

The

Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO—OFFICE : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S HOME, POONA 4

VOL. XIV NO. 7.

POONA—THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1931.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	73
ARTICLES :—	
On "Safeguards."	75
The Princes' "Sacrifices." By G. R. Abhyankar. ...	76
The Meaning of the Declaration. By N. G. T. ...	77
Civil Aviation. By S. G. Sastry.	80
REVIEWS :—	
Sikhs Through Anglo-Indian Spectacles. By M. S. C.	81
The Fascist Regime. By C. V. H. Rao.	81
MISCELLANEA :—	
R. T. C. Delegates' Manifesto.	82
Mr. N. M. Joshi's Views.	83
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
The States and Federation. By H. C. E. Zacharias.	84

Topics of the Week.

Late Pandit Motilal Nehru.

THE death of Pandit Motilal Nehru which occurred at Lucknow on Friday last has cast deep gloom over the whole country. The passing away of a personality like his would at any time be a serious national loss ; but it is far more so at the present time when constitutional changes of a far-reaching nature are impending and when his advice and guidance would have been a great asset to his countrymen. Pandit Motilal Nehru was in the public life of the country for a long time ; but his active participation in it does not date very much earlier than 1919. The enactment of the Rowlatt Act and specially the happenings at Amritsar with which the name of General Dyer would be indissolubly associated turned him into a formidable opponent of the Government. He presided over the last pre-non-co-operation session of the National Congress at Amritsar which branded the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms as inadequate, unsatisfactory and disappointing. This was a turning point in his life. Thereafter he gave up his luxurious and easygoing habits and devoted himself to national work with a degree of self-sacrifice and vigour which evoked universal admiration. Even so one could not be sure that he was a convinced believer in the barren non-co-operation policy initiated by Mahatma Gandhi, for not long after he collaborated with the late Mr. C. R. Das in bringing the Swaraj Party into existence and in leading the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly. A consummate tactician, his leadership of the Swaraj party was a matter for admiration and wonder to everybody, and a source of much embarrassment to the Government. That he was a constitutionalist first and a non-co-operator only afterwards was apparent even from the proposals for a settlement he handed to Mr. Slocombe in June last. It is an irony of the Indian situation that even the ablest sons of the country have few opportu-

nities and little encouragement for constructive work. But Pandit Motilal, though he had to play the role of a critic of Government measures during a large part of his political life, had to his credit the scheme of political reform called after him which is a standing testimony to his constructive ability. In 1928 he presided over the National Congress a second time—an honour reserved only for the select few. But owing to the short-sighted policy of the Government he could not for long continue a friend of constitutionalism. It is a matter of recent history that he was twice sentenced to varying terms of imprisonment. Though he cannot be said to have died young there can be no doubt that his life was shortened to some extent by his prison life. For the illness which put an end to his life he contracted while in prison. Indeed, it was this which secured his release, but not before the disease had time to hold him firmly in its grip, thanks to the slow-moving machinery of the Government. His death creates a void in Indian public life which it will be difficult to fill. We offer our most heart-felt condolence to his widow, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the other members of his family.

* * *

Late Sir Jamsetjee Jejeebhoy.

THE news of the death of Sir Jamsetjee Jejeebhoy which occurred in Bombay early morning on Friday last must have to come many, as it did to us, as a surprise. The late Sir Jamsetjee was a much respected member of the Parsi community which is distinctly poorer by his death. But his sympathies were not confined to his own community alone. He was a man of catholic sympathies and a supporter of all movements which were conducive to the moral and material welfare of the people of this land. Though not much in the public eye, he closely followed the fortunes of our countrymen settled overseas and identified himself with movements in this country designed to secure for them just and equitable treatment. He served in the local legislature as a nominated member and was elected to the first Legislative Assembly of which he was elected Deputy President. So far as the Servants of India Society is concerned, the late Sir Jamsetjee was one of its very valued friends and one who genuinely appreciated its work, as his speech on the occasion of laying the foundation stone of the building intended for the Society's Printing Presses in Poona on 19th February 1928 showed. We offer our heart-felt condolence to the bereaved family.

* * *

European Nervousness.

So far as Great Britain is concerned, responsibility at the Centre of course with safeguards is no longer in dispute, but the Europeans in India, or to be more accurate, the retiring President of the European

Association, Mr. Travers, do not seem to have reconciled themselves to it. For at the annual meeting of the Association recently held at Calcutta Mr. Travers spoke in a way which showed that he at any rate was not prepared to excuse the European delegates to the Round Table Conference for their "mistakes" which consisted in their endorsing Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru's proposals for the introduction of responsibility at the Centre, without securing Mr. Travers' previous approval. But let no body be so unfair as to attribute his protest to considerations of wounded dignity. For he at any rate is "quite certain" of the dire consequences that would follow the Central Government being made responsible to the legislature. Lest anybody should do him the injustice of thinking that in so vehemently standing up for the *status quo* so far as the Centre was concerned, he had only the interests of the European community in mind, he does not forget to mention India and he regards the thing as so objectionable that even if the whole world was in favour of it, he must register his protest so that nobody can say that he did not do his duty. He is apparently afraid that Indian swaraj would usher in the doom of British trade. It is nothing to him that everything reasonably possible has been done by the Round Table Conference to prevent such injustice being done to British traders in India in future. How unnecessarily nervous Mr. Travers is will be clear from the fact that what he is insisting upon with all his might has already been thought of viz. the inclusion of safeguards in the Act. In urging for this, he seems to us to be knocking at a door which is already open.

* * *

General Amnesty.

THOUGH the Legislative Assembly is in session at Delhi, political interest centres round the conversations between Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru on the one hand and Mahatma Gandhi and other Congress leaders on the other at Allahabad. No definite information is yet available as to the impression produced by the former on the latter; but it is reported that the conversations have come to an end without the Congress leaders coming to regard the Premier's Declaration as being less unsatisfactory than they regarded it all along. This, if true, is very unfortunate. Messrs. Sastri and Jayakar will be continuing the conversations to-day, let us hope, with better chance of success. As has been made clear more than once before, a general amnesty is likely to go a great way towards the creation of a proper atmosphere for the dispassionate consideration by the country of the impending constitutional changes. The matter was raised last week in the Assembly by means of a resolution which pressed for the abandonment of repression and adoption of conciliation; but the Government merely repeated what they have been saying all these days. They made it clear that the grant of general amnesty to civil disobedience prisoners was conditional upon the movement being called off. How we wish the Government had risen to the height of the occasion and taking their courage in both hands, had availed themselves of the opportunity to proclaim a general amnesty. As Sir Abdur Rahim pointed out in the course of the debate, the present *impasse* is due to the blunders committed by the Government, not the least important of which was the appointment of an all-white Commission to consider the question of India's political future. The Premier's Declaration marks a welcome change in that hated policy. This deserves to be calmly considered by the country; but unless the Government by doing everything in their power assist in the creation of the necessary atmosphere, the chances of that historic pronouncement receiving

that consideration would be seriously imperilled. The release of all satyagrahi prisoners is perhaps opposed by Government on the ground that it carries with it some risks. Granted the risks, the step is sure to add something to the moral stature of the Government which is very low at present. Moreover, so long as the Government continue to enjoy their extraordinary powers, we fail to see why they should at all be afraid of the risks.

* * *

Police Excesses.

