

Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA.

VOL. XVIII, No. 32. }

POONA—THURSDAY, AUGUST 8, 1935.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	413
ARTICLES :—	
Naked Coercion.	416
The Congress and the States.	418
Sparks from the Parliamentary Anvil	420
Marketing Legislation in Kenya.	523
Educational Reform—II. By V. N. Naik, M. A.	411
REVIEW :—	
Meaning of Democracy. By Dr. E. Asirvatham.	426
SHORT NOTICES.	426
MISCELLANEA :—	
Congress & States' Subjects.	427
Hesitation & Embarrassment Writ Large— <i>Indian Express</i> Comment.	427
BOOKS RECEIVED.	428

Topics of the Week.

Acceptance of Office.

THE two main questions that were considered by the Working Committee of the Congress last week in Wardha concerned the Congress policy in regard to acceptance of office and the British Indian Congressmen's duty towards the States' people's agitation. On the former question no decision was reached, as in fact the Working Committee could not take upon itself to formulate a definitive decision thereon. That must be done by the Congress itself in its plenary session. This in fact was the Working Committee's solution of the problem. All that the Committee as the Cabinet of the Congress could have done was, to indicate what its own view was and to place it for adoption or rejection by the Congress. Advocates of acceptance of office pressed their opinion on the Committee, so also the opponents of this policy. But the Committee considered the merits of neither and gave no lead to the Congress workers on either side. The reason given for a postponement of the decision is unconvincing, viz. that there is not full material yet before the country for framing a policy in respect to the reforms. If what is meant is material in regard to the details of the new constitution, there is as much material now as will be available at any time. Waiting for a few months or even a few years more will not add to our knowledge of the constitu-

tional machinery which will be set in motion by the Reforms Act. But one must realise that it is a most momentous decision to take even provisionally, whether it be in favour of acceptance of office or abstinence therefrom, and one cannot be too hard on a responsible political organisation if it would prefer to watch the repercussions of the enactment of the constitution on various sections of opinion and wish to determine its policy after taking account of all the currents of opinion.

Constructive Use or Destructive ?

WE feel, however, that it is somewhat misleading to put the question in the form in which it is being put in current discussions, viz. acceptance or non-acceptance of office. The real question is whether the Congress or other progressive parties will use the Act constructively for such good as it is capable of doing in that direction or whether they will seek to destroy it. So far as the Congress is concerned, even those who favour accepting Ministerships under the new regime, advocate this policy on the ground that it will enable them to destroy the regime the more effectively. Mr. Satyamurti, who is most vocal in advocating acceptance of office, declared after the Wardha meeting that he must not be misunderstood as advocating acceptance of reforms, and that he is in favour of capturing positions of influence and power only because to do so would place the political machinery at the disposition of those who are determined either to put an end to it or at least not to allow it to move smoothly. Dr. Ansari and Dr. Bidhan Roy, who issued a manifesto in favour of acceptance of Cabinet offices for the consideration of the Working Committee, also spoke in the same strain, though they did not emphasise their wrecking intentions as strongly as Mr. Satyamurti did. To judge from these declarations, all Congressmen seem to be agreed that their endeavour must hereafter be, not to work the reforms loyally and contentedly, extracting from them such advantages in constructive good as they are capable of yielding, but to make a failure of them and, if possible, to overthrow them completely. The only difference among different groups of Congressmen appears to be whether they can achieve their object best from within or from without, by taking charge of the constitutional machinery to the extent that it is possible or by standing aloof from it and throwing the responsibility for carrying on the government on others who would give the constitution an honest trial.

Conquest of New Rights.

IF this is the difference that divides various sections of Congressmen it is a small difference, and at any rate it is such as should give no cause of jubi-

lation to those who have made up their minds, now that the constitution is finally settled, to exercise the power—little as it may be—which the constitution gives honestly and in a spirit of good-will, for Congressmen without distinction are bent upon working the constitution for the conquest of new power rather than for the exercise of the power contained in the Act. It is true that no section in the Congress now contemplates the use of uniform, unvarying and consistent obstruction as the Swaraj Party under the lead of Pandit Motilal Nehru did. The Parliamentary wing of Congressmen would be willing now and then to dilute their obstructionist policy with the object of supporting or even themselves initiating some measures of constructive reform. Nevertheless their main objective remains that of destruction rather than construction. We do not mean of course that there are no Congressmen who are not opposed to wrecking tactics. Perhaps even some leaders who profess to be in favour of such tactics would really at heart like their countrymen not to think too much for the next few years of widening the scope of reforms, but to concentrate on getting the best out of them in a constructive way. There must be quite a good few of this sort. They perhaps think that acceptance of office is not likely to be sanctioned by the Congress unless the policy is represented as only a move in the game of non-co-operation and destruction. But this only serves to bring out into stronger relief the prevailing sentiment in the Congress ranks. We are inclined to believe that the mass opinion in the Congress is solidly in favour of wrecking, and even those who adopt the slogan merely for the purpose of obtaining Congress approval for acceptance of Cabinet offices will be overwhelmed in the end by the strong feeling in the rank and file of the Congress in favour of destruction. On account of the presence of such leaders there will no doubt be many turns and twists in the policy of Congressmen in the Legislatures; it will be a zigzag of construction and destruction, but the policy will in the end look more toward destruction than toward construction.

No Acceptance in a Roundabout Way.

THE most authoritative expression of opinion on this subject that we have had so far is by the Congress President, Babu Rajendra Prasad. In a press interview he said:

The Working Committee's resolution regarding the postponement of acceptance or non-acceptance of office can and should be read in the light of the resolution passed at the Bombay Session rejecting the constitution. It will be for the next session of the Congress to lay down lines on which that rejection should be implemented. Rejection cannot mean accepting the constitution and working it. As a consequence of that it is not possible for me at the present stage to indicate what the next Congress will decide and unless it chooses to reverse the Bombay resolution, of which there is not the slightest chance and which I hope it will not do, the Congress must lay down a programme which would result in actual rejection of the constitution and not its acceptance in a roundabout way.

The following question and answer are also useful in understanding the Congress policy:

Q.—If the Congress decides to contest the elections under the new constitution will it make any alliance with other parties in the country to make sure of a *pucca* majority in the Councils?

A.—The Congress will always welcome co-operation from other parties, but it is obvious that it cannot give up

any of its essential items for purchasing such co-operation. There can be no compromise between rejection and acceptance of the constitution, whether the Congress gets a majority or not. More than this it is difficult to say at this juncture before the Congress chalks out its own line of action.

"Constitution will break Congress"!

WHETHER the Congress, if it decides finally upon using all its resources in overthrowing, defeating or weakening the constitution, will succeed in its policy or not is a different matter. Mr. Hugh Molson, M. P., speaking at a meeting of the East India Association in London on 26th June, confidently asserted: "The effect of the constitution will be to break the Congress; the Congress will not break the constitution." The reason he gave for his opinion would not carry conviction to Indians, viz. "Actually it is impossible for a party to continue to boycott a constitution which offers opportunities of advancement to ambitious politicians and of service to those who desire to serve their fellow-countrymen." The constitution offers very small opportunities for service, which no one need consider it a hardship to abstain from; if by so doing it were possible to replace a constitution of dissembled self-government by genuine self-government. The real basis of Mr. Molson's statement is that the constitution is so honeycombed with safeguards and restrictions and is so effectually closed to future changes that even a strong party intent upon wrecking it by using all available means, constitutional and extra-constitutional, may yet fail to do so. But at the present moment we are only considering what the Congress policy is likely to be, and we feel that it will not be one of patient and loyal working of the reforms as they are, without a thought for their immediate or early expansion or destruction.

Rebuff to Mr. Bhulabhai.

THE other question of importance that was discussed at the meeting of the Working Committee was the recent speech made by Mr. Bhulabhai Desai in Mysore on the place of the States in the federation. The question arose because of requisition made by the Secretary of the All-India States' People's Conference, Mr. Amritlal Sheth, and some other Congressmen for a meeting of the A. I. C. C. to consider whether the speech is in consonance with the declared policy of the Congress on the subject. The contention of Mr. Sheth and his co-signatories to the requisition is that the sentiments expressed in the speech are in flat contradiction to the resolutions of the Congress and the pronouncements of leaders like Mahatma Gandhi. The Working Committee having considered the question *in camera*, it is not known what the Committee thought of the speech as a whole, but its resolution is everywhere regarded as a severe rebuke to the leader of the Congress Party in the Assembly. It gave Mr. Bhulabhai Desai full opportunity to explain his point of view. Mr. Bhulabhai submitted a lengthy memorandum on the subject and also devoted several hours to vindicating his position orally.

THE Committee, however, did not hold that this standpoint could be justified since it was compelled to throw the responsibility for the views expressed in the speech on Mr. Bhulabhai personally and refused to endorse them in any way. It did not even agree, it is said, to put his memorandum on the Congress record. The Committee has gone, we think,

as far as it could be expected to do, in disowning Mr. Bhulabhai as a spokesman of the Congress on this question. There is no doubt that the views which he ventilated in Mysore were such as could be accepted by no political party. He, it should be remembered, was the author of the Patiala Memorandum pleading for a confederation instead of a federation. The Mysore speech only echoed, in somewhat guarded language, the plea, contained in the Patiala Memorandum. The Memorandum might be regarded as a piece of professional work. The speech, however, was made as a Congress leader and claimed to represent the Congress policy. The Congress had therefore to repudiate the speech. It is not easy for any political party to keep career politicians with which every party abounds in their place when they go astray; and the Working Committee, by robbing Mr. Bhulabhai's deliverance of the Congress imprimatur, has administered to him severe enough censure.

