

Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA.

VOL. XIX, No. 33.

POONA—THURSDAY, AUGUST 20, 1936.

INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	385
ARTICLES :—	
Federation	387
India in a European League?	389
Who are the Harijans? By S. R. Venkataraman	391
MISCELLANEA :—	
Reform of the League.—M. Litvinoff's Speech	393
The Indian Problems.—Interview with Dr. Zacharias	395
SHORT NOTICES.	396

Topics of the Week.

Liberal Candidates.

THE Deccan Sabha of Poona is to be congratulated on being able to put forward Principal G. S. Mahajani and Principal K. M. Khadye as the Liberal Party's candidates for election to the Bombay Legislative Council and the Bombay Provincial Assembly for the Poona-Satara and the Poona City constituencies respectively. Of the position of high eminence which they hold in the world of education it would be an impertinence on our part to speak. But of their wholly catholic outlook on public affairs and of their utter devotion to the general welfare in a spirit of complete self-abnegation we might be allowed to give a guarantee to such of their voters as may not know them intimately. While getting from an admittedly unsatisfactory constitution all the constructive good that can be got out of it, they may be depended upon to support all efforts that will be made for reform of the constitution both within and without the legislative chambers. If a thoroughly non-communal and non-sectarian spirit joined to a spirit of independent nationalism and progressive thought is the highest desideratum at the present moment, it is difficult to think of representatives who can fill that need better than the distinguished heads of two educational institutions in Poona that have offered themselves for election from the single desire to do public good.

Freedom of Speech.

WE offer our sincere congratulations to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru on his having protested against Bhai Parmanand being prevented from addressing public meetings in Delhi and Cawnpore. Bhaiji is alleged to have made certain unwarranted remarks about Congress women in his paper and aroused resentment in Congress workers. Making full allowance for this, Pandit Jawaharlal says in his press statement that, while the audience has a right to express disapproval of the policy that a speaker may

put forward, it has no right either to prevent or break up a meeting, as Congressmen sometimes do. "Not to allow a person to address a meeting," the Pandit says, "because of disagreement with his views seems to me highly improper and likely to lead to unfortunate results.... However much we may disagree with others—and indeed because we disagree with others—we must give to them the same freedom of speech which we claim for ourselves." Here is the right spirit of civil liberty. Civil liberty does not mean something to be saved from Government interference alone; it is something to be saved from popular interference as well.

Unamendable.

WRITING on the clause newly inserted in the draft Instrument of Accession making it clear that no amendment of the federal constitution that may in future be adopted will be applicable to a State unless the State accepts it, our valued contemporary, the *Indian Express*, which to our knowledge is the only paper that has given attention to this aspect of the constitution, remarks as follows:

At the time the Act was passed, we pointed out how the Second Schedule prevents the change of constitution in most important respects without the consent of every Prince acceding to the federation. But this omission of any reference in the previous draft Instrument of Accession left it free to the British Parliament to change them and negotiate for the support of the Princes. The present clause in the Instrument of Accession amounts to a formal undertaking not to bring any Bill amending the Government of India Act not included in Schedule II without the previous consent of all the Princes. This is a most mischievous extension of a commitment which was wrong and dangerous in any case. When the Instrument of Accession specifically states the parts of the Act and the limitations within which those parts will be given effect to, we do not see what necessity there is for a fettering of the discretion of the British Parliament in the Instrument itself. The insertion of this clause brings out forcibly Sir Samuel Hoare's intention to use the Princes to prevent even Dominion Status. We challenge the Moderates to show a constitutional way out of the obstruction created by the Second Schedule and this clause (7) in the Instrument of Accession. We do not, however, feel that all these paper facts can prevent India marching along the path of her destiny. The Princes are altogether unwise in agreeing to an arrangement by which the responsibility for defence and foreign affairs can never be transferred to an Indian Minister and the special responsibilities of the Governor-General could not be curtailed or abolished.

We for our part must confess that no constitutional way appears to be available to us out of the obstruction created by the Princes' veto. As a peaceful change is found impossible under article 19 of the League of Nations' Covenant which provides for a revision of treaties, so we are afraid an amendment of the federal constitution which will be applicable to

all the States will be found impossible under the new constitution.

* * *

Ministers and Elections.

THE following extract from an editorial in the *Statesman* which describes the present practice in Great Britain on this subject will be found useful:

A Cabinet Minister, Parliamentary Secretary, or other member of the Administration is free at any time to address a party meeting in his own or anyone else's constituency, and provided he refrains from libel he may criticise the programme or the speeches of his political opponents to his heart's content. He may intervene at a by-election either by speech or by a letter to a candidate. In common with all sitting members of the House of Commons he enjoys certain railway concessions, but apart from these he may not charge Government with any "touring" or other expenses incurred in attending party meetings.

If on the other hand he in his capacity as a Minister attends a non-party function,—if, shall we say, the Minister for Agriculture opens a fat-stock show or the Minister for Education attends an educational conference,—then it would be a gross breach of etiquette to make a party speech and attack the Opposition. But even this would be expected to bring its own punishment or would be dealt with by the Prime Minister as a matter of etiquette and discipline. It would not be strictly speaking a breach of the constitution, or, we think, punishable by any Government rule, though definitely a breach of constitutional propriety. As regards expenses for attending such functions in the interests of a Government Department we doubt if there is anything corresponding to "T. A." or "halting allowance" in Britain for Ministers; if it is technically possible to charge expenses this must be practically a dead letter. There are doubtless, however, some Ministerial compensations, and we do not suppose, for instance, that the First Lord of the Admiralty is charged for board and lodging when he cruises in the Admiralty yacht.

* * *

Legalised Concubinage.

THERE are in Southern Rhodesia about 25,000 labourers imported from Nyasaland. They are not prohibited from bringing with them their wives and children, but most come single, and live with other native women on the locations, these women being licensed as concubines under section 14 (3) of the Natives Registration Act, and when they leave after their contract of service terminates after about a year, they pass the women on to other importees. A great outcry is being raised against this system, and the matter was raised by Mr. Tom Johnson in the House of Commons on 21st July. The Dominions Secretary, Mr. Malcolm Macdonald, admitted the existence of the evil and though he said it could not be abolished by a stroke of the pen it was being regulated and controlled and licences were being issued for the purpose of controlling it.

* * *

MR. MACDONALD said:

The fact is that considerable numbers of natives who come to work in the townships and to live in these locations are married and do not bring their wives. The coming of the white man to Africa and the coming of his civilisation and the growth, for instance, in certain areas of industrialism, have produced great disturbances in native life. Some of the results, we all admit, are very unfortunate. It would appear that they are inevitable, at any rate for a time, until we can get a satisfactory solution to the difficulties. I admit that one of the unfortunate results is this system. The fact is that many of the natives coming to the locations do not bring their wives with them. They come from great distances, and come to stay for

considerable periods. They do not bring their wives with them, not because of any prohibition by authority, but because in many cases the kinsmen of these wives in their native villages prevent the wives from journeying with their husbands. These men come down to the locations. By nature they are polygamous. They have been accustomed to form irregular unions with women living in these locations. So long as they stay in the locations these couples live permanently together. They regard themselves as man and wife, and they are regarded by their fellow natives as man and wife. Their union is perfectly public, and although they are not legally married in the eyes of the natives, they are perfectly respectable. It is these women who are partners in this type of union who have been referred to by the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia as concubines as distinct from regular prostitutes.