THE recent lathi-beating in Madras has aroused such wide-spread indignation that people of all shades of opinion have combined in condemning it in emphatic terms. A public meeting was held at the Gokhale Hall in Madras on the 7th inst. which was presided over by Mr. Arokiaswamy Mudaliar, an ex-Minister. He made the revelation that when the Home Member was told about Mr. Bhashyam, a picketer, having been put in a police van after considerable lathi-beating and left at a distance of some distance from Madras, the Home Member professed ignorance. Later, under pressure from the Council he agreed to bring about a conference between some members of the Council, the police officers and himself; but strangely enough, the conference did not come off. The Police officers may have seen the Home Member privately, but had they refused to come to the conference? In that event, did the Home Member find himself powerless to get them to agree to attend? Apart from this, there is no doubt the police excesses are having disastrous results both on the relations between the rulers and the ruled and also those between Indians and Europeans. As the Chairman said, "every day the Government was adding converts to the Congress by hundreds, thousands and tens of thousands. People who were lukewarm before with reference to the Congress movement were now its enthusiastic supporters." Even so, the Viceroy is reported to have refused to institute an inquiry into the matter as demanded by Mahatma Gandhi, a demand which was supported even by such an Anglo-Indian journal as the *Evening News of India*. Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastri, explaining how light-heartedly the preventive sections of the Criminal Procedure Code were used said:—

A policeman had only to walk into a Magistrate's Court and say there was possibility of a breach of the peace, and that they must prevent certain action being taken by Congressmen or by the public agitators and then the Magistrates put up something like a formal enquiry and passed a prohibitory order. It was thus clear that the apprehension of a breach of the peace had become a mere formula to satisfy the requirements of the statute. Orders were passed and that which was not an offence yesterday became one to-day; because the order of the magistrate prevented them from doing it, and their meeting to do it made them an unlawful assembly.

This from an ex-Advocate-General cannot be dismissed as the raving of an irresponsible agitator. His speech indeed is a strong plea for limiting the magistrates' discretion in this respect. As is well-known, Section 144 Cr. P. C. was used, or rather abused, in some cases for preventing such harmless things as the use of the Gandhi cap and the carrying of the national flag. But when an attempt was recently made in the Legislative Assembly to prevent such abuses, it encountered strenuous opposition from the Government. That is regrettable. Any way it is high time the Government took steps to stop such police excesses. Else a calm and dispassionate consideration of the new constitutional scheme is likely to be prejudiced which must be avoided at all costs.

* * *

Articles.

ON "SAFEGUARDS."

THE Indian delegates to the Round Table Conference who returned to India by the last mail have issued a manifesto which should go a long way to reassure critics and sceptics of the reality and magnitude of the achievements of the Conference. There are two ways of judging a thing of the kind: the progress that has been made and the progress that still remains to be made. When the delegates sailed for London in October last the outlook was anything but hopeful. Many were those who prognosticated failure and disillusionment. The political atmosphere was surcharged with suspicion and distrust. If there was little in England to engender hope, there was much in India to kill it. Nevertheless, sustained by great faith in their cause and inspired by unerring political insight, the delegates went to London. Their action has been abundantly justified. They have been able to report that English public opinion had undergone a remarkable change in favour of India. As Sir Pheroze Sethna put it in his supplementary interview, the Conference provided a platform such as India never before possessed. With such wide diffusion of knowledge of the real facts of India came sympathy for her aspirations, and with it a "change of heart." There were never any doubts regarding the attitude of the Labour Government: they were right through favourably disposed. It was the conversion of the Liberal party under the leadership of Lord Reading that was a distinct achievement of the delegates. The Conservative party has also been brought round a great deal. If the Conference did nothing more than provoke the speeches that the Premier, Mr. Benn, Mr. Isaac Foot, and Mr. Baldwin made in the House of Commons, the Conference would not have been a failure. Few nationalist Indians could have made more convincing and powerful speeches than Messrs. Benn and Foot in favour of Indian Swaraj.

The "change of heart" is but a part of the achievement of the Conference. The outline of a constitution based on the newly established confidence also stands to its credit. The delegates say in the Manifesto that the "scheme outlined by the Conference provides for Dominion Status, with safeguards during the period of transition. It has been explicitly recognised that the task of governing India should in future be entrusted to an Indian executive responsible to an Indian legislature." Federation of British India and the India States and responsibility in the Centre are the two great achievements.

Naturally, public attention will rest critically on the "safeguards", even though they are transitional. The delegates assure us that, in their opinion, these do not affect the substance of the scheme which seeks to transfer political power to Indian hands. Only Defence and Foreign Affairs will be "reserved" and even they not wholly. As much of these as may be shown by special investigation to be transferrable will be handed over to Indian control. As regards

Finance, during the period of transition the Viceroy will have control of the expenditure on the subjects specially reserved to him. As for the rest, it will be under the control of the Legislature. Transfer of currency and exchange will follow immediately on the establishment of a Reserve Bank. Sir Pheroze Sethna, himself a keen businessman who understands Finance, said in his interview that, to his mind, the transfer of Finance, even with certain safeguards for a time, is a "remarkable achievement and should be appreciated in this country at its full worth."

Considered, therefore, from the point of view of progress made, the achievements that stand to the credit of the Conference are indeed great. But there is the other point of view: how far short does the scheme fall of the desirable. It represents a bare outline. The details, "some of which," the delegates themselves admit, "are of a substantial and far-reaching character", have yet to be worked out. A criticism of the defects and failings of the scheme with a view to improving it does not in the least detract from due appreciation of the great progress made.

The R. T. C. constitution provides "safeguards" which are not needed and fails to provide "safeguards" which are necessary. Mr. N. M. Joshi, who represented Labour interests at the Conference, has, in a separate statement of his own, pointed out some of the glaring defects of the scheme from the Labour point of view which is also the right and democratic point of view. Since the plea for adult franchise has been turned down, he points out, with justice, that the scheme transfers political power to the Indian aristocracy and middle classes to the exclusion of the working classes. He even fears that under the rule of the new masters the Indian working classes may fare worse. There is room to fear it. It is, therefore, earnestly he hoped that when the Franchise Committee is set up, its terms will not be restricted in any way and it will be free to consider a more equitable distribution of political power. To meet the criticism that adult franchise is unmanageable, Mr. Joshi offers two other alternatives: indirect election through electoral colleges or raising the age limit. All that he claims is that political power should be shared by every stratum in the cross section of Indian society, though not by every person in each stratum and that it should not be confined to the upper classes. There is also much force in his plea that Labour legislation as well as labour administration and finance should be federal. Otherwise, Labour interests are bound to be neglected.

The safeguards provided in the scheme refer to Foreign relations and Finance and they seem to be unnecessary and dispensable. Their stipulation does no good but much harm. Considering that under the Sapru scheme, Central responsibility and federation are indissolubly linked together, and the Princes are represented effectively in the Central Executive and Central Legislature, there is no reason why the relations of British India with the Indian States generally should not be made a federal subject. Constituted as the Central Government will be, no harm can happen to the Princes thereby; they are given enough power to prevent any if it threatened.

And on the top of it all, there is the final veto power in the Governor General.

Even with regard to the relations of India with other members of the British Commonwealth and foreign States, do the Princes wish that a Government in which they have effective power, should be debarred from taking charge of foreign affairs? Is there any need for the British Government to doubt the wisdom or reasonableness or amenability of a Central Government, so heavily weighted with a stable element like the princes? If, on any question, both the princes and the British Indians agree, do the British Government propose to set aside their conjoint view and act against their wishes? Does not the constitution provide enough conservative ballast in the Central Government so as to ensure its amenability to the wishes of the British Government within reasonable limits? Is not the presence of the princes themselves enough "safeguards" and more?

The same applies to Financial "safeguards." Certainly, the British Government can rely on the princes to see that no revolutionary proposals are manoeuvred through the Central Legislature and the Central Executive; that the red-hot Communists do not walk away with the country or "monkey" with it. As a matter of fact, it has been widely advertised that responsibility in the Centre has been conceded only because stable elements in the person of the princes have been included in it. Why, then, provoke distrust and hostility not only of British Indians but of the princes as well by insisting on further "safeguards"? Even Defence may safely be transferred to Indians. The administration will be as safe as it need be even without "safeguards."

The question of "safeguards" may arise if it was proposed that Indian States should be represented by their subjects and not by the princes. But as long as that consummation is ruled out, insistence on "safeguards" can only do harm and no good.

THE PRINCES' "SACRIFICES".

IN the recent Indian debate in the Commons Mr. Wedgwood Benn stated that the agreements reached at the R. T. C. were three. He explained that on the part of British India the understanding was that for some time to come British services should be enlisted in order to help India to establish an efficient and sound form of self-government. On the part of the Princes there is an undertaking to enter the federation. Parliament for its part is prepared to make the Government of India largely responsible. Safeguards, federation and responsibility were described by Mr. Benn as the three sides of the triangle.