The Hitavada—a Tri-Weekly.

FROM the beginning of this month, the *Hitavada* of Nagpur will be published three times a week. It came into being as a weekly twenty-five years ago and was converted into a bi-weekly ten years ago. The fact that it will hereafter make three appearances a week instead of two will, we doubt not, be widely welcomed not only in the C. P. but in other parts of the country as well. It will be generally recognised that during its existence extending over a quarter of a century, the paper has served to enrich the public life of the C. P. to an extent which hardly any other provincial paper can lay claim to. A faithful organ of public opinion, it never faltered in its criticism of Government and our public men and institutions when it thought that such a course was demanded in the public interest. Nor has it been sparing in bestowing praise out of equally high motives. It is certainly not too much to say that its record in the matter of the political education of the people is as distinguished as it is useful.

The coincidence of its conversion into a tri-weekly and the enactment of the new Indian constitution into law is not accidental, as is apt to be imagined. Messrs. Dravid, Shahane and Mani, whose labours have gone into making the paper the power for good it is in the C. P., had all along contemplated such an enlarged sphere of influence for it simultaneously with the enactment of the new constitution. The wisdom of the step is beyond doubt. To Mr. Dravid in particular it must be a matter of genuine pleasure that the plant he nurtured single-handedly for many a long year promises to grow so rapidly. We bespeak the good wishes of all for a career of great public utility to the paper, which is owned and controlled by the Servants of India Society.

Army Indianisation.

AS our readers are aware, the process of Indianising the officer ranks of the Indian Army has been in operation for nearly fifteen years; but according to information about defence matters recently published from Simla, the number of Indian officers holding the King's Commission has not yet gone beyond 145! The exasperatingly slow nature of the progress of the scheme of Indianisation will at once become obvious when it is borne in mind that the number of European officers to be eventually replaced by Indians is in excess of 3,000. Goodness knows how many centuries it will take to complete the

process. But however resentful the Indian public may be at the snail's pace with which the scheme is going forward, its criticism of the Government policy is no better than a cry in the wilderness, in the absence of a definite obligation on them to prove responsive.

THE first products of the Indian Sandhurst numbering 29 were turned out at the end of last year. 12 of them secured admission to the military college through the door of open competition, 10 were selected from the Indian army and 7 were from the Indian States. Surprise is sometimes expressed that cadets, accepted for admission to the military academy, often fail to receive the Commission. An explanation of this seemingly surprising phenomenon is also furnished. It is pointed out that some cadets, while undergoing the course of instruction at the Academy, which is of a highly specialised nature, show themselves as being thoroughly devoid of the essential qualifications required of the officer. It is only in such cases of proved unfitness for a military career that failure to receive the Commission occurs. While nobody would like to advocate the cause of the unfit, is it too much to ask that means should somehow be found whereby this unfitness will be detected in the early stages rather than after a cadet has wasted a precious year or two in a vain effort to qualify as a military officer?

Motion Picture Society.

THE third annual meeting of the Motion Picture Society was recently held in Bombay. From the report of its activities submitted to the meeting, it has to be said that the Society has, during its brief existence, shown remarkable energy in the matter of the organisation of the cinema industry. This is good so far as it goes. But our main interest in the industry is educational. Apart from its recreative side, we regard it as a potent instrument of public education—a purpose it is admirably serving in other lands. Cannot the cinema industry in this country be turned to a similar useful purpose? The need of its exploitation for educational purposes in a backward country like India with its low level of literacy is self-evident. Indeed the need is more pressing here than elsewhere. But unfortunately this part of its activity has virtually remained unheeded. Perhaps there are formidable difficulties in the way of its development. May be the production of such films is impossible in the absence of Government help and co-operation which are not forthcoming to the desired extent. Anyway all that we wish to emphasise is that this aspect of the problem should receive the serious attention of the Society.

IN this connection it is encouraging to find that the Society is not altogether blind to the educational possibilities of the screen. Last year, e. g., it made a small beginning in this direction by showing free to school children a few educational films at important centres. The production of educational pictures too was not altogether outside its ken; and its recommendation for the reservation of a percentage of the proceeds of the Entertainments Tax for encouraging the production and exhibition of educational pictures deserves careful and sympathetic consideration. The suggestion too that new blood should be infused in the Board of Censors by the inclusion in it of some popular representatives which the Society has put forward also appears worthy of serious thought.

NAKED COERCION.

IS there an instance in history of a constitution, cursed out by a people, being forcibly imposed upon them? If there is, we have not heard of it. But there are a number of instances in which the people are given the right of either accepting or rejecting a constitution offered to them.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

A most striking instance of this kind is in connexion with the Philippine Islands. An Independence Act was passed by the United States Congress in January 1933, promising independence to the Islands after a probationary period of ten years. But the Act gave the Philippine Legislature the option of accepting or rejecting the measure and provided that it should go into effect only if the Legislature accepted it within a year. The Act imposed undue restrictions upon the political power of the Filipinos and upon the economic relations which were to subsist between the Philippines and the United States during the transitional or, as it was called, the Commonwealth period, and the Philippine Legislature rejected the Act by decisive majorities in both Houses. Consequently the Independence Act lapsed. But a Filipino Mission went to the United States under the leadership of Senor Quezon to seek revision of the law. One of the complaints of the Filipinos was about the retention by the U. S. Government of the military and naval bases in the Islands if it so desired. President Roosevelt met the Mission half way by agreeing to relinquish the military bases and to let the question of naval bases stand over for future decision by negotiation. Filipinos were satisfied with this concession. Accordingly, a modified Act was passed by the U. S. Congress in March 1934, which the Philippine Legislature accepted by an affirmative resolution, on the advice of Senor Quezon. This Act, like the former one, provided for the election of a Constitutional Convention which was to draft a constitution subject to certain limitations set forth in the Act. The draft constitution was then to be submitted to the U. S. President for approval, whereupon a plebiscite was to be held upon the constitution in the Philippines. If in the referendum a majority of votes were cast in favour of the constitution it was to be the law of the land; otherwise the Independence Act passed by the U. S. Legislature was to become null and void, and the Islands were to revert to the existing system of government. Filipino delegates to the Constitutional Convention were elected in July last year; a constitution was adopted by the Convention on 8th February of this year; it was approved by President Roosevelt on 23rd March and ratified in a plebiscite on 14th May. There are about 1,700,000 registered voters in the Islands and of them an overwhelming majority voted in favour of the constitution. Indeed the majority was in the proportion of 25 to 1. The constitution is thus to come into effect after the autumn. It reserves foreign affairs to the control of the United States Government, which remains pledged to defend the Islands from external aggression. There are certain other limiting conditions on the power of the

Filipinos during the transition period; but the transition period ends on January 1, 1945, and then the Islands will become fully independent in internal and external matters, and there will be a "final and complete" relinquishment of sovereignty over the Islands by the United States. Under Section 10 of the Act the President is directed to "withdraw and surrender all right of possession, jurisdiction, control or sovereignty then existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippine Islands." Thus for ten years Filipinos will enjoy a large measure of internal autonomy, and subsequently they will enjoy, not dominion status, but complete national independence, actual and titular. What we are concerned to point out immediately, however, is not the plenitude of power conferred upon the Islands, but the fact that at every step in constitution-making the consent of the people was taken. Coercion was indeed ruled out deliberately from the outset from the whole plan.

SOUTH AFRICAN PROTECTORATES.

The British Government itself is not averse to consulting a subject people, particularly when such consultation is likely to result in the retention of political power in its own hands. When it gave self-government to South Africa it excepted three large areas—Swaziland, Bechuanaland and Basutoland—from the control of the South African Union, on the ground of its pledges to the natives to protect their interests, and treated these territories as Protectorates under its own direct control. But it was contemplated at the time the Union Act was passed that, under proper safeguards for the rights and interests of the natives, the territories would eventually be incorporated in the Union. The Union Government is naturally pressing for admission of the territories into the Union. The original reservation of the territories to the British Government's control was certainly justified in native interest, and the question is whether they can now be handed over to the Union Government as this Government desires. The demand for transfer has created an alarm not only amongst the natives but amongst the champions of native rights, and in order to allay this feeling the Dominions Secretary, Mr. Thomas, reiterated in the House of Commons on 20th June Parliament's pledge that the Protectorates would not be joined to the Union till the natives had been consulted, and till it was itself satisfied that native interests would remain quite safe after transfer. So far as consultation with the natives was concerned, it was not merely a consultation such as took place at the India Round Table Conference in which, after ascertaining Indian opinion, the British Government and Parliament promptly put it on one side and went their own way. The pledge amounts to non-transfer of the territories under the control of the High Commissioner except with the consent of the natives. Mr. Thomas referred to General Hertzog's declaration in 1925 that "the Union Government would not wish to incorporate the territories in the Union unless the inhabitants of

