

# The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XVI, No. 41. } POONA—THURSDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1933. { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6  
FOREIGN 15s.

## CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK. ... ..	481
ARTICLES :—	
Constitution and Council-Entry. ... ..	483
Burma. ... ..	484
An All-Party Platform. By Observer. ... ..	485
OUR LONDON LETTER. ... ..	486
SHORT NOTICES :—	489
MISCELLANEOUS :—	
Mr. Devadhar's Note on the Sykes Scheme of Village Improvement. ... ..	490

## Topics of the Week.

### Well-done.

INDIAN delegates on the Joint Select Committee led by Mr. Jayakar have behind them the solid support of Indian opinion in the action they took in refusing to examine the representatives of the Indian Empire Society. The Society, as is well known, consists of retired Anglo-Indian administrators of the most reactionary variety and hopeless British diehards to whom any further political advance to India is gall and wormwood. But their opposition to Indian aspirations is, really speaking, more thoroughgoing. If they were allowed to have their way, they would not hesitate to withdraw from this country such reforms as have been granted to it during the last forty years or so and place it under the unadulterated rule of the British bureaucracy. For, as the evidence of the Society pointed out, its members hold firmly to the belief that the introduction of democracy into India in any form and even under every conceivable safeguard would be a blunder of the first magnitude. They however do not stop here. It is axiomatic with the Society that any reform in India is synonymous with increased corruption and reduced efficiency in administration, that the better class of Indian does not care for democracy and has no use for the vote with which he does not know what to do and therefore sells it to the highest bidder. To what extent, considerations of their own narrow national interests influence the members of the Society in sticking to and proclaiming such anachronistic views, we need not pause to inquire. It is enough to note the fact of there being no common ground between the Society's spokesmen and the Indian wing of the Joint Select Committee

and no scope therefore for the use of the conference method to which Indian opinion naturally attaches great importance as a means of evolving by mutual discussion a larger and larger measure of agreement between people holding divergent views with regard to the details of the solution of the Indian problem. In the art of mud-slinging the representatives of the Indian Empire Society would certainly not have found the Indian delegates very much inferior to themselves if only the latter were inclined that way; but the problem before the Committee was much too serious for such levity and the consequent waste of time it would have involved. Mr. Jayakar's conduct and that of his colleagues on this occasion, is likely to be interpreted in anti-Indian quarters, as their disinclination to face awkward facts. But Mr. Jayakar and those who acted with him may rest perfectly satisfied that they will not be misunderstood by those who, unlike the witnesses before them, are not impervious to light and have not set their heart upon a wilful distortion of facts.

### Pecksniffian Purity.

THE Pecksniffian solicitude of some Britishers to secure the purity of administration in India and to protect it from "political influences" is most sickening. The latest to join this gang of saviours of Indian administration is Mr. H. A. M. Hannay, the Agent of the East Indian Railway who recently presided over the Indian Railway Association Conference in Simla. He defended the creation of the Statutory Railway Board on the ground that thereby the administration of railways would be kept free from political interference. The need for such protection has dawned on these well-wishers of India only when it was proposed to transfer to Delhi a fraction of power now exercised from London. All these many decades when the supreme control was lodged in London, these had no qualms. It is not to be supposed that all these years an independent and immaculate bureaucracy, wholly superior to and proof against political interference, was governing India and that with the inauguration of "democratic" control in India, the necessity of preserving the purity of the administration arose for the first time. The bureaucracy, thanks to the excellent tradition of the service, was wholly subservient to the Secretary of State and the British Cabinet, who

are the creatures of political influences—but of England. The present concern for purity is not even due to the realisation that political interference was an evil, and that if it had been permitted in the past unwittingly, it should, the moment it was recognised as an evil, be eliminated. Even now it is proposed to retain vast and effective powers in the hands of the Governor-General, who has to take orders from the Secretary of State for India. British political influence still remains as effective and pervasive as ever. All that is aimed at by this campaign for purity is to keep out Indian political influence.

#### No Dominionhood, but only "a limited field."

INDIA has been authoritatively assured that the logical outcome of the policy of responsible government officially declared in 1917 would be the attainment by her of Dominion Status. Though no time-limit for the achievement of this goal has yet been laid down or even faintly indicated, "the broad interpretation of these pledges", as Mr. Jayakar pointed out to the Joint Select Committee, "must necessarily mean that the ideal will be reached within a reasonable period and not in eternity." To Sir Austen Chamberlain, all that Lord Irwin's declaration of 1929 means is that "we shall do nothing inconsistent with that, and shall, at such times and in such measure as we consider right, advance towards that goal." This negative interpretation with the addition of the rider that "in the meanwhile remove wherever we are able the obstacles that stand in the way of future advance" commended itself also to Sir Samuel Hoare. Very disheartening as all this doubtless is, the only consolation that can be derived from it is that, apart from the question of how soon or how late the ultimate goal is to be reached, the goal itself is no longer in dispute, at any rate in responsible quarters anywhere. Dr. Ambedkar therefore suggested its inclusion in the preamble to the Constitution Act. The Secretary of State's reply was non-committal, though Sir Samuel Hoare did not conceal his prejudice against "these general declarations in preambles." He thought it was a matter for decision by the Committee itself, adding that no "question of principle, one way or the other" was involved in its decision. With the well-known natural disinclination of the English people to look too far ahead, the chances of Dominion Status figuring in the preamble to the Constitution Act appear by no means too rosy.

Incorrigible optimists or men not given to clear thinking may delude themselves that the White Paper constitution takes India very near the status of a self-governing Dominion. Sir Samuel Hoare, the author of the new constitution, at any rate cannot be charged with encouraging such a belief, by his acts or his utterances. His claim for the new constitution is very modest. He has, as a matter of fact, no compunction in admitting that his proposals fall short of Dominion self-government as understood by the Statute of Westminster. He makes no secret of the fact that "the range of subjects is fairly small at the centre" or that "the field (at the centre) would

be a limited field." If hereafter people speak of the White Paper as entrusting to India a very wide field for responsible self-government at the federal centre, they would be guilty of unquestioned exaggeration.