* * *

MR. CREECH JONES remarked:

Under the (Natives Registration) Bill (now Act), for the first time, a number of arrangements are definitely made. Medical inspection is provided, certain regulations are laid down in regard to contagious diseases, and, further, the women are subjected to exemption passes in order that this particular practice shall be allowed. Therefore, what we are witnessing to-day is an introduction of State recognition of a piece of legalised prostitution which, for the moment, has the name of concubinage; but it is concubinage whereby the woman, when she is left by the man who returns to the territory from which he came, can live only in so far as she is able to sell herself to another native.

The Government hoped, Mr. Macdonald observed, to eradicate and reduce the system gradually to a minimum so as ultimately to eradicate it.

* * *

Indian Education in Fiji.

It is observed from the Fiji Education report for 1935 that the net Government expenditure on European education was £4,149, on Fijian education £16,800 and on Indian education £10,880. If the population figures of the respective communities viz., 8,700 Europeans, 105,000 Fijians and 85,000 Indians, are taken into account it will be found that the claims of Fijian and Indian education do not make the same appeal to the Fiji Government as do those of European education. If the proportion of expenditure on European education to the European population were to hold good in respect of other communities the Government should be spending upon native education not £16,800 as at present but nearly three times the amount and on Indian education not £10,800 but nearly four times as much. But we forget Europeans are a privileged community in the British Empire and it is sheer audacity, if nothing worse, for the other communities to try to compare themselves to it.

* * *

It is comforting to see from the report that Indian education made some, though very slight, progress last year. While the number of Government schools remained stationary, viz. 7, those receiving a grant from the public revenues rose from 51 to 55, the total amount of the grants increasing by about £200 to nearly £5,000. The number of Indian children at school showed an increase of about 500, from 5,000 to 5,500 which was shared by boys and girls in the proportion of 3:2. In the twelve unassisted schools described in the report as "most inefficient" as a rule, 230 additional children (196 boys and 34 girls) were reading. Even if this number is taken into account the total number of Indian children in receipt of instruction of any kind does not exceed 5,800 out of a total school-age population of 12,500. The level of

literacy, so far as the male part of the Indian population is concerned, was 8.26 per cent.; while in the case of the female part it was not even half as much, being 3.82 per cent. This is not very hope-inspiring. It ought to be the aim of the Fiji Government to bring all these children to school not in the fulness of time but in the very near future. Let not the Inspector of Indian Schools who was recently in India take the flattering unctious to his soul, as he seems to do, that Indian education in Fiji is better off or will soon be more wide-spread than in India. Let him not rest on his oars till every Indian child who should be at school is there.

* * *

FEDERATION.

THE publication of a revised draft of the Instrument of Accession by which the States are to join federation brings to our minds once again the utterly unsatisfactory features of this proposed federal constitution. One thing that will strike the reader is the statement in the preamble of the Instrument of Accession that the federation is founded upon proposals discussed at the Round Table Conference "between representatives of His Majesty's Government, of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, of British India and of the rulers of the Indian States," and he will notice that, whereas in so far as British India was concerned both the rulers and the people were consulted, in so far as Indian States are concerned the rulers alone were consulted and the people were left out. This reveals the fatal vice of the whole scheme. Juridically, the British Government has just as much right to thrust a constitution upon British India as the Princes have upon Indian India, and the British Government has exercised it too. But it imposed its will upon British India at least after ascertaining the wishes of the leaders of the people. The Princes, however, have not even gone through the formality of trying to find out the mind of their subjects. Technically, the British Government and its legislature had no less right to formulate a constitution without reference to the people of British India than the Princes had to do so without reference to their subjects. But the manner in which the rulers of Indian States have gone to this business brings out in clear relief the fact, now enshrined in a State document of permanent interest, that, Indian as they are, they have much less respect for public opinion than a foreign Government. Inasmuch as the federation to be brought into being is an interminable federation from which no withdrawal will be allowed in any circumstances, the significance attaching to the omission of any kind of consultation with the States' people will be fully appreciated by all competent observers.

Another striking feature of the Instrument of Instructions is the omission of all reference in it to the States' people wherever federal laws are spoken of. In the Instrument as originally drafted the ruler concerned declared his acceptance of the constitution "as applicable to his State and to his subjects" and his acceptance of the federal subjects as matters in regard to which the federal legislature can make laws

ALTHOUGH Hindustani is the medium of communication in the Indian community in Fiji, the South Indians object to learning it in schools and the Mahomedans wish to use the Persian Urdu script instead of Devanagiri. As a way out of the difficulty the report suggests the use of English as the medium of instruction in the lower classes. According to the Inspector of Indian Schools, the standard of Hindi in Indian schools in the Colony is lower than that of pupils of corresponding age in India, but in English the Indian children in Fiji are found to carry the palm. The average Indian school in Fiji, he thinks, is better furnished and equipped, better lighted, less dusty and the pupils usually brighter and better controlled.

"in relation to his State and to his subjects." In the revised draft, however, the words "and to his subjects" are omitted, thanks to the legal advice which the great patriot Bhulabhai Desai, a member of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's Congress Cabinet, tendered to the Princes. "The object of the omission," he explained "is to prevent the establishment of a direct relationship between the subjects of a State and the federation." The States' Ministers Committee further explained that they were urging the deletion of these words in order to prevent a plea being made in future that federal legislation could be made applicable to the States *proprio vigore*. Federal legislation will be brought into force in the States no doubt, but not in virtue of a certain legislature sitting in Delhi over which the rulers have no complete control passing that legislation. "It may be arranged," Mr. Bhulabhai's fertile brain suggests, "that simultaneously with the passing of any act by the federal legislature a proclamation by the ruler of a federated State should immediately follow declaring that to be a part of the law of the State." Thus the States' sovereignty will be maintained in all its integrity. By this single and simple-looking change Mr. Bhulabhai hoped, as the *Sansthani Swaraj* put it at the time, that "the much-vaunted federation would be turned into a confederation, just the kind of confederation which he had advised His Highness the Maharaja of Patiala to see established," but which then did not materialise. And our contemporary further said that, on account of the deletion of these words, "though the scheme will still continue to be called a scheme of federation it will in fact be a confederation scheme." Even if the gains which Mr. Bhulabhai wished to secure for his Princely clients are in fact found to be not so great, Mr. Bhulabhai at any rate has done his best, and it will at least be possible for the Princes, under the instigation of as clever a lawyer as he is, to urge objections at a suitable time.

But let us get away from these technical points and take a comprehensive look at the federation itself. As Sir Abdul Hamid, late Chief Minister of Kapurthala, triumphantly declares in the *Statesman*, "The internal autonomy of the States remains completely intact. The provision for nomination by the rulers of representatives of States in the federal legislature, as opposed to election in the case of British Indian representatives, rules out uniformity as a *sine qua non*,

and in fact openly contemplates and recognises the existence of dissimilar forms of government in the constituent units of the federation." This is a very frank statement, but its implications are not fully realised in India even by people who are devoted to democracy. We would bring to the notice of such men the discussions that are going on at present about the reform of the League of Nations. The League is not a federation, and in such a body, if in any, democracies and autocracies should work without conflict. But one of the radical defects which thinkers find in the present constitution of the League is that all its constituent members are not constitutional democracies. Sir Alfred Zimmern says :

Had President Wilson, as a political scientist, been asked point-blank whether he believed it possible to organise an international association, under the aegis of international law, amongst States which were not themselves governed under constitutional guarantees, he would certainly have declared that such a project was inherently absurd and self-contradictory. A river cannot flow higher than its source. What reaches Geneva from Rome, Berlin or Tokyo is bound to be tainted with lawlessness. Thus what we have to face today is the division of the Great Powers into what one may without offence call the Civilized and the Backward . . . Thus the first question to be decided is whether the existing League should be continued without reference to the political principles and domestic regime of its members, or whether it would not be better to fall back upon a more limited association, the members of which would be inspired with common ideas, forming a natural basis for common policies.