the territories, native as well as European, are prepared and desire to come in" and added: "The conclusion which we draw from the above consideration is that the policy of both Governments (the Union Government and the British Government) for the next few years should be directed to bringing about a situation in which, if transfer were to become a matter of practical politics, it should be effected with the full acquiescence of the populations concerned." This statement gave general satisfaction. Why was so much concern caused at a premature transfer, as appeared possible, of the High Commissioner territories to the Union Government? Not because it was felt that the administration of the territories by the High Commissioner was all that could be desired. On the contrary many serious complaints were made in the course of the debate in the Commons that the British Government had neglected native interests in education, public health, road development, etc., and Capt. Sir Ian Fraser roundly condemned the Government for such neglect. "Anyone who reads any of these reports (like the report of Sir Alan Pim on Basutoland)," he said, "which have recently been published in respect of those territories, cannot help feeling that Great Britain cannot claim that this is a piece of work of which she can be particularly proud." But still it is felt that native interests will on the whole be better looked after under the existing system of administration than under the rule of the white immigrants. And, under the Statute of Westminster, no kind of safeguards in the interest of the natives can be attached to the transfer, if it is once decided upon. Sir Robert Hamilton rightly stressed this aspect of the matter. He said: "The political position has been profoundly altered from what it was 25 years ago, and the conditions which now surround the transfer are very different from what one envisaged in 1909. . . . If a transfer takes place now it would in its nature be final, that is to say, the Home Government would cease to have the power of intervention which it had under the 1909 Act if any alteration of the conditions were considered. . . . In 1909 there were still these powers reserved to the Crown to look after native interests, but the transfer taking place now would be a final one, and there would be no power still left to the Crown to intervene."

We are not concerned at the moment either with the South African Government's native policy or with the Imperial Government's native policy. We are only concerned to point out that the British Government has pledged itself not to hand over the natives of the three territories to the Union Government without their consent. Presumably the African natives want so much looking after because they do not know their own interests and are unable to protect them. If the trustees can exercise their discretion in any matter, it is just in respect of wards who are unable to understand where their interests lie. But even in settling their future, the British Government insists upon consulting them and is willing to abide by their wishes. It will not transfer them against their wishes even if it should itself think that transfer

would be to their advantage. If so much solicitude is to be shown for the feelings of a people who are supposed not to know their own interests, how much more regard should be paid to the opinions of those who are politically awakened? Would it be right for the British Government to say to them: "We have framed a constitution that we are convinced will do you good. We know that you would rather go without it, but we know better than you do what is in your interests. Whether you like it or not, this shall be your constitution." If consent of the governed is necessary at all, it is certainly more necessary in the case of a politically-minded people than in the case of those who have not as yet attained political consciousness.

WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

Particularly necessary is India's consent because the Indian constitution is a federal constitution. Let us look at what is happening in Australia. One of the States of the Australian Commonwealth—Western Australia—feels that the federation has done, and is doing, it great harm. For a number of years this has been the burning question in the State. The people of the State desire to secede from the Commonwealth and have gone the length of petitioning the British Parliament to allow their State to withdraw from the federation. A referendum was taken on the question of this petition. In the referendum 91 per cent. of the total number of persons entitled to vote took part, and by a majority of over two to one the people voted for the petition. Subsequently a Secession Act was passed by the State Parliament. The Act consisted of a resolution to be presented to the Imperial Parliament and the petition itself is a schedule to the Act. The petition is signed for and on behalf of the people of Western Australia by the Presidents of both Chambers of the State Parliament, the Premier of the State and the leaders of the two Opposition Parties in Parliament. There is no question therefore that the people of Western Australia wish the federation to be dissolved. They say that the federation was brought into being by the Imperial Parliament and should be dissolved by the Imperial Parliament. The Standing Committee on Public Petitions to which Western Australia's petition was referred came to the conclusion (to use the Attorney-General's paraphrase) that "although it would be within the strict legal competence of the United Kingdom Parliament to pass such legislation (as was asked for by Western Australia) it would not be within the constitutional powers of the Parliament of the United Kingdom to do so except upon the definite request of the Commonwealth of Australia." The Committee on this ground ruled that Western Australia's petition was not "proper to be received."

What is the request of the people of Western Australia? It was clearly expressed by one of her champions: "They entered voluntarily into the federation. They have found that they made a mistake. They consider that they made a mistake, and they ask the Imperial Parliament to relieve them of the responsibility of having made that mistake." Necessity arises sometimes even for a federation, voluntarily brought

about, being dissolved. It appears that there is some chance now of a readjustment being made, within the framework of the federation itself, in Western Australia's position and her grievance being remedied. But the fact remains that even a voluntary federation may have to be brought to an end. If it is to have any chance of lasting, it must at least be voluntary when it is established. How will it do to force a federation upon a people and then hold them eternally to its terms? In the discussion of Western Australia's request for secession, British politicians did not take the higher ground that a federal union is an indissoluble union for all time, but one has certainly heard of the doctrine of a federal union being "an indissoluble union of indestructible states" and a civil war having been waged to uphold it. What will be the consequence of this doctrine being invoked for the purpose of maintaining the Indian federation which is admittedly involuntary and forced? Even in the case of the Australian federation, which Western Australia joined of her own free will, the plea that was made to the British Parliament by Britishers was: "We cannot ignore the danger that these people (Western Australians), embittered by a sense of real grievance, may be tempted to take the law into their own hands. That is something which no one who has the welfare of the country at heart can contemplate with equanimity." It may be argued that Western Australians, having by their own choice entered a federation which, when they did so, they knew was incapable of being terminated, have no moral right now to ask either for the whole federation being dissolved or for themselves being allowed to secede from it. They themselves take a different view of the

matter. They think, as Mr. Dickie put it in the House of Commons: "As they entered voluntarily into the federation, there is nothing to prevent them from voluntarily walking out of the federation." But it may be granted that their moral right is rather weak. How strong, however, would be the moral right of a people to get out of a federation, into which they have not voluntarily entered but into which they are coerced by sheer brute force? How strong, too, would be the temptation for them to take the law into their own hands? Perhaps Indians are too weak to do so, and the British Government is no doubt counting upon this weakness in pursuing a policy of naked coercion. But is there anything to prevent their constantly struggling against the constitution, and is it nothing to the British Government that there will be perpetual tension, friction, strife?

If it has any regard for the sentiments of the Indian people and for its own self-interest, it might yet desist from bringing the constitution into operation. It has demonstrated its might by driving a Bill hated by Indians through all its stages in Parliament and placing it on the statute book. The Government will detract nothing from its might if it forbears to put the Act into force on the ground that Indians do not like it. If the Government proceeds to give effect to it in spite of the vehement protests of the Indian nation, it may find that even its great might is powerless to keep Indian politicians from working against the constitution. This is a constitution that can neither be mended nor ended in a lawful way and to impose it upon a people against their wishes is to challenge them to resort to force and violence. British statesmen may yet bethink themselves of the consequences.

THE CONGRESS AND THE STATES.

THE Working Committee of the Congress, after indirectly repudiating the views expressed by Mr. Bhulabhai Desai in his Mysore speech on the question of the States, issued a statement defining its own attitude towards the agitation carried on by the States' people in the States. The statement, although it is a little less unsatisfactory to the States' people than any previous statement, will not remove their grievance at all. It is somewhat less unsatisfactory inasmuch as they are not told, as they were told before, that the States are as good as foreign territory to the Congress, and that the States' people are like the Afghans in whose welfare they cannot take any practical interest. Nor are they told in express terms that it will not be within its legal and constitutional competence to interfere with the States' internal affairs. But the statement really amounts to it, for it says that while the States' people will get as much of moral sympathy and good wishes and even blessings from the Congress as they may desire, of actual material support they can get none. The statement says in effect that the Congress must pursue towards the States as towards other foreign countries a policy of strict non-intervention. The Congress leaders have had the Madras and

Calcutta and Lahore resolutions of the Congress on the subject of the States so much dinned into their ears that they cannot any longer openly put forward legal quibbles as they used to do quite recently. They have now to concede that, having admitted the States' people as its members, the Congress cannot now treat them as foreigners, and that, having taken their help in its purely British Indian agitation, it cannot now refuse to give at least some help to them in their own internal agitation. But they manage practically to revert to their former position.

That they dare not openly treat the States' people as foreigners is a distinct gain to them. The statement says, the Congress has "pledged to the States' people its sympathy and support in their legitimate and peaceful struggle for the attainment of full responsible government. By that . . . pledge the Congress stands." There is no ambiguity about these words. The Congress has obligated itself to give, not mere lip sympathy, but active support to the States' people. Having made this declaration, however, the Working Committee proceeds promptly to evacuate it of all its meaning. For the Committee goes on to indicate the limits within which the Congress can give help in the States' people's activities. One

would have thought that the only limits are the limits set by the resources at the command of the Congress. The Committee might have said, the Congress is pledged to give support to the States' people in their agitation—to the extent of its capacity. What is the Congress pledge to British Indians? To help them all it can. Why should the Congress pledge to the States' people be any less? The fact is that subconsciously the Congress leaders still look upon the States' people as strangers; they feel that they will have to go quite out of their way when they are called upon to render any assistance to them. They no doubt say that British Indians and the States' people are "one and indivisible"; but this has not yet entered into their inner consciousness. What otherwise was the need to point out to what extent the Congress will give help to the States' people, while they never thought it necessary to define to what extent they can give help to British Indians? The only explanation is that they are still under the domination of the idea that British India is the Congress's proper domain; that they must not go into the neighbouring States, and at any rate the trespass must not be repeated too often.

