

The Servant of India

EDITOR: P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XVII, No. 4 } POONA—THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1934 { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 15 s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	37
ARTICLES :—	
Retrogression.	40
A New Swadeshi.	40
Protection to Sugar.	42
OUR LONDON LETTER.	43
REVIEW :—	
The Living Universe. By Prof. D. D. Vadekar, M. A.	44
SHORT NOTICE.	45
MISCELLANEOUS :—	
The White Paper Scheme—Mr. Srinivasa Sastri's Criticism.	45
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
"Binding the Future." By S. Satyamurti.	48

Topics of the Week.

Divide and Rule.

COMMENTING on Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri's speech delivered last week in Madras on the White Paper, the *Madras Mail* fastened on his sad admission that "if we had lost the battle, we have lost it because we are divided" and with righteous indignation asked why the British Government was denounced for recognising the fact of our division and devising safeguards for the protection of those who demanded them. It is unfortunately too true that, due to historical causes, Indians are prone to divide on communal lines. This tendency is inimical to the growth of democracy and the establishment of responsible government in India, which is her inevitable goal and destiny under British rule. Indian politicians and statesmen of the earlier generation recognised it and strove, not unsuccessfully, to abate, if not to eliminate, this unhealthy tendency in the public life of India. It was difficult enough job in all conscience. Its success depended on the concentrated effort of all the forces, Governmental and other, available in India. It was essential that the Government of the country, with its vast power and patronage, should whole-heartedly second the efforts of the unofficial publicists. What was the contribution of the Government? The partition of Bengal, with its object of creating a Muslim province, was the first great disservice of the Government to the cause of Indian unity and nationalism. It was soon followed by the famous commitment of Lord Minto to the Muslim deputation engineered by those high in the confidence

of the Government, to the utter discomfiture of Lord Morley, who, after a vigorous protest, ultimately succumbed to Simla. One commitment led to another and the coping stone of this policy of divide and rule was the Communal Award, which extended the communal principle to communities which did not ask for it and even protested against it. If a community, like the British in India and the Muslims, is given a privileged position detrimental to national and democratic interests, it is only natural for it, even without tutoring by the Government, to ask for safeguards against the loss of the privilege. If the Government had been a little as solicitous of the demands of the nationalists as of the communalists, there would have been fewer divisions and Mr. Sastri would not have had to lament as he did. India must achieve unity, but it will not be because of any assistance of the Government but in spite of its subtle but very powerful opposition. It is too much to expect a foreign Government to be so noble-minded as to assist the nationalist against the communalist. Exploitation thrives on divisions.

Distressful Bihar.

THE most serious earthquake since 1897 overtook Bihar last week and has taken a shockingly heavy toll of life and property. The quake which is reported to have originated in Assam and Nepal was slightly felt in U. P., Bengal and Bombay; but nowhere else have its results been as disastrous as in Bihar. With some of the worst affected parts being inaccessible and with telegraphic or telephonic communication with them being disorganised, the extent of the loss of life and damage to property occasioned by this appalling calamity cannot yet be accurately ascertained. All that is possible at present is the collection of information about the state of things prevailing there by reconnaissance from the air and we find that this means of getting into touch with the isolated areas is freely resorted to. The information thus gleaned discloses a heart-rending state of affairs. Whole towns and villages have been found to be heaps of ruin, the inhabitants having either escaped in time or been buried under the debris. This presupposes an appallingly heavy death-roll, but official communiques on the situation, while not underrating the loss of property, advise caution in accepting unofficial estimates of mortality due to the quake. Even so it is difficult to resist the conclusion that the loss of life will have to be counted in thousands rather than in hundreds. The heart-felt sympathy of the rest of India goes out to Bihar in the fullest measure in its hour of dire need.

If however Bihar is to be set on its feet again, relief on a very widespread scale must be urgently organised. It is a matter for satisfaction that this is being done without loss of time. The plight in

which Bihar finds itself has evoked practical sympathy in all quarters—from royalty downwards and a relief fund has been started by the Viceroy with commendable promptitude. Offers of help have been made to Bihar by some local Governments and official and non-official agencies are vying with each other in their anxiety to relieve distress. Help from foreign lands is also pouring in. Provision of medical aid is the most crying need and is being arranged for by the local Government by the recruitment of extra doctors—a task in which valuable help is being rendered by the Indian Medical Association. Food shortage there does not seem to be any reason to fear, but water scarcity may be expected. Arrangements for giving shelter and clothing to those who are rendered homeless and helpless must be immediately thought of. All which will need an outlay amounting to, how many lakhs nobody can tell. Though the misfortune has fallen to the lot of unfortunate Bihar, it must be shared with it by other provinces which must leave nothing undone to relieve Bihar's distress. May we appeal to those in a position to help to run to Bihar's rescue as promptly as possible?

* * *

The Princes' Protection Bill.

WHEN the Princes' Protection Bill was brought before the Assembly in September last it encountered strong resistance from popular representatives, their ground of opposition being that its enactment into law would remove the only corrective at present available to misrule in the States. Public opinion, for consulting which its further progress was then held up and which has since expressed itself, has proved to be uniformly hostile to it. And it should further be noted that even officials figure among the opponents of the measure. Mr. Justice Niamatullah of the U. P. and Mr. Justice Rachpal Singh from the Punjab, e. g., disapprove of the bill, because they believe that if it were passed into law it would stop the light of public criticism from falling on the misdeeds of the Princes. This is the only means now open to the people of the States for voicing their unredressed grievances. It goes without saying that its withdrawal which would result from the passage of the Bill would be highly detrimental to public interests. The Deputy Commissioner of Nagpur too takes almost the same view. It is perhaps difficult to count him among the out-and-out opponents of the measure, for he ends up his opinion not by a request for its withdrawal but for its improvement, so that bona-fide criticism of the abuses in the administration of the States would not be stifled. He rightly contends that such would be its effect if it were placed on the statute book without amendment. Opinion in the Punjab seems to be in favour of only those clauses of the bill that seek to penalise any invasions on States' territory by so-called satyagrahi groups of people from British India, as happened not long ago in the case of Kashmir. But for the rest it is not less hostilely disposed to the proposed enactment than opinion in other parts of India. It is also worthy of note that the Bihar Chamber of Commerce, no irresponsible critics of Government's actions by any means, looks upon the measure as perfectly unnecessary and suggests its abandonment. The Hoshangabad Bar Association condemns it as "retrograde and repressive in its character, undesirable and unpalatable in its intent, wide and sweeping in its scope and mischievous and un-British in effect." Who can say that the picture is overdrawn?

These samples selected at random from the collection published by Government provide a fair measure of the public resentment occasioned by this unholy attempt to provide an impenetrable screen

against maladministration prevailing in the generality of the States. It would make a Government which at all cared for public opinion to drop it without a moment's reflection. But it would be too much to expect that kind of responsiveness from the Indian Government as at present constituted. Anyway if hereafter they persist in carrying the measure through a legislature which has long ceased to be representative, they cannot do so without being guilty of a calculated defiance of clearly expressed public opinion. The Princes have found it possible so far to carry on their administrations without the kind of safeguard offered to them by the Bill. Can they not be induced to wait a little longer till the new Federal Government begins functioning? There is no reason to suppose that it will turn a less sympathetic ear to any reasonable demand for protection than the Princes may put forward than the present one. In fact with their own representatives in the Federal Cabinet and Legislature the Princes can the more effectively press their demand. On the other hand, if they insist upon exacting this measure of protection from the present bureaucratic Government they will be antagonising the whole of British India. Is that the way to ensure harmonious and smooth relations between themselves and British India in the future, so necessary for the successful working of the federal government?

