

# The Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA.

VOL. XVII, NO. 39. } POONA—THURSDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1934. { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.  
FOREIGN 15s.

## CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	... 457
ARTICLES :—	
The Real Conflict. ... ..	459
Agricultural Indebtedness—Scheme of Redemption in Bhavnagar. ... ..	460
OUR LONDON LETTER ... ..	462
REVIEWS :—	
Essence of Bolshevism. By M. V. Subrahma- nyam, M.A., L.T. ... ..	463
British Colonial Policy. By Prof. T. G. P. Spear. ...	464
MISCELLANEA :—	
Speeches of Rt. Hon. Mr. Sastri and Sir Cowasji Jehangir at the opening ceremony of Gokhale Hall ... ..	465
Democratic Swaraj Party Resolutions. ...	468
BOOKS RECEIVED. ... ..	468

## Topics of the Week.

Mr. Nariman—

WE explained last week how Mr. Nariman, in his eagerness to discredit the Bombay Liberals one of whom is his competitor at the Assembly election first gives the British Government more credit for liberalism than is their due (for Mr. Montagu never offered full autonomy even in the provinces) and then belittles the demands put forward by the Liberals. A correspondent now supplies us with more details of the Memorandum submitted by Sir Dinshaw Wacha and others to Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford, which shows not only that they asked for full provincial autonomy but for autonomy in internal civil administration in the Central Government as well. Their fault only was that they did it nearly a decade before Pandit Motilal Nehru put forward the same demand!! They surely did not err on the side of excessive caution. Indeed, as our correspondent brings timely to our notice, their Memorandum, called very appropriately a "Note justifying and supplementing the Congress-League Scheme of Reform", contains a paragraph warning the Government against pursuing "a cautious policy" as is their wont. The paragraph runs thus:

"Whenever Indians claim and agitate for reforms with the object of securing an effective voice and share in the government of their own country, it has been usual with their opponents to oppose their just claims and aspirations by advancing the grounds of 'a cautious policy,' 'the safe ground,' 'the necessity of control from without' and the like. The people of India have become accustomed to, and have known, too long the devices couched in these familiar phrases of political controversy in this country.

'A cautious policy,' experience has taught, means the policy of leaving things almost in the same position as before. 'The safe ground' is the foreclosed ground of official servitors and red tape. 'Control from without' is doing all for the people in the spirit of 'benevolent despotism' and nothing *by* the people."

\* \* \*

—and the Liberal demand.

WHAT was the demand itself? Our correspondent adds: "This Note further made out a strong plea for the acceptance of the essential features of the Congress-League Scheme, which was explained as contemplating a devolution of powers accompanied by a reform of the legislative and executive machinery of the Government of India and the provincial Governments so as to invest—subject, in all cases to a reasonably restricted veto of Government—the elected representatives of the people with effective control of the administration *in so far only as domestic matters are concerned*', leaving 'untouched the present powers of the Government of India in regard to the direction of the military affairs and the foreign and political relations of India, including the declaration of war, the making of peace and the entering into treaties, as also in respect of military charges for the defence of the country and tributes from Indian States': that is to say, confining popular control, under proper safeguards, to matters of internal administration only, leaving unimpaired the authority of the central executive Government to protect the country against external aggression. Does Mr. Nariman still find anything traitorous in what the Liberals did in 1917 and 1918?

\* \* \*

Justices and Congress.

BOTH the Chairman of the Reception Committee and the President of the Justice party conference held last week-end in Madras, viz. Dewan Bahadur Kumaraswami Chetti and the Raja of Bobbili respectively, severely criticised the Congress for deciding upon the rejection of the White Paper. So far as the former is concerned, the White Paper is a dead issue and the Congress might with equal propriety have made the rejection of the Simon report an election issue. He therefore jumped to the conclusion that the Congress refused to take account of hard facts but lived "in a world of unreality, illusions and dreams." We hold no brief for the Congress which is well able to take care of itself and are in no way concerned to defend its policy or actions.

\* \* \*

BUT if the Congress has failed to take account of the hard realities of the situation, so has the Justice party conference as well. True it does not indulge in any talk of rejection of the White Paper, but to expect the White Paper to be amended in the light of the recommendations made in the British Indian delegation's memorandum is not less futile. As is

well known, the most recent Reform news from London is far from reassuring. It has prepared Indian public opinion for a considerable whittling down of the White Paper by the Joint Committee: indirect election to the Assembly, a smaller federal legislature, provincial second chambers, more restricted franchise than is proposed in the Lothian Committee's report.

THE Committee's recommendations will, it is generally feared, constitute a distinct going back on the White Paper. Is there any the slightest basis for the fond hope apparently held by the Justices that the Linlithgow Committee would liberalise the White Paper by the incorporation in its report of the more important recommendations embodied in the British Indian Delegation's memorandum? If the Congress is living in dreamland, no less is the Justice party. It is all right for the Raja of Bobbili to say that his party stands by the White Paper as modified by the Joint Memorandum. Is there any earthly chance of that aspiration fructifying in the near future?

#### Brahmans Admitted.

THE doings of the Conference included the passage of a resolution removing the ban on the admission of Brahmans to the party's ranks. Much fierce controversy has so far raged in the party as to the desirability of such a course and, according to press reports, the proposal had been rejected more than once. The existence of the ban against Brahmans has laid the party open to the reproach of its being anti-Brahman. Its Brahmano-phobia was apparent from the fact that while its portals were open even to foreigners it could not admit Brahmans to its membership, even if they happen to be in cordial agreement with the party's aims and objects. It may be hoped the change now effected may go far in enlarging the party outlook.

#### Mr. Rajagopalachari and the Award.

THE Tamil Nadu Conference which met at Coimbatore last week had Mr. C. Rajagopalachari as its president. In the course of his inaugural address he tried to defend the Congress attitude towards the Communal Award which is one neither of acceptance nor of rejection. The manner in which he did so does considerable credit to his ingenuity but is hardly such as to carry conviction. He likens the Congress to a father—the head of a joint family—who had several sons. When the sons demand a partition of the ancestral property and place their proposals to that end before the father for his consideration, he neither accepts nor rejects them but tries to bring the different parties together with a view to the promotion of a settlement by consent.

ALL this is not difficult to follow; but what, one may ask, happens if such a settlement is not found to materialise? The parties claiming their share of the family property have, as everybody knows, other means of enforcing their will which are freely resorted to. It was only when an agreed settlement was despaired of by the different communities that they sought the intervention of the court—in this case the Prime Minister. If after the attempts at a solution of the communal problem made by the Congress during all these years Mr. Rajagopalachari chooses to think that the stage of bringing the parties together is yet to be reached, he must indeed be said to be blind to facts. And does he seriously consider a settlement by consent of our communal differences

still within the realm of possibility? If so, self-deception can go no further.

BUT supposing the possibility does not unfortunately turn out to be a reality, what then? What will the Congress do in that case? will it accept the Communal Award? To Mr. Rajagopalachari the Congress attitude of neutrality to the Communal Award might appear as "both wise and logical." But it must by now have become clear even to him that that is not how it strikes the generality of the Indian people. Mr. Rajagopalachari was inclined to blame Congressmen like Pandit Malaviya upon whom withdrawal of their co-operation in the Congress electoral campaign was forced by the neither-accept-nor-reject attitude of the Congress. Is it not more straightforward to lay the blame for this at the Congress door owing to its failure to give any lead?