Now let us examine the limitations which the Working Committee places upon the Congress bounty, so far as the States' people are concerned. First, the Congress can support the States' people only "in their legitimate and peaceful struggle." This really involves no limitation, for "legitimate and peaceful" agitation has a very wide meaning in Congress literature. It includes not only ordinary constitutional agitation, but non-co-operation, passive resistance, civil disobedience and all forms of direct action, so long as violence is eschewed. If the Congress leaders will not attach to the words a more restricted signification in respect of the agitation in the States, the States' people will have no cause of complaint. But the States' people fear that even a mild application of pressure on the States' rulers will be denounced by those who occupy places of power in the Congress as something beyond the bounds of "legitimate" agitation. Second, the burden of the agitation must be borne by the States' people themselves, the part which the Congress can take in such agitation being confined to the exercise of "moral and friendly influence upon the States." This means, then, that the Congress can after all give only moral support to the agitation, and that it can give no active support. If it can give only moral support what is the support worth? It would be like the support it may give to Abyssinia in that country's fight against the aggression of Italy. Such support will help to marshal the world's public opinion against imperialism and oppression, but it can be of no tangible and immediate use. Surely, the support that the States' people expect of the Congress is something less remote and more intimate than this, and the Congress too has pledged something more than sympathy to them. It has pledged its support, but support, as interpreted by the Working Committee, is hardly distinguishable from sympathy. Let us suppose that,

when Mahatma Gandhi started his civil disobedience campaign in British India and called upon the States' people to extend their support to it, the States' people had said: "Certainly, we are bound to give you support. We make no distinction between ourselves and British Indians. We will give you help. Our help will consist in exercising 'moral and friendly influence' upon the British Government. You carry on the fight as strenuously as you can. Lose your all, spill your blood. We will see official A and official B and exert all our powers of persuasion with a view to getting the British Government to do you justice. We will be another Charlie Andrews or another Horace Alexander to you." We have no doubt that that would have given Mahatma Gandhi cold comfort. "Persuasion of the British Government is all right," he would have said, "but can you not give some solid and substantial help? Since you regard yourselves as one with the people of British India, can you not join the non-violent army and actually participate in our Satyagraha campaign, instead of playing the role of neutral mediators?" The States' people may ask the same question to Mahatma Gandhi now. They did not bargain when they were asked to enlist as Satyagrahis under the Mahatma's banner. They joined in large numbers and fought as zealously as did British Indians, making huge sacrifices which Mahatma Gandhi has always handsomely acknowledged. They did not display the qualities only of good neighbourliness, they identified themselves with the British Indian cause. Can Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress be merely good and sympathetic neighbours to the States' people now?

The States' people understand very well that the Congress cannot give them help beyond a certain point on account of the limited man-power at its command and the immensity of work that is in front of it. They surely have no desire to stampede the Congress into a Satyagraha campaign in some State and leave it to that body to carry it on for them. The limitations imposed upon the Congress by its capacity to help are well understood by everybody. But the States' people must be satisfied in their mind that the Congress is willing to give them such help—not of "moral and friendly influence" with the Princes merely, but active participation in their agitation—as it is within its capacity to give. And, speaking of capacity, surely the Congress can give vastly more help to the States' people than the States' people gave to British India in the last Satyagraha campaign. Why does not the Congress, the States' people may ask, at least to vindicate the principle of unity of British Indian people and themselves, formally depute some prominent British Indian leaders to help in carrying on an agitation—a legitimate and peaceful agitation—in some State? The Working Committee says in its statement, "The Congress has no other power under the existing circumstances" than "to exercise moral and friendly influence." It never speaks the language of defeatism in regard to British India. Why must it speak that language in regard to the States? Is it because the Princes are more powerful than the British Government? And if really

the Congress is so helpless in regard to the States, how does it propose to achieve independence—complete national independence—under a federation of which the States will now form an integral part? To be consistent, it must now renounce that creed, if only because it lacks power to deal with the States. The truth is that Mahatma Gandhi does not want the Congress to follow one uniform policy towards all rulers whose rule is oppressive. He makes the un-Mahatmalike distinction between white rulers and brown rulers, foreign oppressors and swadeshi oppressors. While to the former he is truculent, to the latter he is submissive. The fundamental question behind the questions raised in Wardha is: Shall we mete out the same measure to all rulers, white or brown, foreign or indigenous, the measure differing according to the quality and character of the rule certainly, but not according to the skin and nationality of the ruler? The Working Committee's statement does not answer the question in the affirmative.

The statement then goes on to put forward an apologia for the Congress not supporting the amendments in the Reforms Bill that are being asked for by the States' people. The defence is more specious than cogent. It amounts to this: The Congress has branded the whole Bill as worthless. Why then select particular portions of it for especial disapproval and suggest improvements? "To do so would amount to a reversal of the Congress policy" (of total rejection). If this is correct, Congressmen must not speak about any detailed provisions of the Bill at all, but bestow upon it every time they refer to the measure a comprehensive denunciation without alluding to anything in particular. But do they do so? Do they not select this or that portion for attack? Why, Rajendra Babu himself, when he went to Ranchi, spoke of the injustice involved in Chota Nagpur being treated as a partially excluded

area. As a matter of fact the schedule regarding the Excluded Areas is deleted from the Bill. Yet he thought it necessary to refer to the likelihood of Chota Nagpur being unjustly dealt with in the Order in Council which is to be issued on the subject. Did he imply thereby that if this objectionable feature were removed he would not reject the reforms? Why should the Working Committee then think that if it gave expression to views, say, on the question of the election of the States' representatives, it would somehow take away from the rigour of total rejection? If the Congress record were white on this question, it would be a different matter. But the fact is that its record is utterly black. Mahatma Gandhi did not allow himself even to use the word "election" in respect to the States. He piled qualifications upon qualifications when the question arose—and then said, the Princes may do just what they please. Other Congress leaders, when they speak of the Bill, have a lot to say about the safeguards, but they slur (cleverly as they no doubt think to themselves) over the nomination by the Princes and other equally objectionable features regarding the States. If in face of this recent history the Working Committee of the Congress puts forward such an excuse for omitting to do what was its plain duty to do, the States' people would naturally come to the conclusion that the Congress stands even now on this question where it stood when Mahatma Gandhi made the compromising speech at the Round Table Conference to which they have strongly objected. The Working Committee refers to the Constituent Assembly. Even now it has not said whether the Constituent Assembly will or will not include the States' people. We shall be surprised if the States' people will consider the statement at all satisfactory, except in the fact that it speaks no more of non-intervention in the States' affairs expressly, though its policy amounts in practice to a policy of non-intervention.

SPARKS FROM THE PARLIAMENTARY ANVIL.

House of Lords: 24th July.

THE India Bill passed the Third Reading in the House of Lords on 24th July. The debate was almost uniformly dull and unexciting, and the review of it too need not occupy much space.

LABOUR'S "LAST GRUMBLE"

THE Labour Opposition chose Lord Snell as its spokesman, and he reiterated the Labour Party's criticisms against the Bill. "This," he said, "is our last grumble about this Bill, a grumble that we do not expect to be effective." Here is the grumble itself:

Our main complaint about this Bill has not been in regard to the details of the political structure, but in regard to the way in which it touches, or fails to touch, the social and economic problems of the Indian people. We have sought to put first things first, and, as we see this Bill, it ignores the problems which afflict the Indian workers. It shows concern for the landlords and the merchants and the Princes, all of whom are abundantly able to look after themselves, but the attention that is

paid to the future welfare of the millions of Indian workers is meagre, if not entirely non-existent. I said that we had tried to put first things first. What are first things as we see them? First, will this Bill make happier and enlarge the life of the millions of hapless people who now earn their meagre bread in India? Will it secure good will and co-operation in that degree which will make India a satisfied and eager partner in the great British Commonwealth of Nations? Will it give the conditions of progress which will secure to them increasing social improvement? . . .

But we do look with alarm at the future economic and social relationships which are to be established in India in the future. As we see it, we are providing the Eastern world with all the apparatus of cheap production. We are placing in the hands of the Indian capitalists power to exploit the already economically impoverished workers of India, and to flood the world markets with goods produced by workers at an incredibly low level.

This Bill seems to us to hand the future of the Indian worker over to those people, to whom we are also giving special privileges. I do not know what your Lordships expect to happen from such conditions. We, for our part,

foresee the gradual exclusion of Western goods, not only from India but from Asia. We see the cementing of Eastern opinion against the Western world, discrimination not against England but against, as I say, the Western world. If your Lordships are going to rely upon communal differences in India to overcome that problem I believe you are living in a fool's paradise. When that issue confronts the Indian people there will be no differences in India. They will stand solidly together against the Western world. Does any one suppose that the interests which are being pampered and protected in this Bill will reward your generosity in the way that you expect? Why do the mill-owners of Bombay and Allahabad supply funds for Congress agitation? Not to protect and preserve markets for Lancashire, but to bait the swim for a golden catch of their own at some future period. It is to the avarice of these people that you are handing over, unprotected, the workers of India. We have stated many times, and we will now state for the last time, that we will have no part in that transaction, and we warn you, if we may, of its consequences.

