

# The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XVI, No. 29. }

POONA—THURSDAY, JULY 27, 1933.

}	INDIAN	SUBSN.	Rs. 6
	FOREIGN		15s.

## CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK. ... ..	337
ARTICLES :—	
Surrender And Suicide. ... ..	340
Non-Transferability of Paramountcy. By Observer. ... ..	341
President Roosevelt's "Brain Trust." By LIEUT. P. Gopala Kisanayya. ... ..	343
OUR LONDON LETTER. ... ..	344
SHORT NOTICES. ... ..	346
MISCELLANEOUS :	
The Poona Conference—Mr. G. N. Kanitkar's Speeches. ... ..	346
BOOKS RECEIVED. ... ..	348

## Topics of the Week.

### A Notable Utterance.

ON a later page is printed, with the leave of the Acting President of the Congress Mr. Aney, a speech made by Mr. G. N. Kanitkar at the recent Congress Conference in Poona, which shows what a revulsion of feeling has come about in circles genuinely devoted to Congress principles. Mr. Kanitkar is perhaps not much known outside Maharashtra, but whoever knows him will vouch for it that he is one of the very few public men in the country who have a real understanding of and belief in the underlying tenets of Gandhian philosophy. He is probably the most prominent among the active Congress workers in Maharashtra and has suffered long terms of imprisonment every time defiance of law was ordered by the Congress. If Mahatma Gandhi were to select a hundred men fitted by character and discipline for launching individual civil disobedience, he would ordinarily have given to Mr. Kanitkar a high place on this list, for surely Balukaka Kanitkar is, if anyone, "ready for every suffering" postulated by Mr. Aney. But he has now come to realise that this sacrifice would in the present circumstances be wholly fruitless—and worse than that—because so much hard and strenuous work in the constructive line remains to be done. His is a moving plea for a re-orientation of the Congress policy suited to the changed conditions that exist to-day, and we hope it will receive at the hands of brother-Congressmen their most earnest consideration.

### Dominion Status in doubt ?

HAS India been promised Dominion Status? If so, when is she to attain it? These questions formed the subject of some obiter dicta by the British members of the Joint Select Committee which are none too hope-inspiring for the future of this land. Lord Salisbury who may be regarded as a representative of the Churchill or die-hard school went out of his way to stress the absence of any pledge. When confronted with Lord Irwin's historic declaration of October 1929, stating that Dominion Status was the logical outcome of the pronouncement of policy of 1917, he had the hardihood to reply that it had no greater authority than the opinion of an individual which Parliament can, if it so chose, set aside. Lord Irwin did not try to resile from the pledge he had given in 1929 under the authority of His Majesty's Government but added there was no commitment as regards the time within which India was to take her place among the Dominions.

If we look only to the letter of his pronouncement it cannot be denied that the position is correctly described by him. At the same time it is also true that the absence of any mention of a time-limit in no way indicates the indefinite postponement of the achievement by this country of the status of a Dominion. That this cannot be so is clear from the extraordinary expedition with which Lord Irwin proceeded about the whole business. If the conferment of Dominion self-government on India was a question of decades of years if not of centuries, it is a puzzle to us why he put himself to the trouble of undertaking a special trip to England in the middle of his term. The question might as well have stood over till he was back in his own country after retirement, and had greater leisure to persuade British opinion to see eye to eye with him. Moreover his declaration was not by way of an offer made to the Indian people by the British Government in a fit of altruism or absent-mindedness. It was clearly intended as a measure of political appeasement which, it is not unfair to assume, Lord Irwin on the strength of his personal knowledge of Indian feeling must have represented to the British Government to be urgently called for. To try to make too much of the absence of a time-limit in his declaration, as was done on this occasion, is to run counter to the spirit in which the declaration was conceived.

But there is really no need for anybody to speculate on this point. For speaking six years ago at

a Labour Conference, the present Prime Minister, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald said: "I hope that *within a period of months rather than of years*, there will be a new Dominion added to the Commonwealth of our Nations, a Dominion of another race, a Dominion that will find self-respect as an equal within this Commonwealth. I refer to India." (Italics ours.) This utterance shows beyond doubt what was in the mind of those in high places in Britain. They were not thinking in terms of decades or centuries, nor even of years, but of months when considering this question of Indian Dominionhood. In face of all this, how can anybody, much less the author of the declaration itself, point to the absence of a specific time-limit with a view to suggesting that Dominion Status could be withheld from India for very long? No, such a thing is unthinkable, especially after all the hopes raised in India during recent years by Lord Irwin's pronouncement. And, then again, what did the present Viceroy Lord Willingdon mean when in one of his earliest speeches in India on assuming the Viceroyalty he expressed the hope of being the first constitutional Governor-General of this country? His utterance also lends strong support to the view universally held in this country that Dominion Status is now almost within our grasp.

#### India in the Commons.

AS was only natural, recent events in India largely engaged the attention of the House of Commons in the debate raised by Mr. Lansbury on his out motion in the India Office estimates last week. Sir Samuel Hoare, pleading for the continuance of a policy of firmness, upheld the Viceroy's action in refusing to receive the Mahatma even for a discussion of the restoration of peace—a view which the Opposition led by Mr. Lansbury strongly repudiated. Its contention apparently was that, whatever the nature of the reports in the possession of the Government about the doings of the recent Congress workers' Conference in Poona, Mahatma Gandhi's request for an interview with Lord Willingdon was with no other intention than that of discussing with him the means of re-establishing peaceful conditions in India; and as such it should not have been turned down. There is no doubt Mr. Lansbury represented a large volume of Indian opinion in pressing this view. He also hotly contested Sir Samuel Hoare's claim that the Congress had been crushed, thanks to the Government's dual policy. Mr. Lansbury took care to make it clear that his information about conditions in India was derived, not from irresponsible or unreliable sources, but from the Indian delegates on the Joint Select Committee, none of whom endorsed the Secretary of State's view of the Indian situation. As has been pointed out repeatedly, the fact is that though the Congress as an organisation has been brought under owing to the rigorous enforcement of draconian laws and ordinances, greatly restrictive of the freedom of the press and public meetings, the spirit of nationalism and resistance to Government has not been killed.

Dwelling upon the success of the dual policy, Sir Samuel Hoare remarked that the Government followed the path of co-operation with friends in India. If all that he meant was that these so-called friends were not being handled as Congressmen were, the statement is certainly unobjectionable. But if

he intended to convey thereby a greater responsiveness on the part of the Government to their counsel, we are afraid the statement does not accord with facts. If the Government had been all along co-operating with their friends in this spirit, they would have had many more friends left for them in India, which would have greatly weakened the non-co-operation cult, even if it had not rendered its initiation impossible. To go no further back than the present constitutional discussions, the Government have displayed a consistent disregard of the advice of its friends. They have thus to thank none but themselves if as a result of this flouting of friendly public opinion the Indian constitution as it emerges from the Joint Select Committee meets with stout opposition in India.