#### Bhavnagar in 1932-33.

IT is seen from the administration report of Bhavnagar State for 1932-33 that the village panchayat movement there is steadily spreading. Thus we find that the number of village panchayats increased in one year by 7 to 17 and that 50 applications for their establishment were being considered by the State authorities. In this connection it is worthy of note that the villagers are not made to adopt, as in British India, a constitution framed for them at Government headquarters. But a good deal of elasticity is permitted to them in that respect, every latitude being allowed to them to evolve a constitution suited to local conditions. The object aimed at being to make villages self-sufficient in every way possible, the establishment of a panchayat in a village means that the village concerned makes itself responsible practically for the whole village administration including the collection of land revenue. The working of this experiment in the State is fraught with important consequences on rural life generally and its results will be watched with keen interest all over the country. The appointment of a panchayat officer which seems to have been made last year should help considerably in popularising these village bodies.

AS has been pointed out on a former occasion, Bhavnagar enjoys the enviable distinction of enforcing total prohibition in the matter of alcoholic drinks so that it derived no revenue during last year from the customs duty on foreign liquor. The excise duty on toddy yielded no more than Rs. 451 and the misuse of cologne water as a substitute for drink was prevented by legislation passed during the year. This penalises its sale to any but bona fide patients and that too under medical advice. Similar legislation in regard to medicinal tinctures which could be used as substitutes for liquor was also placed on the statute book.

IT is a matter for gratification that the number of educational institutions rose from 427 to 462 and that of students learning in them from very nearly 34,000 to 37,600. The percentage of the total number of students to the total population comes to 7.5 p. c. as against 6.7 of the preceding year. It will thus be seen that nearly one half of the field remains to be traversed before Bhavnagar can be said to have attained the goal of universal literacy. May it be hoped that a resort to compulsion will soon be made so as to facilitate the universalisation of education?

## Articles.

### THE REAL CONFLICT.

**S**ARDAR VALLABHBHAI PATEL'S denial, notwithstanding, we are inclined to believe the press report which says that what made Mahatma Gandhi think of retiring from the Congress under certain circumstances was a strong expression of dissent from the present Congress policy on the part of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in a private letter to the Mahatma. For behind the questions mentioned in Gandhiji's statement like non-violence, spinning franchise, khaddar wearing and so forth lies the great question on which there is a sharp cleavage between the younger and older generation of Congress workers, viz. whether the Congress should concentrate its effort on ousting the British power from India or whether it should also devote its attention at the same time to abolishing all the other vested interests and stopping the exploitation of the masses. This was the question that was raised pointedly in the correspondence exchanged between the Mahatma and the Pandit, which revealed fundamental differences of opinion between the two leaders. At the time the correspondence was exchanged the Mahatma had forsworn politics, and the differences, though vital, could then be put into the background and even ignored. But the moment Mahatmaji entered politics, the conflict between the two schools of thought came to the fore and is having a more and more threatening aspect every day.

The conflict in its final analysis may be summed up thus. The Mahatma wishes, first and foremost, to fight the British; he believes that this fight will be possible only if he does nothing to antagonise the propertied and privileged classes and in fact only if he studies their interests and enlists their active support, though, after the fight with the foreigners is finished, he too intends to turn to the Indian holders of power and put them in their proper place. The Pandit has no faith in carrying on the fight piecemeal; he is against all class privilege and will make no racial distinction in trying to end it; he will not seek the aid of Indian capitalists or landowners or Maharajas in giving battle to British imperialism. His hand is raised against both simultaneously; and he will not temporise with one in order to get rid of the other. Gandhiji, on the other hand, will temporise; in fact, there is no limit to which he will not go in making compromises with the vested interests in India if thereby he can bring down the British Government a good many pegs; he carries on the struggle on strictly racial lines.

A very good illustration of this is to be found in the *carte blanche* that he gave to the Mahomedans in England in regard to all their communal demands provided they would give their support to the political demands of the Congress. He offered to give them satisfaction on all other fourteen points: communal electorates; communal representation in the services; and various other things to which he often declares

he has a conscientious objection. Never mind how strongly one section of the Indian people has to be entrenched in power which does not justly belong to it, he will do so if only that will help him to get the foreigners out of the way. The neither-accept-nor-reject policy which he advises the Congress to adopt towards the communal award is only an outgrowth of this spirit. He wants to form a Patriotic Front among all classes in India even if the Front can be formed on a basis which cannot be justified on any grounds except that of political expediency.

Another illustration, equally good or even better, of this tendency to compromise even on essential principles is the way in which he is quite prepared to take the Princes into the federation with their autocracy and all. He declares himself a born democrat but raises no objection if nearly a third of the Legislative Assembly is filled with nominees of autocratic Princes. Not that he is enamoured even of Indian autocracy; he wants to deal with it too, but in his own good time. At the moment, however, he would take the help of the Princes as of the landlords, commercial and industrial magnates and all the other classes with vested interests in extorting power from the British Government. He is therefore quite prepared to give the go-bye to democracy in order to win self-government, intending, after self-government is attained, to set about removing the oligarchic and plutocratic elements in it and converting it into the pure democracy that he really likes to see established in the country. Pandit Jawaharlal will have none of this strategy. It is not a step forward in his opinion, but a distinct step backward, to effect a deliverance of India from the hands of white bureaucrats only to place it under the control of brown autocrats.

On the question of India's final political destiny also there is a clear division of opinion in Congress ranks. The Congress has committed itself to Complete National Independence, which of course implies the severance of the British connexion. In spite of this fact, however, Mahatma Gandhi persists in giving it a meaning which it was universally understood when the Congress accepted the goal in 1927, that it did not bear. He interprets it to mean Dominion Status without any authority from the Congress. It is quite possible that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has taken strong exception to this interpretation in the letter that he sent to the Mahatma. Mahatma Gandhi too would not mind accepting complete independence in the literal sense, but if he were to do so other elements like the Princes would keep aloof from his Front, and the first need, according to him, is to bring about a combination of all the existing forces in the country against the Britisher. He therefore accepts the word Independence but rejects its natural meaning, which must be very galling to men of fine susceptibility like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. They feel that Mahatma Gandhi is not playing the game with them. They would far rather have him oppose Independence as before than pretend to accept it and then attach to it a significance which the rival idea of Dominion

Status bears. Here again it is clear that Independence—the thing and not the word—is unacceptable to Mahatma Gandhi not in itself, but only because its acceptance would cut himself loose from all the powerful classes in the country whose assistance in his opinion is necessary for winning self-government, not of the democratic, but of the oligarchic type.

For the same reason, keenly as he feels for the masses, he will not lend countenance to any scheme for the prevention of their exploitation which will turn the middle and upper classes against the Congress. The Socialist Party believes that he is at heart too tender to these classes to be of any help to the masses. It is so at the present time, and will be so till political freedom is attained. His social philosophy is however, not very different from that of Pandit Jawaharlal; only he would try to give effect to it in its political aspects alone at present, reserving its application to the social and economic aspects to a later date when India will not have to reckon with the British. The real difference here is not so much of fundamental opinion as of policy and strategy. Mahatma Gandhi believes that in order that the masses may come ultimately into their own, India will have to pass through a transitional period in which the privileged classes will have to be made even stronger than they are at present so that we may wrest power from the British. Pandit Jawaharlal on the contrary is firmly convinced that if power passes from British hands into the hands of the privileged classes in India, it will stay there and will not filter down to the masses at all. A passage from his *Whither India?* may here be quoted:

Indian freedom is necessary because the burden on the Indian masses as well as the middle classes is too heavy to be borne and must be lightened or done away with. The measure of freedom is the extent to which this burden is removed. This burden is due to the vested interests of a foreign government as well as those of certain groups and classes in India and abroad. The

achievement of freedom thus becomes a question of divesting vested interests. If an indigenous government took the place of the foreign government and kept all the vested interests intact, this would not even be the shadow of freedom.