And Sir Alfred's clear opinion is that if the League is to work harmoniously and to good purpose, it must be a like-minded society with similar political organisations of its constituent members as its basis. He sees no advantage in so reducing the conditions of membership as to have a universal or more or less universal League. He is on the contrary definitely for stiffening the conditions so that a League, formed on this basis, will, if small, be effective and useful. League membership is to him a high privilege not to be indiscriminately accorded to all manner of countries, but to be accorded only to those which are worthy of it. He does not want a family of nations in which aggressor and non-aggressor, those in which public right is held in high respect and those in which it is held in scant respect will live happily together. If in a League such discrimination is to be observed in admitting members into its fold, are States to be admitted into a closely-knit federation, which is to last for ever once it is brought into existence, without any reference to the way in which they administer their internal affairs? Will such a federation ever work? An English civilian proposed some time ago that a minimum standard of good government should be required as an essential condition for the admission of States into the federation, but the suggestion was scouted and opposed as being inspired by a desire to obstruct federation, and the British Government's immovable determination to frustrate federation by hook or by crook was for a long time the belief that inspired the political moves of our leaders.

In the Instrument of Accession a new clause has been inserted which says that no amendment of the

federal constitution, duly passed, will be made applicable in a State unless the State accepts it by a supplementary instrument. The novelty of such a provision in the history of federal constitutions is admitted, but it is thought necessary to allow it in order that a federation be possible. Here again the trend of thought in the League should be observed. The States members of the League of course retain their full sovereignty, and each member decides for itself what action it shall ultimately take. The League purports to preserve the *status quo* in general, but there is one article in the Covenant, article 19, which provides for a change. As the article stands at present, no revision of existing arrangements is possible unless all the States affected freely agree to the revision and this is considered by all who have given serious thought to the subject to be an impassable barrier to any change, however desirable and necessary. Opinion is therefore coming round to the view that some amount of compulsion is urgently required, even if it involves an infringement of the sovereignty of the States members. Mr. Mander, for instance, said in the House of Commons on this subject :

It has been rightly said that to preserve the *status quo* is not enough, and that some machinery must be devised for making article 19 of the Covenant function. There must be some method of peaceful change. The countries that take part in this Conference (of the Locarno Powers) will all have to accept the idea of a third-party judgment in any dispute that may arise among them. We ought to try to set up something in the nature of a tribunal in equity, that could deal with non-justiciable disputes in the same way as the Permanent Court of International Justice now deals with justiciable disputes. That arises out of the practice of this and other countries, and any dispute, having been so decided, ought to be given the force of law and maintained by the League, just as judicial decisions are arrived at in this country.

The British League of Nations Union proposes the following procedure for the application of article 19 about the revision of treaties :

If any member of the League desires the Assembly to advise, under article 19 of the Covenant, the reconsideration by members of the League of a treaty (on the ground that it has become inapplicable) or the consideration of specified international conditions (on the ground that their continuance might endanger the peace of the world) a Commission of Enquiry should be appointed, unless the Assembly decides otherwise, to report on the facts and to recommend what, if any, action should be taken.

After considering the report or the reports of the Commission of Enquiry, the Assembly should " advise ", and, if the members of the League who are parties to the treaty or are responsible for international conditions in question do not act upon this advice within a reasonable time, it may be desirable that the Council should consider the matter under article 11.

Article 11 is one of the coercive provisions of the Covenant permitting action by the Council or the Assembly " that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations. " Thus it is being proposed that if advice is not followed compulsion may be adopted even against nations admittedly sovereign. Here no infraction of international law is involved, and yet no nation is to be allowed, according to the proposal, to hold up revision of a treaty. In the Indian federation, however, no matter by how large a majority an amendment of the

constitution be passed, it would be open to any State stubbornly to refuse to accept it. The seriousness of the proposal is not yet realised in India. The constitution cannot be ended and cannot be amended. What then? Revolution?

The gem of the revised Instrument of Accession consists in this—a new clause to the effect that the ruler of a State declares that he accedes to federation

“for the purpose of co-operating in the furtherance of the interests and welfare of India by uniting in a federation.” The unanimous wish of all Indians would be that if Princes must come into the federation with their autocracy, they had better keep miles away. Indian welfare would be promoted by their abstention and isolation.

INDIA IN A EUROPEAN LEAGUE?

IT is beyond question that the League system of pooled security has failed, and has failed signally.

The cause of this sad failure is the fact that, while States members of the League may be persuaded to join in the application of mild economic and financial sanctions against an aggressor at some sacrifice to themselves, none of them is prepared on any account to apply military sanctions or even economic sanctions which eventually lead to war, however urgently the defence of the victim of aggression may require them, unless the interests of the sanctionist nations themselves are at stake. What therefore decides these countries in the final analysis is their own self-interest. Thus the League, which was intended to substitute for the rule “Each for Himself” the rule “All for All”, has ended in re-establishing the old vicious rule again, and naturally, instead of leading to a new dispensation of peace, order and brotherhood, it has only confirmed the bloody dispensation of war, conflict and hatred. In the Italo-Abyssinian war, as M. Maxim Litvinoff pointed out in his speech given elsewhere, 25 per cent. of the countries which had undertaken to impose the milder financial and economic sanctions, failed to do so in practice. And not a single country was to be found—not even Russia—which was prepared to lead in the imposition of the more effective sanction of an oil embargo, not to speak of taking military action. Every country thus adopted a hands-up policy, throwing Abyssinia to the wolves.

The question therefore is, how should things be mended? There are three possible alternatives, and all the three are being considered at present. The first is that of eliminating from the League Covenant those articles which guarantee to the States members their territorial integrity and political independence and enjoin upon each member the employment of sanctions against an aggressor in case of an unprovoked attack, that is to say, articles 10 and 16. Those who sponsor this view say: “The League undertook too big a job when it was formed. Experience has shown that it is not equal to it. When China was invaded by Japan, the Great Powers who were members of the League could at least plead that China was in too remote a region for them to give her any effective help. Ethiopia was, however, in a totally different case. The Great Powers could certainly have rescued her if they were so minded. But some of them thought it necessary to maintain friendly relations with the aggressor and would not give help; and the others did not feel called upon, in a region in which their own interests were not directly involved,

to take the risk of war, though perhaps if they had shown enough strength of soul and fidelity to League principles Abyssinia could have been saved without firing a gun. Anyhow the League is incapable, and will ever be incapable, of putting its universal paper guarantee into execution. Why then give such a guarantee and lull weak and defenceless nations into a false security? Why not ask them to look to their own defences? Again, why keep up the pretence of sanctions when we know for a fact that, in so far as any effective action is concerned, no country would be ready for it? The excision of these two articles will no doubt make the League impotent either for preventing or punishing aggression. But it is in fact impotent now, and will ever remain so. Let it therefore confine itself to peaceful measures. It can do a lot in that restricted sphere in the way of conciliation, and whether it does much or little, it will in any case be good to shed pretensions which cannot be sustained. If the Covenant is shorn of all its coercive or repressive provisions which only inflame the aggressor without restraining him, then all the nations of the world can join the League. No nation need stay out. U.S.A. will come in; Japan and Germany will come in; and Italy will stay in. And the comity of nations will be complete.”