#### Self-Developing Constitution !

AN important cause of public dissatisfaction with the White Paper proposals is that they do not contain any provision for the development of the constitution into one of a full-fledged Dominion even "in the fulness of time." The Secretary of State does not contemplate the constitution to develop. Only his ideas about its development are very different from those entertained by public opinion in India. Replying to a question on the point, he said:

"I should have thought the whole basis of these proposals was a basis of development. What I imagine, anyhow what I hope will happen, will be that the two sides of the (Federal) Government will work closely and sympathetically together, that year by year the Governor-General and the Governor will have less and less reason to intervene in the field of his special responsibilities, owing to the fact that the Ministries themselves will be ensuring that the rights contemplated in the field of special responsibilities are safeguarded, and that, just as in other parts of the Empire, as the Governments develop, so powers of that kind fall into desuetude, not because the powers are unnecessary, but because the Ministries themselves carry those powers into effect, and I hope and believe that that is what is going to happen in India. In course of time, other Acts of Parliament will be necessary, necessary more to recognise a state of affairs that is in existence than to make actually new changes. That is the way I hope and believe the kind of constitution that we are discussing is going to work in the case of India."

This reply had reference only to the special responsibilities of the Governor-General. But what about the Reserved Subjects, of which Indian Defence is by far the most important? Will it come under popular control within a measurable period? Sir Samuel Hoare's reply is none too hope-inspiring. Said he on the point:

"I have always thought that the problem of Indian Defence depends, to a great extent, upon the Indianisation of Indian Defence, and there we are embarking upon a programme of gradual Indianisation. As the Defence of India becomes Indianised, so the particular justification for the reservation of a Defence Department will more and more cease to exist, and the solution, therefore, of the reservation of Defence, *subject always to the rights of the Princes under their Treaties*, will depend, to a great extent, upon the progress of the Indianisation of Defence." (Our italics.)

It may be noted that the transfer of Defence to popular control is saddled with two conditions: (1) Completion of Indianisation and (2) Consent of the Princes. The programme of Indianisation of the Army at the present rate may take centuries for its completion; while the second condition makes matters worse. In these circumstances can public opinion be blamed if it reads into the above reply of the Secretary of State a contrivance to retain control of Indian Defence in British hands till the Greek Kalends?

## Articles.

### CONSTITUTION AND COUNCIL-ENTRY.

"OBSERVER" in the last issue of the *SERVANT OF INDIA* has suggested a new rallying cry, calculated, in his opinion, to bring together all the progressive political parties in India. It is to the effect that the White Paper constitution should be declined. It has the obvious advantage that it creates no new parties, splits no existing parties and is based on the universal dissatisfaction with the Hoare constitution. It has the further advantage that in this rejection we shall have the unsolicited and powerful co-operation of even the most bitter opponents of India's progress, Lord Lloyd, Mr. Churchill and all the other diehards of England. If any political cry has the greatest-common measure of support in India and England, it is the rejection of the constitution. It can bring together on the same platform Pandit Jawaharlal and Mr. Churchill. Such is the argument.

All efforts hitherto have been to try to improve the White Paper and not to reject it. Various improvements have been suggested by different political bodies. And some of the most progressive Indians, like Messrs. Jayakar and Joshi, to name only two, are at the moment serving as Delegates on the Joint Select Committee and striving their utmost to improve the Hoare proposals and to resist the onslaughts of the diehards to whittle them down. They have not yet thrown up the sponge and signalled rejection. Ordinary courtesy, if nothing else, should restrain us from adopting in India a course which may add to the difficulties and handicaps of the Delegates. It may be that the final Bill presented to Parliament may so far whittle down the Hoare proposals that the Delegates themselves may advise their rejection. Then will be the proper time to consider the proposal. There is no particular hurry to raise the standard of rejection at this moment. It can wait till the final proposals are before the country. In the meanwhile, it is best and prudent to persevere in the present policy of trying to improve the proposals and prevent their being whittled down, however vain that attempt may seem.

It should, however, be noted that, while dissatisfaction is pretty universal, its incidence and causes vary enormously. The diehards in England consider that the Hoare constitution goes too far; Indian nationalists consider that it does not go far enough. Even the communalists and special interests are dissatisfied because it does not give them all they want in their particular ways. There is no unity of cause. As for incidence, there are those, particularly the communalists and special interests, who, even if they do not get all they asked for, are not willing to forego what they do get under the Hoare constitution. Even among the undoubted progressives, there are those—and they are not a negligible few—who are not prepared to reject the Hoare constitution, notwithstanding the many grave defects in it, because it is,

like the proverbial curate's egg, good in some respects. There are others who think that it is on the whole retrograde and will gladly forego it. The causes and the incidence of dissatisfaction are not common and universal enough to permit of the joint action proposed by "Observer". It is noteworthy that hardly any influential political organisation has voted for the rejection of the Hoare constitution on its merits, though it has been before the public for some months and several political gatherings have been held to consider it.

But apart from this, if the project of rejection should succeed and the White Paper be withdrawn, what next?

Do the rejectionists propose to be content with the Montagu constitution for an indefinite period of time or do they foresee any turn of the wheel which will bring them a more auspicious occasion when a better constitution, free from the reactionary features of the White Paper, will emerge? Under the indefinite extension of the Montagu constitution, are things in India or England likely to change so much as to facilitate the realisation of an improved constitution? After all that has happened during the last four years, the commitments made and the hopes and fears raised during the time, is central responsibility a practical proposition without federation of almost the same pattern as is now under consideration? Reactionary as the Hoare constitution is in certain respects, are there any hopes on the horizon that, after the lapse of a time, a better one will shape itself? It is not enough to reject the Hoare constitution; it is necessary to find means to secure a better one. It will be more fruitful perhaps if, instead of rejecting the whole of the White Paper, lock, stock and barrel, only such parts of it as are reactionary are declined, saving the progressive parts. If the proposals for the reform of provincial governments are an advance over the existing system, they should be saved. If provincial autonomy alone is demanded even Mr. Churchill and Lord Lloyd will give it their support; the communalists in India will be content and except the Congress, the progressive nationalists, like Mr. Satyamurti will accept it, if the White Paper or the Montagu constitution is the alternative. But a wholesale rejection of the White Paper and an artificial and negative unity for the purpose seems to be neither desirable, nor practicable, nor timely.