To Mahatma Gandhi the White Paper is unacceptable because it leaves the British vested interests almost as strong before; to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru it is unacceptable for this reason, but also because it leaves the Indian vested interests in a stronger position than ever before. The criticism that he levelled at the Round Table is in general true as much of Mahatma Gandhi as of the rest: "Intent on protecting their class privileges they happened to forget an odd three hundred and fifty million people in India"!

The difference may be one of strategy rather than of belief, but it so happens that at the moment Mahatma Gandhi is seen to attach himself and the Congress to reactionary interests and conservative institutions, while Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru puts himself at the head of those who will not allow the Congress to be so used. This is the real conflict in the Congress, and though the conflict does not yet appear definitely in this form, it will assume that form more and more in course of time. Mahatma Gandhi's star was in the ascendant so long as he seemed to be the most radical politician of all. He promised swaraj in a year; he thought he could hold the British Empire at bay by launching upon mass civil disobedience. All this looked impracticable to most people, but still they gave him their support just because he advocated what they considered to be the most advanced policy. Now however he has lost that position; at every point of conflict he is found to be on the side of conservatism and reaction, of prudence and expediency and it is not surprising that he feels that the ground is slipping from under his feet, and that he is no longer the Fuehrer.

## AGRICULTURAL INDEBTEDNESS.

### SCHEME OF REDEMPTION IN BHAVNAGAR.

THE growing burden of debts among the agriculturists has been recognised as a pressing problem for over fifty years. But the recent depression in prices of agricultural produce has increased the urgency of the problem to an unprecedented extent. Political parties and economic reformers are busy framing schemes for relief of the peasants. Among the several proposals put forward in this connection the Bhavnagar scheme has deservedly attracted the most general attention. The officers of the Bhavnagar State, and in particular its indefatigable President of Council, Sir Prabhashankar Pattani, have rendered a valuable service to the cause of agrarian reform by bringing to the notice of a wider public the nature and the results of their efforts for the redemption of agricultural indebtedness.

The broad features of the Bhavnagar scheme have been before the interested public for some time. Acting on the findings of a local investigation into

the economic situation and the moneylenders' practices in one of the Mahals, the Durbar arranged for a general inquiry into the extent of rural indebtedness and the condition of rayats. Out of the 23,000 individual rayats whose cases were investigated by the Inquiry Committee as many as 45 per cent. were deeply involved in debt and the condition of many of the remainder was not much better. "Of the 45 per cent. indebted kheduts about one-third were found to be indebted in sums not exceeding two years' annual assessment payable by them, and the rest were hopelessly indebted, a fair proportion owing to arrears exceeding 10 and 15 years' assessment payable by them." The causes of this indebtedness have been the same in Bhavnagar as in other parts of India, though it might be noted that the unscrupulousness of the moneylenders' practices appears to have been a greater factor in Bhavnagar than in most parts of British India.

Altogether the Committee concluded that unless outside help was forthcoming the Khedut's position would be rendered desperate. This help the State undertook to give in two respects. So far as the existing indebtedness was concerned the State promulgated a Redemption Scheme of which the following were the leading features.

1. If a majority of the kheduts and sowkars of any mahal were willing to adopt the provisions of the scheme the Darbar would introduce it in that area.

2. A Committee consisting of two state officials, one from the Revenue and the other from the judicial departments, two representatives of the creditors and one or two nominated gentlemen to watch the interests of the kheduts would be appointed to visit the mahal and to undertake detailed investigation. All who do not agree to be bound by the decision of the Committee are debarred from the benefit of the scheme.

3. After detailed inquiry into the history of each debt the Committee will award a figure which shall not exceed the equivalent of three times the annual assessment.

4. This awarded sum the State will advance to the khedut for payment to the sowkar, from whom a discharge will be secured. The State will charge 4 per cent. interest and will arrange for its collection in the following manner: "For the recovery with interest of the sum... the produce of such khedut shall be brought over to the Darbari Khalwad and after setting apart the State's share that would be due under the Bhagbatai system, the Darbar shall first deduct from the sale proceeds of such share the amounts due on account of the current year's assessment according to the Nam fixed as also the Tagavi loans falling due and then apply the remaining balance towards payment of the interest and principal of the redemption loan advanced on behalf of the kheduts, and this shall be done from year to year until the whole of the amount due on account of such loan is recovered in full. The Khedut's share of the produce will be left to the khedut and this will enable the Khedut to maintain himself with ease. Any Khedut who has a bumper crop and who desires to reimburse in full the loan advanced for liquidation of his past debts will be free to do so."

Under this scheme the Debt Redemption Committees estimated the total indebtedness of the rayats according to the Sowkar's records at 86'4 lakhs of rupees. Of this amount the Committee held as due the amount of 45 lakhs, and in composition of this due debt a sum of Rs. 20'6 lakhs was paid to the sowkars. Thus the kheduts were freed from all bonds of the sowkar and were henceforward indebted to the State which has made arrangements to recover its dues in the manner above-noted.

So far as the future credit needs of kheduts are concerned it is expected that they will be met by the sowkars lending to them on their personal credit. With a view, however, not to jeopardise the beneficent effect of redemption an Agriculturists' Protection Act has been passed. This measure empowers the agriculturists to sue the moneylender for production of accounts and generally empowers the courts to go into the details of each transaction and

ultimately to award just amounts according to simple interest.

With a view to instil into the minds of Kheduts the feeling of self-reliance and corporate responsibility the State has promulgated rules for the establishment of village panchayats. The panchayats are to be established if the people of a village desire it. The people are given the right to ask for a change in the village officials on valid grounds. The members of the panchayat are nominated by the State from a panel elected by the people and hold office for three years. The panchayat has been given the power to appoint the talati and the revenue and police chowkidars of the village. The appointments of the last two are subject to State sanction, but in all cases the expenses on account of salary are borne by the State. The land revenue administration in each village is vested in the panchayat which is responsible to pay to the Darbar the revenue dues at fixed dates. If the Panchayats are found to exercise, with a due sense of responsibility, these powers regarding land administration, and others such as public works and sanitation, the State will transfer to them further powers of administering civil and criminal jurisdiction. The State authorities hope that freed from the burden of existing debts, assured of fair dealing from the sowkar in future and equipped with their own corporate instruments of social betterment, the Kheduts will live a much more contented and happy life than their present miserable existence.

The Bhavnagar State deserves the best recognition of economic reformers on account of the generous sympathy, broad planning and bold execution of its scheme. The worst attitude towards this question of rural indebtedness is to ignore it as an age-long and chronic ailment. Only less objectionable is the attitude of inaction and defeatism induced by the immensity of the difficulties with which any attempt at solving the problem is beset. The Bhavnagar Darbar have set a most valuable example to the rest of India in this, if in no other, respect. It is easy to spot defects in every scheme but while the doctors wrangle the patient grows desperate, and hence very early action is called for if the economic, social and political health of the nation is not to be endangered.