* * *

Chittagong in a State of Siege?

THE District Magistrate of Chittagong's recent orders include a prohibition against Hindu Bhadrak youths under 25 living in certain localities in Chittagong from leaving their houses for a whole week. The order gives one the impression that every other Hindu youth in Chittagong was a confirmed terrorist and that their activities had shaken the Bengal Government to its very foundations; but even to official eyes the situation is apparently not so black. For in attempting to furnish a *raison d'être* for the orders at a representative meeting held at Chittagong the next day after their issue, the District Magistrate was constrained to admit that the actual number of terrorists was perhaps very small. His fear however was that they were being assisted by large numbers of people. We do not know how far the fear is well grounded. But even assuming it to be not lacking in foundation, it would be difficult to justify such exceptionally severe restrictions upon the freedom of movement of a large section of the population. Rounding up terrorists and controlling their nefarious activities are matters to which no reasonable objection can be taken by anybody; but to issue exasperatingly vexatious orders of the kind referred to is really to carry matters too far. It serves to penalise large numbers of innocent and law-abiding people for the misdeeds of a very small number of the mischievously-inclined variety. This must be avoided at all costs. We cannot persuade ourselves that this very necessary precaution is observed in connection with these orders. In their ruthless war on terrorism, the authorities must see to it that their measures, so far as their rigour is concerned, do not exceed the strict needs of the situation. For if they did, their execution, while removing one evil, would create another, not less serious by any means, by adding to the existing volume of political discontent.

* * *

Travancore's War on Untouchability.

THE Travancore Government deserves to be complimented upon the progressive nature of their recent orders on the subject of the removal of untouch-

chability. These may generally be said to follow the lines of similar orders issued by the Bombay Government not very long ago. It will be remembered that the problem of Harijan uplift with special reference to their claim to enter Hindu temples on a level of perfect equality with other sections of Hindu society was referred for consideration by the authorities of the State to a Committee. This Committee has now submitted its report. One of the recommendations of the Committee is that the so-called untouchables should be allowed to use wells, tanks, roads, serais, etc. maintained out of State funds without any restriction whatsoever. The Government of the State has notified its acceptance of the recommendation and are devising measures to implement their decision. Another equally radical recommendation of the Committee which has also found favour with the Travancore Government was that the idea of pollution occasioned by a person belonging to the depressed classes coming within a particular distance must be banished from the confines of the State. The necessary corollary is that no expense from public funds should be incurred on the maintenance of roads, watering and feeding places, etc. which are maintained for the benefit of particular sections of Hindu society and from even approaching which persons of the untouchable classes are prohibited by custom. We do hope the orders will not be allowed merely to remain on paper; but that their impartial and strict enforcement will be arranged for. In this case it should not be long before untouchability is completely wiped out from an educationally advanced State like Travancore.

Democratic Dictatorship.

YET another country has gone the way of Italy and Germany. Poland is the latest recruit to the prevailing fashion of "democratic dictatorship." According to the Warsaw Correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, Poland is soon to adopt a new constitution as the result of the labours extending over three years of a Committee of the Party of Marshall Pilsudski, which aims at a "strong executive free from Parliamentary control." The President is to have unlimited power. Cabinet is to be responsible to him and not to the Parliament, which may not even pass a vote of "no confidence" in the Cabinet. The popular Chamber has practically no power to influence the acts of the Executive, the entire power in the State being concentrated in the President and the Cabinet. The President can, after seven years' rule, nominate one of two possible candidates for succession. If his nominee is approved by the special "Electoral College," he becomes the President; if not, a general election will choose between the two nominees of the President and the 'Electoral College'. The "Electoral College" consists of the Speakers of the two legislative Chambers, the Chief Justice, the Commander-in-Chief and seventy-five prominent citizens, of whom fifty are to be chosen by Upper and twenty-five by the Lower Chamber. The Pilsudski Party, which has a majority today, will effectively control the succession to the Presidentship and the people will have no voice in the matter.

The members of the Lower popular Chamber will be elected once in five years on a democratic franchise, while a third of the members of the Upper Chamber will be nominated by the President and the rest elected by the "elite" of the State, consisting of a few thousand winners of the "Cross of Independence" and two thousand ex-soldiers who won the badge of the "Order of Military Virtue." The underlying principle of the composition of the Upper Chamber is that the "elite", "who contribute most to

the State and the general welfare of the country, should have the major part in directing the affairs of the country." The Correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* sums up the constitution by stating that while "claiming still to retain democratic rule," it "actually makes an end of it."

Apparently Sir Samuel Hoare and Marshall Pilsudski have been exchanging notes, not without mutual profit. They are vying with each other in devising constitutions which, while pretending to be democratic, will effectively negate it. In their desire to constitute strong executives free from Parliamentary control, it is hard to say if Sir Samuel has been more successful than his rival in Warsaw.

There is this to be said in favour of the Polish constitution that the dictator there is a native of the soil, while the White Paper of Sir Samuel Hoare provides for the dictatorship of the India Office over India, assisted by the autocratic Indian Princes.

* * *

Working of Bihar Local Boards.

THE working of district boards in Bihar and Orissa during 1932-33 discloses two noteworthy points to which brief reference may usefully be made here. The Monghyr district board carried out an amalgamation of the entire engineering staff in the district with the result that a reduction in the subordinate establishment could be effected without loss of efficiency or dislocation of work. The resulting saving was Rs. 9,000, which cannot be said to be altogether negligible especially during the present hard times. There appears to be no reason why similar measures should not be adopted by other boards to their financial benefit; but there was reported to be general unwillingness on their part to profit by Monghyr's experience. This is deplorable. If the opposition to the trial of the Monghyr experiment were based on any reasonable considerations it would certainly be entitled to weight; but the observations on the point in the Government resolution do not warrant any such inference. It is to be hoped that those who are in the control of these bodies will learn to give public interests the first place in their consideration of the problems connected with their working.

The educational expenditure of local boards showed a drop of a little over Rs. 1½ lakhs; but it is satisfactory to note that it was not accompanied by any setback in educational expansion. The decline in expenditure is largely accounted for by reduced salaries to the teaching staff necessitated by a reduction of 10 per cent. in the Government grant. In spite of the smaller expenditure on education by the boards, the number of schools as also that of the pupils in them increased. It is indeed gratifying to be assured that there is now a livelier realisation on the part of some boards of the importance of female education for national progress. An inadequate supply of trained women teachers is described as "the greatest handicap" in this respect. But the Patna board found a way out of the difficulty by deciding to promote co-education in the primary stage with the consequence that by the end of the year it had as many as 2,000 girls reading in boys' schools. With a view to encouraging the spread of education among the depressed classes, the Patna board also arranged for the free supply to students belonging to these classes of slates, books, etc. In both these respects the Patna board has given a lead which deserves to be widely followed.

* * *

Articles.

RETROGRESSION.

MR. B. DAS has given notice of his intention to move the adjournment of the Legislative Assembly in order to protest against the intention of the British Government to sign in London the Indo-Japanese Trade Agreement instead of permitting the Government of India to sign it in Delhi. This raises a matter of no mean constitutional importance.