GOVERNMENT'S HAUGHTY NON-CO-OPERATION.

LORD SNELL described how the Labour Party's co-operation was met by the Government by "haughty non-co-operation." The Indian Liberal Party and Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar and all other politicians who took part in constitutional discussions may well use Lord Snell's words in expressing their own feelings. He said:

I find myself greatly tempted to re-state many of our old criticisms, to lament the policy of the Government in rejecting all our suggestions, and I could speak at length and with great feeling of the thrifty discrimination of the Government, which led them to accept without acknowledgment all our acts of co-operation whilst refusing to give us one single thing in return. I will only say that we have tried in our discussions of this measure to be co-operative, but no plea that we have made has been successful, and no grievance that we have stated has been removed. We have had to suffer grief silently whilst the Bill has been passing through your Lordships' House. Conscious of the obedient battalions behind them, the Government adopted the spirit of haughty non-co-operation; but we did at least gain one victory over His Majesty's Government in that we showed ourselves more generous and more co-operative than they did.

ADVICE TO INDIANS.

LORD SNELL'S advice to Indians was to accept the constitution and work it for what it is worth. His exact words may be given:

I would like to conclude on another note, a note of hesitating advice to the Indian people that they, with all their differences and hesitations about this Bill, should yet accept it and work it to the full. I would ask them, in their disappointment, to reflect upon the history of the Party with which I have the honour to be connected. We, too, began in a hopeless minority. We had not the slightest chance of carrying one of our propositions. We suffered defeat and we endured calumny, but we waited cheerfully. We never fell (a prey) to the temptation of non-co-operation or violence, and at this day the record of our Party is not tainted by a drop of human blood. You get what you want by equipment and diligence and efficiency and not by non-co-operation, and I hope the workers of India will set their faces like flint against any temptation to non-co-operation and violence, for, my Lords, non-co-operation in a democracy is the sin of sins. Democracy is the one form of government in which neither a man nor a group of men may loaf or slack without dishonour. The working faith of a reformer, as I understand it, is

Get what you can, work what you get, and wait until you can get what you have not at present got. Therefore I think that the Indian people would do well to receive this Bill, without any enthusiasm it may be, but at the same time in the full determination to work it for what it will give.

"Non-co-operation in a democracy is the sin of sins." This is very true, but to admit it is not to admit that one can work the new constitution in the hope that one can get even in the remote future what one has not got at present. For this constitution is neither a democracy, nor is it capable, speaking humanly, of ever becoming a democracy. The fact that the constitution is not subject to change in any major provisions in future seems to have escaped the attention of Labour Peers. The Labour Party's leaders in the Commons have realised it well. We would like to ask Lord Snell what the Labour Party would have done if in the British Parliament from one-third to two-fifths of the members were to be always King's men in both Houses having co-equal authority, and for the rest a large proportion of elected members were returned by capitalists, and further the constitution were incapable of further change by constitutional means. We are not sure that in these circumstances they would not have brought about a bloody revolution. We can say this much for the Indian people, that they would not like to use violence. But more than this we cannot say. Lord Snell, thinking apparently that the passing of the Act is going to arouse a great burst of good-will among the people, recommended a general gaol delivery. A political amnesty usually follows measures of great constitutional advance. It would be ridiculous and self-stultifying to ask for it on the present occasion.

THE FUNDAMENTALS OF THE PROBLEM.

THE only other speech worth mentioning was the speech by Lord Lothian. It shows that his Lordship knows what is the test that should be applied to a Bill of this nature. His fault is that he completely misjudges the situation when he claims that the test is even partially satisfied. He said:

Does this Bill meet what I believe is the fundamental spiritual feelings in India? Does it transfer real responsibility for their own affairs on to Indian shoulders? Does it make possible the ending of that barren strife between British and Indian as to where responsibility should lie? Does it make possible steady movement towards full self-government in proportion as the Legislatures show their capacity to discharge that responsibility? I believe it does these things. The question of the speed with which India will develop towards that Dominion Status which, as has been said repeatedly, is the natural issue of Parliament's declaration of 1917, will in the future fundamentally rest upon the Indian Legislatures themselves.

OH FOR LORD CARSON!

LORD RANKEILLOUR, realising how weak has proved the opposition of the Tory die-hards to the essential features of the Bill, wished Lord Carson were strong enough to come to the House and smash the Bill to smithereens! He said:

Speaking for myself, not since I did what I could to help my noble friend Lord Carson in 1912 have I opposed any Bill with such zest and satisfaction as the present. And, while I am mentioning his name, I most deeply regret that that great man is not now with us, owing to age and infirmity, to attack this Bill with that pungency peculiarly his own. I know he detests this measure hardly less than that measure of twenty-odd years ago which he so strenuously opposed and which, in great part, he was able to destroy.

We in India would warmly echo the sentiment. The Right wing of the Conservative Party has been strong enough to secure the insertion of further reactionary provisions in the Bill, but has been utterly powerless to destroy the Bill. We too wish that Lord Carson, the puissant fighter, were able to put an end to the Bill altogether.

One phrase used by Lord Rochdale is worth preserving and memorialising: the Princes are "protected autocrats." What the British Government preserves in India is the Princes' autocracy!

GRANTS TO ANGLO-INDIANS.

AFTER the Third Reading was passed, some further amendments were taken up for consideration. Lord Lloyd moved again the amendment which he had moved on the Report stage confining the benefit of the educational grants meant for the Anglo-Indian community to the children of European fathers and Indian mothers. The objection to admitting the children of Indian fathers and European mothers was that "a child follows normally the religion of his father and all the native customs that ensue." Lord Lloyd did not object to such children being admitted into Anglo-Indian schools, but he objected to their being admitted as Anglo-Indians, which would have the result of diminishing the grants to be given to the issue of European fathers and Indian mothers. If the amendment moved by him could not be accepted, he appealed to Lord Zetland "to do the next best thing and to say across the floor of your Lordships' House something to this effect, that he would give directions to the Governors of Provinces that the educational grants in aid of European and Anglo-Indian communities would not be prejudiced by the admission of these children." Lord Zetland dutifully obeyed this behest. He declared: "Undoubtedly it is the duty of the Governor-General and of the Governors of the Provinces to see, under their special responsibility for protecting the interests of minorities, that the financial provision made for these schools is not endangered in so far as the offspring of European fathers and Indian mothers is concerned, and I think the noble Lord may rest assured that the Governor-General and the Governors will see that their duties in that respect are duly discharged." Lord Lloyd withdrew the amendment upon this assurance. The die-hards have not succeeded in destroying the Bill it is true, but they have certainly succeeded in making it very much worse than they found it.

RECRUITMENT OF ANGLO-INDIANS.

LORD LLOYD then demanded satisfaction, and got it in full, in respect to the demand of the Anglo-

Indian community that statutory provision should be made to ensure that they would have in future not only the percentage of posts on the railways and other services that they had in the past, but that they would be "kept employed in the same classes and character of employment as they had hitherto enjoyed," and that there would be no deterioration in their scale of remuneration. This provision was made by amending Clause 242. This Clause, in its amended form, now stands as follows, the additions and alterations made to the Clause being given in italics:

242--(1) In its application to appointments to, and to persons serving in, the railway services of the Federation, the last preceding section shall have effect as if for any reference to the Governor-General in paragraph (a) of subsection (1), in paragraph (a) of subsection (2) and in subsection (5) there were substituted a reference to the Federal Railway Authority.

(2) In framing rules for the regulation of recruitment to superior railway posts the Federal Railway Authority shall consult the Federal Public Service Commission, and in the recruitment to such posts and in recruitment generally for railway purposes shall have due regard to the past association of the Anglo-Indian community with railway services in India, and particularly to the specific class, character and numerical percentages of the posts hitherto held by members of that community and the remuneration attaching to such posts, and shall give effect to any instructions which may be issued by the Governor-General for the purpose of securing, so far as practicable, to each community in India a fair representation in the railway services of the Federation, but, save as aforesaid, it shall not be obligatory on the Authority to consult with, or otherwise avail themselves of the services of, the Federal Public Service Commission.

(3) In framing the rules for the regulation of recruitments to posts in the Postal and Telegraph Services, the Governor-General or person authorised by him in that behalf shall have due regard to the past association of the Anglo-Indian community with the said Services, and particularly to the specific class, character and numerical percentages of the posts previously held in the said Services by members of the said community and to the remuneration attaching to such posts.

Lord Zetland, before accepting the amendment, expressed the opinion that it would have been better to give all the privileges asked for in the amendment to the Anglo-Indian community without mentioning the community by name in the Statute, but he yielded. He added:

I must, however, make it clear that of course these words are purely declaratory. As he (Lord Lloyd) would be the first to admit, they do not bind anyone to anything, but merely state in the Statute what is the intention of Parliament with regard to this particular community. I must make it clear also that the words which have been added to the Amendment with regard to remuneration cannot be held in any way to be a promise that special rates of pay will be provided at any time for particular communities.