So far as the Indian States are concerned, the understanding appears to us in a different light. To the Princes the principal gain seems to be that their internal sovereignty is kept intact under the shelter of paramountcy to be exercised through a Viceroy in all matters not surrendered expressly to the Federation. The right of Paramountcy over the States is however not included in the reserved subjects. This leads us to believe that when a full-fledged Federation is established in India, the position of the Viceroy would be anomalous. While on the one hand he would have to exercise control over non-federal subjects pertaining to the Indian States, on the other he

would be expected to keep in check six hundred autocrats through the machinery of an alien bureaucracy. The Princes were apparently afraid that the future democracy in British India would seriously prejudice the autocratic character of their rule: but their fears seem to have been set at rest by the very ingenious device of the division of paramountcy relating to the States. By their admission into the all-India Federation the Princes are sure to acquire the power of influencing Federal policies and would constitute a considerable factor in the Federal Legislature. Thus they would seem to enjoy much greater influence in relation to all-India subjects than at present and yet it is they that are never tired of speaking about their own "sacrifices"! What is it, we wonder, they have sacrificed? In the new constitutional arrangements they have secured valuable privileges, which might result in perpetuating their autocracy.

The British bureaucracy also seems to be equally satisfied because they would retain their grip over Indian States through the machinery of the Political Department. A federated India will not put a stop to the social amenities and the wide scope for patronage which the bureaucracy at present has. It appears practically certain that the nominees of the Indian Princes are to have seats in both houses of the federal legislature. This will be a source of strength not to Indian nationalism but to the British bureaucracy, as a little reflection will show. Even under the new constitutional scheme the Viceroy would exercise immense influence over the Princes. Need it be said that their nominees sitting in the Federal Legislature and voting under the mandate of their masters would cast their votes in a way to lend strength to the British Government rather than otherwise? Nor in the making and unmaking of the federal executive would their influence be negligible. In short, the Princes' nominees would only take the place of the present official bloc and are likely to be a mischievous influence. Just as in the old Bundesrath the solid Prussian votes, controlled by the Chancellor, dominated the old German constitution, the nominees of the Princes would have a dominating voice in the Federal legislature and executive and can be used for the frustration of our national aspirations and the furtherance of British interests.

This is the price with which British Indian delegates have purchased the Princes' support to the introduction of responsibility in the Centre. Else we cannot account for their silence over such an important matter as the dual control over Indian States which the new constitution proposes to give the Viceroy. If paramountcy had been included among the reserved subjects along with Defence and Foreign Relations to be transferred in due course to the federal Government, there seems reason to believe that the Princes would not have given their consent to the scheme of an all-India federation. Frankly, we do not regard the Princes to be the friends of Indian aspirations they want us to believe. If they had been genuinely sympathetic and earnestly enthusiastic about federation and responsibility at the Centre, why should they struggle so hard to get themselves divorced from the federal Government, so far as paramountcy is concerned? Why also should they be so anxious to remain under the domination of an irresponsible Viceroy and an alien bureaucracy?

As said already, we are unable to see that they have made any sacrifices to bring a federated India into being. We ask: are they at least prepared to make the federal laws directly operative in their states? Will they agree to the administration of federal subjects within their states by the federal Government? If their answer to these questions is in the affirmative, they must be said to have given up

something to the proposed federal Government. As yet we do not know if the Princes have shown any willingness to part with their sovereign authority in regard to federal subjects.

The first canon of federation is that it must have direct contact with the citizens of the units comprised in it. Is there going to be any direct contact between the proposed federation and the subjects of Indian States? In all federations the lower chamber is composed of the representatives of the citizens. Why should the Princes for all their zeal and earnestness for a federal Government insist on their representatives being nominated by themselves instead of being popularly elected? The inference is plain.

G. R. ABHYANKAR.

THE MEANING OF THE DECLARATION.

IT seems to be too often forgotten that the Declaration of policy made by the British Premier at the final session of the Round Table Conference is not either in intention or in structure anything more than a framework. It has the appearance neither of "a Charter of Indian Freedom" nor of a complete constitutional scheme: to make such wholly extravagant claims on its behalf is surely to invite equally irrelevant and ill-focussed criticisms of it. Apart from the introduction of the principle of Responsibility in the Central Government, the principles it contains do not possess, in any striking degree, the solemnity or the largeness and definiteness of final principles; nor do its proposals possess completeness or detailed constructiveness. It is apparent that the significance of these principles and proposals is essentially relative: relative to the completed structure which will rise upon them. It is also impossible not to observe that the completed structure might either distort and suppress or fulfil and enhance all the promise which the Declaration holds out. Although it has a historical significance and contains basic principles yet it has also a necessary degree of strategical and strictly contemporary significance, which must not be lost sight of. And there can, therefore, be no useful criticism of the Declaration until it assumes its most natural form, viz. that of a constitutional scheme.

But the Declaration has a necessary background: the background of Indian demands. How far does it serve as a framework for the fulfilment of those demands? The cry for Dominion Status has often been—and sometimes wilfully—misinterpreted as a cry for status alone; whereas the National demand has also centred upon the substance of it. This is not to suggest that it is possible to confer status without at the same time conceding the functions associated with it. In fact, there is a minimum of function—that is to say, of self-determination in national affairs, of legislative and executive independence, of financial control, of fiscal autonomy, etc., etc. without which status is quite fictitious and meaningless. There is a theoretical framework in which these functions are set: there is, that is to say, a definable ideology of status which can be traced in the history and constitutions and constitutional usages of the Dominions. The Prime Minister's Declaration purports to be—apparently, at any rate—an authoritative and formal statement, with reference to India, of that ideology.

The main features of the theoretical framework of Dominion Status are, of course, well known. The central principle is that essential and effective sovereignty resides in the Dominion. It is neither internationally recognised nor legally full: but it is effective and, in any ultimate analysis, real: it ex-

tends over all vital departments of the national life. One important feature is that this sovereignty or to use a word less objectionable to the political theorist—autonomy is most jealously cherished in financial and fiscal matters: it is in these spheres that Dominion independence has reached its fullest extent. This is only a little less true of other domestic affairs. Their authority is least marked—and legally non-existent—in Defence and Foreign relations. But even in these subjects actual practice, especially of late years, has helped to establish the principle that the British control over these is the result rather of a historical and so, far eminently convenient division of functions than of anything else. There is, further, an increasing ritual of consent and compulsory consultation in the Imperial Administration of these departments. Canada and lately Ireland have, indeed, gone even farther than this stage. So with the constitutional "safeguards". The Canadian constitution, for instance, does not contain provisions for constitutional amendment: Canada has to go to the British Parliament for such amendment. But no one supposes that the British Parliament will ever find it expedient to refuse any Canadian national preference overwhelmingly and unequivocally expressed. Indeed the cardinal features of the ideology of Dominion Status may clearly be traced in the resolutions of the Imperial Conferences, two of which may be noted here. A Committee of the Imperial Conference of 1926 laid it down that Great Britain and the Dominions "... are autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations." Another resolution laid it down that "it would not be in accordance with constitutional practice" for any advice to be tendered to His Majesty which might be contrary to the expressed wishes of the Dominion concerned.

But the difference between fulness of status and fulness of function—the difference, in other words, between a newly-made Dominion like India, for instance, and a Dominion like Canada—is not a difference which you can trace in their written constitutions. The mere number of safeguards, limitations and guarantees or the mere form in which these are phrased cannot measure that difference. There has arisen, in each case, a different tradition as to the effect and application of the constitutional safeguards. Each of the Constitutional Acts is addressed to a peculiar set of conditions and problems. Canada has a minority and its freedom in the matter of interpreting or amending its constitution is certainly less than that of Australia or New Zealand. But Canada has a powerful neighbour, with 3000 miles of an undefended boundary line and its needs with regard to Foreign relations have compelled it to claim a much larger share of autonomy in that sphere than Australia or South Africa. Each again has its peculiar historical background. We may, therefore, say that fulness of status consists in the establishment, on the one hand, of essential and effective sovereignty in national affairs, and the initiation, on the other, of the definite principle that actual practice, particularly in reference to the constitutional safeguards, should tend increasingly to maintain—and indeed, with the growing needs, to enhance—that sovereignty. The functions, as we have seen, vary with every Dominion, and it is therefore not possible to define fulness of function.