But this is by no means the only claim of the Bhavnagar scheme on our appreciative attention. If we decide to meet the present situation in respect of rural indebtedness in right earnest we will have to proceed in the same business-like way in which Bhavnagar has moved. Committees of Inquiry, sufficiently influential and representative, will have to be appointed to ascertain the exact situation in each area. In arriving at the actual estimates of due debts and further in settling the figure for redemption just consideration must, of course, be shown for the legitimate claims of the creditors. Much will depend, at this stage of the proceedings, on the nature of practices prevalent among the moneylenders in the several parts. But undoubtedly in case of a difference between the claims of the sowkar and the peasant the committees will be interpreting their functions properly in trusting their generous instincts in favour of the peasant.

When debt redemption is attempted on this scale the financial provision for its service is the most important factor. Fortunately for Bhavnagar its government has resources which can finance the scheme thrice over and still not feel the strain. The position of State reserves is exceptionally sound and instead of a public debt which is the normal accompaniment of provincial and central budgets the Darbar has extensive State investments. Moreover, the income of the State on account of customs duties, railway earnings, stamps and other sources is so far in excess of what they get from land revenue or what they need for their present expenditure that the Darbar can boldly undertake all the immediate and imminent responsibilities of the measure. Thus the Khedut who is now expected to borrow from the sowkar for his current needs on personal security is bound to come against an insuperable obstacle if he wants a bigger loan for improvement, or for taking him over bad times. Under these circumstances the Darbar is in a position to lend him the money and again recover it from the produce of his field as contemplated by the present scheme. In fact the financial position of the State allows it to undertake very extensive present and future responsibilities and its combined rôle of the governing authority and virtual mortgagee gives it special advantages.

In British India there are very grave financial difficulties. To take Bombay. Here the agricultural indebtedness is estimated as being above Rs. 80 crores. The total income of the provincial Government is only about Rs. 14 crores, out of which between Rs. 4 and 5 crores is collected from land revenue. Far from the Government having any reserves or a surplus for investment the Government is already weighed down by a burdensome debt. If such a Government were to appear in the market with a loan at all commensurate with the needs of a redemption scheme, its credit is bound to be broken. Moreover, the Government of Bombay cannot hope to assure the emancipated peasants of future accommodation. It is obvious, therefore, that the financial side of a scheme of redemption for British India or for States less solvent than Bhavnagar, will have to be more carefully thought out.

The Bhavnagar authorities have shown a very commendable insight into the real needs of agrarian reform in providing for the resurrection of panchayets and in particular in equipping these bodies with revenue and police functions. It is an axiomatic truth that the lost regard for corporate village life and village authority will not be restored so long as the average villager has not been made to realise that it is worth his while to cooperate in the functioning of the village bodies. The only way to achieve this end is to endow the village bodies with essential governmental functions such as collection of revenue and maintenance of order. In providing for this much needed reform the Bhavnagar State has taken a very progressive step and it is to be hoped that all the villages in the State will be thus provided. Debt redemption is only a preliminary, if a necessary preliminary, to the reorganisation and revival of rural life. In this process

the entire life of the villager has to be suitably influenced, but the necessary adaptation can never be complete and effective so long as the villagers are not conscious of a feeling of self-control and self-improvement.

Admittedly the scheme launched in Bhavnagar has rare advantages in the financial strength and the administrative beneficence of its rulers. In British India financial, constitutional and legal details will necessarily have to be provided in a way different from those incorporated in the Bhavnagar scheme. Moreover, the actual economic condition of the peasants in different parts will introduce additional features of local variation. In its boldness, generosity and comprehension the Bhavnagar scheme is calculated to serve as a model and as a spur to economic reformers all over the country.

---

## Our London Letter.

---

( BY AIR MAIL. )

( From Our Correspondent. )

LONDON, 21st September.

MR. GANDHI'S FUTURE.

THE news agencies this week have informed us of the Memorandum issued by the Mahatma, in which he sets forth his attitude towards Congress and Congress policy, and delivers a characteristic diatribe against the methods and weaknesses of Congressmen, or at least considerable sections of them. If the conditions that he is stated to have laid down to warrant his continuance of the Congress leadership are persisted in unmodified, there seems very little doubt that, within a very short time, he will have ceased to exercise the authority as Leader of the Congress that he has hitherto wielded. It seems highly improbable, looked at from this distance, that his colleagues will agree to the stipulations that he has apparently laid down as to the qualifications for the Congress membership or Congress delegates, unless Congress is intending to adopt the methods of intense exclusiveness adopted by the Communist Party in Russia. As, however, there seems very little likelihood of this, the probabilities are that the Mahatma will soon be ploughing a lonely furrow of his own and that the direction of Congress policy will shortly be placed in other hands, with possible occasional reference to him on some particular issue for advice, or on some particular occasion for his blessing. That Congress policy will in future be a very different thing from what it has been in the past is almost certain, and it is likely to be a great deal more realistic from the point of view of practice and expediency. The question that many observers here, however, are beginning to ask themselves is whether, with the hiving off of the Nationalists, the process of disintegration already begun may not proceed at a more rapid pace if the Mahatma should withdraw. The probability is that if he were free and available that particular matter could more easily be decided with the help of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

There seems to be, in the minds of a number of people who have been studying the trend of events in India, a consensus of opinion that the Mahatma's natural successor in the leadership of left-wing Nationalism is to be the Pandit. That may be one reason why Government are in no hurry to release him. They may prefer to see the process of nationalist disintegration carried a little further before they



think it wise to exercise clemency in regard to him. Nevertheless there will be very many people to support the appeal made by Miss Ellen Wilkinson, in Wednesday's *Star* for Pandit Jawharlal's release, if only on grounds of humanitarianism and common decency. She tells the story of the domestic idyll of the Pandit and Mrs. Kamala Nehru, in touching and choice language, and in a manner calculated to extort respect and admiration for a suffering couple from a chivalrous people, who can well afford, in their strength, to deal tenderly and generously with a redoubtable, but honourable, opponent. It is a little singular that the next we hear of Miss Wilkinson is that she has been successfully prosecuted, for the second time within eighteen months, for driving a car without licence. Still more astonishing is her explanation given to the policeman that stopped her. "I suppose it is the stupidity of us women." This is hardly the sort of language that one would have expected a woman ex-Member of Parliament to hold in regard to one of the duties of our common citizenship.