\* \* \*

#### The late Mr. Sen-Gupta.

THE death of Mr. J. M. Sen-Gupta at Ranchi on Saturday last will be deeply mourned as a great national calamity. Besides being a distinguished lawyer, he was a no less distinguished politician who rose to enviable fame after the death of Mr. C. R. Das. To the Swarajists in Bengal he was a tower of strength. As leader of the Opposition in the Bengal Legislative Council the late Bengali leader had a good record of work to his credit. He was for a time the Mayor of the Calcutta Municipal Corporation, to which he rendered valuable services. Mr. Sen-Gupta acted as the chairman of the Reception Committee of the memorable Congress Session of 1928 held at Calcutta, over which the late Pandit Motilal Nehru presided. He took a prominent part in the deliberations of the All-Parties Conference also held there just before the Congress session. It will be remembered that it was at this Conference that the Nehru report was adopted as the national demand. A section of opinion represented at the Conference was insistent that India's political goal should be complete independence and not Dominion Status. It may be recalled that Mr. Sen-Gupta with the insight of a true politician threw the whole weight of his personality in favour of the latter in preference to the former; and in doing so, he showed himself to be a faithful disciple of the late Mr. Des. The civil disobedience movement of three years ago claimed his unquestioning allegiance and in due course he found himself behind prison bars. Prison life was stated to have damaged his health beyond repair and even his European visit undertaken with a view to the recuperation of his health was believed not to have done him much good. On his return he was arrested in Bombay as a State prisoner under the notorious Bengal Regulation of 1818 and detained at Darjeeling. His health however never improved, with the result that he had to die not as a free man but as a State prisoner. Genuine sympathy will be felt in all quarters for Mrs. Sen-Gupta who, though a Westerner, showed by her conduct on more than one occasion that she shared her husband's ambitions and ideals to the full.

\* \* \*

#### Harijans and Temple Entry.

WE had occasion to comment on the Madras Government's circular to its officials that they should not take active part in the movement for the uplift of the Harijans. The Madras Government has since made its position clear by issuing a press communique. It draws attention to certain measures taken by the Government granting equality of public facilities to Harijans with the caste Hindus. The Government has further given notice of an amend-

ment of the Madras Local Boards Act in order to bring it in line with the recent amendment of the Madras District Municipalities Act, by which all wells, tanks and reservoirs which are not private property will be thrown open to all persons irrespective of caste. Obstruction to the exercise of this right will be penalised. If the amendment is carried, as we hope it will be, Harijans will have equal rights with caste Hindus in rural as well as in urban areas. The sincerity and zeal of the Madras Government in the matter of the uplift of the Harijans is beyond question; Madras ranks only next to Mysore in this respect.

Nevertheless, the Madras Government found it necessary to prohibit its employees from taking active part in the Harijan movement inaugurated by Mahatma Gandhi because of the highly controversial character of the semi-religious question of temple-entry. While the social, economic and political amelioration of the Harijans is common ground between the Government and the reformers, and even the Sanatanists, temple-entry, rightly or wrongly, happens to be a dividing force. Since the cooperation of the Government is of the utmost value to the cause of Harijan uplift, it seems advisable that temple-entry should be separated from other forms of Harijan uplift and entrusted to a different body, even as the khaddar propaganda initiated by the Congress was subsequently separated and put under the All-India Spinners' Association. Under such an arrangement both aspects of the cause will thrive.

#### Social Legislation.

It appears that the Baroda Government propose to introduce a bill to penalise social customs which stand in the way of the assimilation of the various castes and communities in the State. Sensibly enough, the bill is of a negative character and aims at removing restrictions that now cramp the social liberty of the people rather than laying a positive injunction on them. Customary law operated by caste panchayats which are of a restrictive character will be declared null and void and penalties imposed on those who persist in enforcing them. This is all to the good, though it would be foolish to be too optimistic about the rapid achievement of the objects of the bill. Presiding over the anniversary of the Widow Marriage Act in Bombay the other day, Mr. Justice Divatia mournfully observed that though the Hindu Widow Re-Marriage Act was passed as long ago as 1856, the rigour of custom forbidding the re-marriage of widows had not materially abated and that, according to the last census, there were nearly three lakhs of widows under 25 years of age!

The Indore Durbar is reported to contemplate a piece of social legislation intended to prohibit the ruinous expenditure on weddings and other social events. The Indore bill proposes to penalise those who give more than two caste dinners or invite more than fifty guests on such occasions. If this be true, it is a most preposterous and unwarranted interference with the liberty of the individual citizen. The bill is not meant to remove a restriction but to impose one,—a course of action which requires much greater justification than has been vouchsafed so far. However desirable it may be to live within one's means and restrict wasteful expenditure, it is not certainly a matter for legislation to prescribe how many dinners a person may give and how many guests he may invite. Such restriction was, we have been reliably told, attempted in Australia, when Labour ruled, but not by legislation. It appears that a cook told her mistress one afternoon that she could not cook for the dinner party that night as the trade

union rules permitted only two dinner parties a week, and no more! In consequence, the guests and the hosts had to make a picnic party of it. Indore proposes to go one better. The enlightened Maharaja will do better to set an example himself, which will be followed by others, than to interfere by legislation with the social liberty of his subjects in this ridiculous manner. But anything is possible in an Indian State.

Whatever be the merits of such proposals, some of the Indian States are entitled to the credit of being ahead of British India in the matter of social legislation. It would indeed be more gratifying if they were equally go-ahead in the matter of political reform and gave a lead to British India. But of that there is no sign. On the other hand, Indian States, the most progressive among them, are decades behind British India in political evolution.

#### Broadcasting.

SPEAKING at the sixth anniversary of the inauguration of broadcasting in India on Sunday last in Bombay, the Governor of Bombay rightly expatiated on the greater need and wider opportunities of broadcasting in India compared with other countries, because in India the written word has a lesser reach due to the phenomenal illiteracy of her peoples. He referred to two drags on the rapid expansion of broadcasting in India: the number and variety of languages and finance. Each linguistic area is, however, large enough to form a broadcasting unit. And at any rate the drag is not one which holds out hope of being eliminated in time. Finance, however, is a drag that can be eliminated. If we are not mistaken, the Government of India's secretariat has even now a scheme fully worked out for a broadcasting service for the whole of India and the cost is not prohibitive, at any rate, compared with other schemes of lesser public utility that the Government have been able to finance. To promote such a scheme of adult education there should be no serious objection to raising a loan. The Government of India will do well to call together the Education Ministers in the Provinces and hammer out a broadcasting service for the whole of India. If the will was there, finance should not be an insuperable obstacle even in these days of financial depression.

The control and use of the service will, however, be a ticklish proposition, particularly if, as the Bombay Governor wished, the service is to be utilised for the purpose of explaining the policy of the Government. Broadcasting is a powerful weapon to influence the voter and, controlled by Government, particularly in the present circumstances of India, it is liable to unworthy exploitation. It was widely believed in England that the last election was precipitated in favour of the National Government by the last minute speeches of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and Lord Snowden in which they were alleged to have frightened the voters that if they did not vote for the National Government their savings would depreciate enormously! It will also be recalled that Mr. Winston Churchill was again and again refused permission to broadcast a speech on India while others were allowed to do so. In India, broadcasting under Government control is bound to be used only for giving publicity to the speeches of Governors and of officially-inspired persons. It is very unlikely that its use will be lent to, say, Mahatma Gandhi. Broadcasting for political purposes is a questionable advantage anywhere and more so in India to-day.