It has been affirmed on the highest authority that for inter-imperial and external affairs India was a Dominion, in anticipation of her attaining that status for internal purposes. It is in virtue of this status that India was admitted to the Imperial Conferences and the League of Nations and other international assemblies on a par with the other British Dominions and the independent States. India was permitted to negotiate the Cape Town Agreement direct with South Africa, a Dominion within the British Commonwealth. And now for the first time, she was permitted to treat direct with Japan an independent State. It was not considered necessary that the Indo-South African Agreement should be signed in London by the British Government on behalf of India either on grounds of constitutional propriety or of British interest in the South African Indian question. There is no reason why India should be denied the right to sign the Indo-Japanese Trade Agreement in Delhi. Canada and South Africa have concluded trade agreements direct with the United States and Germany respectively without apparently violating constitutional proprieties.

Moreover, the Imperial Conference of 1923 expressly stated that "bilateral treaties imposing obligations on one part of the Empire only should be signed by a representative of the Government of that part." This expressly confers the constitutional right on India to sign international as well as inter-Dominion agreements. The present insistence of the British Government to sign the Indo-Japanese Trade Agreement in London deliberately runs counter to this resolution. And this retrograde step is being taken at a time when at the Round Table Conferences, even those Indians, who were prepared to reserve foreign relations to the Governor-General, distinguished trade agreements from foreign affairs proper and demanded that the former should be made over to the ministers.

The other ground on which the British Government and its Foreign Office may wish to interfere is to safeguard "the international obligations of the Empire or any fiscal arrangements within the Empire to which His Majesty's Government is a party." This ground applies to every other Dominion as to India. But it did not mean that the British Foreign Office had to sign the trade agreement between Canada and the U. S. A. International and inter-imperial interests must be and have been safeguarded by making representations to the Dominion concerned. In the case of India also, when the Manchester cotton trade put pressure on the Secretary of State to direct the Government of India to abate the tariffs against British cotton manufactures, the Secretary of State replied that he could do no more than make representations to the Government of India and that it was not open to him to order the tariff policy of that Government. The policy, therefore, of influencing the decisions of the Government of India by means of representation is already in vogue and will be no new innovation, derogatory to the British Government. In the present instance, the Government of India is not a "responsible" Government, the creature of an anti-British electorate likely to be either inimical to or unmindful of the commitments of the Empire as a whole, and apparently there was no occasion for even a representation to be made by the British Government to the Government of India. There has been no allegation that the freedom of the representatives of the Government of India had been fettered by instructions from London. And it cannot be that London was ignorant as to what was happening in Delhi. In the circumstances, it is clear that the Indo-Japanese Trade Agreement does not adversely affect any "international obligations of the Empire or any fiscal arrangements within the Empire to which His Majesty's Government is a party."

It may be said that Mr. Das's grievance is more sentimental than substantial inasmuch as the Government of India was allowed full freedom in their negotiations with Japan and it was merely the formality of signing the treaty that has been reserved to the British Government. The sentiment concerns the status of India, of which she is, and rightly, very sensitive. The decision of the British Government is a deliberate rebuff to the aspirations of India. And more. It is a distinct lowering of the status of India, for which there is no justification either of form or substance. It is a gratuitous insult to India.

A NEW SWADESHI.

TILL now the swadeshi propaganda consisted almost exclusively in exhorting the people at large to confine their purchases to home-made goods, even at a sacrifice. No matter how unsatisfactory the goods may be that are offered to the public, no matter how great may be the sacrifice that is entailed on them, they are still adjured in season and out of season to buy Indian and eschew foreign.

Swadeshi, as popularly interpreted, only spells obligations upon the consumer, none upon the producer. The former must buy as dear as may be necessary; the latter may sell as dear as possible. The former must patronise the swadeshi articles of the latter, but the latter may well use foreign materials in making them even when swadeshi materials are available. No stipulations of whatever kind are to be made with

the producer in respect to the treatment he metes out to his workmen; no limitations are to be imposed upon the profits he makes or the manner in which he spends them. All these are matters with which the consumer is to have no concern; his part in this business is only to buy swadeshi goods and to take his chance that the country will by his sacrifice be enabled to advance ever so little in wealth and well-being, though in fact his sacrifice may have resulted only in encouraging industrial inefficiency. Even to such a one-sided appeal the trustful public have responded most nobly; but it is time that the other side of it was put equally strongly and persistently before them. For the true swadeshi gospel has duties to lay upon industrialists as well as consumers, and it will not conduce to the health of our national economy if we neglect to emphasise these duties, as we did woefully in the past.

It is a very encouraging sign that the All-India Swadeshi Sangh, which is doing such useful service in educating the public, has recognised the necessity of carrying on its propaganda in both these directions. At the All-India Conference of Swadeshi Workers held by it in Bombay at the end of last year, it passed resolutions which, among others, drew the public attention to the need, while giving a preference to indigenous goods, of ensuring a decent standard of living to workers engaged in the industry and of safeguarding the interests of the consumers upon whom the policy of swadeshimism entails sacrifices. The resolution relating to the first point is as follows:—

"This Conference is of opinion that while the country is anxious to develop its industries it can on no account countenance any departure from or violation of the recognised and humane standards for the treatment of labour and, in particular, the recognition of the right of association."

The resolution relating to the second point reads thus:—

"This Conference views with grave concern the increasing exploitation of the masses and the consumers by Indian industries enjoying the benefit of protective tariffs and of the swadeshi sentiment which charge high prices and place on the market goods of inferior quality; and it earnestly appeals to those in control of these industries to share the benefit of protection with the consuming public and to adopt the policy of popularising swadeshi products by selling them cheap."

These resolutions, though rather halting and vague, are of good omen in that they indicate a distinct change of outlook on the part of workers in the swadeshi cause. The sacrifice which the consumer is called upon to make will be justified, the resolutions say in effect, only if the industrialist observes certain principles of action. The consumer's duty is no longer absolute; it is contingent upon the performance by the industrialist of his duty. But if this conditional character of what the general public owe to swadeshimism is to be made effective, we must

define more precisely and, what is even more important, must take steps to implement what the industrialist owes to it. It will not be enough merely to say that industry should treat labour in a humane way; some tests of this humane treatment must be specified, and arrangements must be made to inform the consuming public whether any particular industry does or does not satisfy those tests.

To take an instance, the All-India Swadeshi Sangh has framed a definition of swadeshi goods in so far as non-textiles are concerned and is about to frame a definition of swadeshi textiles. Further, the Sangh proposes to constitute an All-India Swadeshi Certifying Board, with power to issue certificates to those manufacturers whose articles fulfil the requirements of the Sangh's definition and whose articles alone it will recognise as swadeshi. It is only these articles that the Sangh will appeal to the public to buy in preference to other bideshi goods. This is good so far it goes; but similarly, the Certifying Board should be charged with the duty of seeing whether any particular manufacturer does or does not fulfil the terms of the Sangh's Labour Code, and issue certificates to those manufacturers only who fulfil them. Just as it will not be incumbent on the public to buy goods which are not certified as swadeshi by the Certifying Board, so it should not be incumbent upon them to buy goods which are not certified by the Board as fulfilling in their manufacture the Labour Code of the Sangh. This Code may at the beginning be quite simple and elementary and may be gradually stiffened afterwards. But unless the public are informed by a competent and trustworthy body like the Sangh whether the minimum requirements of the provisions in regard to labour are satisfied or not, they will have no guidance in determining whether they should extend their patronage to certain goods or withhold it from them. Without some such arrangement, the Sangh's resolution on the subject, however excellent in itself, will remain a pious hope. It will, however, be putting teeth into the resolution if it will remit to its Certifying Board the task of refusing certificates to those firms that fail to enforce its Labour Charter. In the same way the Sangh's appeal to the industrialists to refrain from exploiting the consumers will go unheeded unless it takes upon itself the duty of giving some guidance to the public as to what a fair selling price would be in the case of all industries which enjoy a certain amount of protection. It may in fact go further and place some limit—which may be generous in the beginning—upon the profits earned. But whatever criterion of good conduct on the part of manufacturers be adopted, the Certifying Board must be called upon to say whether the manufacturers concerned satisfy it or not. Unless this is done, exploitation of the consuming public is not likely to be effectively checked.