The specific percentages of posts to be given to the Anglo-Indian community are not mentioned in the Clause, but Lord Zetland made the following declaration:

It is the intention of the Government that the existing policy in this matter—that is to say, the policy laid down under the Government of India's Resolution of July, 1934—is the policy which they intend should be pursued, and if he asks me for an assurance on that point I am perfectly willing to give it to him. That is our intention and

more than that, the draft Instrument of Instructions proposes to instruct the Governor-general and the Governors that in the matter of securing "a due proportion of appointments in Our Services to the several communities" they shall be "guided in this respect by the accepted policy prevailing before the issue of these Our Instructions" unless they are "fully satisfied that modification of that policy is essential in the interests of the communi-

ties affected or of the welfare of the public." I may add that it is my intention to inform the Government of India that the Resolution of July, 1934, is to be regarded by them as the "accepted policy," in those words in the Instructions from now onwards, and I hope that with those words the noble Lord will be satisfied that we are doing as much as is possible to safeguard the interests of this very meritorious and deserving community.

MARKETING LEGISLATION IN KENYA.

THE marketing legislation in Kenya which was debated by the local legislature last month was greeted with a storm of opposition on the part of our countrymen there. The main ground of the Indian attack against the Bill is that it is aimed impliedly if not expressly against Indians and will, when enacted into law, result in their elimination from trade in the colony in course of time. As in the case of the clove legislation in Zanzibar, this unholy purpose is sought to be achieved in Kenya in a very subtle and insidious manner. Under the guise of protecting the interests of the natives, the legislation, it is feared, will inflict irreparable injury on Indian interests. It is true it is not avowedly racial in the sense that it studiously avoids any reference to Indians, but when it is remembered that under the present conditions none but Indians are the accustomed buyers of native produce it does not need much thinking to see against which section of the Kenya population the proposed marketing law is really directed. Long before the British Government took upon themselves the onerous, though by no means the disinterested, role of trusteeship for native interests, the Indians had been having unrestricted dealings with them and even to-day enjoy unfettered rights of buying their produce. From the lack of any outcry against them on the part of the natives, it is but fair to infer that these dealings have always been fair and just to the latter. All this will however cease when the new legislation becomes operative and Indians will be forced to have dealings with them under vexatious restrictions.

The proposed marketing scheme is admittedly modelled on similar legislation in force in the adjoining territories of Tanganyika and Uganda. Its adoption as a model by the Kenya authorities implies a belief on their part as to its efficacy in securing a better return for the native for his produce. It is difficult to know what, if any, action was taken by the Kenya Government to make sure that such a belief was really founded on fact before they framed similar legislative proposals for application to Kenya. Whatever that be, there appears reasonable ground to fear that the legislation has not proved uniformly beneficial to native interests in both these territories. According to Mr. Pandya, in Uganda, at any rate in the case of groundnuts, the marketing system seems to have turned out to be a complete failure. In these circumstances considerations of the merest prudence should have dictated to the Kenya Government the desirability of instituting an inquiry with a view to ascertaining whether

its enforcement in the peculiar conditions of Kenya would advance native interests. Such a course was as a matter of fact pressed on their attention by the Federation of Indian Chambers nearly two years ago, but the suggestion was unfortunately not heeded by them.

If an inquiry had been undertaken as a preliminary to the introduction of the present measure, it is contended that it would have been found that what was really necessary for the promotion of native interests was, not so much the system of marketing with which Kenya is now threatened, but steps designed to enable the native to increase his production. This purpose might have been accomplished by impressing on him the need for the adoption of improved methods of agriculture or by the provision of better means of communication as a facility for the marketing of his produce. At the present stage of his agricultural development, all the solicitude shown for providing marketing facilities for him is thus uncalled-for and really in the nature of an attempt to put the cart before the horse.

The principal objects of the legislation may be briefly stated as follows: 1. All native produce should be bought for cash only, bartering being strictly prohibited. 2. The price paid to the native for his produce should be a fair market price. 3. His being cheated in weight should be prevented. It could be shown, as was done by Mr. Pandya, that all these objects, very desirable in themselves, could be achieved even without the aid of the proposed marketing law; and that therefore its enactment, in the teeth of non-official opposition, constituted a needless affront to public opinion. So far as the need of cash trading went, even the Kenya Government itself will be hard put to it to deny that the need was being increasingly realised on the part of buyers of native produce. The testimony of the Agricultural Economist to the Kenya Government, who holds the view that instances of bartering are very rare, is conclusive on the point. There can be no difference of opinion that the native should receive a fair return for his produce. Is it seriously contended that this does not happen at present? In this connection Mr. Pandya referred to the experience of the Director of Agriculture Mr. Holm, who not long ago had the matter inquired into and on the strength of that inquiry reported to Government that the native generally obtained a fair price for his articles. The presence of competition at trading centres was also a helpful factor to the same end. In any case, if the Tanganyika experience is to serve as a guide, it seems very doubtful if the pro-

posed legislation would at all improve matters. It is easy to see that the cheating in weight, in so far as it takes place, could have been avoided merely by a tightening up of the existing Weights and Measures law. It would thus be seen that in persisting with the present legislation the Kenya Government is alienating public opinion without sufficient cause. After two years' experience of similar legislation, public opinion, both Indian and European, in Tanganyika, was asking for the abandonment of the system, inasmuch as it had "resulted in increasing the operating cost of buying the native produce, in encouraging undesirable competition at the hands of people from outside coming over here temporarily with the bonafide residents of the territory on an uneconomic level and in rendering the properties valueless." Is there any reasonable ground to expect that the marketing scheme now under consideration by the Kenya legislative council will have a more successful career in Kenya?

In Indian eyes, the obnoxious nature of the whole scheme is further aggravated by the provision made for the grant of what are euphemistically termed exclusive licences, but which are hardly distinguishable from monopolies. The grant of monopolies goes directly against the whole trend of modern commercial opinion, which rightly condemns them as creating vested interests centred in a single organisation or in the hands of a small group. In Kenya, moreover, with its clash of racial interests, the administration of the system, as is generally feared, is bound to lead to racial favouritism. Mr. Pandya did well in warning the Government in unmistakable terms of such undesirable consequences. In Uganda the working of the system seems to have aroused feelings of strong revulsion against it and strengthened the hands of the Jinjia Chamber of Commerce, which has an Indian and European membership, in its demand for its abolition. But the Kenya Government does not appear to be inclined to profit either by Uganda's well-known experience or by the clear warning of the Indian representatives against the inclusion of this hateful feature in their marketing scheme. May it be hoped that better counsels will prevail before it is too late?

EDUCATIONAL REFORM—II.*

EMPLOYMENT or profession in these days is neither an easy nor a soft job, and the struggle for it, if the boy has no other responsibilities on hand as his social heritage, does him more good than harm. The crux of the matter is *not* so much that he has to struggle or to fight, as that he remains unemployed because he is a misfit and can turn his hand to nothing useful as the result of the education imparted to him. That is the flaw in the present system of education in India from top to bottom. It can be only removed by the combined and strenuous efforts of the Government, the University, the teaching profession and the public at large. The Saddler Commission on education had suggested for

the purpose the creation of a Central Board, an idea which also had commended itself to the Committee appointed by the Bombay University Senate in 1920. In the report submitted by the Committee occurs the following statement: "The Committee are entirely in favour of the creation of such a board for the reasons given by the Saddler Commission. The functions of the Board should be legislative and deliberative, supervisory and advisory, and that they should be limited to prescription of curricula, conduct of examinations, appointment of inspecting officers, inspection and recognition of Intermediate Colleges and schools and defining the qualifications and the minimum salaries of teachers and the framing of rules for the distribution of grants." The constitution of the Board recommended by the aforesaid Committee clearly envisages united endeavour and co-operation of the four parties alluded to above in the management and levelling up of secondary and higher education, so that it should be "wide and exact, adapted to individual aptitudes and to growing national needs, liberal as a preparation for life, and also specific in its preparation both for the University and for the immediate entrance upon other careers." The report was submitted in 1921, and nothing has been done since to implement its recommendations. We have, instead, the make-believe of reform in the shape of the University Reform Act, under which University affairs are at the best a muddle, and the University has been turned practically into an electoral machine conducive to nepotism and inefficiency all round. On the other hand, the Department of Public Instruction is equally idle or at the best, is simply carrying on. It has found neither time nor means to adopt the recommendations of the Hesketh Committee, as the University has not cared to put into practical shape the suggestions formulated by the Report mentioned above. And the public at large is busy with other matters and has no time to devote to things that vitally affect national well-being. The beginning of all reform in our University matters is the scrapping of the University Reform Act that has proved such a strangle-held of both the higher and secondary education in the Presidency. It has set such a premium on the manoeuvring for offices in the University and sets such small store by things that are indispensable in education. In the name of a democratic senate, it has encouraged communalism, set province against province and turned colleges into distinct groups fighting for power and distribution of loaves and fishes. Worst of it all, it has brought in mediocrity and driven out ability and independence by making it possible for those alone to be at the helm of affairs who know the master-art of diplomacy and selfish intriguing. As a result we witness inaptitude all over the field, patronage where it ought not to be bestowed, and the choice of text-books and teachers such as would not be tolerated in any educational body worth the name. A critic of these matters, however honest and disinterested, is least tolerated there. And a hush-hush policy has been rather the rule than an exception.