There is another school of thought which propounds just the contrary proposition. It says: “The present position is intolerable. The League solemnly resolves to bring sanctions into play and then leaves it to the discretion of each State member to enforce them or not. This degrades the League to the position of a debating society. Whatever sanctions the League may decide upon should be of a binding nature. It should be obligatory on all the States members to apply them rigidly. Nay, more. It should be incumbent upon such States to apply automatically all the sanctions, including military. It is only when this duty is clearly laid upon all the countries, when the obligation to render military assistance to the victim of aggression to the full extent possible is made universal and automatic, that weak and small countries can be given the security that they need. The adoption of this proposal will perhaps lead to a number of defections from the League. It is no real loss to be rid of members who are unwilling to discharge the responsibilities which membership of such a body entails on them. It will be a small but withal an effective League, which is much better than a large but a totally ineffective League.” Among the proponents of this idea is Senator Boy-

debt of South Africa. On 2nd June he said in the Senate of the Union:

What I myself think should be done is this. When a crisis has been reached and the League of Nations has got to name an aggressor, simultaneously with the naming of the aggressor there should be at once protective military measures taken as a safeguard. As soon as the League has decided to take action against the aggressor it should do so in an effective manner. One of the most spectacular demonstrations of League effectiveness would be for the League to be in a position to call upon each member State for a small quota of its armed forces to be sent to the country which has been declared the non-aggressor, and which is likely to be the victim of the aggressor. . . . The position then would be that Britain for instance would send, say, 10% of her forces; France, 10%; Belgium, Holland and other countries a smaller quota in proportion. They should be sent to line the borders of the country of the non-aggressor. In the recent war they would have lined up on the border of Abyssinia and if Italy or any other aggressor came along, they would be told, "This country is now under the armed protection of all the forces of the League of Nations; one act against this country now amounts to an act of war against all these countries represented here." In those circumstances what country would declare war against all countries represented by the various armies who were there at the request of the League of Nations to protect that particular country against an aggressor?

Senator Thrash proposed more or less the same thing. He said:

It seems to me that the weakness of the League in this matter lies in the fact that, instead of deciding afterwards what sanctions should be employed, the sanctions should have been decided beforehand as part of the constitution where a nation was designated as the aggressor. If the League had decided beforehand exactly what sanctions were going to be imposed automatically and progressively, where one set failed in its object within a certain time, another set would come into operation, culminating in a blockade of the country concerned, then my submission is there would have been no war against Abyssinia. It might even be necessary to decide that immediately a nation was declared to be an aggressor a blockade should be instituted by all the signatory nations against the offender.

Between these two there is a third school of thought; indeed, as Mr. Eden said in the Commons debate on 27th July, between these two extreme courses "there is an almost infinite gradation of opinion." But two categories of opinion belonging to this school might be noticed. It is common ground between them all that the obligations of the Covenant must be restricted and thus made more precise. "The ideal system of collective security," Mr. Eden said at the League Assembly, "is one in which all nations are prepared to go to all lengths—military lengths—to deal with any aggressor." But this ideal being unattainable, one group says: "Let the economic and financial sanctions that may be decided on by the League be binding upon all the States members. Enforcement of the military sanctions, however, should be governed by Annex F to the Locarno Agreements, which declares that 'each State member of the League is bound to co-operate loyally and effectively in support of the Covenant and in resistance to any act of aggression to an extent which is compatible with its military situation, and takes its geographical position into account.' Two principles stand out in bold relief here. One is that sanctions are to be imposed collectively by the League and not by each

individual State at its discretion; they are mandatory and not optional. The other is that, while the responsibility of each State in regard to economic and financial sanctions is the same, that in regard to military sanctions will vary, but it will vary not according to the idiosyncracies of each nation, but according to its geographical situation and the extent of its military resources, and in no case is the degree of its interest in the dispute to enter as a factor into this question." The British League of Nations Union has recommended this reform, and several speakers including, Mr. Lloyd George and Sir Archibald Sinclair advocated it in the House of Commons in the debate above referred to. Mr. George said: Britain will of course defend her own shores and her Dominions and Colonies; she will also defend France to whom she is pledged. She might not send an army to other countries; but this does not mean that she is to do nothing in such cases. The rule governing the giving of assistance should be this: "Those that are geographically continuous would contribute their portions (to the army), and then we should come in with our economic sanctions and our financial sanctions. . . . Military intervention where it is appropriate, economic and financial sanctions elsewhere." Sir Archibald Sinclair said: "Certainly, as long as we are loyal to the Covenant, neutrality as between an aggressor and his victim is out of the question. We cannot continue to supply the aggressor with the means to make his aggression effective. Therefore we must impose sanctions. We need not declare war on the aggressor, but if he attacks us in an endeavour to break through the sanctions ring, we must be prepared to resist the attack."

The British Government has not yet declared its mind, but if it could be inferred from the speech of Sir Austen Chamberlain who, as Mr. Lloyd George said, "wields the whip" and "is the bell wether" of the Government, the British Government is against this proposed amendment of the Covenant. It is not ready to treat economic and financial sanctions as obligatory, nor is it prepared to exclude British interests as a relevant factor in deciding upon employing military sanctions, where the employment of such sanctions by Britain is necessary and possible. His own words may be given:

It is hopeless to expect every country to go to war in every quarrel. We are agreed that there are certain cases or that there is a case in which we must go to war. There is the case of our own defence, including in that certainly the defence of the whole Empire. I make no distinction between defending this island and defending any part of the British Empire. There is our defence, and there is also the defence of the independence of the Low Countries, Belgium and Holland, and of France. Their independence is absolutely bound up with the independence and integrity of our own land. We cannot maintain it if France is conquered or diminished. Those are cases in which I believe every person in this House would be prepared, after using every reasonable effort to prevent war, to take up any challenge which might be thrown down to fight again to a finish as we fought before.

I agree that to say that we will fight then, and only then, in those cases, would be to license war everywhere throughout the rest of the world. That is a thing which we have not the right to do, but I think we have, outside the specified limits in which we are prepared to use our whole force.

the right to reserve our right of judging each case on its merits and to make our efforts proportionate to our capacity, our interests, and to what other people are doing, to what those who are the immediate victims are doing and have prepared for, having regard to the dangers which are involved. I venture to think that one of the great difficulties in these years has been that the Covenant was drawn too tightly . . . Unless you can get down to the reorganisation of the League, on the basis of realities and on a local body of resistance that is immediately effective, and which the generality of the League can support, I think you will always find that the League will break down in the future as it has broken down in the case of Abyssinia.

It will be noticed that many conditions are mentioned here, but one of them is the interest which Britain may have at stake in the particular quarrel in which her military intervention is required.