We would not disguise from the Sangh the fact that it has much harder work to do in guiding public opinion along these lines than in rousing the national sentiment in favour of indigenous goods. Consumers' swadeshi is immensely popular, not so manufacturers'. The people in general have displayed an almost

inexhaustible capacity and desire to undergo sacrifices; the industrialists however have not yet shown themselves capable of even a moderate amount of self-restraint in turning this general trait of our people to good account. Our legislatures too are too much under the domination of the magnates of industry to make it possible to insert conditions relating to labour and the consuming public in legislation granting protection to industry. Every time protection was given either in the form of subsidies or customs duties to industries like textiles, steel or sugar, Mr. N. M. Joshi and a few others have pleaded for such stipulations, but they have always met with scandalously scant support in the Legislative Assembly. But just because the legislatures are so unsympathetic and inconsiderate to the interests of the poorer classes, upon whose enthusiastic support the swadeshi propaganda rests, the Sangh, whose contact with the masses, we are glad to recognise, is close and intimate, must make it its business by its own unofficial agency to sort out the sheep from the goat from among the manufacturers and to tell the public who deserve their patronage and who do not. As a sample of what Mr. Joshi has been trying to do in this direction in the Assembly, we will quote below the amendment moved by him to the Sugar Industry Protection Bill in 1932:—

"Undertakings engaged in the manufacture of sugar shall submit to the Government of India ... a declaration whereby they pledge themselves to keep prices of the articles during the period when such protective duties are in force at such figures as the Government of India may approve.

"Notwithstanding the passing of this Act the protective duties shall not apply unless the condition laid down in (the foregoing) section and the following conditions are found by the Government of India to have been fulfilled.

"Undertakings engaged in the manufacture of sugar shall submit to the Government of India ... a declaration whereby they pledge themselves for the financial year during which the protective duties are in force —

(a) not to pay any fee or equivalent sum to the Directors or management for the said financial year;

(b) not to pay to shareholders and other participants with limited liability a greater sum by way of annual dividend than what they would get at 6 per cent. on the actual capital invested in the undertaking by the persons concerned;

(c) to employ any further surplus in consolidating the position of the undertaking in the manner approved by the Government of India;

(d) not to employ anyone who is not an Indian except with the permission of the Government of India; and

(e) to produce a certificate that the labour conditions in the undertaking are satisfactory from a committee of three persons appointed by the Government of India for that purpose.

"If an undertaking manufacturing sugar fails to perform its duties under (the above) sections within a fixed period the Governor General in Council may impose on those responsible to perform these duties the penalty of a daily fine not exceeding Rs. 1,000."

We do not ask the Sangh either to adopt these propositions wholesale or to rely upon the Government machinery for giving effect to them. Let it have its own machinery and let it prescribe its own standard to the manufacturers; but whatever the machinery and whatever the standard, it must make them an integral part of its policy, and not confine itself merely to encouraging the public to buy swadeshi goods, pointing for the rest to the resolutions we have extracted above, which must remain ineffective till the scope of the Certifying Board is enlarged as suggested by us. A swadeshi movement which requires large sacrifices of the masses but leaves the manufacturers untrammelled can neither succeed nor promote the nation's interests.

PROTECTION TO SUGAR.

HOW coolly it is assumed by industrialists in this country that the emergency surcharge of 25 per cent. on all import duties that is now in force will be continued indefinitely in the interests of the industries concerned even after a recovery has taken place in the revenue position of the Government! The Mody-Clare-Lees pact is being denounced everywhere for no other reason than that the Bombay mill-owners promised not to ask for a retention of the surcharge if and when the Government of India will contemplate its abolition. As if the surcharge was a permanent affair and the millowners had given up something that is already theirs in agreeing not to stand out for the additional protection which the weakness of our financial condition had helped to confer upon them! In fact the leaders of the cotton textile industry in Bombay have done nothing better than to recognise that they must not continue to exploit to their own advantage the crushing load of taxation which the country is patiently bearing on account of the world-wide economic depression. But the leaders in the other centres of the industry apparently want to maintain the present excessive level of taxation in order that they may be enabled to make the country self-sufficient in the matter of clothing—at the cost of the people, and, what is more important, they wish to attain this highly patriotic purpose without having to undergo the somewhat inconvenient scrutiny by either the Tariff Board or the Government.

Similarly, the sugar industry too has made up its mind apparently that the surcharge must be maintained for its own benefit, even if it could be removed in the case of other industries. The Associated Chambers of Commerce at their recent meeting passed a resolution favouring the withdrawal of the surcharge and have brought a veritable 'hornets' nest about their ears by so doing! We have no sympathy whatever with the object which the Chambers had in view in adopting such a resolution. They are

concerned about the surcharge mainly because it puts the import trade in jeopardy. The interests of the import trade have no claims upon our consideration if in the national interests a continuation of the surcharge is desirable. The reason upon which the Chambers' demand for abolishing the surcharge is based and the motive with which it is made are thus wholly unjustifiable, but the critics of the resolution seem to imply that sugar must continue to receive the extra protection that it is now receiving even when, owing to an improvement in the public finances, the country is in a position to forego the surcharge. We hasten to warn these critics and the sugar industry itself that any such presumption would be entirely without warrant.

The only consideration that should weigh with us in determining the continuance or the discontinuance of the surcharge is the state of our finances. If this be such that we can do without the surcharge, the surcharge must go. No other consideration would be relevant. If any industries need protection beyond what is being given them after a full consideration of their position, they will have to make out a case for it, and it will have to be considered as a separate question. If a case is made out to the satisfaction of the legislature, then either a 25 per cent. addition, or more or less than this, will be voted according to the requirements of the industries concerned. But the public must not, and will not, agree either to keep on the surcharge for an indefinite period for all industries because some industries want it or to keep it on for some industries and abolish it for the others. This would mean an extension of the protective system by a side-door, which the people will never tolerate. If the level of protection, already high enough, is to be raised still higher, let it be done in a straightforward manner and after a full and open inquiry.

Indian Finance, writing on the subject of a surcharge on the sugar duty, argues that the basis of the Tariff Board's recommendation, which was substantially accepted by the Government of India, may have been upset in the interval between then and now. The fair selling price may have undergone an increase; and if Holland goes off the gold standard as a consequence of the depreciation of the dollar the competition of the Java industry may become too severe. This latter contingency has not yet materialised, and we need not think of crossing the bridge before we reach it. The advance in the fair selling price too is yet in the region of possibilities, and it would be wrong to insist upon the maintenance of the surcharge before the possibility is converted into an actuality, and it will be for the industry, when the Government finds it possible to take off the surcharge, to prove that an advance has taken place in the fair selling price of sugar to justify, in the case of this industry, a rise of 25 per cent. in the existing duty, which is over 150 per cent. The Associated Chambers of Commerce are quite right in saying that this is "a crushing burden," and we cannot understand any responsible person maintaining non-chalantly that a further increase in the duty which was rendered necessary by a temporary emergency should

be made permanent during the tenure of the original duty, which is no less than fifteen years. Instead of holding out to the industry the hope of continuing the surcharge for this long period, a hope which cannot be realised, we had better urge the industry to bear constantly in mind that, after the period for which protection is guaranteed to it, it will have to stand on its own bottom. We are glad to find in this connection the All-India Swadeshi Sangh taking up the right attitude. It says in its brochure No. 2: "The example of the textile industry should be a warning to those engaged in sugar production in this country that an industry cannot continue always to depend upon protection without creating discontent amongst the taxpayers." It is in this direction that all reasonable people should cast their influence.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

London, January 12.