## Articles.

### SURRENDER AND SUICIDE.

THE Poona Conference convened by Mr. M. S. Aney, the Acting President of the Congress, is a deplorable instance of an utter lack of political sense in the most popular of political organisations in the country, the Indian National Congress. Notwithstanding the seal of secrecy laid on the members of the Conference, enough is known of its proceedings to permit the public to draw reliable conclusions therefrom. The Conference had to discuss the mutual relations between Mahatma Gandhi, the Congress and civil disobedience. The proceedings of the first day made it absolutely clear that the great majority of the delegates were opposed to the continuance of civil disobedience in any form and were anxious that it should be called off on its own merits and irrespective of the attitude of the Government. Vigorous opposition was voiced from the most unexpected quarters, and amongst them, Bombay, which contributed most in men and money. The Mahatma had, on the other hand, made up his mind that, whatever happened, civil disobedience should be continued, if only in a modified form. He was prepared in the last resort to confine it to himself, for to him it was a matter of conscience and religion and not a matter of policy. Civil disobedience was inevitable for him; but he was willing to release the Congress from it. That would mean depriving the Congress of his leadership—a contingency which neither the Mahatma's Cabinet nor the Conference was willing to contemplate. The Congress would suffer very heavily in prestige and influence if the Mahatma abdicated its leadership. The Mahatma and civil disobedience were inseparable; and if the Congress must have the one it must swallow the other. If the Congress is to be involved in the movement, it is obvious that it would create greater impression on the Government if civil disobedience was on a mass-scale and not confined to a few individuals. But the Mahatma was not so keen on impressing the Government as on satisfying his own conscience. He found mass civil disobedience had degenerated on account of secret methods and other causes. He would, therefore, have none of it. There was, thus, hardly any common ground between the Mahatma and the Conference. To sum up the position: the Conference would retain the leadership of the Mahatma but drop civil disobedience, individual or mass; if, however, civil disobedience should be continued, it preferred mass to individual. The Mahatma, on the other hand, would retain civil disobedience but confine it to individuals. He would continue to be associated with the Congress on that condition, failing which, he would withdraw from its leadership, plough his lonely furrow, and let the Congress follow a different course.

In a characteristic speech charged with his own personality and made more powerful by a strong appeal to emotion, the Mahatma asked the Conference

to give up with righteous indignation the defeatist talk of surrender, the unconditional abandonment of civil disobedience. It would mean not merely the admission of the failure of civil disobedience but an abject surrender to a haughty and insolent Government. It was an irresistible plea. It was further reinforced by the passionate appeal of "no surrender" made by the venerable Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, the Bhishma of Indian politics. The combination of the Mahatma and the Pandit was, naturally enough, irresistible; and the Conference, much against its judgment, almost solidly voted against the calling off of civil disobedience unconditionally. The Mahatma's proposition in favour of individual civil disobedience was, however, defeated. The only alternative was the retention of the *status quo ante*. But to give it a more innocent look, the Conference decided to call off civil disobedience on the 1st of August if in the meanwhile the Mahatma came to an honourable settlement with the Viceroy.

The Mahatma promptly telegraphed to the Viceroy for an "unconditional" interview. The Viceroy declined to bargain with the Mahatma the terms for the withdrawal of the "unconstitutional" campaign. It must be withdrawn first. And as Government had reason to believe that the Mahatma was not willing to do so, no useful purpose would be served by an interview. The Mahatma expressed surprise that the Viceroy should have credited unauthorised press reports of confidential proceedings of an informal conference and based his refusal on it and renewed his request for an interview. The Viceroy again refused. Sir Samuel Hoare challenged the Mahatma to deny that he advocated the continuance of civil disobedience. The Mahatma replied evading the direct challenge and drawing a red-herring across the path.

In the meanwhile the Mahatma held daily and prolonged debates with his Cabinet regarding the policy of the Congress. Ultimately he succeeded in imposing his will on them. In flat contradiction to the resolution of the Conference carried by an overwhelming majority, his Cabinet agreed to the indefinite suspension of mass civil disobedience and the adoption of individual civil disobedience. The Mahatma was apparently not impressed with the argument that it required no organisation for purely individual action, that it was wholly unnecessary to commit the whole Congress to civil disobedience if only a few individuals on their own responsibility and initiative were to act upon it. He would insist with a zeal worthy of a better cause on the retention of civil disobedience as the nominal, if wholly unreal, policy of the Congress.

The Mahatma went further and practically dissolved the Congress organisations in the country. Mr. Aney has since issued a statement foreshadowed and practically anticipated by the Mahatma in which, while not unconditionally withdrawing civil disobedience, he advised the discontinuance of mass civil disobedience, including the no-tax and the no-rent campaign, and the abandonment of secret methods of propaganda and the dissolution of the Con-

gress organisations, including the All-India Congress Committee. The right of the individual who may be ready for 'every suffering' was reserved, and Congressmen who wished to do constructive work were permitted to do such work as they were best fitted for.

From every point of view this decision is most lamentable. It is true that the attitude of the Government gave no encouragement to the Mahatma to abandon civil disobedience altogether. The Congress stood to gain nothing from the Government by so doing. There was no prospect of the Congress being at this stage invited to co-operate in the work of the Joint Select Committee. It was a colossal blunder on the part of the Government to refuse to see the Mahatma, though it may be that from the Congress point of view it was an advantage to be denied an interview rather than that the Mahatma should break off negotiations subsequently on some comparatively minor point of difference.

Nobody who knew anything of the temper of the present Government could have been surprised at its unaccommodating attitude. It would have been a gratifying surprise if it had acted otherwise. It would have displayed statesmanship. The only ground, therefore, on which the Congress was justified in basing its decision was other than the attitude of the Government, which was a foregone conclusion. Was it in the interest of the country and the Congress itself to take the line which it ultimately did? The Congress has done exactly what the Government wished it to do and did much more, but without getting any benefit out of it. It surrendered to Government but gracelessly and unprofitably. Government demanded the abandonment of civil disobedience; the Congress

went further and dissolved itself. All that the Congress stood for has been abandoned except the name of civil disobedience. The Government could not have wished for a greater disorganisation of the Congress than what the Congress leaders have themselves brought about. The victory of the Government is complete. The only surprising thing about it is that neither the Government nor the Congress will admit it. Civil disobedience is dead, but the prestige of both is very much alive.

It is not surprising that the futile and self-stultifying tactics of the Congress high command have not won universal acceptance from Congressmen. Some of them continue to rebel against the decision and are exploring other courses of action. In almost every province there are influential Congressmen who contemplate the revival of the Swarajist school of politics, associated with the revered names of C. R. Das and Motilal Nehru. These dissentients are sure to gather some support in the country. But they suffer from the disadvantage that they have no outstanding personality comparable to Mr. Das or Mr. Nehru to lead them today. Nor are they likely to command the funds necessary for the efficient organisation of their party. The net result of it all is the utter demoralisation of all nationalist forces in the country, and in particular, of the one powerful and well-organised party, the Congress. There is nothing to take its place. The communalists and the reactionaries will have a free run of the country. This is where high but impracticable idealism in politics has landed the country. Nobody need be surprised if the British Government plays fast and loose with India's aspirations and whittles down even the White Paper proposals.