## II

The occasion for "Observer" to make his proposal of a united front for rejection of the Hoare constitution arose from the conferences recently held in Pen under the chairmanship of Mr. Jinnah, as also the recent moves made by Mr. Satyamurti and others to create a new party in the Congress in favour of council-entry as opposed to civil disobedience. "Observer" has correctly assessed the difficulties that face Mr. Mehta and his friends in promoting their programme because of their own past history and the commitments of the true-blue Congressmen. But if "Observer" is one of those who had consistently preached to the Congress

to abandon civil disobedience and work the Montagu constitution, it seems strange, to say the least, that he should turn against Mr. Mehta and his comrades, as it were, for doing now exactly what he wished them all along to do. It is even more strange that he should himself deprecate the move towards council-entry and further seem to favour direct action when the Congress itself has practically given it up. Mr. Mehta and his colleagues deserve the congratulations of "Observer," and in view of the exceptional difficulties that face them, his sympathy too and not a cold *douche*.

Perhaps there is some confusion on the question of council entry. Supposing the White Paper proposals are successfully rejected, the Montagu constitution will continue. The councils will be there. Should Mr. Mehta and his friends and, for that matter, the true-blue Congressmen themselves, enter them or boycott them? If, as is likely, there should be general elections in the near future under the existing constitution, in view of the probable delay in launching the new constitution, should Mr. Mehta and his friends seek entry into the councils or continue the present boycott? It appears to us that the question of giving up the boycott of the Councils which has been the policy of the Congress these many years, and of entering the Councils stands on a different footing from that of the evaluation of the character and adequacy of the new constitution or, for that matter, even the present Montagu constitution. The late Mr. C. R. Das did not organise the Swaraj party to capture the councils because the Montagu constitution suddenly became acceptable to him after three years of boycott. He saw that, whatever be the nature of the Montagu constitution and however unsatisfactory and unacceptable it was to him, it was in operation and it was being used or misused by others and in the national interests, as he conceived them, he decided to capture the councils himself. Similarly, even if a worse constitution than the White Paper one should ultimately come into operation, which the Heavens forbid, and there should be enough support for it in this unfortunate country to keep it going, it is better that it should be captured by the nationalists than by the communalists. A bad constitution worked by good people will do less harm than a bad constitution worked by bad people. The boycott of a constitution will be justified in so far and only in so far as it is effective and will lead to its replacement by an improved constitution. In India, in the present circumstances, with a multitude of special and anti-national interests, the true nationalist has but Hobson's choice in the matter of working a constitution, however bad and unacceptable it may be. There is nothing illogical in holding that the new constitution will be worse than the Montagu one and still asking the Congress not to boycott it. On the other hand, it is all the more reason why the Congress and the nationalists should capture the new constitution. Mr. Mehta and his comrades deserve every encouragement in their efforts to bring the Congress round to this view.

If by rejection is meant that the Hoare constitution is extremely unsatisfactory, disappointing and

in some respects retrograde, all progressives in India are already united and have made known their views pretty emphatically. It will be more useful if these progressives jointly formulate the improvements they wish adopted and press them on the authorities in England consistently and persistently till the very last moment. But if by rejection is meant that if the Hoare constitution is enacted and brought into operation, the nationalists should boycott it and give a free hand to the communalists and the special interests, it will be a betrayal of the true interests of India. If, on the other hand, by rejection is meant that the existing constitution is preferable to the new one and that the latter should be abandoned for the *status quo*, it is a desperate and despondent advice which will not receive enough support to make it effective; it will only drive the communalists and the other special interests more firmly into the arms of the enemies of Indian progress in support of the Hoare constitution. At all events, the move is ill-timed, inasmuch as it will amount to letting down the nationalist Indian Delegates now in London.

#### BURMA.

SIR SAMUEL HOARE'S "personal" opinion submitted to the Joint Select Committee that Burma should be separated from India fairly seals the fate of Burma. Separation is now inevitable and it is doubtful if anything that the Burmans can now do will make any difference.

The reasons given by Sir Samuel Hoare are however not so convincing as he thought. He said that separation was in the interest of Burma and it accorded with the general opinion of Burma. In support thereof he quoted the finding of the Simon Commission, and the resolution of the Burma Legislative Council in 1929. It is worth while remembering that, rightly or wrongly, most of the anti-separationists had boycotted the Commission and the Council at the time. Sir Charles Innes, himself no mean separationist, acknowledged that when the resolution was passed "most of the anti-separationists were at that time non-cooperators." The last general election specially fought on the separation issue gave an unequivocal verdict in favour of federation. Twice subsequently the Legislative Council declined to give a clear verdict in favour of separation, notwithstanding official lead given to that effect. It should however be admitted that the Legislative Council failed to give a clear decision in favour of permanent federation and the federationists themselves desired to have the freedom to secede at a future date, if they so felt. So much then for Sir Samuel Hoare's conclusion that "the general body of Burman opinion supports separation."

In support of his other conclusion that it was in the interest of Burma, Sir Samuel Hoare stated that the economic interests of Burma and India were often divergent. Granting the truth of his statement, is it to be taken that the economic interests of the provinces of India themselves are not often divergent? Are the economic interests of the maritime and the

inland, and of the agricultural and industrial provinces and of provinces and States the same? Is the divergence of economic interests of India and Burma so much greater than between any two units in India herself as to justify separation? The divergence of economic interests between certain Indian States and British India was no mean obstacle to closer federation, as was demonstrated at the Round Table Conference. Nevertheless, the attempt has been to accommodate and find compromises and invite units which are now outside to join in. Burma is today a province of India. Divergence of economic interests did not originate just when there was a talk of a new constitution for India. If Indian States, with no less economic divergences, are being invited to join the federation for the first time, it seems ridiculous that Burma, now an integral part of India, should be torn apart and an economic excuse invented for it.

Much is being made of the desire of the Burmese federationists to reserve the right to secede at a future date. It is true that, according to orthodox doctrine, no unit of a federation should be given the right to secede. As far as possible there should be no departure from that doctrine. But then, an orthodox federation is not what is being attempted in India. A unitary and well-knit polity is being broken up, against all canons of political wisdom and expediency. The Indian States, which are being invited to join the federation, are being given latitudes and options which make a mockery of federation in the orthodox sense. There have been so many departures from the prescribed path that one more departure, and a contingent one, need not stand in the way, though there is much to be said for the argument that one inevitable departure is no justification for another avoidable one and that such departures should as far as possible be resisted and minimised.