Sir Austen and his friends thus favour regional pacts, and the pacts will be formed as national interests may dictate. The conclusion from this is inescapable, that, if any country which is in danger of being attacked is in the unfortunate position of having no powerful allies to defend it, the League will allow it to perish. The League, under this plan, is not for the small nations, but for the Great Powers, and, as things stand at present, it means that the League will confine its operations to Europe. Sir Austen would, as the *Spectator* puts it in its issue of 10th July, "see the League not only retain, but strengthen its weapons at the cost of restricting its field of action to the area where its available weapons are likely to be effective—in practice, to Europe, and perhaps not even the whole European Continent." In all likelihood the League will be re-formed on these lines. It will be limited, in so far as any action is contemplated, to either the whole of Europe or part of Europe. Non-European countries will not be ordered to walk out; their subscriptions will come in handy, but they will be told that their political independence will not be a matter of active concern with the big European States, of whose designs the League has become an instrument. The *Spectator* says: "Retirement into Europe with its weapons so far as possible intact seems the predestined course; and Mr. Eden's very guarded words at Geneva (that the methods of the League should be so amended that they 'may correspond to the action which nations are in fact ready and willing to take') may perhaps be taken to indicate that this is what the British Government, like the French Government, have in mind." The question for India is to consider whether if this "reform" is brought about, as seems likely, she should continue to remain in it on sufferance, as indicative of her having attained the status of a self-governing country, or whether from a feeling of national self-respect she should not say good-bye. We do not raise here the question, important as it is, that India does not have an independent voice of her own in League affairs; that her representative cannot make the kind of pronouncement that the South African representative, M. te Water, made. The latter said at Geneva:

My Government, whom I have the honour to represent desires me to say here that this renunciation by the most powerful members of the League of the collective decision most solemnly taken by us all, under the obligation by which we declared ourselves bound, can alone be inter-

preted as surrender by them of the authority of the League a surrender of the high trust and ideals of world peace entrusted to each member nation of this institution. . . The Union of South Africa cannot, without protest, subscribe to a declaration to the world which, in their profound belief will shatter for generations all international confidence and all hope of realising world peace. . . I beg to announce the decision of my Government that it is still prepared to maintain the collective action legitimately agreed upon by the resolution of this Assembly of the League of Nations on October 10th, 1935.

We leave this question on one side altogether for the present. But has India really any place in a Concert of Europe that the League threatens to become? The *Spectator* goes on: "Nevertheless, the course (which the British Government appears to be contemplating of restricting the League's zone of active interest to Europe) is full of difficulties for a country in the situation of Great Britain. A European League in which non-members, including the British Dominions, pay their subscriptions and play the role of supers is not the League which has become, irrespective of party, an article of faith for so many of the most progressive minds in the British Commonwealth of Nations. The Central and South American delegates are already restive; and other more important resignations can scarcely be avoided if the League is to proclaim that its effective interests are limited to Europe."

WHO ARE THE HARIJANS ?

MR. MANUBHAI C. PANDYA writing in the *Times of India* of 31st July disputes that there are 60 to 70 million depressed class Hindus in India. He says that backward class Hindus, such as Dhobies, barbers, potters and others, who are not untouchables have been treated as untouchables. According to Mr. Pandya's ingenious calculation and loose thinking, untouchables in India do not exceed 7 millions in all. It must be admitted at the same time that the statement that there are 60 to 70 million untouchables in India is equally misleading. No doubt the truth lies midway, but nearer the higher estimate than Mr. Pandya's estimate. It may be said without any fear of contradiction that the untouchables in India number a little over 50 millions according to the Census of 1931 as made by Dr. Hutton, who has gone into the details very carefully. We give below the figures for the various Provinces and States in India with their total :—

PROVINCES.	HARIJAN POPULATION.
1. Ajmer and Merwara	76,816
2. Assam	18,29,009
3. Bengal (as per Reforms Officer	91,25,625)
4. Bihar and Orissa	57,44,393
5. Bombay including Sind	17,50,424
6. C. P. and Berar	28,18,346
7. Coorg	24,803
8. Delhi	72,883
9. Madras Presidency	72,34,104
10. Punjab	12,79,459

PROVINCES.	HARIJAN POPULATION.
11. United Provinces ... (Chamars only are 62 lacs).	... 1,13,22,281
STATES.	
1. Baroda State 2,03,043
2. Bihar and Orissa States 6,31,864
3. Bombay States 3,48,574
4. Central India States 7,97,902
5. C. P. States 2,52,732
6. Gwalior State 6,78,119
7. Hyderabad State 24,73,230
8. Jammu and Kashmir State 1,70,928
9. Cochin State ... (Thiyas or Illavas 2¾ lacs excluded)	... 1,25,339
10. Travancore State (Thiyas included)	17,69,735
11. Mysore State 10,00,326
12. Punjab States 4,87,346
13. Rajputana States 15,65,409
14. U. P. States 2,08,864
15. Western India States Agency ... (Kathiawar and other States)	... 3,18,220
Total for Provinces and States	5,00,83,958
Other States and minor Provinces	1,11,812
Grand Total	5,01,95,770

This will convince Mr. Pandya that his contention that the untouchables do not exceed 7 millions is totally untenable. The figure 7 millions is palpably incorrect and a ridiculously low figure.

Mr. Pandya says that all the depressed classes are not untouchables. But what is the definition of an untouchable? Mr. Pandya conveniently burks this fundamental question. Opinions and definitions of what constitutes untouchability vary widely according to orthodox prejudices from province to province, in this vast continent of India. In the absence of a definition of untouchability, which will be accepted by all in India, we have necessarily to be guided in this matter for all practical purposes by the definition given of untouchability both in the Simon Report, 1930, as well as the Census report of 1931. The Census report gives nine tests of what constitutes untouchability. Mr. Pandya who appears to have looked into the Census report of 1931 seems to have conveniently ignored Appendix I entitled Exterior Castes in Part I of the said report, page 472. The nine tests given are:

1. Whether the caste or class in question can be served by clean Brahmins or not (at a marriage and death ceremonies).
2. Whether the caste or class in question can be served by the barbers, water carriers, tailors etc. who serve the caste Hindus.
3. Whether the caste in question pollutes a high caste Hindu by contact or by proximity.
4. Whether the caste or class in question is one from whose hands a caste Hindu can take water (not food).
5. Whether the caste or class in question is debarred from using public conveniences such as roads, ferries, wells or schools.

6. Whether the caste or class in question is debarred from the use of Hindu temples.
7. Whether in ordinary social intercourse a well educated member of the caste or class in question will be treated as an equal by high caste men of the same educational qualifications.
8. Whether the caste or class in question is merely depressed on account of its own ignorance, illiteracy, poverty and but for that would be subject to no social disability.
9. Whether it is depressed on account of the occupation followed and but for that occupation it would be subject to no social disability.

Judged by these nine tests, or at least some of them and not only by No. 3, Mr. Pandya will admit there are many Hindu communities who would come under the definition of "the depressed classes." The disabilities from which the depressed caste Hindus and the untouchable Hindus suffer are many and most humiliating and some of them inhuman. It will serve no useful purpose either to minimise them or to underestimate them or even to exaggerate them. Further, Mr. Pandya does not know that the disabilities of the various communities vary from province to province. It will do him good to read the pertinent chapters of the 1931 Census report on the matter a little more carefully and sympathetically. When Mr. Pandya refers to the depressed classes, he is having in mind only the untouchables. Even granting it to be so, he does not know that the sweepers who are untouchables are known by different names in different provinces. They are known as Churahs in the Punjab, Malis in Eastern Bengal, Bhambhis in Rajputana, Hadis in some provinces, Lalbegis in others, Doms in Eastern U. P. and so on. The Doms and Sansis and Kanjars are considered to be inferior even to sweepers. All these castes or communities in the different provinces have to be included if we desire to arrive at a correct figure of even untouchable sweepers of India.