Reverting to the case of the Mahatma, it would appear that the suggestions for an early visit by him to this country, put forward by certain friends, have now receded somewhat into the background. At the same time it seems very important that people in the West should have placed before them in literary form the story of his life since he left England at the end of 1931. These three years have been full of moving events, in which he has figured prominently, and which have also set their mark very heavily upon him. Perhaps one of these days, in the not distant future, Mr. Andrews will set himself to the task of putting the case for the Gandhi of to-day before the Western public. In his recent book, entitled "The Theory of Gandhi," to which I referred upon its publication some weeks ago, and which has been well reviewed in the British Press, Mr. Glorney Bolton brought the story of the Mahatma down to his departure from Europe and the story of the alleged Italian interview, which Gandhiji so emphatically denied and repudiated. Mr. Glorney Bolton, unlike some other persons who presume to write with knowledge of the Mahatma, but who are singularly ignorant of his fundamental characteristics, had many opportunities of meeting and knowing the Mahatma, whom notwithstanding certain idiosyncrasies and ascetic tendencies, he likes and admires, very definitely is prepared to accept the Mahatma's word on that subject. Indeed it would be well for those who wish to have before them a refreshingly frank estimate of the Mahatma's personality, with which they are likely to agree or disagree according to temperament, to keep beside them a copy of this very useful book, which had the advantage of being able to depend, to a considerable extent, upon the famous "Autobiography" itself, and upon the labours of a number of Mr. Glorney Bolton's predecessors. If, however, all that the Western public had before it was the story of the Mahatma's life and career up to the time of his departure from Europe in 1931, it would end on a note of pathos and disappointment, as well, probably, of considerable misunderstanding. A great deal of the misunderstanding has, however, been straightened out and illuminated by the events of the last three years, but it seems important, in the interests both of truth and of the history of the nationalist movement in India, that these events should now be set in a true perspective, if the people of the Western world are to form anything like an accurate estimate of this remarkable man.

#### THE CONSERVATIVE CONFERENCE.

Among the matters to be dealt with at the Annual Conference of Conservative Associations, to be held at Bristol on the 4th and 5th October, are the

dangers of dictatorship, House of Lords reform, and self-government for India. Motions on these subjects have been set down and the suggestion has been made for the formation of an Anti-Dictatorship League. It would be interesting to observe the Tory attitude towards, say, Fascism. The proceedings are to be wound up by an address from Mr. Baldwin. The motion on India stands in the name of Sir Henry Page Croft, and reads as follows:

"This Conference, whilst prepared to support proposals for a great measure of self-government in the Provinces of India, step by step in accordance with the Government of India Act, records its emphatic opinion that the partnership of Britain and India in the central government of the Indian Empire must not be dissolved and urges the Government to assent to no proposals which would imperil the future of India within the Empire, or impair the confidence and unity of the Conservative Party in view of the menace of Socialism."

It is questionable whether this motion will be discussed at all, or it may be ruled out of order. It is not known whether it has provoked any amendments, but probably a number have been sent in. One's general impression is that the Conservative organisation is not at all anxious to have a further discussion on India, in view of the fact that the Report of the Joint Select Committee, due within a month or so of the Conference, is to be referred to a special conference in fulfilment of Mr. Baldwin's pledge. As, however, Tories have rather a habit of expressing disbelief in the bona-fides of those with whom they happen to disagree, even though members of the same party, it would not be surprising if the Tory Conference provides a fresh occasion for domestic ill-will in the Party.

#### THE OTHER PARTIES.

The Liberals, who have recently held counsel as to their policy at the next General Election, have decided to reject Sir Charles Hobhouse's proposal that they should fight only those constituencies where there was reasonable chance of successfully winning a seat. Whether, however, the Samuelite Liberals will go to the other extreme of contesting no less than four hundred seats, is quite another matter, and will depend, to a large extent, upon financial considerations. The political exchequer is none too full and the Samuelites cannot draw upon the Lloyd-George Campaign Fund. Apparently, too, the Lloyd-George party cannot draw much advantage from it either.

So far as the Labour Party is concerned, the proceedings at the forthcoming Party Conference, unlike those of the recent Trade Union Congress, promise to be bright and lively. The Socialist League have very skilfully put forward their propaganda in the form of over sixty reasoned amendments to the official Party programme, and it looks as though there is likely to be a really first-class fight between the two sections of the Labour Party. It will be interesting to watch the results of this struggle between the "hasten slowly" group and the "Socialism in one year" group, as they are likely to be described.

## REVIEWS.

### ESSENCE OF BOLSHEVISM.

LENIN ON BRITAIN. A Compilation with an Introduction by HARRY POLLITT. (International Publishers, New York.) 1934. 22cm. 316p. \$3.00.

A LETTER TO AMERICAN WORKERS. BY V. I. LENIN. (International Publishers, New York.) 1934. 23p. 5 cents.

GIOSUE CARDUCCI, an Italian poet regarded Modern

Europe as an old and rotting harridan covering her wrinkles with meretricious cosmetics. The experience of some countries in post-war Europe seems to justify the rather grotesque expression of the Italian poet. In certain European countries political democracy was only a thin veneer which served to conceal class antagonism and the maladjustment of the industrial system. But industrialism smashed through the superstructure of inefficient democracy and hence instead of a virile Europe we are threatened with a Europe which promises to expire in a series of revolutionary and militaristic convulsions. Communism in Russia, Fascism in Italy, and Hitlerism in Germany are mere manifestations of the failure of political democracy in those countries to solve economic problems and to bring about the contentment of the masses.

To those who have lost faith in democracy and who look upon the Communist experiment in Russia as a successful experiment, the books under review will have a special appeal. We are afraid that Harry Pollitt, the Editor of 'Lenin on Britain,' and Alexander Trachtenberg, the Editor of 'A Letter to American Workers' have Communist sympathies and take Lenin's writings as Gospel truth. It is rather difficult for us who may be accused by these Editors as having a bourgeois outlook to review these two Red publications. We are as much conscious of the evils of modern capitalism as Lenin, though the latter exaggerates some of them. We feel, to quote the words of Matthew Arnold, "that modern industrialism materialises the upper classes, vulgarises the middle classes, and brutalises the lower classes." But Capitalism should be mended by reformist legislation and not ended by a violent proletarian revolution. The British Socialists, MacDonald, Henderson, Snowden & Co., are reformists and to mend the capitalistic society have sought the aid of Liberals and Conservatives. Why therefore accuse the British Socialists as 'lackeys of capital' and 'independent of socialists'? In these two publications Lenin calls upon the British and American workers to overthrow their democracies and to establish a Dictatorship of the Proletariat. But we are sure that Lenin's teachings will not be favourably received in England. Lenin succeeded in Russia mainly because the masses in that country had been oppressed, suppressed and depressed for centuries and there was not a modicum of political liberty in that country. But in England and America political liberty has been in existence for centuries and their citizens have shared in the political destinies of their country. In these countries, unlike pre-war Russia, dictation has been replaced by discussion, and force by reason in the direction of human affairs. When therefore capitalistic society can be reformed by reasonable legislation, the call to use force made by Lenin to British and American workers in the books under review will fall on deaf ears.

In its most general aspects Communism is founded on Lenin's interpretation of the writings of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, and in the books under review British and American capitalism are seen through Communist spectacles. Lenin is very unsparing in his attacks on the Labour Party, Trade Unions, and I.L.P. for their association with the 'social-chauvinists' or Liberals, but we may point out that what is required of a great leader is not sentimental emotionalism, but calm thinking, not silly vapourings but chastened expression. It is easy to dogmatise about the benefits that will be enjoyed in a Communist society but it is also easy to doubt whether such benefits will materialise.

Lenin is partly right in criticising the Allied interference in the affairs of Soviet Russia, but may

we point out that it was the Communist preaching of an International Proletarian Revolution that made the Allies attempt to crush the Bolshevik Revolution by helping Kolchak and Denikin? It may be interesting to note that to-day in the invitation to Russia to join the League of Nations, Switzerland is not a signatory as she feels—and we think she feels rightly—that Russia will use Geneva to broadcast her Bolshevik doctrines.