INDIAN AFFAIRS IN ENGLAND.

SIR JOHN WARDLAW-MILNE, member for Kidderminster, has received a letter from the local Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the unpenalised admission into this country of manufactured goods from the Dominions and "made with the cheapest form of practically slave labour." Reference appears to be especially made to the importation of Indian carpets "to an extent never previously known." It is stated that the Board of Trade figures for November last showed that in that month British India sent into this country 138 thousand square yards of carpet compared with 64 thousand square yards in 1931 (before the introduction of tariffs). These figures, it is claimed, indicated that the importations were a serious menace to the carpet trade of this country, Belgium and British India accounting for more than three-quarters of all classes of carpet imports.

It is not true to say that young Conservatives are in favour of Mr. Churchill's policy and against that embodied in the White Paper proposals. On Wednesday last, as a result of a lengthy discussion in a debate on a motion from Cambridge, asking the Conference of the University Conservative and Unionist Associations to say that it would welcome the transference of power in India from the British democracy to the King in Imperial Council, the delegates refused the invitation of Cambridge and announced their adherence to the policy outlined in the White Paper.

Sir Henry Page-Croft, M.P., who is strongly opposed to the Government's policy, has returned to the attack in a letter as member of Parliament for Bournemouth to the Chairman of the Bournemouth Constitutional Association. He gives twelve reasons, all of them unconvincing, why the Government proposals should be resisted by all faithful Conservatives.

Mahatma Gandhi figures in a large reproduced photograph in *The Daily Express*, of all papers, either presiding at or being the chief guest of a women's meeting at Bezwada. Curiously enough, whilst every one else, except a lady speaker, is squatting, the Mahatma, in a characteristic attitude, is seated on a

chair. Nothing is said in the letter-press of the fact that this is one of a large number of public meetings that this apostle of freedom for India's Harijans has been addressing on this subject, but the lie is repeated that "eggs and other missiles" have been thrown at him.

SIR STAFFORD CRIPPS' INDISCRETION.

Sir Stafford Cripps has for some time been "asking for it." He scared large numbers of people stiff not long ago when he declared that the next time that the Labour Party was returned to office, should it be in a majority, it would immediately take steps to sterilise the House of Lords and give immediate effect to its programme, whatever the consequences. He definitely created the impression that the Labour Party with a parliamentary majority would at once establish a revolution, and that it would virtually set up a Socialist Dictatorship, in order to combat the probability of an alternative Fascist Dictatorship. Very soon, under protest from the Trade Union section of the Party, the ex-Solicitor General had to moderate his transports (this has no passing reference to Transport House), and it is very significant that the Labour Party has not only refused so far to adopt either Sir Stafford or his language, but it has demonstrated strongly in favour of Democracy, so that even Sir Stafford himself has been obliged publicly to declare himself an ardent believer in, and supporter of, Democracy. The *Manchester Guardian*, however, considers that it would be a miracle if the Party and the Trades Unions, with all their demonstration and eloquent manifestoes in favour of Democracy in general will be able to counter the belief propagated by their political opponents that Labour is in favour of a Socialist Dictatorship, a constitutional revolution, and a private Communist and Socialist army. This may be the purest nonsense, but, with less than the usual distortion to be found on the political platform, this revolutionary programme can be built up and substantiated out of Sir Stafford Cripps' speeches.

Last week-end, however, Sir Stafford Cripps, addressing a gathering of University students, who, with all their natural enthusiasm and ardour, cannot be suspected of having any knowledge or experience of the working of the Constitution or of the difficulties attending the bringing about of and the clearing up of the mess after a revolution, once more spoke of a rapid Socialist revolution, for "there must not be time to allow the forces outside to gather and to exercise their influence upon the legislature" before the State has seized and taken control of the land finance. In this summary manner he would dispose of the House of Lords, crush the City, and overcome opposition from "Buckingham Palace and other places as well." Yet, within a few hours, Sir Stafford was telling an adult audience that he was unalterably opposed to any violent revolution and that "we of the Labour Party have decided absolutely definitively that the only way to bring about the change from the Capitalist system to Socialism is in a democratic way." It all sounds extraordinarily complicated and difficult.

Had he paused to think, Sir Stafford must have known that for the student the words "Buckingham Palace" could symbolise only the Crown and the Royal Family. Who would have supposed that all that he meant to convey was Court circles, and that he has the most active affection for the King (who may, of course, in no circumstances be criticised in public, particularly by an ex-servant of the Crown)? Yet that is exactly what he stated a few days later at a luncheon in London after he had drunk the Royal Toast, fervently "God Bless Him." One expects the latter phrase, for Sir Stafford is the son of

that very devoted churchman Lord Parmoor, the Labour leader in the House of Lords during the last administration. But it was a little surprising to learn from Sir Stafford that he had no complaints whatever against a Constitutional Monarchy in England, even under a Socialist regime, for the King only did what his responsible Ministers told him to do, and he, Sir Stafford, infinitely preferred a non-political Constitutional Monarch to a political President, such as, for example, Mr. Ramsey MacDonald.

What may be the effect of all this upon the Trade Union movement is pretty clear from an outburst by Mr. Fred Montague, another former Minister, who, after denouncing the use of "bogey men," such as the attack on the Banks, and "Buckingham Palace" which were hardly calculated to convert the present thousands who understood and wanted Socialism into as many millions, described as "hysterical nonsense" talk that is "based upon the assumption that a whole nation is clamouring for revolutionary changes against a conspiracy to prevent them." "Do not", he adds, "let our very advanced friends imagine that a Labour majority will necessarily be a Socialist one. An election won on the iniquity of the present Government will be no mandate for Socialism, and to force revolutionary changes on the strength of a Means Test election or a War or Peace election will lead us into disaster. Fascism is a much more attractive proposition to the merely dissatisfied and disgruntled than Socialism. It requires less hard thinking about. The present hullabaloo is explained by a curious mixture of Communist and sentimental mentality existing in the Party to some considerable measure."

Review.

THE LIVING UNIVERSE.

THE LIVING UNIVERSE. By FRANCIS YOUNGHUSBAND. (Murray.) 1933. 252p. 10/6.

SIR FRANCIS YOUNGHUSBAND, who has been known as a mountaineer of world renown and has written about the wonders of the Himalayas explores in this book the Universe and finds that it is a living universe in which we live. "The living universe is an ever-living universe, lovely, loving, lovable" (p.249). It is a reassuring conclusion to reach in these days and the book from end to end breathes a certain mountain freshness which it owes (as the author tells us in the preface) "to remoteness—especially remoteness in mountains." The germ of it was conceived by Sir Francis forty years ago in the Himalayas and in its present form it shaped itself in his mind a couple of years ago in the Alps.

The book in reality is an attempt to formulate a suitable reply to the ominous philosophical forebodings of certain eminent astro-physicists (e.g. Jeans) who on the basis of the second law of thermodynamics prophesy a "heat-death" for the universe at some definite time in the future. According to this view the universe has been and continues to be a "running down" process, in the course of which all heat and light ultimately will have radiated away and the inevitable destination of which will be a cold icy death of all that lives and possesses value. If such a view is accepted, then the universe has obviously to be characterised as hostile and unfriendly and as being governed by physical, and not spiritual, laws, and leaving consequently no room for optimism.