It is for the Burmans to realise that the British anxiety for the separation of Burma is not in their interest; that, on account of the less developed political consciousness of the Burmans, the British will find it easier to exploit them than when they are linked with Indians; and that the separation is to the interest of Britain on account of the oil, minerals and other economic wealth of Burma. It is best for them to throw in their lot with Indians, particularly as they are not to get a better and more progressive constitution for a separated Burma. It is as well for them not to press for the right to secede at a future date. If and when separation becomes urgent, they can make out a case and solicit the general consent of the other units of the federation for it. At the moment it is a theoretical remote contingency, which only causes immediate trouble. On the Indian side, it is best that India agreed to giving Burma the right to secede as a special case, accept one more departure from orthodox doctrine, in the hope that the exercise of the right is a distant and improbable contingency and that if the contingency arose, it were part of political expediency to permit an unhappy and unwilling unit to separate peacefully rather than compel it to remain in, just to conform to orthodox political doctrine.

If, apart from the violation of political doctrine, there are other and more practical disadvantages to both India and Burma by separation at a later date, they are no less if it takes place today. Whether Burma breaks off from a unitary state now or the proposed federation later should make no difference from that point of view. If India should be guided solely by Burmese opinion in this matter of separation, it should again make no difference whether Burmans decided to separate today or later.

## AN ALL-PARTY PLATFORM.

PANDIT MADAN MOHAN MALAVIYA deprecates the formation of parties within the Congress (like the Democratic Swaraj Party proposed to be formed by Mr. Jamnadas Mehta) in order that the dissenting sections may compel a change in the governing Congress policy. Probably Malaviyaji himself desires a change in this policy, though not in the sense in which Mr. Jamnadas Mehta desires it. But he will do nothing to break the solidarity in the Congress. He is convinced that things are going and have been going ill for this country in England at the constitutional discussions, so that the new system of government promises to be in essence "the present system in some respects in a worse form," because of the disintegration of political forces in India. The supreme need of the hour is therefore in his opinion a re-establishment of that unity which was so effective in combating the reactionary influences in England at the time of the Simon Commission, but which has since been steadily breaking up, with the result that there is a rapid deterioration in our political situation. A split in the Congress must therefore be averted at all costs, but it is not enough to maintain unity in the Congress ranks; this must be made only the starting point for bringing about a wider unity

among all the progressive groups in the country. The first move however must be taken in the Congress, so that, united among themselves, Congressmen may, by proposing an acceptable programme of work, rally all the other groups of advanced politicians to themselves.

Panditji has himself formulated a programme which he thinks is calculated to achieve this end. He will submit it first to the All-India Congress Committee, of which a meeting is apparently going to be summoned, and having obtained its approval, he will place it before other parties. Now, what can such a programme be which all parties can unreservedly join in carrying out? The first aim of such a united programme must obviously be to stop the rot that has set in in connection with constitution-making in England. The Congress is no longer taking a part in this business, it is true; but it cannot afford to be indifferent to what is going on in the Joint Committee at present or what will happen in Parliament later. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, in his inspiring message to the country, not to be content to work for a nationalistic swaraj, "preferring merely home interests to foreign interests," but to strive for social and economic equality within the country it-

self; not after swaraj is obtained, but here and now, says incidentally. "The Round Table scheme is almost dead as Queen Anne, and hardly deserves notice." Unfortunately the scheme is not at all dead, but very much alive and kicking, and our first concern must be to see to it that it is dead and then to give it a decent burial. Congressmen too will treat the scheme contemptuously at their peril. Only the rigidity of the constitution should be enough to make them turn their energies to it, leaving aside everything else. It is both unamendable and unrepealable in future. Once they allow it to be imposed upon India, no amount of civil disobedience or soul force that they can put forth afterwards will be of any avail. As a matter of fact I am firmly persuaded that, after the new constitution comes into force, civil disobedience on an extensive scale will become almost impossible. And this for two reasons. First, those who will offer it will be handled with an unheard of rigour in repression by the Indian Ministers who will then be in charge of law and order everywhere. Second, under the new dispensation, Indians will be at any rate nominally and outwardly in control, and the satyagrahis will then lack the inner urge to fight Indians such as they now have in fighting the foreigners, even as no satyagraha is practised at present by Congressmen in Indian States where misrule is at least ten times worse than in British India. The peculiar weapon of the Congress will thus fail in their hands when they will begin to apply it under the new regime. They must therefore take an interest in the constitution that it is proposed to foist upon the country and bestir themselves, in conjunction with other progressive groups who also think that the constitution is not only disappointingly meagre but in substantial respects reactionary, to rid themselves of it if possible.

Only on this basis, it seems to me, will unity be possible. But Pandit Malaviya is apparently thinking of proposing "an economic and political programme" "calculated to command the support of all honest and earnest patriots." There is no such programme which will be acceptable to "all honest and earnest patriots." There will necessarily be a wide divergence of opinion even among patriots of the approved pattern over every single item of social and economic policy. The first question that will divide them is whether they should not for the present concern themselves with wresting power from the hands of the foreigner, reserving to a later date the distribution of that power among the different classes of our own people. Pandit Nehru has just raised it prominently, and there is as little unanimity about it among Congress patriots as among others. If by a miracle we all came to the conclusion that we must strive simultaneously to get rid of the injustices practised by swadeshi as well as bideshi tyrants, the question will then arise what are the kind of arrangements that justice requires and by what means they can be brought into force. As often as these questions are raised, differences of view will show themselves, and the differences will not run along party lines either. They will cut across the existing division of party, since parties are based at present mainly on the attitude which one takes towards the foreign Government. One who is reckoned as a radical at present in politics may well have to take his place among conservatives on social and economic questions that will hereafter come to the fore and probably there will be as large a proportion of social Tories in the ranks of the politically advanced Congress as in those of what are now known as Moderates and Liberals. Such diversity of views is only natural. If we expect to find only men of advanced thought in social matters in India because India is struggling for political freedom, in England which is already

free there should only be men of backward ideas, socially, which however is obviously absurd.