In 'Lenin on Britain' there are constant repetitions but they cannot be helped in a book which is merely a collection of Lenin's writings. The author has arranged his work not chronologically but according to subject and this makes the book eminently readable. The explanatory notes at the end of the book leave nothing to be desired.

The International Publishers, New York, deserve thanks of the educated public for publishing Lenin's writings, for it is sometimes useful to know how British and American Capitalism is viewed by its mortal foes.

M. V. SUBRAHMANYAM.

### BRITISH COLONIAL POLICY.

**THE COLONIAL POLICY OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM.** By RALPH FOX. (International Publishers, New York.) 1933. 21cm. 122p. 75 cents.

THIS is an interesting specimen of Communist propaganda. Any critically-minded and well-informed person who may have leanings in that direction should certainly study it, and he will never be tempted in that way again. The method is that of British Israel and flat earth propaganda, which starts by assuming to be true what is the subject of debate, and thus hails every stray fact or fancy as a triumphant vindication of their contention.

The book devotes three chapters to the development of colonial policy, then three chapters to India, two more chapters to Africa and the Near East and a final chapter on the working class and the colonies.

The two authorities upon whom the author relies for India are Marx and Lenin; he valiantly attempts to interpret Indian history and economics in the light of the Marxian Theory. Not only Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, but also Mr. Brailsford, is anathema to our author. Miss Vera Anstey is a "capitalist" historian, and other writers on Indian history and politics are too unholy even to be mentioned. In these circumstances it is not surprising that the book abounds in misstatements and grotesque distortions. Thus on p. 10 our author is convinced that Congress is intimately connected with the frontier tribes. "It is not without significance that the Congress surrender and the march of the Peshawar brigade against the rebel Mohmand tribesmen have taken place simultaneously." Tibet is "a vast country, nearly as large as British India itself" (in population?), and "in the last few years has been absorbed into the British Empire." On p. 29 it is asserted that no effort was made to relieve the distress of the various famines of the 19th century. Has our author heard of the Famine Code? On p. 27 we read that in 1857 the Bengal peasants "came out openly" against the British. On p. 50 we read that "the stirring up of pogurus(?) of Hindus against Musalmans, or vice versa, has become a complete art with the British." The Cawnpore riots, for instance, or the Kashmir troubles? All this is in a book of 122 pages.

Our author involves himself in misrepresentations and contradictions even more freely. On the



one hand he maintains that the British have been ruthlessly exploiting the whole country in their own (specially Lancashire's interest) and on the other, that they are allied to the Indian industrialists, bourgeoisie money-lenders, priests and vested interests of all kinds. From the one point of view Congress is his friend, from the other his enemy. Mr. Gandhi, on p. 74, is said "to have betrayed the struggle of the Indian masses;" on p. 67 the Congress opposition to Government is a "farce" and on p. 78 Congress is "the capitalist National Congress." The book in fact is muddled even from the Communist point of view. It assumes that the British are its main enemies in India, whereas logically Indian capitalism and vested interests are really even more formidable. British capitalism is based on British power which any international chance may under-

mine or overthrow, but Indian capitalism is based not only on the police, but on religion, immemorial customs, and the inertia of the masses, which is greater in India even than in Russia.

In conclusion, we may say that the communist interpretation leaves out of consideration all factors other than the economic. In discovering the importance of economic forces Communist thinkers seem to have been inoculated against all other ideas and forces, such as nationalism, religion, custom and tradition. In the long run this is the fatal weakness of Marxian Theory. Man does not live by bread alone. The British Government and the Indian capitalist have both been responsible for much, but this is not the book to explain what they ought not to have done, or to tell us what they ought now to do,

T. G. P. SPEAR.

## GOKHALE HALL, POONA.

### MR. SRINIVASA SASTRI'S SPEECH.

*The opening ceremony of the Gokhale Hall in Poona at the hands of Sir Cowasji Jehangir, Bart., K.C.I.E., O.B.E. took place on Friday, September 28. In requesting Sir Cowasji Jehangir formally to declare the Hall open, the Right Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, President, Deccan Sabha, said :*

ON behalf of the members of the Deccan Sabha I welcome you most cordially to this auspicious function. It is perhaps excusable that on an occasion like this one's mind should be allowed to go back to the origin of this institution. The Deccan Sabha was started in the year 1896 under the distinguished and eminent auspices of Mahadeo Govind Ranade. In the prospectus which is believed to have come from his own pen, he describes the circumstances that led to its establishment and the aims and objects which it was intended to serve. There is a paragraph in it which it would be appropriate on my part to read to this audience. Many of you may remember the words of the passage, but there are many others to whom they will be comparatively unfamiliar and there are thousands in the country to whom they will be absolutely new. Let me first read the words to you—"Liberalism and moderation will be the watchwords of this Association".

Now, ladies and gentlemen, within the sheltered privacy of these walls one may shout the words 'liberalism' and 'moderation' as loud and as often as one pleases. "Liberalism and moderation will be the watchwords of this Association. The spirit of liberalism implies a freedom from race and creed prejudices and a steady devotion to all that seeks to do justice between man and man, giving to the rulers the loyalty that is due to the law that they are bound to administer, but securing at the same time to the ruled the equality which is their right under the law. Moderation imposes the condition of never vainly aspiring after the impossible or after too remote ideals, but striving each day to take the next step in the order of natural growth by doing the work that lies nearest to our hands in a spirit of compromise and fairness." In these wise and weighty words is enshrined a doctrine of abiding value. The years that have passed have not diminished in the

least their validity. On the contrary, one may venture to say that the events of the past few days have added to the significance and practical bearing of this great teaching. After Ranade the greatest name among moderate and Liberal politicians is that of my master Gopal Krishna Gokhale. It will be allowed by everyone who is acquainted with Indian affairs that the teaching of Mr. Ranade was carried forward by his most eminent pupil in the most faithful and effective manner. It is not for me, speaking in Poona, to say anything about the great work that Mr. Gokhale performed in his all too short a career; but I venture to say this, that there is not a day on which some of us who were his immediate pupils do not wish that he were alive to give us some clear guidance in this chaos of opinion and thought.

Let us hope, ladies and gentlemen, that in this place dedicated to his name the work that he did under the inspiration of Ranade will be carried on without abatement and the reputation which he left behind and the faith which he held firmly all through will be maintained undimmed. It is difficult for me, exceedingly difficult, to speak as I would like to speak upon him and his career. In my own city of Madras there is a hall named after him built many years ago, thanks to the munificence of Mrs. Besant. That hall, I am happy to think, serves a great purpose in the city. Nearly every day it is used for some public purpose or other. If it is not a purpose of public instruction, it is at least an innocent public entertainment. That place is filled with portraits of eminent patriots of all schools of thought and every variety of political opinion. We are proud of the Gokhale Hall there, and it is my earnest hope that the public of Poona and the neighbourhood will make as good use of this Hall as the hall that bears the great name in Madras. As far as I can gather, it is the wish of the Council of the Deccan Sabha that this Hall should really be public in its character and should be used by all alike.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am tempted to say a word of those to whom Ranade and Gokhale and the ideas and beliefs which they stood for are cherished memories. They are not growing in number or