Thus, to the Churchillian dilemma—that if there is a real need for safeguards, then those safeguards must be effective and real, but that where the safeguards are real and effective there is no real Dominion Status—a sufficient answer is made by the consti-

tutional history of the Dominions, especially during the last three decades. That history, of course, is not free from records of conflicts and protracted struggles: but mostly the safeguards have quietly fallen into disuse, as the self-consciousness of the Dominions has expanded.

In the context of Indian conditions and problems the dilemma arises with added plausibility. The safeguards foreshadowed in the Declaration may be grouped under three general heads. (1) Safeguards in the interests of the minorities, (2) Safeguards and reservations in financial matters, and (3) The political safeguards in which may be included those arising out of the doctrine of Paramountcy. British Tory and Indian Congressman, curiously enough, agree in denouncing the Declaration as a sham, the Tory because he believes that the need for these safeguards is so real and deep-rooted in Indian conditions that there can never be any real Dominion of India for a long long time to come, the Congressist because he sees in these safeguards nothing but a sheer negation of real Dominion Status.

But theirs is too syllogistical a way of treating political and historical problems. The fact may be admitted that the Premier's Declaration fairly bristles with safeguards and reservations. But that should not obscure the other fact—which we have observed—that the mere number or the mere phraseology of safeguards is of little account in the accepted ideology of status. On the other hand, in the current discussions upon safeguards, one fundamental difference is lost sight of. This is the difference between safeguards meant for a truly transitional period—that is to say, for any stage upon the road to full and complete responsibility—and safeguards meant to protect the constitution and certain interests or groups against possible abuses of power *after* full and complete responsibility has been granted. The difference is, I think, real and crucial. To interpret the safeguards and reservations indicated in the Declaration as being of the former type is, in the first place, to place the whole emphasis upon the peculiarity of Indian problems and conditions at the expense of obscuring the principle of responsibility and secondly, to deprive India of the right to claim that actual practice in regard to the constitutional safeguards shall follow the Dominion model. But if the safeguards are to be interpreted as belonging rather to the second type then of course no general question arises.

Coming down for a moment to the actual safeguards we can see that as regards the minorities the safeguards are rather necessary concessions than real safeguards. It is idle to expect either that constitutional safeguards would prevent conflicts or that they can always effectually counteract the tyranny of the majority, if that majority is tyrannically-minded. On the other hand, it is very probable that a multiplicity of safeguards in this matter will defeat its own purpose and make it far more difficult for the minorities as well as the majority to develop the necessary habits of accommodation and national unity. Indian conditions clearly show that the less constitutional safeguards there are, the better will be the prospects of peaceful progress. It is true that with the Tory obsession about the protection of minorities neither the British Parliament nor the interests or communities concerned will be ready or able to look so far ahead. A constitutional safeguard has the supreme virtue of being immediate, tangible and formal, and it is entirely natural that those concerned should prefer a present strategical security to a real but future advantage.

The category of reserved subjects, in the Indian context, has various implications. In the case of the Dominions too Defence and External Affairs are reserved; but there the problem has practically no

financial aspect (Defence expenditure in relation to the national expenditure is only between 2 and 5 per cent. whereas in India it is nearly 55 per cent.) and is, besides, far less complex than in the case of Indian Defence. If, as a direct result of these subjects being reserved and certain guarantees with regard to the security services being made final and non-votable, the Indian Legislature loses all control over nearly 80 per cent. of the national expenditure, it would be meaningless to maintain that the Declaration embodies the grant of effective responsibility. It is not necessary for one side to emphasise or for the other to deny the nature and magnitude of Indian needs in this matter. The essential thing is to devise a scheme whereby the burden of Defence expenditure is brought into strictest conformity with the needs and is more equitably distributed as between India and the Empire and secondly,—and this is the more important part—to devise machinery for compulsory and full consultation between the Imperial Authority and the Indian executives. A categorical reservation, unaccompanied by any express realisation of the serious financial handicaps it involves upon effective responsibility, is bound to be resented by the people. Acceleration of Indianisation, establishment of an Indian Sandhurst, revision of the Anglo-Indian doctrine of "the martial races," disappearance of the present needs of internal security, compulsory military training—these surely are not sufficient to balance that resentment.

About the reservations arising out of the implications of Paramountcy little may be said here. With British India organised upon a basis of political freedom, the States will have very strenuous days ahead of them. But the complaint which Mr. Sastri has voiced with regard to the lack of a definition of the British Indian sphere of functions in Federal affairs is serious, especially if, as Mr. Jinnah seems to think, an All-India Federation is envisaged in the Declaration as a necessary condition precedent of the introduction of responsibility.

There are again the fears entertained with regard to the Trade Convention which Lord Reading, for instance, insisted upon making a necessary condition of the whole settlement. Here too, if, in practice, the effect of the Convention is that it puts some restraint upon the Legislature in taking whatever legitimate steps it desires to take to encourage Indian Industry and Trade, it will obviously have to be revised. It would be a needless platitude to point out that the task of national reconstruction is indispensably and vitally connected with political as also with economic freedom: the connection may be largely psychological one,—in some way, with the inner currents of man's life—but it is very real.

This brief survey of the safeguards indicated in the Declaration enables us to make two or three general observations. In the first place, it is to be noted that the Prime Minister has nowhere given us the interpretation which is to be put upon the nature of the safeguards. This may be—as I think it is—intentional, at any rate natural. But it would be futile to ignore the fact that Indian politicians have unmistakably shown their preference for 'reality of power and responsibility'. They have made it abundantly clear that they want Responsibility with safeguards; not safeguards with responsibility. The period of transition which they have envisaged is not the transition from partial responsibility to full and complete responsibility, but rather the transition from reality of status to fulness of function—transitional safeguards, accordingly, have; or ought to have—meant to them safeguards, mostly of the second type.

In the second place, there is an indefiniteness and inconclusiveness about the safeguards as well as about the positive principles indicated in the Decla-

ation which does not encourage any dogmatic view about them. This may indeed be fortunate. It emphasises the fact that the Declaration is meant definitely to be of a secondary—or at any rate of a strictly relative—importance. Take, for instance, the passages dealing with financial control:—"As regards finance, the transfer of financial responsibility must necessarily be subject to such conditions as will ensure the fulfilment of the obligations incurred under the authority of the Secretary of State and the maintenance unimpaired of the financial stability and credit of India". "Subject to these provisions the Indian Government will have full financial responsibility for methods of raising revenue and for control of expenditure on non-reserved subjects". Or take again the passages dealing with Federation: "His Majesty's Government have taken note of the fact that the deliberations of the Conference have proceeded on the basis accepted by all the parties that the Central Government should be a Federation of all India..." "With a Legislature constituted on a Federal basis His Majesty's Government will be prepared to recognise the principle of responsibility of the executive to the legislature". As we have clearly seen, neither the mention of non-reserved subjects nor the condition of an All-India Federation is sufficient, such as it is, to justify the fears of the Congress: nor, for the matter of that, the extravagant hopes entertained by its opponents.

Upon the background of what I have called the accepted ideology of Dominion Status, therefore, it is not possible to criticise the Declaration adequately. The bare framework of that ideology is there, as we have seen: but it is a bare framework and it is neither definite nor final, much less complete: the principle of responsibility is there: but its fulness is nowhere categorically affirmed: there are many safeguards: but there is a promise that they will be handled in accordance with the practice now prevailing in the relations between Great Britain and the Dominions: on the other hand, to offset this promise there is the fact that the nature and extent of the safeguards proposed is such that until they assume their final constitutional form it is possible to see in them effective instruments of strangling Dominion Status.

