY STEEL OLCOTT. (Theosophical Publishing House, Madras.) 1932. 19cm. 531p. Indian Edn. Rs. 4/8 and Foreign Edn. Rs. 5/8.
THE SCIENCE OF SOCIAL ORGANISATION OR THE LAWS OF MANU IN THE LIGHT OF ATMA-VIDYA. By BHAGAVAN DAS. (Theosophical Publishing House, Madras.) 1932. 18cm. 394p.
THE ESSENTIAL UNITY OF ALL RELIGIONS. By BHAGAVAN DAS. (Theosophical Publishing House, Madras.) 1932. 24cm. 279p.