popularity or influence on public movements in the country as much as we should desire. It is a thought which occasionally makes one sad. Why is that the case? It would take me long, and perhaps I should weary you, to examine this matter with the care and patience and impartiality that it deserves; but this remark I will venture to make. Those that still remain true to the faith that they have inherited need not, it seems to me, hold down their heads or go about as though they were the bearers of some discredited or obsolete doctrine. Times change, the character of the activities required from day to day changes, the fortunes of institutions no less than the fortunes of individuals are subject to great vicissitudes. We can afford to look at these matters not only as they appear to-day—that is a great thing no doubt and full of instruction,—but as they would appear to people of a remote day, when may be in more auspicious times India will have moved on, the skies will have become brighter, our destinies may shine forth with greater lustre, and even the doctrines of liberalism and moderation which are defined in such beautiful language, even these doctrines will come back into their own and actuate men's minds and hearts as they should. Truly, there never will be a time either here or elsewhere when it would not be necessary to be liberal, when it would be dishonourable to be moderate. We may not be to-day the strength and the force that we wish to be and that we deserve to be; but, gentlemen, to quote the glittering phrase of Milton we may boast "of all the faithless faithful only we." There was a time when moderation was enjoined on all as the crown and glory of all the virtues that adorn human character. Shall not that day come again? I live in the fullest hope that in this land every virtue which our ancients praised and honoured will continue to be praised and honoured, that in this land as of yore patience, wisdom, farsightedness, justice and virtues of that order will receive their due and will bear the rich and glorious fruit which they have always borne in the history of our kind.

Now, before I discharge the very pleasant duty of asking our distinguished guest to perform this ceremony, may I say, with your good leave, that he comes to us to-day as a sound and good liberal. We welcome him for his faithfulness to our flag, we welcome him for the courage with which he faces his electors with the name of liberal and moderate fixed upon his forehead. Sir Cowasji, just as you do us honour, we wish to do you honour. Go forth and conquer! Now, Sir, may I request you on behalf of the members of the Deccan Sabha to declare this Hall open?

#### Sir Cowasji Jehangir's Speech.

*In declaring the Hall open, Sir Cowasji Jehangir said:*

I am wondering why I am here to open a memorial to one of the greatest Indians of our time in the presence of many who worked with him, who fought with him, who suffered with him, and who rejoiced in his victories while I had merely, unfortunately for myself, an acquaintance with Gokhale. Mr. Sastri, you on whose shoulders the mantle of Gokhale fell are

truly the most worthy person in India to-day, to be associated with memorials to the man whom you are pleased to call your master. There are others I notice on this platform who were also his chelas. Nevertheless, I perform the duty with the greatest pleasure and conceive it as the greatest honour that could be paid to me by the friends and contemporaries of the greatest Indian of our times.

Ladies and gentlemen, you in the city of Poona know the life history of Gokhale. Who am I to repeat or to remind you of his great work? But there are certain features which it is well to remember, for in these times memories are short. Gokhale was born of poor parents, and suffered the great misfortune in the loss of his father at a very early age and it was left to his brother earning but Rs. 15 a month to educate the man whose loss we mourn to-day. Just realise what that means. If that brother, earning but Rs. 15 a month had not made what was to him a very great sacrifice, there would have been no Gokhale and as I hope to show you there might not have been many an event nor might we to-day. Mr. Sastri and gentlemen, have been in the position in which we are. I hope to show that within a few minutes. If his brother made a great sacrifice Gokhale has repaid it by living a life which was a life of sacrifice and if he was educated with the lifeblood of his family, he returned it a hundredfold to his country with a motto of sacrifice and devotion to duty.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, Gokhale started his life as a teacher of youth and in that process he so educated himself that he became a statesman. His first inspiration after being educated by his brother, was to become a missionary and he joined the Deccan Education Society as such. Providence ordained otherwise and he became a statesman; but he died a missionary and posterity will remember Gokhale not so much as a politician, nor as a statesman, but as the Indian who brought to this side of India the missionary spirit and set an example to his countrymen that a life led on a mere pittance but entirely and absolutely for the good of his people is a life worthier than of the greatest statesmen, worthier than any life man can live. But in the Servants of India Society, Mr. Sastri, you begin a missionary's life, but believe me I know like you, a missionary may become a statesman, but you and your colleagues like Gokhale will die missionaries serving the poorest and the highest in the land.

Ladies and gentlemen, one could go on talking on Gokhale at great length but I will immediately come to that portion of his career which is a living example in our present times. Was Gokhale a success as a politician or a statesman? Did Gokhale achieve anything for his country in the sphere of politics? I, without the slightest hesitation or fear of contradiction, state that Gokhale achieved more for his country in the sphere of politics and statesmanship than any Indian of his time. He was but only for two years in the Legislative Council of Bombay and showed such a mastery over any subject that he dealt with that his colleagues sent him to the Imperial Council and it was there that Gokhale did his life

work in only one sphere of the many activities for which he lived. In those 12 or 13 years he was responsible for many immediate reforms. His very first budget speech gave us lower taxation. May I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, a question whether any other line of attack for the duration not of one year but of five years has given you lower taxation in any one direction? Gokhale in the very first year of his career in the Imperial Council showed such a mastery of his subject that he compelled, it may be an unwilling Government, an autocratic Government, much more autocratic in those days than it is to-day, to listen to him and I see many on this platform who have vast experience of legislatures and I will ask them a simple question: whether they have seen not in one year but in five years by merely speaking, with not a single vote behind him, with nothing to help him but his intellect, his logic, his facts, his figures and above all his simplicity and honesty to help him, has anyone of these legislators seen Government bend before any man? And they bent before Gokhale year after year for 12 years and what was the result? They changed the financial policy of the country and above all before Gokhale departed from this world he saw an advance in the constitutional position of his countrymen. However small that advance may have been, however insignificant it may have been felt by some, it was nonetheless an advance which was appreciated at that time and he lived to take part in that advance.

Whom was it due to? It was certainly due to the combined pressure of many of our great men, alas, who are no longer with us, but if any man is to be picked out amongst those many the name I would pick out as the one who did more than any other would be the name of Gokhale. It may be a thing to-day that may appear ridiculous to many that we should consider the Morley-Minto reforms as any achievement. It may seem ridiculous to talk about it to-day. But you, Mr. Sastri, remember the day when the legislatures functioned even without the Morley-Minto Reforms and those who had had experience of those days realised that an advance, however small, however insignificant, however trifling, however ridiculed by some of my friends, was an advance and to have been able to obtain that advance with nothing to aid you but your brain, your logic, your mastery of facts and your honesty of purpose is a great achievement and Gokhale, the man Gokhale, whose deeds, whose life, whose character, has been greatly and universally appreciated after his death, was misunderstood by his own countrymen and by others during his own lifetime. It is easy to criticise—and Gokhale during his lifetime was not one who lived without criticism. Although criticised as he was from all sides, believed by some of his own countrymen not to have been a great patriot, sometimes suspected by Government of being merely a secessionist, it is to that Gokhale that history will state India owes and will owe its constitutional freedom, which is bound to come, whatever we may say, if not today, tomorrow; if not tomorrow, the day after and history will relate whatever may have been said in Gokhale's lifetime, that that freedom we shall owe to that man who died at the age of 49