## NON-TRANSFERABILITY OF PARAMOUNTCY.

THE demand of the Indian States' people for elective representation in the federal legislature as an essential condition of federation provokes a feeling of ineffable exasperation in the minds of many British Indian leaders. There being not the least chance of its being conceded, it can possibly do no good to the States, but can only put a spoke in the wheels of British Indian self-government, since British statesmen have rightly or wrongly made federation an essential condition of Indian self-government. In spite of this feeling the Conferences of States' people, under the guidance of British Indian politicians themselves, have been reiterating this demand year after year. Nor are these politicians who have lent the weight of their name to the Conferences as Presidents to be lightly set aside as wholly irresponsible and unimportant people; for they are no other than Dewan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao, Mr. C. Y. Chintamani, Babu Ramanand Chatterjee, and Mr. N. C. Kelkar. These would rather have no federation and no self-government for British India (assuming that self-government for British India is bound up with federation) than have a federation dominated by autocratic Princes and the kind of self-government that such a federation would make pos-

sible. The accession of Mr. Kelkar this year to the ranks of politicians who hold this view is full of significance. For, from the antecedents of the political party of which he is now the acknowledged leader, one would have thought that, given a choice between the elimination of British authority and the substitution for it of some Indian authority, however autocratic or oligarchic, Mr. Kelkar would unhesitatingly prefer the latter. In no party's programme did naked and unashamed racialism fill such a large and dominating part as in that founded by the late Mr. Tilak; and if his successor now, with the support of the same party, deliberately rejects what is put forward before the country as the only means of getting rid of the British and their control, may it not be that the federal union that is now proposed between the people in British India and the rulers in Indian States will be of such a character that, without putting the British out, it will put the Princes in? Our hot-gospellers of federation may give a thought to this.

The All-India States' People's Conference introduced a somewhat novel feature in its work this year. Local grievances of the residents of individual States are usually considered in conferences

of those States; but a great many of the grievances are of a similar character and are common to a large number of States. It was therefore decided, on the suggestion of the President, that a general resolution detailing a number of more important grievances should be placed before the Conference and that the speakers, in speaking to it, should give specific instances of injustice and ill-treatment from their own States. General allegations of misrule were rigorously excluded; detailed statements of happenings within the speakers' personal knowledge were called for and the heavy responsibility which they incurred by making such statements was repeatedly pointed out. With all these precautions some thirty speakers gave such a harrowing account of the oppression and misdeeds of the rulers and other officials of their States that it would be incredible if it were not made under the conditions just mentioned. The recital of these cases of gross misgovernment brought the Conference face to face with the question of the suzerain power's intervention. Quite a short time ago the workers in the cause of the States' people, particularly of the Congress persuasion, were not disposed to invoke or even to support the intervention of the British Government in States' affairs. They thought then that their political creed of non-co-operation put them under a disability in this matter. This feeling has now undergone a complete change. There can be no sin, they seem to argue now, in receiving even from a satanic government protection against still more satanic governments. Opinion is now unanimous among all States' workers that the paramountcy of the imperial Government must be maintained intact, and, what is more important, the Government must be pressed to bring it into exercise whenever there is need for it.

The main purpose of the present article, however, is to draw attention to the theory that the States' people have just developed about paramountcy. But before doing so, reference must be made to the theory enunciated by Sir Leslie Scott on behalf of the Princes. Before the appearance of this lawyer upon the scene, it was thought by all in this country, including our own lawyers, that paramountcy properly belonged in the Government of India, and would, like all other subjects dealt with by this Government, be given over to popular control on a grant of self-government to British India. It never dawned upon anyone then that it could possibly be otherwise. Sir Leslie Scott however propounded a new doctrine. It was somewhat like this. Paramountcy really belongs in the Crown and not in the Government of India; and the Crown has no power, even when it turns over the whole of the Government of India to popular control, to transfer paramountcy with it, unless it be with the consent of the States' rulers. For paramountcy consists of a bundle of rights and a bundle of duties. While the former it can transfer at will, the latter it cannot, according to the well-known legal maxim that rights can be transferred, but not duties, except with the consent of those in whose behalf the duties may have been

assumed. The Crown has undertaken by treaty to protect the States and it must continue to fulfil that obligation until the States themselves absolve it from its performance. In order, however, to be in a position to carry out the undertaking, it is necessary for the Crown to keep the armed forces of India under its control. Defence of India therefore is one of those subjects which it will not be legally open to the Crown, however well-disposed it may itself be to this course of action, to transfer for management to the people of British India. Such transfer will require the previous consent of the States, i. e. their rulers. British Indian self-government will thus require the previous consent of the Princes. Not only was it the case that this theory did not lie within the horizon of the British Indian lawyers before it was put forward by Sir Leslie Scott, but they refused to recognise it even after it had been put forward. They wrote elaborate refutations of it. But political circumstances have changed, and so have the opinions of our lawyers on constitutional theories. British Indian lawyers and politicians as a class now accept the Scott thesis. Defence and, therefore, self-government are, as a matter of pure constitutional theory, incapable of being transferred to the British Indian people, without the consent of the rulers of States, in whose behalf the obligation of protecting the States was undertaken by the Crown.

The States' people now say: since you accept this doctrine in its application to the rulers, you must accept it in its application to us too. As the Crown by its position as a paramount power has undertaken to protect the States and their rulers from internal insurrections and external invasions, so has it undertaken to protect the States and their people from the misgovernment of the Princes. And as it would be legally incompetent to the Crown to transfer the performance of its obligation towards the States' rulers to British India, so would it be legally incompetent to it to transfer the performance of its obligation towards the States' people to British India. The Crown is bound by treaty engagements to protect the States, and it is admitted that the consequence of the assumption of this obligation is that it has got to keep the Indian army under its control in order that it may be able to give the promised protection to the Princes, release from this obligation being obtained only by securing the consent of the latter. Similarly, it must be admitted that the Crown must keep the Indian army under its control in order also that it may be able to give to the States' people the protection that has been promised them in treaty, release from this obligation too being obtained by securing the consent of the latter. It is obvious that the duty which the Crown has undertaken by treaty to discharge towards the people of the States, viz., that of protecting them from gross misrule, is not a duty, release from the performance of which can be given by those from whom misrule is to be apprehended. It is not therefore to be supposed that British Indians can secure control over the army only if they get the Princes to consent to it; they must

also get the consent of the States' people. The army may be required for protecting the latter as well as the former. Consent of both will therefore have to be taken before military control can be transferred. It is not therefore as if all obstacles to the transfer of defence would be removed if only a federation is brought about. Then the objection on the side of the Princes alone will have been surmounted, though even with regard to this the Princes say that their consent must not be understood as being given merely because they join the federation; and that their individual consent will have to be expressly taken before military control can be transferred. But, whatever that may be, the objection would still remain after the effectuation of federation, that the people of the States, for whose protection also the Crown has to keep the army under its own undivided control, have not given their consent; and this consent will not be forthcoming until elective representation in the federal legislature is provided for. For the army to be transferred therefore it is just as necessary, under Sir Leslie Scott's theory, which is now accepted both by the British Government and British Indian politicians, to concede the demand of the people as that of the rulers of the States. The All-India States' People's Conference definitely adopted a resolution to the effect that paramountcy and all that it implies should be held incapable of transfer by the Crown until the people in the States are satisfied that the obligation undertaken by it of protecting them from misrule can be otherwise adequately discharged.

This is a matter for jurists to decide, but we are curious to know how our politicians and lawyers, accepting a theory in one aspect, can reject it in another. If it holds good in regard to one obligation, we as mere laymen think that it should hold good in regard to another obligation.

OBSERVER.

### PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S "BRAIN TRUST."

THE professor is now having his day with the Government of the United States. Educators who used to be accused of sitting in their classrooms hundreds of miles away from the capital and telling how the Government ought to be run are being given an opportunity by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to put their theories into practice.

One after another half a dozen College Professors have come to the foreground as drafters of the emergency legislation the President has been presenting to Congress. Mr. Roosevelt has relied heavily on this group in the months he has been in office.