With reference to Mr. Pandya's allegation that backward class Hindus such as potters, Dhobies, barbers and others have been wrongly treated as untouchables, all that need be said in reply is that Mr. Pandya does not know the real state of affairs in India. There is a community of washermen in Cochin called Velans and Purada Vannans in Tinnevely whose members are treated as untouchables and unseeables respectively. The Dhobies of Bengal and Bihar are also treated as untouchables. Similarly the disabilities of all these communities vary from province to province. If even some of the nine tests given in the Census report are applied to the communities mentioned, he will find that they come under the definition of the depressed classes.

The words 'depressed classes' and 'untouchables' are used in a very loose sense, both by leaders and public workers. The proper designation for them is Harijans or castes scheduled for the several handicaps imposed upon them by the Hindu society.

Mr. Pandya exceeds the bounds of fair criticism when he says that neither the Congressmen nor the

reformers have any regard for truth. I will not follow Mr. Pandya's example, but I will say this much that Mr. Pandya's article is full of statements which are not borne out by authoritative and recorded facts. His article is full of misstatements and misleading half-truths which no serious-minded

student of public questions will allow to go unchallenged.

S. R. VENKATA RAMAN
(of the Servants of India Society).

Harjjan Sayak Sangh,
New Delhi.

REFORM OF THE LEAGUE. M. MAXIM LITVINOFF'S SPEECH.

M. Litvinoff, the delegate of the U. S. S. R., made a speech to the Assembly of the League of Nations on 1st July, extracts from which bearing on the reform of the League are given below.

I speak of the necessity for every Member of the League now to realise its individual responsibility for the lack of success of the common action undertaken in defence of the independence of a fellow-Member of the League, because, both inside the League and outside it, there have been attempts to ascribe this lack of success to the League Covenant, to its defects and to the present composition of the League. From this are drawn far-reaching conclusions, which may lead to the result that, together with Ethiopian independence, the League itself may turn out to have been buried as well. Such attempts and conclusions must be decisively rejected.

We find ourselves face to face with the fact that the League of Nations has proved unable to secure for one of its Members the territorial integrity and political independence provided for by Article 10 of the Covenant, and to-day is able only to express to that Member its platonic sympathy. We cannot tranquilly and indifferently pass by this crying fact; we must analyse it, and draw from it all the lessons requisite to prevent similar cases for the future.

Some, however, are proposing too simple a remedy. They tell us: eliminate Article 10 altogether, free yourselves from obligations in respect of guaranteeing the integrity of the territory and the independence of League Members, and then it will never be possible to accuse the League of Nations of being bankrupt. They even consider it a mistake for the League to attempt to stop aggression and defend its Members. Only those can hold such views who deny the very principle of collective security, who deny the principal function of the League and the whole *raison d'être* of its creation and existence. It is, therefore, not worth while arguing with such people.

But those who recognise the principle of collective security, who continue to regard the League Covenant as an instrument of peace, might blame the Covenant only if they could show either that the Covenant does not provide sufficiently effective means in support of Article 10, or that, in this particular case, all such means were utilised to the full, yet failed to achieve their aim. But they will not be able to prove that.

I assert that Article 16 equipped the League of Nations with such powerful weapons that, in the event of their being fully applied, every aggression can be broken. Moreover, the very conviction that they may be applied may rob the aggressor of his zeal to put his criminal intentions into practice. The melancholy experience of the Italo-Ethiopian conflict does not contradict this assertion: on the contrary. In this particular case, whether because this was the first experiment in the application of collective measures; whether because some considered that this case has particular characteristics; whether because it coincided with the preparations elsewhere for aggression on a much larger scale, to which Europe had to devote special attention; whether for

these or other reasons, it is a fact that, not only was the whole terrible mechanism of Article 16 not brought into play, but from the very outset there was a manifest striving to confine the action taken to the barest minimum. Even economic sanctions were limited in their scope and their function, and even in this limited scope sanctions were not applied by all Members of the League.

Four Members of the League, from the very beginning, refused to apply any sanctions whatsoever. One Member of the League bordering on Italy refused to apply the most effective sanction—namely, the prohibition of imports from Italy; while, of those countries which raised no objections in principle to sanctions, many did not in actual fact apply several of them, pleading constitutional difficulties, the necessity of "study," etc. Thus, even the embargo on arms was not applied by seven Members of the League, financial measures by eight countries, prohibition of exports to Italy by ten countries, and prohibition of imports from Italy by thirteen countries—i.e., 25% of the total membership of the League. It may be said that the Latin-American countries, with a few exceptions, did not apply in practice the more effective sanctions at all. I am not in any way making this a reproach against anyone; I am simply illustrating the point I have been making. Furthermore, the proposal to deprive some non-members of the League of the possibility of counteracting sanctions, or to limit their opportunity of so doing—a proposal which could have been applied in practice—was not approved by the Co-ordination Committee.

Given all these restrictions, sanctions could have been effective only in the event of their more prolonged application side by side with the military resistance of Ethiopia herself. The latter, however, was broken down much sooner than our most authoritative sources of information anticipated.

In such circumstances, it may be said that Members of the League of Nations, for one reason or another, refrained from bringing Article 16 completely into play. But it does not follow from this that Article 16 itself is a failure.

Some are inclined to attribute the failure of League action to the absence from it of some countries or its insufficiently universal character. We see, however, that not every Member of the League took part in sanctions. There is no reason to believe that sanctions would have been endorsed by those States which left the League, since they rejected the very foundations of the League, and particularly the presence of Articles 10 and 16 in the Covenant. Their membership of the League would only have facilitated the still further disorganisation of our ranks, and would have acted rather as a demoralising factor than otherwise. On the other hand, we see from the example of the United States of America that the League of Nations may reckon on non-members of the League in applying Article 16, and reckon with them all the more, the more energetically it acts itself. Thus we see that it is not in the imperfections of the League Covenant that we must seek the causes of the failure to grant adequate aid to

Ethiopia, nor yet in the lack of universality in the League.

We have heard other arguments in Geneva, too. Let the League Covenant be entirely unimpeachable (they say); let Members of the League and individual persons bear the blame; but does not this show disharmony between the Covenant and the state of mind of the people called upon to fulfil it, and does it not follow from this alone that it is necessary to adapt the Covenant to the existing state of mind, or, as they also put it, to "realities"?

But this argument, again, will not hold water. After all, people are different, and even in one and the same country not all statesmen think alike. To whose state of mind, then, should the Covenant be adapted?

Of those who take their stand on the consistent and collective defence of security, who see the highest interest of all nations in the maintenance of universal peace, who consider that, in the long run, this is required by the interests of every State, that it can be achieved only by sacrificing temporary interests to the community of nations, and who are ready even to place part of their own armed forces at the disposal of that community?

Or of those who, in principle, swear allegiance to collective security but in practice are ready to apply it, only when it coincides with the interests of their own country?

Or, again, of those who reject the very principle of collective security, replace international solidarity with the watchword "Sauve qui peut", preach the localisation of war and proclaim war itself to be the highest manifestation of the human spirit?