The conclusion to which this discussion leads is that if it is desired for the moment to attain unanimity among politicians in this country, it would be fatal to raise the questions which Pandit Malaviya seems to raise in the programme which he is going to put forward before the All-India Congress Committee. Unanimity can however easily be reached if we focus attention on getting the British authorities to scrap the reforms on which they are working at present. Even here we ought to be careful not to bring in matters which are not strictly germane to our immediate purpose. We must cease all talk about improving the scheme, for improvement is outside the range of practical politics. We must not worry about the White Paper scheme being whittled down. We must not involve ourselves either in Council Entry or Council Boycott, leaving each party free to decide upon either course of action at the proper time if unfortunately we do not succeed in having the scheme laid aside. Provided we take these precautions, we may expect a fair amount of success in presenting a common front in the solution of the most urgent question. For only those will not be able to join in such an enterprise who think that the White Paper has something substantial to offer which it would be folly to forego, and that what it now offers can be subsequently enlarged by suitable amendments in the constitution. I do not believe that there are many such; at any rate, I have yet to meet a person who denies that the constitution will in effect be closed to future amendment. Anyhow if there are such people I would say to them that, instead of denouncing it in unmeasured terms as they often do, they had better begin educating public opinion in the undetected virtues of the Hoare constitution. But there may be some who would like to have the constitution stopped if possible, and yet who may have grave doubts about the available political strength in the country being sufficient for the attainment of the desired end at this stage. To such we may say that nothing is lost even if we fail. Our failure will in such a case be anyhow less than that which will be our portion if we go on talking about making an attempt to improve the White Paper scheme. My suggestion for a common programme, a programme on which both Congressmen and non-Congressmen can wholeheartedly unite, will therefore be just this: let us do everything we can to get British statesmen not to proceed with the Hoare constitution.

OBSERVER.

---

## Our London Letter.

---

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, October 6.

### ANOTHER DIEHARD DEBACLE.

SOME of the Tory diehards must be praying to be saved from their friends if not from themselves.

Sir Henry Page-Croft has hardly yet recovered from the *faux pas* that he committed in trying to force an anti-Government pamphlet on India upon the delegates to the Birmingham Conference early this week, and for which he received a tremendous castigation from a number of the local Party organisations, and from the Party Headquarters. Sir Henry, however, as a bluff soldier ought to be, is thick-skinned about all these things, and professed



great surprise that his well-meant efforts to prejudice the Indian Reforms scheme, as outlined in the White Paper proposals, and the Secretary of State's elucidation thereof, should have been received with so much open suspicion and hostility. The end of his troubles, however, was not then. He was foolish enough to make a number of statements in his pamphlet on the history of reforms in India from and inclusive of the Montagu-Chelmsford scheme, so full of inaccuracies, omissions, over-statements and distortions as to make it an easy task for Sir J. P. Thompson, now the most energetic member of the Union of Britain and India upon the basis substantially of the new reforms scheme, to prove in the columns of *The Times* that the redoubtable diehard was a mere baby in these matters, that he did not know his facts, that he had hardly made any intelligent study of the history and the circumstances of constitutional events in India during the last sixteen years, and that he was really incompetent to do more than say vehemently, loudly, and brusquely, if at some length, "I don't like reforms in India, neither do my friends. We don't think that Indians are fit for anything else than direct British rule for untold decades. The Government are fooling the country into believing that Indians are fit even for partial self-government, and they are therefore destroying the foundations of the British Empire. Therefore, let us destroy all chance of these reforms."

Nor was Sir J. P. Thompson's castigation the end of Sir Henry Page-Croft's discomfiture. Eager for the fray, sensitive to the prestige of himself and his colleagues, if indifferent to the sensitiveness of Indian Nationalists, he had rushed in with an amendment to a harmless resolution, in which he sought to anticipate the general debate on India set down for to-day by endeavouring to secure a vote of censure on the Government on account of their Indian policy. The amendment was never reached, or to be more strictly correct, the Party managers had seen to it that the resolution against which the amendment was aimed was side-tracked, doubtless to the relief of Lord Lloyd, Lord Wolmer, and their followers, who were looking forward to taking the centre of the stage themselves this morning.

The debate opened on Lord Wolmer's motion which began by stating that the Conference "accords its confidence in the National Government," and went on to record the apprehension felt regarding the White Paper proposals concerning finance, defence, police, the welfare of the Indian people, and trade discrimination. The motion was seconded by the Marquis of Hartington. Both of these gentlemen are heirs to Peerages, one being next in line to the Earl of Selborne, Lord Salisbury's brother-in-law, and the other to the Duke of Devonshire. An amendment was moved by Sir Thomas White of Liverpool, proposing that the words of the resolution after "National Government" should be omitted, and that there should be inserted thereafter "and congratulates them on the success of a policy of maintaining law and order in India." The amendment then urged postponement of a decision upon the reforms scheme until after the Select Committee have reported thereon to Parliament. Lord Lloyd who this week refused to listen to any "damn nonsense" about pacifism, strongly supported the motion, whilst Mr. P. J. Hannon, M. P., Lord Ellbank, Mr. L. S. Amery, and Lord Fitz-Allen spoke for the amendment. Lord Howe and the Duchess of Atholl, nobly supported by Sir Henry Page-Croft, joined Lord Wolmer. As was expected, Mr. Chamberlain who wound up the debate in favour of the amendment, had little difficulty in persuading the Conference to regard the motion as being in substance a challenge

to the Government, notwithstanding Lord Wolmer's heated protest. Mr. Chamberlain pointed to the fact that to the Select Committee had been committed by Parliament the task of reporting to it as to the lines upon which, in its opinion, an Indian Reforms Bill should be framed, and that they were now being asked to prejudice its recommendations. As to the dangers mentioned by the Government's opponents, these had been foreseen, and the safeguards had been carefully devised against them which were now being examined in the most careful detail by a responsible body. "In view of the agitation that is being conducted outside, you cannot doubt that what you are being asked is really to say that you will not have responsible self-government at present, but you confine yourselves to some form of provincial autonomy. That is what it comes to." In the circumstances, notwithstanding Lord Wolmer's reply, Mr. Chamberlain had no difficulty in persuading the Conference to reject the motion by more than two to one, the figures being for the amendment 737, against the amendment 344. Doubtless the discomfited opponents will try to assuage their anguished feelings by taking a census of those delegates who, for one reason or another, did not vote. It could not have been many.