The President's practice of consulting Professors can be traced back through the political campaign and pre-inauguration days. One of his prominent advisers then was Dr. Raymond Moley, professor of public law at Columbia University, who is now Assistant Secretary of State in the Government. Around Dr. Moley has sprung up a whole group of professor advisers. These include Dr. Rexford Tugwell, professor of economics at Columbia

University, who has become Assistant Secretary of Agriculture; Dr. Adolf A. Berle Jr., a Columbia University financial authority who is appointed Government's adviser on railroad legislation, Dr. H. Parker Willis, professor of banking at Columbia University, who helped to draft the Federal Reserve Act of 1913 and has lately been aiding with new banking laws, Dr. Herman Oliphant, professor of law at Johns Hopkins University, who has been appointed general counsel for the Federal Farm Board and Dr. I. Myers of Cornell University who has been appointed assistant to the Chairman of the Federal Farm Board.

The man who drafted the agricultural bill was Dr. Mardecai Ezekiel, economic adviser to the Secretary of Agriculture. While not a college professor, Dr. Ezekiel is the same type of man.

Another recent addition to the professorial staff of the Government is Mr. H. E. Babcock, assistant to the Chairman of the Farm Board in charge of marketing. Mr. Babcock was professor of marketing at Cornell University for two years 1920-22. He left the teaching staff to enter into more active work of co-operative purchasing. He is a trustee of Cornell University.

This group has been under search-light for some time. Political circles in Washington call them "professors" or "the Columbia (University) crowd." A common newspaper phrase for them is the "brain trust", this was used by Mr. Roosevelt himself during his campaign, when they were assisting him with his speeches and providing him with ideas. For a characterisation of their leader I quote, *The New York Times*. The group "is headed by Professor Raymond Moley... He is miles ahead of his fellow collegians in influence (with President Roosevelt) and mental fertility. To him come all the schemes he does not himself invent and he passes on them."

A poetic catalogue of the principals in the "brain trust," done by a newspaper vesifier, runs:

#### OLD SONG, WASHINGTON STYLE.

School days, school days  
Good old golden rule days  
Moley and Tugwell and Dr. Berle,  
Telling us all how to save the world'.

That this group has much influence with President Roosevelt, that Professor Moley sees the President more often and more intimately than any of his other advisers or any Democratic party leader, and that they press the President in a direction contrary to the best of such orthodox Democrats and Conservatives as Secretary of State Cordell Hull, Secretary of the Treasury William Woodin, Senate Leader Joseph T. Robinson, Senator Carter Glass, by far the most important party leader in the Senate—all this is the commonplace observation of every well-informed person in Washington. Speeches in Congress allude to them and to the power ascribed to them. As a leading newspaper man puts it:

"The brain trust is a confident group. Its members almost completely occupy the inner chamber of the President's ear. They produced the farm relief bill... They worked out the currency devalouring and stabilization formula. They sponsor the bill for government supervision of wages, hours of labour and production."

In personal relations, the Professors are agreeable, urbane gentlemen. They are a group to themselves. They are as distant as possible from the Democratic leaders in Congress. Senator Carter Glass has frankly made public his disapproval of some of the measures which the professors inspire. Party Senate Leader Joseph T. Robinson is obliged

to gulp some of the Professors's ideas which are hard to swallow. Democratic heads of important committees in the House of Representatives and Senate have been close to open rebellion against pressing on Congress measures which the Professors have inspired.

The Professors are by no means to be confused with political "radicals." There may be a partial identity of view, or overlapping of ideas, between the academic group around the President, and a very few of the more extreme radicals in Congress. Generally the Democrats in the Congress are a little suspicious of the academic group, vaguely aware that the Professors have a portentous end in view, and disturbed by the very mystery of it. The Democrats in Congress resent the Professors as persons who have come into power through the mere accident of personal association with Mr. Roosevelt, whereas Congressmen feel they have worked for their power and place, have attained their franchise in the normal political way, by submitting their ideas and their personalities to the voters. Aside from that resentment on personal grounds, most of the members of the party would be strongly opposed to the form of social organisation toward which the Professors work.

The Democrats in Congress, while vague about the ultimate objective of the Professors, know pretty well that their programme is about the opposite of everything that Democrats hold high, as contrary as possible to the doctrines of Jefferson. Some Democrats in Congress hold their principles dear; an explosive insurrection against the Professors is distinctly a possibility. "We worked and sweated," one Democratic leader says, "to give the country a Democratic administration. But these Professors are neither Democrats nor Republicans. They don't let us know what they are."

As to the public, I wonder how the average American would feel. Possibly some, especially those of the City worker type, would say in effect: "The politicians have done pretty badly, the business men not much better; let's give the Professors a chance." But so far as the average American would say that, he would mean: "Let's give the Professors a chance to put us back on the old track." Very few average Americans in my opinion would be willing to give the Professors power to set the country on a new track, strange to American ways.

What are the ideas of the Professors who inspire the measures being enacted by the Congress? What is their objective? Towards what changes in the social system do they wish to carry the country?

Here again we have a complexity of terms. One writer says that the Professors are out to "destroy capitalism." The word "destroy" is much too strong to describe the Professors' present intention, though one or two of them may have consciously in mind the getting rid of capitalism as the ultimate objective of their theories. If the American system is to be called capitalism, then the system the left wing of the Roosevelt administration has in mind must be called socialism. But the more appropriate words to describe them would be individualism and collectivism.

But the professors do not have collectivism as their immediate objective. To describe what they propose to do in the immediate present is difficult. A word that appears over and over again in the present changes they are making or advocating, is "Control". There has till now been "controlled" currency, "controlled" prices, "controlled" production in industry—the control being governmental, located at Washington, and exercised by the Professors or by those whom they approve. Another word they often use is "planned." *The Balti-*

*more Sun*, a principal Democratic paper in the country, which is pretty excited against the Professors and the power they exercise, calls them the "planned wing."

Some light is thrown upon what the Professors at Washington have in mind by a book published recently by one of them. The book, of course, is not to be interpreted as an authentic programme. All we can say is that it was written by Professor Rexford Tugwell of Columbia University, now assistant Secretary of Agriculture in the Roosevelt administration. The book's title is, "The Industrial Discipline". It gives a scholarly political philosophy of state control of industries. Throughout the book Dr. Tugwell writes with restraint and with scholarly discipline. Dynamic things are said and advocated in the most dispassionate, disinterested, scholarly and difficult way. In fact the book is a very difficult reading even for a scholar and much more so to an average man. The author all through maintains that he is a liberal. But he proposes a system in which constraint, "control," is a first principle. A pregnant sentence in Professor Tugwell's book reads: "It becomes more and more clear that these freedoms have to be restricted". The Democrats in despair are asking if restriction of freedom marks a liberal.

The Democrats as well as the other parties in the United States feel that the Professors seem to attempt to do something to America without letting America become aware of it until after the thing is done. They think that in a spirit of sportsmanship and good faith the professor controllers ought to tell Americans plainly just where they propose to carry them, and give them a chance to say in advance whether or not they wish to be carried there.

New York.

P. GOPALA KRISANAYYA.

---

## Our London Letter.

---

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, July 14.

INDIAN NEWS.