* The first article appeared in our issue of July 25.

The creation of a Central Board on the lines suggested by the Saddler Commission should be the first step in the reform of our education upwards. Thereby the schools, through proper supervision and guidance, will turn into nurseries of education and will not be, as they are to-day, mere institutions that coach pupils for an examination.

The reform of the schools and colleges is the first matter to which it must apply itself. And the beginning of that reform lies in the positive discouragement, as regards the Schools, of mercenary institutions which infest education to-day with their noxious and mushroom growth. For these have no other ambition than to sweep into their nets as large a number of pupils as they can with a view to pocket their fees and enable them to appear for the matriculation examination. The staff, in these schools, is made up, for the most part, of birds of passage, ill-trained, ill-paid and ill-treated. It is drawn from the ranks of B. A.'s and matriculates who have nothing else to do in life. These take to an educational profession not as a calling but as their last resource in a bad world. These are the persons who do the utmost harm to a sound system of education, for the schools, referred to above, exploit their helplessness. Here they find men that can be engaged and dismissed at the sweet will of the proprietors. They are offered no security of tenure, no promotion, no end to look forward to as the fulfilment of a career. As such they take no interest in their work, lead a sort of hand-to-mouth educational life. No wonder, then, that pupils that learn in such institutions learn nothing better than to cram the lessons and pass the examinations.

Such schools should have no place in any scheme of education. They are not feeders of education but parasites on the system. They defeat all intensive learning and teaching and vitiate the whole atmosphere. The Central Board should see to it that no affiliation should be granted to such schools. Today, any one starts a school and can run it as its principal. He need not apply to any authority for previous sanction to start a school. The freedom, that should be well used, is being systematically abused to the detriment of education itself. These schools hardly make any provision for an efficient staff, for its regular payment, for graded rank, promotion and a maximum to reach up to, for those who accept work. The proprietor has only to advertise that he has started a school, and the flotsam and jetsam of the student population flock to its standard. This must end forthwith and along with it, a similar inefficiency in institutions of the so-called collegiate type. If the Board would but scan carefully into the learning and teaching ability of men who pass off as teachers and professors in these institutions, it will realise how our education has fallen in esteem and why it cannot be improved, how it is that Allahabad and the Punjab, that were so backward when the Bombay University had started on its career, have now forged ahead whereas Bombay is left in the doldrums.

In these matters plain speaking has become an absolute necessity. Our grievance against education to-day is not so much about curriculum as about its being manned by men who are not fit to conduct it either as administrators or teachers. In schools as well as in colleges there is a paucity, if not total absence, of first-rate men, who will be the inspirer of youth and who are themselves devotees of learning who "scorn delights and live laborious days," to make learning prevail and to widen the bounds of knowledge. It is no use making a grievance of emoluments. They are surely not so inadequate to-day in Government and private institutions, speaking of colleges, as in the days of Bhandarkar, Agarkar, Kelkar and Waman Shivram Apte. But where are the professors to-day of the rank of a Grant, a Wordsworth, a Hughlings, a Bhandarkar, an Apte, an Apte, in all our institutions, dedicated to learning and inspiring reverence and affection throughout the student world? Level up the teacher and the professor, impart to the school and the college a right kind of atmosphere through living contact with the right kind of men, and you level up the student who is to be the citizen and worker of tomorrow. As things are to-day, the schools and colleges have ceased to be living organisms and have fossilised into puppet shows. At the best you can admire their structures in stone; but the soul is not there—the soul that makes, in the long run, the soul of a people. This discussion cannot be better summed than in the following words of Lord Haldane addressed to the members of the University of Wales. Said he reminding them what constitutes the life of University, "to maintain the University of the country at the high level is an act of high patriotism on the part of its citizens. And not only the citizen but the student himself has a deep responsibility here. To each student comes an opportunity for influencing those around him; in other words, for leadership. To the question how he may best equip himself for this endeavour, the answer is an old one—by getting ideas, ideas which have hands and feet, ideas which not only transform that on which they are brought to bear, but in doing so expand themselves and their meaning. Now, to get great ideas, we require great teachers. These teachers may be living persons with whom we come in daily contact, or they may be dead and yet reach us through great books which they have given to the world. In whichever way it comes, the teaching required is that which guides to a large outlook and to none but a large outlook." Look wherever you will in our present-day schools and colleges, you will not find in them great teachers who are living personal influences or who guide their pupils to master-minds old or new. As Lord Haldane puts it, there is no other royal road to learning and the improvement in learning, except through the clash of mind with mind, through the teacher, living a dead, who moulds the personality of the student. If we would have our schools, colleges and the University to which they look up, move along right lines and mark progress, then the reform must begin with the

reform of the teachers, among whom we include the teachers in colleges as well. Who will do it and how it can be done may be told on some future occasion.

V. N. NAIK.

Review.

MEANING OF DEMOCRACY.

THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS. By BENI PRASAD. (Oxford University Press, Bombay.) 1935. 22cm. 301p. Rs. 7.

THIS book will be greatly welcomed by all those who have been watching with interest and, perhaps, with some anxiety, recent attacks on democracy. In dealing with democracy, Dr. Beni Prasad is wise in giving it the widest possible meaning. He does not confine it to mere Parliamentaryism or the representative form of government. He equates democracy with human welfare and social progress and rightly argues that we are at the beginning, and not at the end, of the democratic process. He traces the evolution of society from the *pain* economy of the past to the economy of *universal welfare* of the future. It is the author's belief that promotion of human welfare should be the guiding principle in solving problems of race, nation, population, government, distribution of economic goods, etc. He throws his weight on the side of peace, international control, and planned economy and finds that the chief enemies of democracy to-day are poverty, ignorance, social discord, and militarism. The book is full of suggestions for the improvement of human relations and the completing and perfecting of the democratic process. Some of these suggestions, in the present temper of the world, appear to us to be a mere cry in the wilderness, but that does not diminish the value of the book. One of the best chapters in the book is Chapter XVI, where the writer carefully considers the case for dictatorships and further alternatives to democracy. More attention might have been profitably paid, however, to the claim that dictatorship is the new phase into which democracy is now entering.

The author is to be congratulated on his width of learning and the rare practical bent of mind which characterises his work. The book abounds in copious illustrations from history and footnotes containing extracts from recognised authorities on the subject discussed. The approach is from the realistic and psychological points of view. There are a few spelling mistakes such as 'conterminous' for 'coterminous', p. 251, line 10 and 'extent' for 'extend', p. 260, line 13. The definite article 'the' before 'monarchy', p. 240, line 3, seems a misprint. We have no doubt that the volume is a valuable contribution to students of human affairs. It deserves careful and sympathetic reading.

Passages from the book which are worth quoting, as revealing the mind of the author, are:

"There is scarcely a vital national concern but is international in its ramifications and capable of satisfactory adjustment only on international lines" (p. 6). "Economics should now be cultivated as the science of the welfare, not of the State, much less of a class, but of the whole world" (p. 6). "Democracy is as yet an aspiration rather than a reality" (p. 24). "The application of science to agriculture, industry and transport all over the world is the condition precedent to the realisation of universal democracy" (p. 115). "International conventions and recommendations must be carried out mainly by national agreements" (p. 197). "Democracy is incompatible with poverty as with excessive private wealth" (p. 202). "There

is no reason to doubt that in Asia and Africa democratisation will prove on the whole as beneficial as anywhere else" (p. 246). "Education produces its best effect not when it trickles slowly but when it is rapidly universalised" (p. 270). "All institutions, economic, political and cultural, ought to rest on principles consistent with equality of maximum opportunity for self-realisation—liberty, growth and happiness—to every human being on earth" (p. 290).

E. ASIRVATHAM.

SHORTS NOTICES.

CULTURAL FELLOWSHIP IN INDIA. By ATULANANDA CHAKRABARTI. (Thacker, Spink & Co., Calcutta.) 1934. 19cm. 192p. Rs. 4.

AT no period in the history of the Indian nation, the Hindu-Moslem problem has attracted a greater degree of attention than the present one, especially in view of the much vexed question of the Communal Award. As the author rightly diagnoses it, "the Hindu-Muslim trouble is more a matter of mind than a fight over percentages." In fact everybody is anxiously awaiting a satisfactory solution of the problem, and a genuinely amicable settlement. And for this what is essential is a mutual real understanding on the part of the communities concerned. It is at this opportune time that the author makes a laudable attempt to point out the basis of cultural unity between Hinduism and Islam in philosophy, theology and mysticism. He bases his statements on the Hindu and Mohomedan scriptures such as the Vedas, the Upanishad, and the Quran, as also on the subsequent religious texts of either of the two religions. One wonders how strikingly similar is the tolerant outlook of these cultures. But the practice of the faiths grossly contradicts the theoretical teaching of the creeds. In a particularly interesting Chapter on the Psycho-Analysis of Islam the author points out that though the Quran originally meant by Jihad primarily "exertion in the way of God" and secondarily only "fighting in defence of the true faith." Religion later came to be used as a weapon for political aggrandisement and untold persecution of the people of other faiths and widespread destruction of their temples. The book may be commended to the notice of all those who are interested in the very vital problem of Hindu-Moslem unity.