But upon the background of what seemed possible—from the point of view of the British political situation—about nine months ago, the Declaration appears very impressive and startlingly substantial. Judging from a distance, the change wrought in British opinion and attitude towards India appears stupendous and significant. Those of us who, only some months ago, had read Mr. Lloyd George's article in the *Daily Mail* fulminating against weak-kneed concessions to revolutionaries and conjuring up pictures of an India plunged in chaos and anarchy—those of us who had read the *Daily Telegraph* as well as the Sunday papers led by the *Observer* writing about Dominion Status being nowhere in sight, if not actually impossible, will readily realise the magnitude of this change. Here in India, on the other hand, it is but imperfectly understood that, that change itself is partly a tribute to the sacrifices and awakening wrought in India during the short period of a year.

But the fact is that in the situation created by the Declaration the most urgent and supreme question is a question rather of strategy than of political creeds or ideologies. The Premier's Declaration is partly a pledge, partly a gesture, but essentially a framework. But underlying its comparative lack of definiteness and finality as a framework is the clear intention that it should reach acceptability in the form of a completed constitutional scheme hammered out with the co-operation of the Congress—a co-operation which it so unmistakably invites. It would be futile to hold out

such an invitation if the final scheme is not intended to emerge with the impress of Congress cooperation upon it. And it seems to me to be implicit in the very nature of the Declaration that everything now should hinge upon Congress strategy.

It is possible to belittle the Premier's pledge by reducing it to the level of so many of Britain's unfulfilled pledges: it is possible to despise or ignore the framework by saying that it is no more than a framework: it is possible, in the same breath, to harp upon the existence of safeguards and reservations and to belittle the prospects of our being able to nullify their effects either through constitutional arrangement and modification or by establishing healthy usages. It is possible to insist upon the solemnity and magnitude of the suffering which more than sixty thousand men and women have piled up as a barrier between the substance of independence and any other settlement, it is possible; in other words, to refuse to give your orthodox distrust of the British another chance to prove itself.

It is for the Congress to decide how it is going to use the fact—the one clear fact—that the Declaration must find its significance and its ultimate fruitfulness solely in Congress strategy. Let there be no mistake about the responsibility of the Congress leaders in this matter. The whole fabric of tempers and ideas, proposals and hopes, woven around and by the Round Table Conference will fall to pieces if the Congress and its leaders remain hostile to or even aloof from the work that lies ahead. For, the conclusions emerging from the Round Table Conference as well as the principles affirmed in the Prime Minister's Declaration form the less important part of the two-fold effort which is necessary before India can have a workable constitution. The more important work of construction lies ahead and ultimately with the Congress. The Prime Minister's Declaration, along with the gestures appropriate to it, is a clear invitation to the Congress to lead in that work.

Those who would rather stick to the term "Dominion Status" and who, therefore, understand the position that the Indian Constitution must ultimately be embodied in an Act of Parliament will realise that acceptability does not refer exclusively to the Congress; it also refers to a majority in the British Parliament. The constitutional scheme must, at least in form, be such as to make it possible for a majority in Parliament to give its assent to it: and this it will not be possible for a majority to do unless there are some safeguards and reservations conspicuously present in the structure. At the present moment Mr. Lloyd George and the Liberals hold the key of the Parliamentary situation. The Labour Party, one is pretty sure, would support a full measure of Dominion Status: but, to get the necessary Bill passed it must secure a large measure of Liberal backing: on the other hand, the Labour Party cannot obviously go to the country on the issue of Indian Home Rule at this moment. It is important to realise that the Prime Minister's Declaration is full of the implications of this situation. An analysis, therefore, of acceptability in its British aspect helps us to explain many of the reservations and lop-sidednesses and vaguenesses apparent in the framework which the Declaration is meant to provide. It also means that the Congress leaders should insist not on the strict form but on the strict substance of freedom: and if they do that, they need neither be afraid of the safeguards and reservations nor reject the invitation contained in the Declaration. The British Government too must realise that there is a necessary and large fringe of emotion to Congress strategy at this moment: and such acts as the incredibly wanton folly of the Sholapur executions are not calculated, even though they are followed up with such a necessary gesture as

that of the release of the Congress leaders, to help the Government in getting round that fringe. If the invitation to the Congress is genuine then Government action must present a coherent and consistent whole.

N. G. T.

CIVIL AVIATION.

MIRACLES are happening every day owing to the rapid advance of applied science and yet the people generally do not think about them. It was less than a quarter of a century ago that Louis Bleriot crossed the English Channel in his monoplane and that event was then hailed as a miracle. Since that time phenomenal advances have been made in the realm of aviation and the last war was mainly responsible for these advances. War Office records in the belligerent countries abound in instances of heroic flight of intrepid aviators who laid down their lives unhesitatingly and gladly in the service of their own country. By the time the war came to a close, it had been universally established that aircraft would very soon take a dominant part in future conflicts between two warring nations.

At the end of the War in 1919 the belligerent countries had left on their hands a large number of military planes and it was a very natural idea indeed that these planes should be made use of not only for purposes of military defence of one's own country, but also for purposes of civil aviation, for carrying passengers, mails and light freight. Germany and Austria were forbidden to build any aircraft for military purposes, but no such ban was placed on aircraft meant purely for peaceful purposes. When these facts are remembered, it is easy to see the number of complicated international problems that crop up in the realm of aviation. It is not only the balance of power, purely from a military point of view, but also the economic rivalries between nation and nation that brings to the forefront the urgency of the international control of aviation. In the meanwhile researches were in progress to make the aeroplane more and more perfect and capable of more sustained and longer flights. Sir Ross Smith flew 11,295 miles in 124 flying hours during November and December 1919. This was followed up by a series of brilliant flights by the United States army airmen, and those of Sir Alan Cobham, and Lieut. Commander Byrd, later followed by the magnificent soloflight of Col. Lindbergh, etc., finally culminating in the thrilling exploits of Miss Amy Johnson in 1930. The first passenger flight after the war was in the year 1919 from London to Paris and that plane carried only two passengers huddled up in an uncomfortable cabin. Scarcely a dozen years have passed and now the luxuriously fitted up saloon planes carry 40 or more passengers at a time in a most comfortable manner across long stretches of the country. What a miracle!

Unstinted praise is due to Prof. Kenneth W. Colegrove, Professor of Political Science, North Western University, for having made available to those interested in the international control of aviation a book of first-rate importance surveying the whole problem in a series of brilliantly written and well documented chapters. The international problems involved in aviation from the point of view of jurists, military experts and commercial firms and also sportsmen have been very lucidly dealt with. Even though international concord has not yet been achieved in the realm of aviation, the problems affect-

International Control of Aviation. By Kenneth W. Colegrove. (World Peace Foundation, Boston.) 1930. 20cm. 234p. \$2.50.

ing the rival nations have been fairly and squarely stated and future lines of investigation and work have been adroitly indicated. A historical survey of all the private and public international conferences that have taken place since the time of the old-fashioned balloons has been carefully made and also facts and figures relating to the present status of aviation in different important countries of the world compiled and made available. Subjects like the sovereignty of the air, the airworthiness of the machines, the qualifications of the pilots, navigators and ground engineers, the nationality and registration of the planes, the applicability of the laws governing aviation in one country while flying over the territory of another nation, prohibited routes, the employment of military officers in civil aviation, the construction of civil aircraft according to military standards with a view to easy conversion during war to military planes, safety devices for pilots and passengers, uniformity of signals, landing facilities, the pooling of meteorological information, compensation to be given for damage done to private property, the question of proper insurance of air planes, pilots and passengers, free exchange of technical information that enhances the safety of flying, the equipment of wireless apparatus in all aircraft, the dropping of destructive projectiles on non-combatant population during war, the spraying of poisonous gases and liquids on enemy population during war-time, limitation of armaments so far as it relates to aircraft, and also proper protection and facilities to be given to sportsmen, pioneers and research workers, and also the promotion of international trophies as a means to advance the science of aviation: these and other allied subjects require international agreement. A measure of progress has been made by official and non-official conferences, but one can only say it is the beginning of things. To introduce harmony amongst and uniformity in laws of aviation of fifty or more countries is not the work of a day. The League of Nations is also making its own efforts in this direction. *Sentimental pacifism will not help in this matter.* Steady, continuous and patient work alone will win in the end. Progress achieved till now in all these phases of the problem has been admirably summarised in this book. The temptation to write about the romance of aviation, while handling such an important subject as this, has been carefully avoided by the author and this authoritative publication, which is going to be a book of reference and which has numerous extracts from the proceedings of conferences and other official publications, has not got even a single dull page in it—so masterly has been the treatment of this difficult subject.