AT the time of writing we are still awaiting the result of the Congress meeting at Poona. The report seems to be confirmed that, instead of accepting the view that civil disobedience is dead, and that its resuscitation as a mass movement would be unpopular if not quite unsuccessful, Mahatma Gandhi has upset his colleagues by urging them to substitute a system of individual civil disobedience by the selection of a hundred tried colleagues and followers who would be willing to act as exemplars of the cult, with a view to keeping civil disobedience as a principle before the country and in order to attract the sympathies of the outside world to the cause of Swaraj and of Indian nationalism. Such a recommendation seems to have little, if anything, to recommend it, and it is extremely doubtful if a scheme of this kind would have any moral support at all abroad, where, except in narrow radical and theoretical circles, it would in all likelihood remain unobserved and without influence in the direction desired by Gandhiji. Apart from that objection, it is inconceivable that it would result in any better relations between the Government and the Congress. Almost inevitably the Government would take the line that they cannot possibly recognise a Congress decision that would in effect merely mean the suspension of mass civil disobedience for an in-



definite period, whilst experts in civil disobedience were being created under the ægis of the Congress or were perfecting their technique in order that, at some indefinite date in the future, a fresh concerted mass movement of civil disobedience might be organised by them at different centres in India. Observers who have recently come here from India have reported the general conviction said to have been expressed yesterday by Mrs. Hansa Mehta that the civil disobedience movement was dead long before it was technically suspended by Mahatmaji at the beginning of his fast. If that be in truth the fact and if there be a widespread feeling among Congressmen in all parts of India that the new instrument for the expression of Congress policy ought to be forged in the light of whatever constitutional developments may come into operation within the next two years, it would seem that Congress would be stultifying itself by adopting Mahatmaji's recommendation. Notwithstanding the strong personal authority that he wields he has been so long out of touch with events in the country that it is hoped that those of his colleagues and his non-Congress friends who are more closely in touch with the desires of the nation will prevail and that he will be persuaded to bow to their judgment.

Meanwhile it would be interesting to know the origin of the *canard* to the effect that Mahatma Gandhi had requested an unconditional interview with the Viceroy, but that Lord Willingdon had declined to see him until the Congress had definitely abandoned its association with the unlawful movement of civil disobedience. The report created considerable disturbance in the minds of friends here, who were not reassured until they learnt authoritatively that there was no truth in the statement, which was confirmed by an official denial the following day.

#### Later.

Since writing the above a confusion of telegrams has reached here, purporting to give the results of yesterday's discussions among Congress representatives gathered at Poona. It would appear therefrom that no decision has been taken to abandon civil disobedience, but that Mahatma Gandhi has been authorised to communicate with the Viceroy, with a view to discuss with him or his representative the conditions of an honourable settlement, and that depending upon the result of such a request or negotiations arising therefrom, would be determined whether on the 1st August next civil disobedience is to be brought to an end or to be continued. This is distinctly worse than we had been led to expect from messages received from Poona during the previous twenty-four hours from apparently well-informed correspondents, and from which it was possible to deduce that the majority of the Congress leaders present were strongly opposed to continuing civil disobedience and were in favour of calling it off altogether, without prejudice to the right of Congress, if at some future time the circumstances should so require it, to resort once more to civil disobedience as an instrument for the attainment of Congress aims.

It seems almost inconceivable, in view of recent official declarations, that Lord Willingdon will, in the present circumstances, be willing to receive Mr. Gandhi. Well-informed and sympathetic Indians of distinction here would not be at all surprised if the official reply to Mr. Gandhi's request is not substantially as follows:—"The Government of India will refuse to discuss with the Congress or its spokesman so long as it is committed to the support of an unlawful activity." It is a great pity that the Congress decision has taken its present shape, for it now makes it difficult, if not impossible, for an agreement to be reached without commitments on either side,

and saving the face of both parties by simultaneous action such as resulted from the agreement between the British and Soviet Governments regarding the release of the British political prisoners in Moscow and the lifting of the mutual trade boycott. Of course the official view would be that the Congress cannot be recognised as a co-equal negotiator, and that in any case with the failure of the present civil disobedience movement Congress has shot its bolt and the Government will take all necessary steps to prevent or deal with any revival or extension of civil disobedience, on or before August 1. I have summarised here the general views of such Indian friends as I have been able to canvass, in the short time available before the closing of the mail. I have naturally not given the views of those who, whether Indian or British, are ready to support the Congress, right or wrong, or who, because of private Congress sympathies which they are not willing to obtrude, hesitate to make any statement of a critical character. Yesterday's *Manchester Guardian* contained a fairly sympathetic editorial on the general Indian situation, and taking it all in all the editorial in to-day's *Times* is not unfriendly, though it expresses great regret at the indeterminate nature of the Congress decisions.

#### THE SELECT COMMITTEE.

I learn that the Indian Women's Delegation have written to the Secretary of the Joint Select Committee, who had notified them that they should be prepared to give their evidence before a sub-Committee, that, I understand, will be presided over by the Chairman of the Committee, and that would include the Secretary of State for India, that they have no intention of appearing before any subordinate body but only before the Select Committee as a whole. Their reasons are, first, that the question of the franchise rights of Indian women affecting in principle nearly one-half of the total population of British India, are of such vital importance as to require the attention of the Committee as a whole; secondly, that they wish to confront all their opponents and those who are in need of conversion; thirdly, that certain evidence of which they do not entirely approve, has already been given before the full Committee by Miss Eleanor Rathbone, M. P., on her own behalf; fourthly, because the Committee as a whole have already agreed to hear witnesses on behalf of the Hindu Mahasabha and other organisations in regard to matters that have already been discussed one way or another ad nauseam, and whose advocates have been formally represented at every previous stage of the constitutional proceedings whereas, with the exception of Mrs. Naidu in 1931, the Indian women's organisations were, in their opinion, not effectively represented; and sixthly, and lastly, for other good and sufficient reasons into which it is unnecessary to go into detail, but which may be summarised as feminine determination to insist upon the women's point of view being properly heard and considered. My forecast is that the women will win, though it is possible that they may be required to wait over until October for their evidence to be formally taken. It is very improbable that grouse-killing Tories can be persuaded to remain in London for anything less than a declaration of war after the first week of August, when as much evidence as can be taken after the forthcoming discussions will be heard.

In the meanwhile this week has seen on Tuesday, Thursday and yesterday, the Secretary of State in the witness seat, assisted by Sir Malcolm Hailey and Sir Findlater Stewart, the permanent Under Secretary, submitting to meticulous cross-examination of the proposals contained in the White Paper by both

British members and Indian delegates. From all appearances, this examination will go on for at least another week, if indeed it is completed by then, and not until it is completed will the discussions begin. So far he has stood up well to the British reactionaries, and as firmly supported the general principles contained in the White Paper. Some of his Indian cross-examiners, and notably Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, yesterday, have induced him to reconsider some of the safeguards proposed both on the score of effectiveness and on that of the absence of machinery for their operation. I understand that one of the most prominent of the Indian delegates, who is unable to remain here after the 28th July, and who will not thereafter return to London, is submitting to the Committee a lengthy memorandum of the first importance, covering the whole field of the reforms scheme.