#### IN FAVOUR OF REFORMS.

As I wrote last week, it would be a mistake to suppose that all the retired Indian generals are supporters of the O'Dwyer-Lloyd League, which reminds me that Sir Michael O'Dwyer and Sir John Thompson have, since their famous encounter some months ago at the East India Association, been careful not to cross swords directly, probably as an act of mutual courtesy in memory of days gone-by. It is noteworthy that whereas Sir Michael has gone consistently further to the right since his retirement from India, Sir John Thompson, who remained behind and who observed the current of events there at close quarters, has preserved an attitude of friendliness and sympathy towards Indian national aspirations, based upon a realistic appraisal of their strength and meaning.

Another ex-civilian, Sir Hugh Macpherson, formerly of Bihar and Orissa, who retired some seven years ago after thirty-five years' service, has come out strongly in favour of the reforms; and he has roundly told the public that nation-wide boycott is more than an act for the bayonets recommended by the Generals for holding down India, and that nothing would be better calculated to achieve dire results than they professed to fear from the adoption of the present reforms scheme, than the success of the present agitation tearing and raging all over the country, pursued by the India Defence League. Sir Hugh's letter to which considerable prominence has been given is a vigorous defence of the Union of Britain and India policy and deserves careful consideration.

#### THE JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.

The Joint Select Committee on Indian Reforms resumed its sittings on Tuesday, with a few words of welcome to the Indian members from the Chairman. The Committee then proceeded with a further examination of the Secretary of State for India who was accompanied by Sir Malcolm Hailey and Sir Findlater Stewart. The subjects upon which Sir Samuel Hoare gave evidence have been the Public Services, and the White Paper requirement of previous sanction to legislation, central and provincial. Yesterday afternoon Sir Alan Anderson, on behalf of the Associated British Chambers of Commerce and other trade organisations in this country, completed the evidence on commercial discrimination and other subjects of business interest. These proceedings have

not yet been published at the time of writing, but they are believed to have been somewhat more reactionary than the corresponding evidence given by the British Chambers in India. It is strange how comparatively remote British merchants here are from realities in India, and how slow they are to learn from their countrymen there. It is as well that some of the Lancashire cotton leaders should have gone to India in order to meet prominent Indian business men face to face, and discuss with them actual problems of commerce and industry instead of mere theories.

I gather from conversations with Indian members of the Committee that they are none too cheerful as a result of the week's proceedings. Several well-known personalities are badly missed, and in particular one whose name is a household word among the members of the staff of Delhi Congress papers. It is to be hoped that a more cheerful note will be struck by the remaining delegates, and that there will be a closer co-ordination of effort, in view of the fact that with the absence of prominent Indian Nationalists, the forces of reaction in the Committee have been proportionately strengthened. I am informed that advance copies of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru's Memorandum, with notes of support from Mr. Jayakar, Mr. Joshi and Mr. Rangaswami Iyenger annexed, have been received this week in London. As this Memorandum will be presented to the Committee from a colleague and member, and not by way of evidence, it is as yet uncertain how and when it will be publicly circulated. It is possible that its contents may not be published until after the Report, with annexed documents, is presented to Parliament. The procedure on a matter of this kind is somewhat obscure.

#### THE CANADIAN CONFERENCE.

The non-official Conference held in Canada recently of representatives from Britain, the Dominions, and India, seems to have had certain advantages from the Indian point of view. I understand that the status of Indians in the Dominion was privately discussed and sympathetically viewed, and that the question has thereby been advanced a stage further. Another point that was emphasised was that, whilst regional matters might best be handled by the Empire countries most nearly concerned, where they impinged upon international interests it was very desirable for the Empire units to act in conference, in order to secure the most favourable results even as regards regional interests. Yet a third point was brought out, namely, that whilst the same status of internal independence was desired for the great nations of the Empire, anything like a standardised constitution would not only be unacceptable but unworkable, in view of the separate and different internal problems of each. I am informed that the relations among the various national groups, and within the Indian group in particular, were of the friendliest, and that as regards the Indian group, an Indian point of view as distinguished from a racial or a communal one was throughout emphasised, notwithstanding the varied composition of the group.

LONDON, September 29.

#### THE TORIES AND INDIA.

What they sometimes call the "reptile Press" of India has very little indeed to teach the Tory diehards and their organs in the Press in the way of vilification, vituperation, and political trickery of all kinds. For example, this week the *Daily Mail* assured its readers that the Government had already decided upon substantial modifications of its constitutional policy, with a view to conciliate their

opponents in the Conservative Party, in view of the forthcoming Party Conference at Birmingham. The incredibility of the statement at this juncture was patent; but that did not prevent some of the diehards from assuming its accuracy and congratulating themselves thereon for purposes of propaganda in the Tory party at large. It is to be supposed that the Government are well aware of the ignorance and stupidity of most of their supporters in the party organisations, for they hastened to issue a prompt disclaimer on the ground that the official policy could only be disclosed after the Report of the Joint Select Committee had been issued, and had been considered by the Cabinet. That is, of course, not to say that there may not be some dotting of "i's" and crossing of "t's", nor is it to assume that if the Party hostility becomes, as it is not yet, formidable, the Government may not be compelled upon political considerations to agree to some kind of compromise that would in effect be a whittling down of the proposals contained in the White Paper. However, the point is that at the present moment the India Defence League is out for propaganda and is seeking to capture the constituencies, and it is quite willing, both to inspire and to make use of all sorts of tendentious reports in the Press and otherwise. Their latest cause of offence has been the issue by the League of a letter to members of Conservative Associations, asking them to do all that lies in their power to see that delegates to the Tory Party Conference next week may support the attitude of hostility to the Government programme taken up by the League. This endeavour to influence the Conference by seeking to pack it with anti-Government delegates has been strongly resented by the Unionist Parliamentary Committee on India, which yesterday issued a statement of protest against the League's methods and tactics. Sir Edward T. Campbell, M. P., the Chairman of the Committee, is obviously voicing the views of a very large section of the Tory Party when he describes as not being cricket endeavours to anticipate the Report of the Select Committee, which as I intimated to you some time ago and is this week confirmed authoritatively, is not expected before next March, with a Bill to be introduced at the earliest in the late autumn of next year.