I fear that it is precisely this last category of persons whom people have in mind when they argue the necessity of adapting—or, as I would call it, degrading—the Covenant, since they reinforce their argument by asserting that in this way States which have left the League may be brought back. Thus we are asked at all costs to restore to the League States which left it only because they see obstacles to the fulfilment of their aggressive intentions in the Covenant, in Articles 10 and 16, in sanctions. We are told: Throw Article 10 out of the Covenant, throw out Article 16, renounce sanctions, reject collective security and then former Members of the League may return to our ranks, and the League will become universal." In other words: "Let us make the League safe for aggressors."

I say that we don't need such a League, we don't need a League which is safe for aggressor with all its universality, since such a League, from an instrument of peace, will turn into its very opposite. At best, by depriving the League of the functions of collective security, we should be turning it into a debating society or a charitable institution unworthy of the name of League of Nations, unworthy of the resources spent on it and not answering to those hopes and anticipations which are centred upon it.

For my part, I would propose that the Covenant be adapted, not to the frame of mind of any particular category of people, any particular statesmen or temporary rulers, but to the frame of mind of the millions of people in all countries and in all continents—those who are rightly called humanity and who demand the maintenance of peace at all costs and its defence by all means. It is not the Covenant which we have to degrade, but people whom we have to educate and bring up to the level of its lofty ideas. We must strive for the universality of the League, but not make safe for the aggressor for the sake of that universality. On the contrary, every new Member, every old Member wishing to return to it,

must read over its doorway, "All hope of aggression with impunity abandon, ye who enter here."

Let us be frank. The League of Nations is not going through its first reverse by any means. There have been not less, but even more striking cases of military attacks by one Member of the League on another when the League did not react at all and left the victim of aggression face to face with the aggressor in an unequal struggle. There was no question then of the Covenant being unsuitable, or of revising it. If there were no grounds for such actions then, there are still less to-day. For my part, I prefer the League which attempts to afford even some kind of aid to the victim of aggression, albeit unsuccessfully, to a League which shuts its eyes to aggression and calmly passes by.

I consider that the League made a tremendous step forward when the overwhelming majority of its Members, regardless of substantial material sacrifices, came to the assistance—even unsuccessfully—of a fellow-Member who was attacked, instead of busying itself solely with sending the dispute from committee to sub-committee, and despatching commissions of enquiry, as has happened in other cases. In other words, the frame of mind of the Member States has been improved considerably, and this justifies our hope that next time it will rise to the full level of League ideas, and the victim will be saved from the aggressor altogether.

I am far from idealising the Covenant. Its imperfections consist, not so much in its articles as in its omissions and obscurities. Therefore, one has to speak, not of reforming the Covenant, but of making it more precise and of reinforcing it. I consider it, for instance, a serious omission that a definition of aggression is absent from the Covenant, a fact which, in the Italo-Ethiopian conflict, enabled some Members of the League to refuse to participate in sanctions at the very beginning. There is no clarity on the question of what organ of the League registers the fact of aggression. There is no clarity as to the binding character of decisions by League organs in the matter of sanctions. We must put an end to the situation in which references to sovereignty and constitutional formalities serve as obstacles to the execution of international undertakings. Article 16 must remain untouched. Economic sanctions must remain obligatory for all Members of the League. Only when sanctions are obligatory will be removed the apprehension and mistrust that if, in a certain case, certain States which have no direct interest in the conflict undergo considerable sacrifices, in another case other disinterested States will act with less idealism.

What is necessary is confidence that in all cases of aggression, independent of the degree of interest in the particular conflict, sanctions will be applied by all, and this can be attained only when sanctions are obligatory. I consider this circumstance to be the principal cause of the reverse sustained by the League in the Italo-Ethiopian conflict. It may be possible to conceive of individual cases—very rare, it is true—when aggression may be stopped by economic sanctions alone; but I recognise that, in the majority of cases, economic sanctions must march parallel with military sanctions as well as economic sanctions ought to be binding on all.

But, if we cannot as yet rise to such heights of international solidarity, we ought to see that every continent, and Europe, if only as a beginning, should be covered with a network of regional pacts, in virtue of which individual groups of States would undertake to defend particular regions from the aggressor, and the fulfilment of these regional obligations would be considered equivalent to the fulfilment of obligations under the Covenant and would have the full support of

all the Members of the League. These regional pacts should not replace, but should supplement the League Covenant otherwise they would amount in effect to the pre-war military alliances.

These are the directions in which I conceive of the perfection and reinforcement of the League of Nations, and my Government is ready to co-operate to the utmost with other Members of the League in achieving this. I welcome the programme developed before us by the Prime Minister of France, with which my observations coincide to a very considerable extent.

As I have dwelt on all this in the interest of the reinforcement of peace, I cannot but refer to the measure which the Soviet Government has always considered, and continues to consider, the maximum guarantee of peace—namely, total disarmament. I want to believe that humanity will not have to go through yet another Armageddon before all the peoples come to this conclusion. But, so long as this radical measure has not been adopted, we have nothing

left but to strengthen the League of Nations as an instrument of peace. You cannot strengthen the League of Nations if you do not stick to the principle of collective security, which is not at all a product of idealism but a practical measure for ensuring the security of all peoples; if you do not stick to the principle of the indivisibility of peace, and to the conviction that, at the present time, there is not a single State, large or small, which is not exposed to aggression, and that, if the next war spares one country or another, the latter will sooner or later arouse the appetites of the aggressor who has emerged victorious from the War.

The carrying into practice of these ideas will preserve us from new disappointments, similar to those which we are now undergoing, will infuse new life into the League, and will bring it abreast of the great tasks it has to perform. The League of Nations is now more than ever an international necessity: it must live, it must be strong, and stronger than ever.

THE INDIAN PROBLEMS.

INTERVIEW WITH DR. ZACHARIAS.

Dr. H. C. E. Zacharias, who is re-visiting Malaya after seventeen years, is a keen student of Indian affairs, both social and political, and for a time he was an active worker for the welfare of the Indian people and he is still an associate member of the Servants of India Society. Prior to that Mr. Zacharias was associated with the Malayan rubber industry in various ways. Mr. Zacharias is now staying as the guest of Mr. H. B. Talalla, J. P., in Kuala Lumpur pending his departure for China shortly to take up a lecturership at the Fu Jen University of Peiping, says the Indian of Kuala Lumpur in its issue of 8th August.

"I very much deplore the enactment of the new constitution. It panders further to communalism and I consider it worse than the Montagu-Chelmsford constitution in its main effects, though slightly better in some minor points. Under the new Act, the Princes, landlords and the vested interests have all the power in their hands and the constitution cannot be changed unless the consent of every Prince is first obtained. It is impossible when there are over 300 Princes in India to think we shall ever get the signature of every one of them to effect any change in the present constitution," said Mr. H. C. E. Zacharias, referring to the new Government of India Act in the course of a conversation with our representative.

TRIBUTE TO MR. SASTRI.

Continuing his views on the new Government of India Act, Mr. Zacharias said: "In the original draft constitution there was a clause that, if by obstruction or otherwise the present constitution failed, things would automatically revert to the Montford constitution; but this provision was taken out before the Bill was passed in Parliament. So, as it stands, the new constitution is practically unalterable. Even though the Provincial Governments will operate the constitution right away, let us hope that the provisions regarding the Federal Government will never come into force at all. The only hope for Indians is to prove its unacceptability until they get another constitution altogether."