All branches of aviation have been taken into full consideration, but whereas rules and regulations affecting the motor-driven aircraft have been fully discussed, there is not even the barest mention of the motorless planes, popularly called Gliders. When it is remembered that Ferdinand Schulz, a German, flew on May 3rd, 1927 (at Rossitten, East Prussia) in a Glider and kept in the air for a period of 14 hours and 7 minutes, it will be easily seen that other flights in Gliders may involve the crossing of international boundaries. Therefore, while drafting regulations for motor-driven aircraft it will very soon become necessary to take Gliders also into consideration. So rapid has been the advance in the technique of Gliders that it may soon assume really important proportions.

Turning now to conditions obtaining in India: it is very sad to note that our own country is exceedingly backward in the field of aviation. It is no doubt true that the Military Department of the Government of India have their own equipment for purposes of defence and offence. But the civil avia-

tion as compared with other progressive countries of the west is practically nil in India, and barring the exploits of Messrs. Chawla and Engineer we have not got much to be proud of. Even as a sport, it is only the Europeans in India that are showing the greatest amount of keenness and enthusiasm in the aero-clubs at Karachi, Bombay, Delhi, Calcutta, etc. From the commercial and political point of view it is hard to believe that our politicians and economists have seriously thought of the possibility of aviation in India. Recently there was introduced in the Legislative Assembly at Delhi a Bill for the reservation of coastal traffic for Indian ships alone. Strongest opposition to this Bill came from those who had already built up the coastal traffic and who had large vested interests at stake. It is up to Indians now so to organize civil aviation in India that no vested interest of outsiders will be created in our own country. Whatever may be the reasons why we did not organize the Indian merchant-shipping in the past, we have learnt a lesson and the way to benefit by this lesson will be to see that the financing and the control of civil aviation in India will remain at all events predominantly Indian. Nobody will sympathise with us at a later stage if we let slip these opportunities and then try to legislate to keep out the foreigner. In this connection it is very heartening to see that Messrs. Tata Sons Ltd., of Bombay have recently purchased an aeroplane to carry the English mail from Karachi right on to Bombay. It is sincerely to be hoped that this initial enterprise shown by an Indian firm would be taken up and followed by others for the benefit of our own country.

S. G. SASTRY.

Reviews.

SIKHS THROUGH ANGLO-INDIAN SPECTACLES.

RELIGION AND SHORT HISTORY OF THE SIKHS, 1469-1930. BY GEORGE BATLEY SCOTT. (The Mitre Press, London. 1930. 20cm 96p. 5/-)

THE author of this small book was a young boy at the time of the Sikh wars towards the middle of the last century. He served in the Survey Department of India and saw a number of campaigns on the Frontier. There he saw the Sikhs in action. His admiration for this race might have prompted him to write this book, barely covering a hundred pages. He divides it into two distinct portions. He devotes the first forty pages to a very brief description of the Sikh religion. This compactness has been the cause of a few minor inaccuracies. He says that Nanak spoke and wrote in Gurmukhi. This script is of a later origin. Then his greetings of the Sikhs and their war cry should be wah-i-Guruji Ka Khalsa, Wahi-Guru-ji-Ki-fateh and sat sri Akal respectively (pp. 20-30).

The history of the Sikhs as an independent and ruling race culminated before the second half of the last century. He has only seven pages to give to this phase of the rise and progress of the Sikhs. Here too a couple of mistakes of facts are noted. For example, Ranjit Singh, the Maharaja of the Sikhs, belonged to the Sukharchakya and not the Bhangi Misal. Then the Phulkian states did not put themselves under the British of their own accord in 1809. They were forced to do so. The author has nothing to say about the Sikh wars, which form an important chapter in their history.

As one follows the book one is led to believe that his real aim in writing it was to decry and lament the growth of nationalism in India, to which he devotes more than half of it. The early portion seems like an introduction to what he really wants to say. Reared and grown up in barracks, he belongs to the old die-hard type of Anglo-Indian. In every attempt of the Indians of any shade of opinion to secure control of their own affairs, he sees a desire for "arson and plunder". The Indian National Congress is merely a pernicious body, "out to loot and plunder". This body, according to him, "drew within its fold all English-speaking malcontents and eloquent gas-bags... who overcome by the exuberance of their own verbosity spread sedition among the town mobs". This movement is a conspiracy of "Bengalis, Arya-Samaj and Deccan Brahmins" to capture the ever loyal Sikh. While talking of the "1919 disturbances" he says, "the populace were exhorted in posters and speeches to murder all Englishmen and dishonour all English women and so get rid of these devils". This of course is as ludicrous as untrue. He believes that during the martial law regime of 1919, force ought to have been relentlessly used so as to inculcate a complete terrorism into the populace in general. The attempt of the Sikhs to regain the control of their religious institutions is sedition, in his eyes. It surprises and irritates him that such a loyal people should go against the law, even for a purpose of great religious significance. He thinks the Sikhs had no right to make such a demand, much less to make it effective. They were simply, "netted in". A little further the facts are distorted when he says, "at the Guru Ka Baug sticks were used on both sides". It is a well known fact that this privilege belonged only to one side—the police. The Sikhs were under a vow of non-violence.

The author must be about ninety years old (since he joined the Survey Department in 1863). It is too much for him to face the truth, viz. that India wants to manage her own affairs. The Montagu-Chelmsford reforms were "merely pandering to the revolutionaries". He is full of misgivings about the outcome of the Simon Report. He wonders, "is the loyalty in the past or seditious conspiracy and murder to be rewarded? The leaders of the loyal peasantry or of the revolutionaries to be placed in power? Is the British steel frame to be strengthened or scrapped?"

As a book on History it has little or no value. As a frank confession of the misgivings about the future of India of an old, nearly defunct, type of Anglo Indian, it may be taken for what it is worth.

M. S. C.

THE FASCIST REGIME.

TYROL UNDER THE AXE OF ITALIAN FASCISM. By EDWARD RENT-NICOLUSSI (Allen & Unwin.) 1930. 22 cm. 277 p. 12/6

THE doings of Italian Fascism under the leadership of Signor Mussolini are known to many outsiders only in a very vague and indistinct manner, but the book under review written by one who has actually felt the brunt of Italian oppression gives us a concrete and vivid illustration of the real working of the machinery of the Fascist dictatorship in its relation to a subject country. The author no doubt writes with passion but it is the righteous passion of an individual who has seen with his own eyes the wrongs, the indignities and the oppression which his country has suffered under the tyranny of an overweening alien domination. The slow but systematic trampling down of a people's rights and liberties with the idea of exterminating its culture and civilization and all else that it values very high in its national life

makes very distressing reading; and the feeling of revulsion will be aroused in any one who has read the deliberate work of denationalization accomplished by Italy in South Tyrol, which was before the war an Austrian Province, but which after that event had been occupied by the Italians and incorporated into Italy as a dependant province.

The long series of measures systematically undertaken for the purpose of stamping down the liberties of South Tyrol are graphically described by the author, who was peculiarly fitted for the task by his prominent position in the public life of South Tyrol both as a member of the Austrian Parliament before the war and of the Italian Parliament after the Incorporation for the short time that Italy granted popular representation to South Tyrol in its Parliament, and by the part he took in defending in his capacity as an advocate many cases in which individual Tyrolese men were charged for one offence or other by the Italian Police. The trampling down of the Press, the ruination of the Tyrolese peasantry, the spoliation of Tyrolese property, the curbing of the communal assemblies in South Tyrol and, last but not least, the suppression of the Tyrolese language and the schools which taught it and the consequent denationalization of the youth of the country—all these and several others represent the ruthless and thorough-going methods of Fascism in its attempt to "convert" South Tyrol to be a loyal and faithful province of Italy.