but who sacrificed his life to obtain that freedom for us. You, Mr. Sastri, have talked of liberalism and moderatism. There are many of my friends in this Presidency, nay in India, who believe as we do that a constitutional, consistent and regular pressure on Government will achieve more in the long run than spasmodic and revolutionary attempts for a short time. But believing with us as they do, you and I know, Mr. Sastri, that they are ashamed of being called Liberals. I have never been ashamed of being called what I am. If I have been foolish and people choose to point it out to me, it is not their fault, it is mine and if I am a Liberal, that is to say a man who believes that the best can be only achieved for my country by a consistent, constitutional and strong effort, day in and day out, what have I to grumble about if they call me a Liberal? If that consistent, that regular effort, because it is constitutional, is called moderate, what have I to grumble about it if I am called a moderate? It doesn't hurt me. It won't hurt you, Mr. Sastri. I have experience of what your moderatism means. I have experience of how you in private and public put your demands. If that is being moderate I ask in all conscience why we should not be proud of being called moderates along with my friend Mr. Sastri, why, nay with my friend Mr. Kelkar. Why, my friend Mr. Kelkar is as great, as strong, as firm a moderate as Mr. Sastri and swayed away as he may be sometimes, he comes back to the fold and he is the first to lead the march back and it is with you, Mr. Kelkar, and with Mr. Sastri that I merely as an humble follower will be proud to be labelled moderate if we achieve one-tenth of what Gokhale achieved during his life-time, one-tenth of what Gokhale left to past and future generations. Call him a moderate if you will, call him a Liberal if you like, it was Gokhale who gave you reforms in this country; it was Gokhale who made Indians members of the Government; it was Gokhale's work that will give your legislatures powers that they want and deserve. Call us moderates if you choose. Call Gokhale a Liberal if you choose. You dare not deny, Liberal or moderate, Gokhale was the greatest of patriots that India could produce and if his patriotism led him to the conclusion that the only method of advancing the interests of his country was what is called by my friend Mr. Sastri moderation all the more credit to him that he stuck to his principles in order to achieve for his country what he did within the short space of time destiny had given him in this world.

You have read, Mr. Sastri, a para from the prospectus of the Deccan Sabha. I would like to read to you the preamble written by Gokhale to the rules of the Servants of India Society and I think it summarises what is going to be the politics and the principles of India of all parties within the next ten years. This is what it is: It is known to you by heart, Mr. Sastri; it is known to many of you, gentlemen. I will crave your indulgence if I read it for the information of those who may not be aware of it.

"Its members frankly accept the British connection as ordained in the inscrutable dispensation of providence for

India's good. Self-Government within the Empire for their country and a higher life generally for their countrymen is their goal. This goal they recognise cannot be attained without years of earnest and patient effort and sacrifice worthy of the cause. Much of the work must be directed towards building up in the country a higher type of character and capacity than is generally available at present and the advance can only be slow. Moreover, the path is beset with great difficulties. There will be constant temptations to turn back, bitter disappointments will repeatedly try the faith of those who have put their hand to the work. But the weary toil can have but one end if only the workers grow not faint-hearted on the way."

That embodies not only Gokhale's principles but ours, to-day his chelas and we are proud to maintain that we would not change one word of what he wrote, that we still without being compelled cling to the faith he had and to what we believe, as he did. His is the only policy that will lead to the goal of our ambition.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, I have nearly come to the end. As I have said, it is difficult to compress one's remarks about Gokhale within a short speech. Gokhale, as I have said, was a great statesman but the side of his character that will always be most appreciated in this city will be the side which taught his countrymen to sacrifice their own worldly possessions and their own materialistic careers for the good of their country. He started, as I have said, as a missionary. As I have already stated, he turned out to be a statesman. He again became a missionary and started the Servants of India Society of which he was the first President, the second President was the worthy gentleman sitting on my left (Mr. Sastri). May Gokhale from above shower his blessings on the Society which he formed and may that Society continue to give us missionaries who become statesmen, missionaries who become orators, missionaries who become ambassadors for India such as Gokhale and Sastri and if the Servants of India Society will give us more Gokhales and more Sastris, why, that will have been the greatest work that Gokhale will have done for his country.

I thank you, Mr. Sastri, for the opportunity you have given me of, being amongst you to-night. I echo your hope and desire that this Hall may be used everyday for the most useful purpose that a hall can be used. May this building ultimately fulfill the object for which it was built and be a house of learning for the students of political economy. With the blessings of your Society, I am certain that the Deccan Sabha will succeed in fulfilling that object and although a hall of brick and mortar it will remain a memorial to Gokhale. The greatest memorial can never be of brick or mortar or marble, it can only be the reverence, the fragrant memory and love for him in the hearts of his countrymen.

Mr. Sastri, ladies and gentlemen, I declare the Gokhale Hall open.

## DEMOCRATIC SWARAJ PARTY.

*Some of the more important resolutions passed by the Democratic Swaraj Party in Bombay on 21st September are given below:—*

**T**HIS meeting of the Democratic Swaraj Party offers its sincere welcome to the Congress Nationalist Party for the specific purpose of resisting the White Paper and the Communal Award and hopes that all Nationalists in India, whether within the Congress or outside, will put forward their best efforts in fighting the Communal Award at all points.

This meeting expresses the Party's satisfaction that the futility and undesirability of the policy of boycott of legislatures has at last been recognized by the Working Committee and the All-India Congress Committee of the Indian National Congress.

Resolved that the conditions proposed by Mahatma Gandhi to the Congress, in his recent statement demanding certain changes in the Congress creed, as well as conditions of membership of the Congress are most impracticable and if accepted would result either in the growth of hypocrisy or in turning the Congress into a small coterie of persons indiscriminately loyal to and ruled by a metaphysical dictator, thereby making it absolutely unrepresentative of the nation. This meeting, therefore, calls upon all delegates to the Congress to oppose those changes in the open session of the Congress in Bombay.

Resolved that this general meeting of the Party accords its full support to the All-India Anti-Communal Award Conference to be held in Bombay on the eve of the Indian National Congress in October next and calls upon the members of the Party to attend the Conference as delegates, and also in view of the strong and universal condemnation of the so-called Communal Award throughout the country by Nationalists, Democratic Swarajists, Hindu Mahasabhaites, Sanatanists, Varnashram Sanghaites, Arya Samajists, Sikhs, Christians, Liberals and even by some Congressmen and Socialists, in short, by the entire Indian public, it appeals to all political, social and religious organizations of the country to join the Conference.

The eighth resolution says that in view of the attitude of the Working Committee and the Parliamentary Board towards the Communal Award and in view of breaches of the Pact by some Congressmen of the Maharashtra, the Party rescinds the Aney-Kelkar Pact.

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE SECRET OF HITLER'S VICTORY. By PETER and IRMA PETEROFF. (Hogarth Press.) 1934. 20cm. 128p. 3/6.
- MUGHAL KINGSHIP AND NOBILITY. By RAM PRASAD KHOSLA. (The Indian Press, Allahabad.) 1934. 21cm. 11p. Rs. 35.
- INDIA, WHAT NOW? By N. GANGULEE. (Allen & Unwin.) 1933. 21cm. 280p. 7/6.
- FUNDAMENTAL LAWS OF THE CHINESE SOVIET REPUBLIC. (International Publishers.) 1934. 20cm. 87p. \$0.75.
- RACE AND ECONOMICS IN SOUTH AFRICA. By W. G. BALLINGER. (Hogarth Press.) 1934. 18cm. 67p. 1/6.
- NICHOLAS ROERICH. By R. C. TANDAN. (The Roerich of Art and Culture, Allahabad.) 1934. 18cm. 53p.