### SHORT NOTICES.

**THIS MONEY BUSINESS.** By BERNARD ELLINGER. (King.) 1933. 24cm. 141p. 6/-

PROFESSOR SCHILLER has rather unkindly suggested that economists have of late deliberately cultivated unintelligibility by wrapping themselves in mysteries of technical jargon. By becoming more technical they have sought to become more unassailable and therefore more authoritative. The result has been that the world has relapsed into its primitive depths of economic ignorance and every economic heresy and delusion which had been exploded by Adam Smith has again become rampant. This was painfully clear at the time of the peace treaties of 1919, which imposed economically preposterous conditions on defeated Germany. This colossal ignorance of elementary economics on the part of the public is a serious danger and the task of interpreting economic truths for popular understanding has

assumed an importance it never possessed before. Mr. Ellinger's work is a successful and creditable attempt of this kind. It is a simple and practical description of the organisation and working of the banking and financial system of the modern civilized world throwing much light on the important bearing which international monetary problems have on the present economic crisis. Mr. Ellinger has based his exposition largely on the evidence heard by the Macmillan Committee on finance and industry which, however, is much too bulky and inaccessible for the ordinary student and the busy citizen. Even the professional teacher of economics will find much that is helpful in this valuable little volume which must be hailed as a notable effort to substitute thoughtful economics for popular economics in one of the most important branches of the subject.

G. B. JATHAR.

### THE STRUGGLE FOR FIVE YEARS IN FOUR

Ed. by L. KOGAN. (State Publishing House of Fine Arts, Moscow.) 20cm.

THE book contains 64 charts representing the way in which the Five-Year Plan in U.S.S.R. has been functioning. Each chart shows the progress made in a particular industry or line of business and in each case apt symbols have been used to indicate the quantitative progress made in each industry. A study of the charts proves that in several directions the original estimates have been exceeded and what was intended to be done in five years has been completed in four. Besides the above, there are also charts representing such things as the reductions made in hours of work, the progress in house-building for workers, the average income of the workers in different industries and so on. The charts are an epitome of Russia at the present day, and for purposes of comparison and ready reference, they are invaluable.

C. V. H. R.

## THE POONA CONFERENCE.

### SPEECHES OF MR. G. N. KANITKAR.

*Below are given two speeches made by Mr. G. N. Kanitkar, a well-known Congress worker of Poona, at the Congress Conference held in Poona between the 12th and 14th of this month. The first speech was made at the beginning and the second at the close of the Conference. Reference is made to these speeches editorially in the Topics of the Week columns.*

Most revered Mahatmaji, Lokanayak Bapuji Aney, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I AM a humble worker, unknown to many of you. Yet to-day I am taking the liberty to place my views before you. Some may think it a sublime piece of audacity. I would not mind it. My inner voice orders me to have a heart to heart talk with you. You may like it; you may not like it. The nation is looking to you for a proper lead. You are about to take momentous decisions. So I appeal to you to attend to my views for what they are worth.

Just now there are friends having indomitable faith in Civil Disobedience, who admit certain facts. They say, 'Repression has cowed down the masses. Economic depression has helped this phenomenon.' Yet they believe they must persist in C. D. There will again be a revival. The Government will climb down. India will have Swaraj.

I, for myself, cannot understand the logic of this

line of thinking. I believe in self-reliance. Swaraj will never drop down from 10, Downing Street, London. It will grow out of the peasant's hut. This is Mahatmaji's dictum. I swear by it. It ought to guide our future policy.

Self-reliance presupposes training and strict discipline. Mahatmaji has said this time and again. In 1921-22 he appealed to Bardoli not to challenge the might of a great Empire, till certain conditions were fulfilled. The conditions related to Swadeshi, Hindu-Moslem unity, untouchability and non-violence.

In 1930-31 Mahatmaji, the Dictator, challenged the might of a great Empire, even though, according to my knowledge the above conditions were only partially fulfilled. It was a fair trial of the nation's strength. The response was indeed magnificent. But it could not, in the very nature of things, be so effective as to force an alien bureaucracy into abdication of power. It always pays to be wise by experience.

For a time C. D. bewildered the Government, threw it into confusion and stampeded Lord Irwin into a pact with the Congress. The whole bureaucracy resented it and was bent on wrecking it. The pact is now a thing of the past. The number of Civil Resisters in jails has dwindled down to a few thousands. Tens of thousands of Satyagrahis released from the jails, have not cared to return there

New recruits have not come forward. It is the writing on the wall. In Mahatmaji's words 'the battery must be refilled.'

If friends, instead of facing realities, persist on harping on the same tune of C. D., they are sure to find themselves in a blind alley, which leads nowhere; and then there will be nothing to choose between them and the terrorists, who pursue their own tactics even though they do not seriously expect Swaraj to come out of them.

Peasant Maharashtra, not the Maharashtra of the learned few, tried to connect the links between C. D. and Swaraj and failed. In 1930-31 hundreds of peasants from this province filled the jails. Tens of thousands of them took part in jungle-Satyagraha, knowing full well that by this action of theirs they were courting not only imprisonment but even death by firing. The Government had no jail accommodation for them.

In the second campaign the number of civil resisters from the villages was comparatively very small. The main reason was this. They were promised certain results. They were told Swaraj was coming. Their condition would be improved. The land and other taxes would be reduced. Juagale fees would go; and so on. To their utter discomfiture every thing went amiss. Swaraj did not arrive. In its place there was great repression. They were unused to it. Their leaders being in jails, there was nobody to help and guide them. They were non-plussed. To add to this the prices of corn and other commodities went abnormally down. They found it almost impossible to meet their cash liabilities. Land-revenue could not be paid. The land-lords did not get their rents, nor the money-lenders their interest. The peasants had to sell their pots, cattle, trinkets and all possible other forms of moveable property. They have mortgaged their lands and borrowed money at high rates of interest and God alone knows how they are going to get out of this plight. They are faced with complete ruin.

With these facts staring the nation hard in the face, one is at a loss to know how the continuation of C. D. is going to help the nation to reach its goal. It is no use indulging in deceptive heroics by trying to conceal realities from one's own self or from responsible leaders like you.

So far as I know, the majority of Congressmen, at least in Maharashtra, voted for C. D. not in a spirit of blind adoration but because they believed that some tangible good would come out of it, not in the distant future but immediately. Theirs was quite a utilitarian point of view. Three years was the period, in which Swaraj was promised to them, in 1930. To-day is the 12th of July 1933, and Swaraj is as distant as ever. There must be something wrong somewhere. It is high time for us to take stock and revise our policy, so far as C. D. is concerned.

(2) There are other friends, who swear by the Councils. They stake everything on them. I differ from them also. This remedy, too, falls far short of the actual needs of the situation. Yet to-day I am against boycotting the new Councils. I firmly believe that as many seats as possible must be captured and that, too, not with a view of wrecking the Councils, but of actually working them for what they are worth. They will be just big, provincial municipalities and ought to be utilised as far as possible for ameliorating the condition of the half-starved, ignorant millions.

The powers and resources at the disposal of the new Councils are bound to be very limited. So I do not expect much substantial work from them. Still I want them to be captured and worked for prevent-

ing the mischief, likely to be done by incompetent, self-seeking representatives, not trained in the methods of real democracy. I want the Councils to be manned by genuine patriots. The last two C. D. movements have showed us who is who. We have now a very large number of persons who have proved their bona-fides by suffering for their motherland. By their very temperament and circumstances some of them will not find themselves fit for the spade work of construction and yet who will always remain true to the masses. Why not send them to the Councils?

Let us have a division of labour. The majority of workers should be reserved for the programme of self-reliance outside.

I expect the friends in the Councils to serve as a second line of defence for the workers outside and to give them a helping hand, when possible. The constructive workers are sure to be handicapped in their efforts, if the Councils are packed with self-centred, inefficient, interested busibodies, who will have their own axe to grind. Not only will they obstruct the constructive programme at every step but they will also so grossly mismanage the affairs of the whole country that after a period of say five or ten years the masses will again sigh for the old comparatively well-ordered regime of pre-reform days.