The reading of the book leaves one with the impression confirmed that the struggle for liberty presents the same features everywhere; but in the case of South Tyrol the struggle was all through a most unequal one in that the country was a comparatively small one with only half-a-million inhabitants pitched against a whole peninsula. South Tyrol, in the reconstruction of Europe that followed the termination of the great War, was placed under the hegemony of Italy not for being exploited and ruined but with a solemn pledge, guaranteed by her allies, to leave the inhabitants of that land immune in their nationality; but Italy had thrown that pledge to the winds in her ceaseless and thorough-going endeavour to stamp out all traces of that nationality which she guaranteed as immune! The author has made out a clear case for the interference of the League of Nations, in the interests of humanity and in the interests of saving the soul of a people from utter and irrecoverable ruination and secure either the clubbing of South Tyrol with Austria from which she had been separated and given over to the tender mercies of Italian Fascism for the "military security" of Italy.

The book is divided into three parts, in the first of which the author describes the occupation of the country by the Italians, in the second, its incorporation as a province of Italy and finally in the third, how the Italian axe had begun its work of destruction and had succeeded in striking completely and mercilessly at everything near and dear to the Tyrolese hearts. The author in closing the book hopes that the righteous cause of South Tyrol will win; it is an optimistic forecast no doubt; but let us hope it will be fulfilled.

C. V. H. RAO.

Miscellaneous.

R. T. C. DELEGATES' MANIFESTO.

The following statement was issued to the Press by the Delegates to the Indian Round Table Conference whose signatures it bears on landing from the P. and O. s. s. "Viceroy of India" on Friday (Feb. 8) morning.—

ON our return to India we consider it our duty to state as briefly as we can the results achieved by the Indian Round Table Conference and the general impressions that we have brought with us from England. Three of us, viz., Messrs Sastri, Sapru and Jayakar, have already informed Mahatma Gandhi, and two other leaders that they will personally see them in order to explain fully the nature and implications of the results achieved. Unfortunately, owing to the illness of Pandit Motilal Nehru, which we deeply regret, this meeting is not likely to take place for some time, and it is therefore, not possible to defer this statement until we should have had the benefit of this discussion.

CHANGE IN BRITISH OPINION.

At the outset, we desire to emphasize the fact that English opinion has undergone a remarkable change in favour of India. Besides the Labour Government, the Liberal Party, under the fine lead of Lord Reading has declared itself unequivocally in favour of India's claim to self-government as an equal partner in the British Commonwealth of Nations. And the friendly attitude of the Conservative Party has been made quite clear by the speech recently made in the House of Commons by Mr. Baldwin and by the firm stand taken by him against Mr. Churchill.

His Majesty the King Emperor was graciously pleased to evince throughout the most sympathetic solicitude for the welfare of India and her people and for the success of the Conference. The British public belonging to all shades of opinion extended to the Delegates the kindest welcome. The British Press as a whole was extremely friendly throughout the Conference. Although the attitude of two or three organs was and still is unfriendly, we must acknowledge with gratitude the great service rendered to India by many powerful organs.

The release of Indian political leaders affords in our opinion further proof of the anxiety of His Majesty's Government to secure for the scheme evolved at the Conference free and full consideration by all sections of opinion in India. The scheme represents a bare outline, the details—some of which are of a substantial and far-reaching character—have yet to be worked out. We earnestly hope that the leaders of the Congress and of other parties will now come forward to make solid contribution to the completion of the scheme.

It is our hope that an atmosphere of complete peace will be created for the consideration of these questions of high import and that the release of other political prisoners who have suffered incarceration for their convictions will follow.

BASIS OF NEW CONSTITUTION.

It is our considered view that the attainment by India of Dominion Status is no longer in dispute. Indeed the scheme outlined by the Conference provides for Dominion Status with safeguards during the period of transition. It has been explicitly recognised that the task of governing India should in future be entrusted to an Indian Executive responsible to an Indian Legislature. The basis of the new Constitution will be a federation of the whole of India—i. e., of autonomous Provinces of British India and of Indian States on a footing of mutual equality.

This projected federation into which the Indian States represented at the Conference have expressed their willingness to enter and which we hope the other States too will join will tend to bring about uniformity of legislation and policy in regard to many matters of common interest to the whole of India, which are of first rate importance, e. g., Defence, Fiscal Policy, Communications, etc., and it should grow in strength as confidence is established.

A common policy in regard to these matters is of vital importance to the well-being and prosperity of India and cannot be attained without providing for that harmonious adjustment of the interests of British and Indian India which federation alone can ensure. The scheme evolved by the Conference purports to achieve this object while recognising the Sovereignty and autonomy of the Indian States, both large and small, as regards their internal affairs, and marks the beginning of a process of unification which is fraught with possibilities of incalculable benefit to our Country.

SAFEGUARDS DO NOT AFFECT SCHEME.

Side by side with the Constitution of a responsible Federal Government at the Centre, the Provinces of British India will be endowed with full autonomy to regulate their internal affairs and their Executives will be entirely responsible to their Legislatures which will be wholly elected bodies except to the strictly limited extent that nomination of non-officials may be necessary in some Provinces to secure the representation of groups unable to return their own members through the polls.

As regards the "Safeguards," it is our opinion that they will not affect the substance of the scheme which seeks to transfer political power into Indian hands. These safeguards are intended only for the period of transition and are subject to further examination. Every department of the Central Government, including Finance, and excepting only Defence and External Affairs, will be under the control of the Indian Legislature. We would add that the question whether any matters relating to Foreign Policy and Defence can be immediately brought under the control of the Legislature will be examined in the ensuing stage of the negotiations.

As regards Law and Order, the Governor-General will not have the power to interfere with the day-to-day administration and will step in only when peace and security over a considerable part of British India are seriously imperilled or when the interests of any minority are seriously endangered.

In the sphere of Finance it is agreed that the Legislature shall have full control over all questions of taxation, fiscal policy including tariffs, and expenditure on subjects other than those under the Governor-General's control during the period of transition, i. e., Defence and External Affairs. The Legislature will also have control over monetary and exchange policy as soon as a Reserve Bank has been established.

A RESERVE BANK.

We would observe that there is no valid reason why a Reserve Bank should not come into being in the near future. In regard to external loans the position will be the same as that of any other Dominion. Certain other provisions have been suggested in regard to ensuring India's credit in the event of "Methods being pursued which would seriously prejudice the credit of India in the money markets of the world".

In respect of internal loans, it was understood that only in the rare event, when after a series of deficit budgets, a rupee loan is sought to be raised to meet such deficit at a heavy rate of interest affecting existing securities, will the Governor-General be able to intervene with advice or with his constitutional right of veto. These provisions will have to be carefully considered in the future stages of negotiations with a view to ensuring complete financial and fiscal autonomy of India consistently with the safety of her economic and financial structure.

INDIAN SANDHURST.

As regards Defence, immediate steps are to be taken to increase substantially the number of Indians holding the King's Commissions in the Indian Army with the object of making the Defence of India the concern of the Indian people to an increasing extent and an Indian Sandhurst for training Indians in all arms is to be established at the earliest possible moment.

The framing of a scheme for the establishment of a Sandhurst in India and the question of the gradual reduction of British troops are to be remitted to two Committees on which Indian opinion will be strongly represented. As soon as the Indian Army has been Indianised the Federal Legislature will naturally acquire control over Defence.

We note with satisfaction that the proposed constitution will provide adequate safeguards for the rights and interests of the Minorities. Some of the points of controversy between the Hindu and Moslem communities have been satisfactorily settled; and we earnestly hope that means will soon be found of effecting a satisfactory settlement of these points.

APPEAL FOR PEACE.

Those who are anxious that India's progress should be all-sided will note with gratification that the Conference recognised the need for the progressive association of women in the public life of the nation.

Speaking with a full sense of responsibility, we firmly maintain that the political outlook has so materially changed that the new situation should be calmly and dispassionately considered by all parties in India, with a single eye to the abiding interest of India as a whole.