One rather funny incident in these devious manoeuvres is the suggestion of a Tory Peer who is a member of the India Defence League to two other Peers, both members of the League, that they should endeavour to obtain admission to the last Council Meeting of the National Union of Conservative and Unionist Associations. This unfortunate Peer, however, in his enthusiasm on behalf of the good cause, forgot that neither of his colleagues was eligible to attend as both were Liberals. Even that sounds queer.

#### THE MAHATMA'S INFLUENCE.

The *Manchester Guardian* today contains a very interesting reference to Mr. Bhulabhai Desai, who is presently expected back here from Geneva, and who, during a recent visit to London, in an interview with a member of the *Guardian's* staff here, discussed the proceedings of the recent Poona Conference of Congress leaders, and who describes a resolution that was passed thereat requesting Mr. Gandhi to seek an interview with the Viceroy, in order to explore all avenues of conciliation, as being "not a mere matter of policy but a sincere and genuine gesture of good-will on the part of the Congress." He regarded the manner in which the Government of India misrepresented the purport of the Conference and the language used by them to turn down the request as being such, as had the incident taken place between private individuals, "would be clearly regarded as insulting." It



almost looked as though the Government of India or the British Cabinet had given up their earlier professed desire to gain the co-operation of Congress in the working of the new constitution. Mr. Dasai insists that not only has the civil disobedience movement not failed, but that it has succeeded in its historic purpose namely, "to rouse the minds of the Indian masses to the desire for freedom and to prepare them to make the sacrifices required for the cause." In his view a temporary inactivity should not be taken by a thinking mind as the failure of the movement. I quote textually Mr. Dasai's concluding words.

"If the attitude of the Indian Government had been conciliatory there would not have been any difficulty in coming to a reasonable understanding. The failure of the Government of India to accede to any request for discussion while the hostilities were definitely suspended created the real difficulty, and this is the true explanation of the decision which has been arrived at for calling off mass civil disobedience. My own feeling is that the Government of India fully realise that the success which their Executive are claiming is more apparent than real and it is not too late yet to bring about some means of conciliation, for, after all, merely collecting taxes and policing the country can hardly be called real government.

"The inactivity of the civil disobedience movement should not be mistaken for a suppression or destruction either of the Congress movement or its principles or of the wide and deep influence which Mr. Gandhi has on the bulk of the people in India. Whatever be the disagreements as to the personal or spiritual views of life of Mr. Gandhi, it is not likely to affect his political influence, because it is not founded on any single political question or issue. Mr. Gandhi's influence rests not on any particular issue or question but upon the broad basis of the general awakening of the conscience of the Indian people to the value of freedom and the necessity of sacrifice in the attainment of it."

#### TWO INTERESTING PRONOUNCEMENTS.

In connection with the reforms, two pronouncements of considerable importance have been made during the week. One is by Lord Bingley, better known as Colonel G. R. Lane-Fox, M. P., when he was a member of the Simon Commission. He contributes an article in the October issue of *Home and Empire*, from which the following extracts are taken:

"We have been pledged again and again to give India a democratic form of government. It is right to say that we must now honour our pledges and try a constitutional experiment. Any alternative plan of dictatorship or bayonet rule is out of the question for the moment. . . . The great defect of the present system of Government in India has been that in the more important fields of administration the Indian Legislatures had no real responsibility, except in the rather minor matters dealt with as transferred subjects to the Provinces. The Government of India could in reserved subjects frame its own policy, and in many ways it might have been better if there had been no discussion in the Legislatures, for it has so often concentrated on an attack on Government policy involving them in no responsibility or any alternative policy of their own. . . . The only chance of securing that Indians shall criticise with a fuller sense of responsibility is to make them responsible for the results of their criticism. Thus the present tendency is for elected bodies to criticise severely police action as administered by the Indian Government in every case. It is for this reason that the Simon Commission saw the necessity of giving to Provincial Governments the control of their own police through a Minister responsible to the Provincial Council."

On the same day as this appeared there was published a letter from General Sir W. C. G. Heneker, formerly of the Southern Command in India, and who now writes from the offices of the Union of Britain and India! Criticising the eight retired

military men who recently wrote to the Press to remind Mr. Baldwin that Britain could still hold India, and that "if and when the White Paper proposals are put into force without modification, the Army becomes Indianized throughout, and the police, railways, post and telegraphs have been handed over to entire Indian control, the danger of our losing India will arise," Sir W. Heneker points out that the White Paper makes no such proposals, but adds that the gradual Indianization of the Indian Army has been supported by practically every Commander-in-Chief who has held office in India in recent years, and he quotes in further support the specific recommendations of the Simon Commission. Sir W. Heneker's conclusion is valuable:

"An India which is held only by force would not be an asset to the Empire but a constant drain upon the United Kingdom. A hostile India would be valueless for trade. And if India is not to-day, in the opinion of the eight Generals, 'a united and virile nation' no measure could be calculated to make India such a nation than the attempt to hold it down by what the signatories call 'an alien military force'. Whatever solution of the Indian problem of government may be found, it is certain that there can be no permanent solution either by force or by offering to India a scheme so restricted that it would be accepted by no single party or community in India, and would leave us the problem, which we have not hitherto had to face, of governing India without Indian assistance."

#### GOPAL KRISHNA GOKHALE.

The Y. M. C. A. Publishing House, Calcutta, has issued several valuable books describing the life and work of a number of builders of modern India. The series already includes Dr. Tagore, Justice Banerji, and Mahatma Gandhi. To it Mr. John S. Hoyland has now added a life of Gokhale, in which he covers the ground upon the basis of Messrs. Natesan's edition of Gokhale's Speeches, Principal Shahani's Monograph, Dr. Paranjpye's little life, and Professor Raju's small biography, as well as original letters lent to the author by the Servants of India Society. Another authority referred to is Professor Kale's *Gokhale and Economic Reforms*. This book which, has now reached here will be gladly welcomed by his many friends, who will naturally turn as soon as possible to the author's final chapter on Gokhale's place in history. He is of opinion that Gokhale has not yet come into his own and that "probably another generation will have to pass—and what is a generation in the long stream of India's history?—before it begins to be recognised how immense were the benefits which this College Professor conferred upon his Motherland." It is a noble tribute that Mr. Hoyland pays to the many and varied parts that this great son of India played during his lifetime. Doubtless the book will be widely reviewed in India; whether or not it is so here, it will be widely read among the many still surviving who enjoyed his friendship or who in one capacity or another had the privilege of collaborating with him and serving some of the many causes to which this noble man dedicated himself through the whole of his strength and capacity.