And such a consequence has been fearlessly accepted by some thinkers. Bertrand Russell, for in-

stance, in his celebrated essay "Freeman's Worship" tries to think out with equanimity the ruthless implications for human life of such a position and declares his pathetic personal conviction that whatever be the fate of the material universe, our values would continue to remain valuable even if unrealised.

But our author thinks that such spiritual heroics are unnecessary as the universe rightly interpreted will reveal itself to be not a dead material universe in which life appears as a mere local and ephemeral accident,—but a living universe, organic in character and indicating the operation of a cosmic spirit behind,—a spirit which possesses a personality and inspired by creative love. The universe on such a view is not a "running down process," but a "rhythmic process."

The book is divided into two parts. The first of these states "Mainly Facts" about the universe as they have been ascertained by the principal branches of natural science—astro-physics, biology and psychology (including the psychology of mystical experience). In the course of this part of his book the author traces the evolution of the astronomical universe and describes the birth and development of life and mind and makes out that the mystic is the highest product of the whole evolutionary process. In following this story of the cosmic evolution our author has wisely chosen his authorities. This whole survey in fact reveals on the part of the author a wide, accurate and up-to-date knowledge of scientific developments and is an unmistakable indication of the mountaineer's general scientific culture and the catholicity of his interests and outlook.

While offering a warm praise for these features of Part I ("Mainly Facts"), however, we are constrained to make an important reservation. Sir Francis has traced the main features of infra-human cosmic evolution in a strictly scientific and dispassionate way without exhibiting any unnecessary emotion or bias. But when he enters the human, especially the psychological, domain his descriptions cease at places to be matter-of-fact and he appears to be indulging in a kind of idealising glorification, and preferring artistic representation to a cold and detached statement of the bare facts. We would refer the reader as an instance in point to his descriptions (Chap. IV) of the impulse of love in the animals and that in men. His descriptions of human love as compared to those of animal love smack more of romantic poeticism than scientific rigour and detachment. What is wanted in such contexts is a more cold and behaviouristic description than the sentimental glorification of the objects. Nor can we rank Sir Francis' apotheosis of the mystic as in any sense a sound proposition or a well-authenticated finding of modern science.

Part II is "Mainly Inferences" and constitutes the strictly philosophical portion of the work. The author has followed in a general way the lead of the eminent Dr. Whitehead and has propounded the "organic view" of the universe. Agreement in essence of the microcosm and the macrocosm is the leading principle which leads him to formulate a conception of the "Cosmic Spirit" and "Personality" (Chap. VI). He also speculates on the possibility of life on planets other than the earth and the same general principles of Dr. Whitehead's philosophy of the organism yield

to him the "inhabited universe" (Chap. VII). In this universe "Holiness" appears to him to be the principle of "governance" (Chap. VIII). And speaking about the "future of the universe" (Chap. IX), he again follows Dr. Whitehead's lead and views the universe as a "rhythmic process" rather than as a running down process. "Culmination, rather than destination, is then the leading feature of the universe." It is "a pulsing universe" (p. 225).

And such a view of the universe has important "implications" for us men (Chap. X). They need not resign themselves to a dismal fate of cold and darkness and can surely depend upon the friendly universe around them. And this is the mountaineer's refreshing whiff that breathes in Younghusband's pages—a message from the Himalayas and the Alps!

Such is the general tenor of Part II, which of necessity is of the nature of an imaginative construction. And we have again to offer a general remark on it. The general conclusion reached appears to us to be sound enough. But at places again Sir Francis allows too much scope for personal speculation (vide Chap. VIII) and his mystical bias (vide Chap. X).

On the whole however Sir Francis Younghusband has produced a thoroughly readable and delightful volume. He is one of the clearest writers we have come across.

D. D. VADEKAR.

SHORT NOTICE.

THE LIFE OF A TIGER AND THE LIFE OF AN ELEPHANT. By S. EARDLEY WILMOT.

(Edward Arnold.) 1933. 20cm. 371p. 3/6.

It is a great delight to feast one's imagination on a book so richly vernal in its associations and containing beautiful wild life which wears a blood-thirsty aspect because man disturbs the peace of its peculiar monarchy. How really true to nature and free from the insincerities of Rudyard Kipling, Sir Eardley Wilmot's skill as a word-painter is, will be apparent on reading these fascinating biographies of the two distinguished beasts of the forest. The biography of the Bee is all there is, by courtesy of its rendering in English literature, to equal them. In these days when attempts are being made to preserve the wild animals in their native state of sanctity, there is much to be learnt from this book of tender characterisation—which for the refined simplicity of its language is highly suitable as a text-book in Indian schools. The Indian boy whose learning is dissociated from intimate contact with realities, and so undeveloped in its colour, zoological and botanical sense will profit more from this book than from a vapid syllabus of studies. Here and there, there are touches suggestive of man's affinity with his four-footed fellow creatures of the jungle and the very delicacy with which they are introduced render them inoffensive.

"Tigers have this one thing in common with the Natives of India that they will not eat in the company of their females, preferring a solitary repast."

The Kingfisher Library ought to feel the prouder for counting this book in its collection.

K. VENUGOPAL RAO.

THE WHITE PAPER SCHEME.

MR. SRINIVASA SASTRI'S CRITICISM.

On the 16th inst. the Right Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P.C., C.H., LL.D., addressed a crowded public meeting held at the Ranade Library Hall in Madras on the White Paper Scheme. He said:

IN November last there was a debate in the House of Commons on India, in the course of which Mr. Winston Churchill drew a picture of the White Paper and of the speaker (Mr. Sastri) in that

connection to which he desired to refer at the outset. Mr. Churchill stated that the speaker recommended the White Paper scheme to some of his countrymen, because the speaker saw in it several advantages for India including the right of secession from the British Commonwealth. That would enable the audience to judge how the portraits current in England of Indian public men differed from the originals. He never recommended the White Paper to Indians. How could he? Who could find in the White Paper itself, applying the most powerful microscope, anything like the right of secession on Dominion Status or the reality of Responsible Government or indeed anything like real advance in the democratic direction upon the present state of things which was not neutralised by two or three carefully devised safeguards. It was extraordinary, Mr. Sastri declared, that such misconception should prevail regarding the situation in India and the sort of welcome that the present proposals had received at the hands of Indians who were primarily interested in it. Sir Samuel Hoare had before the Joint Select Committee produced a formidable Bhashya on the White Paper which exceeded in bulk more than a hundred times the original work. Sir Samuel Hoare had been praised for his courage in standing the cross-examination for several days together, for his perfect candour with Indians and also for the thorough grasp he had manifested of the Indian problems in all its aspects. The speaker believed that that praise was fully justified and he did not wish to abate from it one jot. Those who were on the spot and listened to Sir Samuel from day to day seemed to have been filled with admiration at the way in which he championed the White Paper against its critics and more than once when men like Mr. Winston Churchill appeared, it seemed the combat between them assumed great proportions. Their friends in private letters had alluded to this combat as though it were really a trial of skill. "To me, however", Mr. Sastri said, "as I lay on my sick bed reading these debates bed-ridden by a sense of defeat and prostration, the matter did not appear in that light. I rather thought in my fancy that I was seeing enacted before my eyes a new and fantastic version of the Mahabharata, the fortunes of war being completely reversed—the Pandavas representing the fortunes of India, stricken dead on the field of battle, a hush as if complete extinction falling all over the place, only broken by the quarrel between two parties of the victorious Kauravas upon the question of the exact extent of despoilment they were to effect upon the corpses, upon the methods to be employed and upon the instruments they were to use. (Hear, hear.) It was not a heroic encounter. For, remember while Sir Samuel Hoare upon the whole stood up for the White Paper, the only changes he agreed to make now and then were in the direction of the stiffening of the anti-Indian provisions."