If there are defects and shortcomings in the constitution proposed they should be examined in a spirit of mutual confidence by a free and frank exchange of views, and we earnestly appeal to all sons and daughters of India to unite in bringing into existence an atmosphere of peace and goodwill so that all political parties acting in concert may complete the task begun in London and help India to secure her rightful place as an equal partner in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

(Sd.) Ganga Singh, Maharajah of Bikaner; Jay Singh, Maharajah of Alwar; Udaibhan Singh, Maharaj Rana of Dholpur; Ranjit Singh, Maharajah Jam Sahib of Nawabagar; C. A. Patwardhan, Chief Saheb of Sangli; Krishnama Chari, Dewan of Baroda; Manubhai N. Mehta, Prime Minister of Bikaner; Prabbhankar Pattani, President of the Council of Administration, Bhavnagar; Sultan Ahmed Khan, Political Member of Council, Gwalior; J. N. Basu, A. G. Ghuznavi, Ghulam Hussain Hidayatullah, Bhaskarrao Vithojirao Jadhav, M. R. Jayakar, Cowasjee Jehangir (Junior), Pravash Chunder Mitter, H. P. Mody, Krishna Chandra Gajapati Narayan Deo, Raja of Parlakimedi, Annepu Parasuramdas Patro, Abdul Quaiyum Khan, M. Ramachandra Rao, Tej Bahadur Sapru, Muhammad Shafi, V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, Pheroze Sethna, and Begum Shah Nawaz.

MR. N. M. JOSHI'S VIEWS.

Mr. N. M. Joshi who did not sign the joint statement of the British Indian delegates to the Round Table Conference in a press interview, said:

The result of the Round Table Conference may be regarded as satisfactory from the point of view of the Princes and of the middle class politicians inasmuch as the political power except as regards the transitory safeguards reserved in the hands of the Viceroy is to be transferred to the Indian aristocracy and the middle class oligarchy. But so far as the Indian working classes are concerned they are not interested in the mere change of masters. They want the establishment of real democracy in India wherein they will get their due share of power.

Unfortunately in the outline of the constitution which has resulted out of the reports of the various committees there is no provision made for giving to the working classes their due share in the political power that may be transferred and I am afraid that the constitution is so framed that the interest of the working classes will not only be not safeguarded but their position will even become worse to some extent.

In the first place, the constitution which is not based on adult suffrage cannot give the working classes adequate representation in the legislatures. I shall even prefer some form of indirect election through electoral colleges if adult suffrage is found to be impracticable in a direct system of election. If the number of votes must be kept down in any case to make elections manageable this can be done by fixing an age limit, say, of thirty years or even forty years before which no person will be eligible for voting. But this limit must apply to all classes equally so that there will be fairer distribution of political power among all classes.

Unfortunately the Franchise Committee which was dominated by the representatives of the middle classes did not pay any heed to these considerations, being anxious to get the political power in their own hands. They did not even agree to increase the size of the Indian legislatures to make it equal to the size of the British Parliament. Such an increase would have facilitated greater enfranchisement without increasing the size of the constituencies.

Secondly, the federation in which labour legislation and its enforcement are not made federal subjects is of no interest to the working classes. Unfortunately the Federal Relations Committee did not agree to make 'labour' a federal subject. It is suggested that the labour legislation should be a Central subject for British India alone but as the administration of such legislation is made provincial the central legislature cannot pass legislation which may throw financial burden upon provincial treasuries without creating deadlocks or without leaving the legislation ineffective. Moreover, when the federation comes into existence the argument that labour legislation throwing some financial burden upon industry, if made applicable only to British India, will drive the industry from British India to Indian States, is bound to have some more weight.

Thirdly, if the Indian constitution becomes federal with a limited power of ratifying conventions of the International Labour Conference the conventions will be treated only as recommendations which have less practical utility. The Federal Relations Committee does not state which will be the authority for ratifying international conventions and whether the power of ratification will be limited or not. If the Viceroy who will have the sole charge of foreign affairs is such an authority, although he may have in theory unlimited power of ratification, his power will be limited by the fact that he will have no power to enforce ratification either in Indian States or in British India, as he will have no right of intervention either in Indian States or in British India so far as labour questions are concerned.

Thus the outline of the constitution framed at the Round Table Conference does neither give any political power to the working classes nor safeguard effectively their interests. I still hope that when further discussion will be started these defects will be removed.

Correspondence.

THE STATES AND FEDERATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—1. In your excellent leader on this subject (*vide* your issue of December 4th, 1930) you seek for precedents of the anomaly of persons having the Federal franchise, whilst lacking the State franchise. You adduce some precedents, but omit the most telling, viz., that of the late German Empire of the Hohenzollerns.

When Bismarck created this Empire at Versailles 60 years ago out of a federation of 25 Sovereign States, he granted to every adult male, *qua* German federal subject, the equal, direct and secret vote—without touching his franchise or lack of franchise rights *qua* State subject. In fact, hardly any of the federating States had at that time any system of universal franchise: Prussia, the dominating partner, for instance, had an absurd indirect system of voting, which left all the power in the hands of the nobles and the rich. More telling still: two States out of the 25, the grand-duchies of Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Mecklenburg-Strelitz, had no parliamentary institution whatsoever!

Here, surely, you have a most complete precedent. Let me add, that, though the Bismarckian Empire was permeated through and through by the monarchical sentiment, three of the federating States were city-republics. This German Empire, then, is surely the classic proof for the fact that a federation of democratic and autocratic units is possible and can be very satisfactorily worked.

2. As for assigning subjects respectively to State and Federal authority, it seems to me that—

under one safeguard which I have not yet seen alluded to—anything nearly which the federating Princes today demand under this head, might well be conceded to them. The safeguard which I have in mind is the exception of any matter which may form the subject of international engagements, which the Federal Government of India decides to enter upon. Being an international affair, i.e., a question of "foreign affairs," such international engagements are admittedly a subject reserved for the federal government: but in order to be able to carry them out efficiently, the federal government should be able also to deal federally with the subject inside the federation. One thinks of international engagements on such matters as disarmament, opium, labour...

And as international interdependence is bound to increase, rather than decrease, such a proviso will surely be found more than ample to ensure that India does not lag behind internationally agreed standards, because of the stubborn backwardness of some of its Princes. And yet this "formula" would allow the Princes to enter the Federation with all their *izzat*, their privileges; even with all their anachronisms. Lophem, Dec. 23 1930.

Yours, etc.

H. C. E. ZACHARIAS.

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

Children's Aid Society's Work.

The Children's Aid Society of Bombay held its fourth annual meeting yesterday with His Excellency the Governor in the chair. The Society came into existence as a result of the passage by the Bombay Legislative Council of what is generally known as the Children's Act, under which the Government made itself responsible for the well-being of helpless and uncared-for children, below a particular age. The Act laid upon them the duty of making due provision for the upbringing of such children in proper surroundings. The importance of this work cannot be overestimated, seeing that the children of today are going to be the citizens of tomorrow. We observe from the Society's report for 1930 that it maintains a Remand Home and a Junior School. But it should be understood that the Home affords temporary asylum to destitute children until permanent arrangements can be made for their reception in any one of the certified schools or co-operating institutions. To the Remand Home 784 children were admitted in 1930—a number greater by little over one hundred than for the previous year. The figure would have been higher still if the police were not required to give their almost undivided attention to the suppression of the civil disobedience movement. On the other hand that movement also contributed its own share to swell the number of the inmates of the Home to its present proportions. For we find from the analysis of cases admitted in 1930 appended to the report that 31 children passed through the Home for political offences like selling proscribed literature, picketing, membership of unlawful associations, breeches of the Salt Act, etc. Turning to the Junior School, we find the total number of commitments was 55 boys under 12. The year under report was the first year of the School and yet almost the whole of the provision made has been utilised—a proof of the necessity of extending the Society's activities in that direction. The report gives very interesting details about the Society's work which every social servant ought to know, but to which a more detailed reference is not possible here. Suffice it to say that the Society's work is of great nation-building value and deserves all the support it can get.