D. G. LONDHE.

UNTOUCHABLE. By MULK RAJ ANAND. (Wishart Books Ltd.) 1935. 232p. 7/6.

THIS is a "novel" without any plot, describing but a day in the life of a sweeper in an Indian town. Bakha, the hero of the story, is an honest lad who suddenly realises his lot on being insulted by a high caste Hindu. His feelings are well and vividly described. One appreciates his burning desire to learn English, his sense of duty to his father and his affection for his sister, while smiling at his blind worship of Tommies, their dress and fashions. An amusing, unimaginative, boring Salvation Army padre—untrue to type, we are afraid—and a Gandhi meeting, add to the interest of the book.

Apart from its lacking a plot and its being confined to the events of a single day, the book has other serious defects. "Is it a clean book or a dirty one?" asks Mr. E. H. Forster in the preface and gives the answer, "The book seems to me indescribably clean." Few, however, will agree with him, at least so far as the earlier part of the book is concerned. Even

granting the purpose of the author as some justification, there is unnecessary dwelling on dirt—on dirty places, dirty language, dirty habits, dirty incidents—which is very trying to the reader and which even comes in the way of his sympathising with the untouchable class. The book is apparently meant for British consumption. By the kind of picture it has drawn of Hindu life, it should become popular with the section which likes to believe everything ill that is said of Indians. Each term of abuse and each incident mentioned in the book may have been taken from life, but the whole appears to familiar Indian eyes as a distorted picture.

There is, however, talent in the author. With more of taste and less of psychology he should be able to write a better story on the same subject if he should be inclined to pursue it.

D. D.

Miscellaneous

CONGRESS AND STATE SUBJECTS.

The Working Committee of the Indian National Congress which met at Wardha last week has issued the following statement defining its attitude towards the subjects of Indian States. The statement runs:

“ALTHOUGH the policy of the Congress regarding the States of India has been defined in its resolution, persistent efforts are being made by, or on behalf of, the people of the States to get a fuller declaration of Congress policy. The Working Committee therefore issues the following statement concerning the policy of the Congress with regard to the Princes and the people of the States.

“The Indian National Congress recognises that the people of Indian States have an inherent right to Swaraj, no less than the people of British India. It accordingly declared itself in favour of the establishment of representative responsible government in the States, and has in that behalf not only appealed to the Princes to establish such responsible government in their States, to guarantee the fundamental rights of citizenship, like the freedom of person, speech, association and the Press, of their people, but has also pledged to the States' people its sympathy to support their legitimate and peaceful struggle for the attainment of full responsible government. By that declaration and by that pledge the Congress stands.

“The Congress feels that even in their own interests the Princes will be well advised to establish at the earliest possible moment full responsible government within their States, carrying the guarantee of full rights of citizenship of their people.

“It should be understood, however, that the responsibility and burden of carrying on the struggle within the States must necessarily fall on the States' people themselves. The Congress can exercise moral and friendly influence upon the States, and this it is bound to do wherever possible. The Congress has no other power under the existing circumstances, although the people of India, whether under the British or the Princes or any other power, are geographically and historically one and indivisible. In the heat of controversy the limitation of the Congress is often forgotten. Indeed, any other policy will defeat the common purpose.

“With regard to the impending constitutional changes, it has been suggested that the Congress should insist upon certain amendments to that por-

tion of the Government of India Bill which deals with the relation of Indian States to the Indian Federation. The Congress has more than once categorically rejected the entire scheme of constitutional reforms on the broad ground of its not being the expression of the will of the people of India, and has insisted on a constitution to be framed by a constituent assembly.

“It may not ask for an amendment to the scheme or any particular part of it. To do so would amount to a reversal of Congress policy. At the same time it is hardly necessary to assure the people of the States that the Congress will never be guilty of sacrificing their interests in order to buy the support of the Princes. The Congress has stood unequivocally for the rights of the masses as against vested rights.”

CONGRESS POLICY TOWARDS THE STATES.

HESITATION AND EMBARRASSMENT WRIT LARGE.

Commenting on the Congress Working Committee's resolution on the Indian States, the Indian Express of Madras writes as follows in its issue of the 2nd inst.:

IT may be admitted that the Working Committee's statement of the Congress policy towards the States is the best of the many statements so far made. Still, it is not quite satisfactory. Hesitation and embarrassment are writ large upon the resolution. If the States' people have the same inherent right to Swaraj as the people of British India, if the Congress has pledged its sympathy and support to the people of the States in their legitimate and peaceful struggle for the attainment of full responsible government, there ought to be no difficulty in saying simply that the Congress is a common national organisation for all the people of India—British as well as Indian—for the complete emancipation of their common fatherland.

Reading between the lines, there are three implications in the statement which prevent the formulation of the policy in the simple and logical fashion indicated above. The Working Committee seems to consider that the Congress is primarily a British Indian organisation. Secondly, the resolution suggests that the Congress is not for the abolition of the hereditary princes and lastly, the Congress is not prepared to lend its support to any direct action within the States for political reforms.

It is curious to note that the Working Committee seems to have felt that its resolution was so halting as to necessitate an apology. It says, “The Congress can exercise a moral and friendly influence upon the States and this it is bound to do wherever possible. The Congress has no other power under existing circumstances although the people of India, whether under the British or the Princes or any other power, are geographically and historically one and indivisible.”

We would like to know if the Congress formulated its goal of independence only when it possessed the power to attain it. The Congress has all the means to exercise political pressure in the States which it has in British India. It can agitate, launch a publicity campaign and, in the last resort, offer satyagraha. It may be that the Indian Princes would not give it even the short shrift that the bureaucracy gives. What does it matter? No individual or organisation will be blamed for not doing

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- UNTOUCHABLE. A NOVEL. By MULK RAJ ANAND. (Wishart Bros.) 1935. 20cm, 232p. 7/6.
- THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS COVENANT. By K. R. R. SASTRY. (Devi Press, Mount Road, Madras.) 1935. 20cm. 133p. Rs. 2.
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE DURING THE MUSLIM RULE IN INDIA WITH A HISTORY OF THE ORIGIN OF THE ISLAMIC LEGAL INSTITUTIONS. By WASHED HUSAIN. (University of Calcutta.) 1934. 22cm. 185p.
- WAR: ITS CAUSE AND CURE. By WILLIAM LEIGHTON GRANE. (Allen & Unwin.) 1935. 20cm. 164p. 4/6.
- MAN'S COSMIC HORIZON. By H. M. NATHAN. (Rider.) 20cm. 157p. 5/-.
- TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF THE REIGN OF KING GEORGE V. By J. A. R. MARRIOTT. (Methuen.) 1935. 20cm. 96p. 2/6.
- TWENTY YEARS IN CHINA. By W. S. PAKENHAM-WALSH. (Heffer.) 1935. 20cm. 127p. 5/-.
- THE INDUS CIVILIZATION. By ERNEST MACKAY. (Lovat Dickson & Thompson.) 1935. 20cm. 210p. 6/-.
- QUACK, QUACK. By LEONARD WOOLF. (Hogarth Press.) 20cm. 201p. 7/6.
- LONDON'S HEART-PROBE AND BRITAIN'S DESTINY. By AYUBE M. EDUN. (Stockwell.) 20cm. 212p. 6/-.
- THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF RADIO TALKIES AND TELEVISION. By D. N. VASUDEVA. (Atmaram & Sons, Lahore.) 1935. 20cm, 190p. Re. 1/12.
- A DIRECT AREA. By THOMAS SHARP. (Day to Day Pamphlets-25.) (Hogarth Press.) 1935. 20cm. 49p. 1/6.
- SOME ASPECTS OF RURAL ECONOMY IN THE PUNJAB. By B. K. MADAN. (Rama Krishna & Sons, Lahore.) 1934. 25cm. 52p. Re. 1.
- FAMILY BUDGETS, 1932-33, OF FOUR TENANT-CULTIVATORS IN THE LYALLPUR DISTRICT. By SARDAR KARTAR SINGH. (The Board of Economic Inquiry, Punjab-No 40.) 1934. 24cm. 31p. As. 6.
- THE SWADESHI ANNUAL, 1935. (Lucknow Swadeshi League, Lucknow.) 1935. 24cm. 104p. Re. 1.
- TWO SERVANTS OF GOD. By MAHADEV DESAI. (The Hindustan Times Press, Delhi.) 1935. 20cm. 106p. As. 12.

The Industrial and Prudential Assurance Co., Ltd.

The Premier Indian Life Office.

Estd. 1913.

Head Office — BOMBAY.

UP-TO-DATE BENEFITS.

LOW PREMIUMS.

BONUS:

Whole Life—Rs. 22-8-0 per Thousand per Year.

Endowment— „ 18-0-0 per „ - „ -

For Agency apply to—Secretaries and Managers,

Industrial and Prudential Assurance Coy., Ltd.,

Esplanade Road, Fort, BOMBAY.

SUPREME FOR YEARS SUPREME TO-DAY— QUALITY ALWAYS TELLS



Mysore Sandalwood Oil B. P. quality, the finest in the world, is perfectly blended and milled by a special process with the purest ingredients to make.

Mysore
Sandal Soap

“It's good through and through
to the thinnest wafer”

Available Everywhere.

GOVERNMENT SOAP FACTORY,
BANGALORE.