To add to all this, foreign capitalists, with the help of interested parties in India, both Indian and other, will manage to get from the new Councils, packed with the busibodies mentioned above, as many concessions as possible for their commercial, industrial as well as agricultural adventures and will try their best to create one hundred times more vested interests and are sure to demand one hundred times more safeguards, when the proposed transition period is over. In fact the India of the post-transition period will be an even more consolidated unit of the British Empire, not much dissimilar to the other units, like the Australian Commonwealth, the South African Union and the Dominion of Canada. The major portion of the Indian population will be not much better off than the Zulus, the Hottentots, the Kaffirs and the Maoris of Africa and Australia. The only way to prevent this is, in my opinion, to embark on a policy, which I have tried to indicate below.

I hold that we should at once withdraw the C. D. movement indefinitely without any reference to any sign or gesture from the Government. We should at once place an all-comprehensive programme before the country. A much enlarged constructive programme of town and village organisation, on lines mentioned in the printed English pamphlet, which I got distributed among you before you entered this Hall, should be one plank of this programme. Of course additions and alterations will have to be made. The programme of capturing and working the new Councils should be the other plank of this all-inclusive plan. All talk of C. D. and non-co-operation, all talk of bluff and bluster, should be put a stop to. The whole attention and energies of the nation should be concentrated on the carrying out of this plan. The whole nation—the classes as well as the masses—should be asked and trained to regulate their lives in a manner, suited to the present circumstances of the country. That the average daily income of an Indian is not more than seven pice should never be forgotten.

There should be an all-embracing party, formed not on communal but national lines, with its own manifesto, outlining its general principles and discipline. The members, whether doing constructive work outside the Councils, or working in the Councils, should observe all the rules of the party.

and should try to propagate its tenets by precept and example. The members in the Councils should help the constructive programme to the best of their ability, so far as the different items such as Khaddar, Hindu-Moslem unity, removal of untouchability, the creation and preservation of a non-violent atmosphere, spread of literacy, physical culture, improvement of agriculture, sanitation, establishment of Panthayats etc. are concerned. The members outside should in their turn try their level best to help and strengthen the hands of those who work in the Councils. The ultimate aim of the party should be systematic nation-building with a view to the attainment of real Swaraj within a measurable period of time.

In conclusion, I appeal to you, Mahatmaji and other leaders, on bended knees, not to make a fetish of C. D. in the present helpless condition of the masses. Mahatmaji, I know you are a *सत्यवादी*. Whether you are in Yeravda or outside, it is all the same to you. But the masses, believe me, want you outside. It is a question of life and death to them. Their very existence depends on the successful carrying out of the constructive programme. Without you the programme will be just like a motor-car without its dynamo. You suspended C. D. in 1922 after Chawri-chowra. It was a great service done to India. You will have to do it again; and Mahatmaji, you and you alone can do it. It is a very, very bitter pill indeed; sweets never cure ills. And you are the only person in India, who, like the great God Shankara, can gulp down this Halahala poison in the form of the withdrawal of the movement and can allay all the resulting agonies and come scatheless out of this fiery ordeal by chanting the immortal Ramanama in the form of an all-invigorating constructive programme.

In 1921-22 the experiment of C. D. was not tried and so there was some justification for complaining against the suspension. Today the great experiment has been tried, not once but twice. The youths in the country, who longed for some fighting programme, have been given full scope for demonstrating their prowess. The part played by them was, indeed, splendid and something to be proud of. There is not the least shadow of doubt about it. But the penance could not, in the very nature of things, be so effective as to induce the rulers into yielding India an equal partnership in the Commonwealth of Free Nations. India, therefore, must pray to God for better luck next time and, in the meanwhile, must again, for a number of years, wander in the wilderness of self-inflicted tapasya as, Mahatmaji, you so touchingly put it in one of your speeches in the second R. T. C. and then—Then the future, of course, lies in the hands of the Great Almighty.

One last point and I finish. There is the question of prestige, humiliation and so on. I am sure you will not allow yourself to swerve from the clear path of duty by this consideration. India's crucifixion, started 5000 years back when after the Mahabharat war had destroyed the Kshatriya steel fence round India, the great Arjuna could not even defend the women entrusted to his care by Lord Shree Krishna against the attacks of the robbers and freebooters from the North. From that time India has been passing through a series of humiliations, one after another, and no one knows when this process is going to stop. We are paying old debts and will have to do so till the dawn of that glorious day of Purna Swaraj when we will again come into our own. So I am sure

this consideration will not deter you, Mahatmaji and other leaders, from the right step.

Mahatmaji, President, Ladies and Gentlemen,

The speeches delivered by Mahatmaji and Panditji really moved me to tears. They have put so much heart and sincerity into them; but I was not convinced by them. If by the grace of God, Bhagat-singji was allowed to come here, he could as well have moved us all to tears by describing the shame of slavery and by talking about the honour of the motherland. But he also would not have been able to convince me about the efficacy of his methods, although he would have said, "We take our lives into our hands and mount the gallows if necessary for the country. Why do you not follow us?" And, obviously the sufferings of the terrorists are far greater than those of the civil resisters. It is not a question merely of suffering and trying to move other people's hearts by emotional speeches. It is a question of practical politics, a question of the link between the particular method you preach and the attainment of Swaraj. I can't find the missing link between C. D. and Swaraj. Again what suffering is there in the present jails? There was real suffering there when Lokamanya and Sawarkar were there, today there is no jail, no real jail, in Yeravda, Nasik or Sabarmati, whether one is an A class, B class or even a C class prisoner. The real jail is in the seven lacs of Indian villages; the people there have to do hard labour every day of their lives and they can't get sufficient food to eat. Such is not the case with the prisoners in Yeravda or other jails. If you want us to undergo real suffering ask us to go to the seven lacs of prisons in the form of the Indian villages and serve the prisoners who are there. Ask us to teach them either the three R's, spinning or any other desirable thing you like. You say we would not be allowed to do anything there by the Government. If so, so much the better for you. If the Government arrests you and puts you into its own prisons, while you are serving in the villages, your object of filling the jails will be equally effectively achieved. What is the use of courting jails by simply waving a flag or by doing something else like this? I am not ridiculing flag-waving. I have done it myself, I have done my little bit as regards the different aspects of direct action during the last 13 years from the beginning of the Mulshi Satyagraha movement down to the movement of 1932-33. My experience tells me that it is far better to suffer while doing some service to the masses than by courting imprisonment otherwise. So if you at all want to fill the jails, send all the people assembled here to jail through the villages, while serving the masses.

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

- RENASCENT INDIA. By H. C. E. ZACHARIAS. (Allen & Unwin.) 1933 304p. 10/6.  
 THE INDIAN TARIFF PROBLEM IN RELATION TO INDUSTRY AND TAXATION. By HIRENDRA LAL DEY. (Allen & Unwin.) 1933. 304p. 16p.  
 INCOM-TAX MANUAL. (5th Edn.) (Official, Calcutta) 1932. 24cm. 266p. Re 1.  
 COLON CLASSIFICATION. By S. R. RANGNATHAN. (Madras Library Association.) 1933. 22cm. 15/-  
 TREASURE-HOUSE OF LIVING RELIGIOUS SELECTIONS FROM THEIR SACRED SCRIPTURES. Comp. & Ed. By ROBERT ERNEST HUME. (Charles Scribner's Sons.) 1933. 22cm. 493p. 12/6.