INDIANS OVERSEAS.

"What is the position of Indians overseas?" was the next question our representative asked. "Again, I must say, deplorable," said Mr. Zacharias. "There were glorious opportunities to consolidate the British Empire, if only British citizenship, one and indivisible, had been made to prevail throughout the

Empire. Instead of which, second class citizenship was introduced for non-whites, the most flagrant example being the treatment of Indians in Kenya. I do not speak of Indian disabilities in the Union of South Africa: the Union is a Dominion and it can be pleaded that Whitehall is powerless to interfere. But Kenya is a Crown Colony; it therefore provides a touch-stone of equal citizenship for whites and non-whites alike. The words of the Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri still ring in my ears, who on that occasion when the fatal step had been taken, exclaimed: 'Kenya lost, all lost.'"

PANDIT JAWAHARLAL NEHRU.

The conversation then turned to Pandit Jawaharlal, the man of the moment in India. "I have read Mr. Nehru's Presidential address and found it most inspiring in its general concept", commented Mr. Zacharias. "How far it can be brought into practical politics it is difficult to say," he added. Regarding his autobiography, Mr. Zacharias said that he had not yet had the opportunity to get the book, but meant to go through the same as soon as possible.

Referring to Mr. Nehru's advocacy of socialism, Mr. Zacharias said that this word was commonly used in England and also in the East in a loose way. What Pandit Kunzru, the present President of the Servants of India Society calls *practical socialism*, is of course not communism, nor even socialism in the strict technical sense. I could call myself a "practical socialist", being a member of the British Labour Party, and social reconstruction and reformation on such lines of course is urgently called for in India."

THE HARIJAN MOVEMENT.

"The Harijan movement", observed Mr. Zacharias, "is no doubt one of the foremost social movements in India. Mahatma Gandhi's stimulus is having its due effect, though of course slowly—but I think surely. The idea of mass conversion on political grounds and for political ends is of course repugnant to me," he added. In reply to another question, whether caste was not also to be found outside Hinduism, "That is so", he said, "but it is not to be denied that Harijans would improve their social status, if they ceased to be Hindus."

With regard to the question of a coalition between Congress and Liberals, Mr. Zacharias said: "There is no question of fusion between the two parties as the methods and temper of the two parties

have been different all along, but for the purpose of uniting for a common object, as for instance at the present moment against the new constitution, a coalition is most desirable and I hope sincerely that in the present situation all parties will join hands for that purpose.

OFFICE ACCEPTANCE.

"What do you think of the question, whether Congress candidates, successful at the polls, should accept office under the new Constitution?" asked the interviewer.

"Not being a member of Congress", replied our distinguished visitor smilingly, "it would be impertinent for me to want to tell another party what policy they should adopt. As for myself, that seems to be a question, reply to which depends very much on the circumstances. The Indian Liberals always said that they would use every opportunity, Council-entry and acceptance of office included, if thereby they could advance India on the path of social betterment and political emancipation. Now, after all these years of fierce opposition to our principles and methods, Congress seems to be bent on stealing our thunder. Why should I quarrel with them over it?"

INDIANS IN MALAYA.

Turning to questions affecting Indians in Malaya, Mr. Zacharias said that he had not had the opportunity to study them at first hand and he therefore did not think that he could give any useful opinion, except on very general lines. Pressed to say something on the Colonisation scheme for Indian labourers in Malaya, he asked in return whether there was not a contradiction between this policy and what he understood was the "Malay polity" recently espoused. "If I go to Canada to colonize it, I go there to make it my home for good and the home and native country of my children. I can only do that, if I know that my children will rank as Canadians on a par with all other Canadian-born children. I must believe that Canada will be entirely theirs and that it will depend on their worth, what they will make of it. I must believe that, if they have it in them to end up as Prime Minister of Canada, they will be able to reach that rung on the political ladder. If that avenue is closed to them, not because they are not fit for it, but because they happen to have me for their father, how could you ever expect me to want to emigrate and settle for good in Canada? I do not believe in Herr Hitler's race myth", added Mr. Zacharias decisively.

INDIAN AGENTS.

As regards the status of Agents of the Government of India abroad, Mr. Zacharias did not like very much the present situation. The name "Agent" to begin with, was not a very dignified one. Just fancy a diplomat and statesman of the first calibre, a member of His Majesty's Privy Council, a freeman of the City of London, a Companion of Honour, like Mr. Srinivasa Sastri, representing India in the Union of South Africa under the title "Agent of the Government of India"! Obviously India should have its Ministers, Consular Agents and Trade Commissioners, just as other Dominions within the Empire. There are plenty of prominent unofficials or Indians in the Civil Service fit to represent Indian interests abroad in such a capacity.

PRESENT MISSION.

In conclusion Mr. Zacharias referred to his own present mission and said: "My object in going to China is to act as a link between Indian and Chinese cultures. I am asked at the Fu Jen University of Peiping to fill a chair of Indian and Colonial History

and in that capacity I hope to forge new links of friendship and mutual understanding between the two oldest and highest civilisations in the world—those of India and of China."

As for delivering a lecture or two in this country, before leaving for China, Mr. Zacharias could give no definite reply, until he had settled the length of his stay here. In any case he has kindly consented to speak at the local India Association on the 22nd inst.

SHORT NOTICES.

SEX AND EVOLUTION. By ALEC CRAIG. (Allen & Unwin.) 20cm. 144p. 4/6.

ALEC CRAIG is known as an advanced writer on sexual problems, though he may not always see eye to eye with other advanced writers. In this book he considers divorce, abortion, sex education and the Soviet Marriage Code, the full text of which was published in England in 1932, and he emphasises the fact which communists are bent on ignoring or denying, that sex reform is not entirely dependent on economic reform, since the Soviet Code could be easily adopted in England with very few changes. An important chapter is the one entitled "Some Revaluations", in which he considers what such words as "modesty", "chastity", "purity" and "fidelity" can mean to people who have modern ideas on sex. To the orthodox, 'modesty' means covering the body and concealing particularly the genital organs from persons of the opposite sex, even when you happen to be married to them. The modern person will wear many, few or no clothes on different occasions according to convenience, nor will he or she be outraged at the sight of love-making in parks. Modern modesty will however refrain from all attempts to pry into other people's love affairs and consider them as entirely private. The author insists on the sanctity of love and considers that "a first love affair should be with a person who moves our whole personality, i.e. a person with whom we are in love". 'Purity' differs from chastity in the orthodox sense, since even a married woman may be pure, but the word is rather difficult to understand, since an absence of sexual desire is hardly desirable, at least in married people. To the modern, purity may mean keeping love free from extraneous motives such as money or position. 'Fidelity' in the orthodox sense means that "if two persons once engaged in sexual intercourse, each has a right to expect from the other perpetual repetition, and that no intercourse shall take place with a third party."

R. D. KARVE.

INSTRUCTION IN INDIAN PRIMARY SCHOOLS. By Various Authors. (Oxford University Press.) 1936. 20cm. 134p. Rs. 2.

THE book is a reprint of some articles published in *Teaching* together with three more which are printed in the book for the first time. The articles which now form the chapters of the book discuss the aims and methods of teaching the different subjects of the primary school curriculum. It is essentially a book for the primary school masters but cannot be used by them as they cannot read English.

M. R. PARANJPE.