SECRETARY OF STATE'S EVIDENCE.

Proceeding, Mr. Sastri referred to two or three points in the evidence of Sir Samuel Hoare and pointed out how the Secretary of State had to draw back under the blows of men like Sir Austen Chamberlain, on several important points like the question of Police and Commercial Discrimination. The Police and the C.I.D. had now been placed practically under the direction of Governors of the provinces. Again, in his deposition regarding the question of commercial discrimination, Sir Samuel was driven from pillar to post and he went so far as to propose to take away the fiscal autonomy, unsatisfactory as it was, that India at present enjoyed. Some of them who followed the evidence closely were struck very much with the marvellous ingenuity with which the defects that might operate to the disad-

vantage of British trade were discovered by the members of the Joint Select Committee and how Sir Samuel at every stage was invited to fill up the gaps so disclosed. Nothing distressed the Indian readers more than the way in which Sir Samuel maintained the doctrine that while the Dominions of the Commonwealth might oppress and ill-treat Indians as much as they pleased, India must be denied the power to retaliate to any extent. In other words, Sir Samuel, in his kindness to India, went so far as to maintain that although the Dominions might fall away from the path of rectitude, it was up to Indians, the descendants of ancient Rishis (laughter), to keep always to the path of righteousness—returning good for evil. Even the Mahatma would not go so far (Laughter). On this point it was worth while to remember that the Government of India and Sir Fazl-i-Hussain showed that they could be trusted to stand by India and her real interests and the speaker desired to pay both a tribute of praise and gratitude for the way they stood up for India's rights of reciprocity, to use a colourless word. It remained to be seen how far the Secretary of State had been impressed by the gallant stand they had taken. He did not want the audience to think that Sir Samuel Hoare had not yielded anything to pressure from the Indian side. But what he yielded was done so reluctantly and was so slight that it was difficult to be grateful to him. (Cheers.) When Indian representatives contended that the Federal Legislature should have some constituent powers, which had been denied in the White Paper scheme, Sir Samuel Hoare stated that he had decided upon a slight modification by which the Federal Legislature could modify the franchise after the lapse of ten years from the commencement of the operation of the new constitution. That was how Sir Samuel appeared to yield to Indian opinion.

DOMINION STATUS.

Referring to the complete omission of the word "Dominion Status" from the White Paper, the speaker said that Lord Willingdon, they might remember, had committed an indiscretion when he said that he expected in his term of office to become a constitutional Viceroy. Lord Willingdon was attacked for this at the time by Mr. Churchill and others. Sir Samuel Hoare, however much he disliked that expression Dominion Status, had to use it in order to explain that Lord Willingdon did not mean what he said (laughter). This was the first time that Sir Samuel used that expression since the speaker complained about its absence from the White Paper. The explanation of the Secretary of State was most extraordinary. He would not put it in the preamble of the Constitution Act. Sir Samuel stated that the conditions in India were quite different from the conditions in the Dominions where the privileges of Dominion Status were appropriate. Sir Samuel did not visualise a time when India would achieve Dominion Status. He was content to let it remain as a far-off dream, always to be beheld at a distance, dim and obscure. Some might ask why they should attach so much importance to this phrase, so long as they got power. In this view certain British statesmen had also agreed, and they pointed out that in the history of British politics, the meaning of this phrase was continually changing from day to day for the reason that it was dynamic and progressive. It was for this very reason, the speaker said, they wanted to get hold of this expression, in connection with their constitution. It would appear that whenever sympathetic British statesmen proposed to insert this expression in constitutional documents, the Dominion Prime Ministers and others objected to it upon the ground that Indians had not

yet become "Brahmarishis," but only "Rishis" of the lower caste. And these four or five Vasishthas had to approve of that name being bestowed upon Indians. The speaker had stoutly maintained that the expression 'Dominion Status' should find a place in the statute, even if it were to express that India should be a Dominion minus certain powers. This would give them the assurance that they would be a Dominion when power came fully into their hands. This view prevailed, and Lord Irwin, with the full consent of the Labour Government, made the emphatic declaration that India was to march towards Dominion Status. But this did not suit the party now in power because they did not want to see India placed amongst the Dominions. They wanted India to remain at the bottom, a little above Fiji, and somewhat higher than Barbados, but nowhere in the picture near the great Dominions. It was wrong for Indians to contend that they must not fight for their place. It seemed to the speaker that all their energies should be directed to urge the insertion of that expression in the documents. They could not afford to wait on the pleasure of the Dominions to acquire Dominion Status, and whether it be Sir Samuel Hoare or another, they must not shrink from fighting for the position which, under Lord Irwin's declaration, had been definitely and absolutely promised to them.

"It is strange," Mr. Sastriar said, "that Sir Samuel Hoare should venture to claim on behalf of the White Paper that it contains within itself the germs of India's progress towards her destiny. I do not see those germs. But he does maintain, in order to satisfy his critics, that the words of Lord Irwin's declaration have been fulfilled. You know we have got to deal in this matter with diverse personalities. May I pause for a minute while I ask you to see two or three people? Lord Salisbury, pre-eminent in British politics and second to none in the influence he wields, went so far as to say that the pledge of Dominion Status conveyed to India was not a pledge that England was bound to honour, that it was conditional, conditions in his mind being conditions impossible of fulfilment. That gives you an indication of how even a promise made to people, considered politically weak and subordinate, is regarded as by no means sacred. It seems to these people that Indians are in a state when they can be trifled with; when their hopes are raised and when they are rejoicing, their hopes might be dashed to the ground."

The speaker next referred to the attitude taken by Lord Reading and said that while he owned in 1930 that he had become a convert to the theory of Dominion Status, his Lordship had now evaded that issue as the Conservative Government was enthroned in power and therefore it was possible to play with the feelings of the Indian community. It grieved the speaker beyond words when he had to say that Lord Irwin too ran away from it. Where was Mr. Ramsay MacDonald now—the man who said that India was to be a Dominion not in the course of years but in the course of a few weeks? The distance that Mr. Ramsay MacDonald had travelled backwards from that position exactly measured the steps in retrogression that they had taken since the Round Table Conference began in 1930. It would be remembered that even after he had been delicately told not to use the expression Dominion Status, Lord Willingdon in a recent speech had the audacity to repeat it in Madras. Sir Samuel Hoare would probably excuse this 'escapade' because was Lord Willingdon not the man who after Lord Irwin's mistakes had brought peace and order into India, and put down the Congress led by a small man clothed in a yard of loin cloth, whose followers numbered thousands and were people who consented to be beaten in

public streets, when dragged in courts pleaded guilty and asked for the maximum sentence, and when locked in jail considered it a promotion to be changed from class A to class B and still greater promotion to be changed into class C from class B? Was he not the person who issued mighty Ordinances and declared all sorts of bodies illegal and prohibited meetings? When such a pacification had been produced in the country, Sir Samuel Hoare was quite willing for this consideration to let Lord Willingdon have a little latitude in the use of political phrases. (Laughter.)

SAFEGUARDS.

Mr. Sastri next dealt with the question of safeguards. The White Paper, for every advance it made, had two or three safeguards to neutralise it. The practically-minded Britisher accused the Indians of having been logical, visionary and having been unable to grasp the fundamental truths of political science. (Laughter.) The Britisher had said that if there were these safeguards, they were only to be used when an emergency arose and when the situation was out of control, when some foolish ministers took an indefensible step. If Indians were wise people, the Britishers told them that they would behave properly to allow safeguards to remain on paper, never to be called upon to apply them. If the safeguards fell into desuetude, the Indians after ten or fifteen years could ask the Britishers to take away the powers as they had never been used. Perhaps, Britain might then appoint a Commission or India might send a deputation to England, to settle everything. That was how the Britisher explained the safeguards to Indians; but to England, to men like Lord Lloyd and others it was explained that they had safeguards in abundance and safeguards arrayed one behind the other and therefore why trouble about it? These safeguards, it was further explained, were not there to be merely worshipped or to be explained away but to be used in day-to-day administration. The real nature of the safeguards, the speaker said, was this: They were designed in order to protect some interest or other, some minority or other, and to protect the feelings of minorities and interests as against the interest of the nation as a whole, feelings which had been brought into play, which had been stimulated to an unhealthy degree, making people believe that India was not one nation but a land of minorities and special interests. Whenever any progressive step was taken in future, was it not likely that some interest or minority would invoke those safeguards and in the face of repeated invocation, how could a Governor or the Viceroy, however much he might be endowed with common sense and good will, and special qualifications, keep these powers in the background? They would tell the future ministers that, as good boys, wherever a Governor threatened them with the use of safeguards, the best thing for them would be to succumb to it. Under such conditions, the speaker was of the opinion that it was impossible for any Federal Minister or for the minister of a province to feel independent and to feel that he was the agent of the people. Those ministers would always walk under a sense of complete humiliation. It was simply an impossible position. With so many stringent safeguards, the constitution could work only on a very low level, reducing the ministers to mere agents of the heads of the respective governments.

JOINT MEMORANDUM.

"We want our ministers to feel," Mr. Sastri said, "that they are the custodians of the nation's interests, that at the bidding of the constituency they can take a bold course of action for developing our resources. How can they feel like that if, in a

hundred directions, they are pulled back or are likely to be pulled back? The mere existence of these safeguards is a menace to the growth of the constitution. But there is one silver lining in this sombre cloud. It is really a piece of good fortune that our Mahomedan friends and Hindu friends and Sir Henry Gidney have all joined to produce a body of demands which would really change the whole phase of the White Paper. These demands, though they have filled us with pleasure and satisfaction, were produced in the last stage of the sittings of the Joint Select Committee, when our friends felt that the battle had gone clear against them. They are therefore in the nature of a parting shot, not in themselves of much value except as an indication of what our expectations were. These friends have done one good thing. People in England, even the die-hard section, can no longer pretend that they have produced a constitution, believing that it will satisfy the Indian people or any section of the progressive politicians here. We have deprived them completely of that excuse. That is something. Their friends, Mr. Joshi, Sir Abdur Rahim, Mr. Jayakar and others, have said that they have brought nothing with them. That is the conclusion of the matter which opened in 1930 with speeches from Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, Lord Sankey and Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, speeches full of the greatest promises, speeches that seemed to indicate that the work of the Indian National Congress, which began forty years ago, was at last reaching a happy consummation. Here I am reminded of the Tamil proverb that, when they attempted to make a clay-model of God-Vignaneswara, the model turned out to be that of a monkey. (Laughter.) Who would have thought when we began in 1930 that we would finish by producing not a smiling auspicious god, who overcomes all obstacles and takes us into the land of happiness, but a hideous and grimacing anthropoid? The tragedy of the thing is this. This shape, having been given, it was no easy thing to change it thereafter and try to produce a divine face out of it. The trouble is that this constitution, misshapen as it is, redounds to the advantage of certain misguided sections and interests of the population of India, and therefore if we want to change things to our benefit the British Government can quietly withdraw and say 'now fight out among yourselves.' Our people will resist the change."

"The present Conservative Government is very anxious to put this constitution through. Their fear is that, if the Labour Government came into power ten or fifteen years hence, they would give peace to India if nothing was done now. It is better to give a constitution in this shape, they think, for, with the best of intentions, hereafter it will be difficult to put matters right. That is the psychology behind these efforts. "If we have lost the battle," Mr. Sastri concluded by saying, "we must realise that we have lost it because we are divided. You may ask what next? By way of a partial answer to this question, I may say this. This is a moment when, our fortunes having sunk to a low depth, it is incumbent upon all wise men in India, whatever badge they wear in politics, to come together to pool their experience and their knowledge of practical affairs and try to settle what action should be taken in the future. I am happy to think that the Liberal Party have extended their hand of welcome to all those who may wish to come into this big Conference. I quite realise that in certain quarters we are met with scorn and rebuff. That is the misfortune of the day. But we believe that it is good for us to extend our hand of welcome and to embrace all honest patriots and

say to them 'We have to sit together and thrash out all problems.' The situation is acute and it is likely to land us in disaster, if action is not taken in the right spirit. If you do the right thing—I am reminded of the famous "sloka" in Gita—if you do the right thing, you cannot come to a bad end; steps taken in the right direction must be good. It seems to me that those who confer together and take counsel in this respect serve their country well for the moment. I have a feeling that there is something in the very intensity of our grief which must furnish a contrast. The situation is so unstable that even if this constitution came it will prove its own weakness, and sooner or later a better day will dawn. All that is required now is for you to remain alive somehow. Fortune will not always be adverse. It will take a good turn. But you must be alive till then. What is the thing you have to keep alive? In the ascendancy of narrow sectional interest, everybody who can think of India as a whole and the future of the Indian nation must feel that against odds he must somehow keep the seeds of the national spirit alive, national as opposed to communal. There are not many of that kind. They, whether in the Congress or outside, must take steps to keep alive the national spirit, wherever the national interest is being served. Unless that view is taken, however unfashionable it may be for the moment, while all round us a spirit of anti-nationalism prevails, unless we stand up for the true, lasting and beneficial interest of India, unless we do so, we shall also have betrayed the country. I look forward to the time, and it would not be long, when this blight will pass away from our land, and rains will fall and there will be green all round and the air will once more be pregnant with hope. When that day dawns, God grant that our national spirit should be there so that our children and our children's children may reap a rich and sustaining harvest." (Prolonged cheers.)
—The Hindu.

Correspondence.

"BINDING THE FUTURE."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR.—I agree with "Observer" that the proposed ALL Parties' Conference should not evade issues connected with the States. The Conference must put forth among its demands a demand for elected representation and other minimum changes in the States which desire to join the Federation. I, of course, entirely agree with him that the Federal plan now adumbrated may well be dropped, and Indian politicians should not share responsibility for forcing this unwanted federation on the country. Rightly, "Observer" says: "In India too the forcible imposition of a Federation upon the people would lead ultimately to the explosion of Federation." I agree that Indian progressives may well tell the Government that the Federal scheme may be taken back by the Government. But I would not advise them to tell the Government that "they hope that the country will soon change its mind." For the country will not.—Yours, etc.

Madras, January 16.

S. SATYAMURTI.

INCREASE YOUR HEIGHT.

Why remain short-statured, meek and absurd?
Become taller, add 3 to 5 more inches and become smart, handsome and commanding.
Full Illustrated Course Rs. 3 only.

IMPERIAL STORES, (S. I.)

Kasur, (Punjab).