#### SHORT NOTICES.

**ISLAM AND MODERNISM IN EGYPT.** By CHARLES C. ADAMS. (Oxford Univ. Press) 1933. 23cm. 283p. 6/7.

IT is usual to regard Muhamadan countries as proofs against any kind of progress and as centres of conservatism and reaction. This belief must have received a rude shock when Turkey under the guidance of Mustapha Kemal Pasha threw overboard all those

institutions that had stood in the path of her advancement. But the great changes in Turkey have been the result of the developments which have been taking place in Islamic countries since the beginning of this century. The learned author of this splendid book deals with the Modern Reform Movement in Egypt in the first decade of this century.

In Egypt the Reform Movement was inaugurated by the Grand Mufti, Muhammad Abduh and its object was to free Islam from the shackles of orthodoxy and reconcile it with the scientific ideas of the West. The initial impulse to the movement was given by the Sayyid Jamal-Din-al-Afghani, a noted exponent of Pan-Islamism. Before describing the Reform Movement, the author rightly sketches the careers of master and disciple, Sayyid Jamal Afghani and Muhammad Abduh so that the fundamental principles of Egyptian modernism could be better understood. The author next deals exhaustively with the doctrines of Muhammad Abduh and points out how his Reform Movement has resulted in an intellectual and literary Renaissance and movements for social reform and political advancement. The work inaugurated by Abduh was continued after his death in 1905 by his principal associates and by the Manar Party, a party which was influenced by his teachings and which identified itself with his Reform Movement. The author discusses at the end of the volume the influence of Abduh on some advanced Egyptian thinkers.

The book is the only English work dealing with the trend of Islamic thought in modern Egypt and is written in a readable style by an erudite scholar. It is the fruit of much original research and long thought. No serious student of history should fail to read it thoroughly.

M. V. SUBRAHMANYAM.

**INDIAN CURRENCY AND EXCHANGE WITH ITS HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT.** By S. B. SEN-GUPTA. (The Student's Popular Depot, Karachi.) 1932. 20cm. 312p. Rs. 3/-

INDIAN Currency and Exchange is a subject which has always roused the keenest interest both among the professional economists and the general public. In spite of this wide interest and the large number of publications that have been issued to satisfy it there is a standing need of a book which will, while doing justice to the historical part of the study, bring the currency developments up-to-date. In a study of such an ever-changing problem as currency and exchange it is very difficult for writers to keep abreast of the advancing theory and practice. It must be said to the credit of the author of this book that he has succeeded in maintaining the proper historical and theoretical perspective. The reports of the several currency committees and commissions have been ably presented by Prof. Sen-Gupta and we feel assured that his book will serve as a good companion to students of Indian Currency and Exchange. The arrangement of the book is eminently suited for a text-book on the subject meant for fresh students.

D. G. K.

## Miscellaneous.

### THE SYKES VILLAGE UPLIFT SCHEME.

MR. G. K. DEVADHAR'S NOTE.

THE publication of this Brochure on Village Improvement embodying therein the ideas of His Excellency Sir Frederick Sykes and his Government on the subject of improving the

conditions of life in villages will go a great way in clarifying the ideas on this problem of immense importance and will give a great impetus to clearer thinking thereon.

2. I have been asked by four or five departments of Government of Bombay to submit my views, suggestions and criticisms, if any, on the subject matter of this Brochure and I am, therefore, attempting here a brief statement embodying some of these so as to represent the highest measure of agreement on them among the various colleagues of mine in several organisations with which I happen to be vitally connected at the present moment and with regard to the work of which I am brought in contact with the several departments of Government of nation-building character.

3. I propose to offer a few suggestions and also add a few criticisms; but before attempting to do that in brief I would make a few preliminary observations with regard to the nature of this subject. Though the problem is not new the push and the impetus given to it by His Excellency the Governor Sir Frederick Sykes by his persistent advocacy are novel and helpful to the workers in the field and are calculated to rouse enthusiasm in those who were so far slow to recognize the importance of the subject.

4. His Excellency the Governor, therefore, is entitled to our best thanks for the vigorous advocacy which he has been carrying on for over a year so successfully and systematically. This is an all-important and all-absorbing problem today; and it must be clearly understood that it is a very complicated problem and its solution is not quite simple and, therefore, it cannot be rushed because there are many difficulties in its way. It depends upon a number of factors on which its ultimate success rests.

5. His Excellency has proved himself a most powerful propagandist and his example, therefore, deserves to be copied by several responsible officers of Government in broad-casting these truths and carrying the valuable advice down to the villages and other central places where helpful forces and facilities are seen to exist and could be easily availed of by means of suitable propaganda which is the first great need in making advance towards the goal. Non-officials who are keen on the solution of this problem have already been roused and will not be slow to understand its significance and co-operate with the officials in this common pursuit.

6. *Federation for Rural Uplift of British and Indian Princes' Territories.* In working out the Federation by means of co-ordination of efforts in similar directions that are being made in British territories and in Indian States great care will have to be taken in adjusting these efforts. In any case the linking of the Indian States with the British territories at least in matters relating to Rural Uplift activity is very desirable and likely to prove very profitable. Such an adjustment could be brought about by means of a composite or a joint board of responsible workers in these respective spheres.

7. *Organisation on All-India wide basis.* It is true that a few provinces in India had already stolen a march over this Presidency which has thus to make up a good leeway but the methods followed in Punjab and C. P. would not have answered the purpose in this Presidency, taking into consideration the mentality of the people. If the action to be taken in the promotion of this problem is to be, looking to its vastness and importance as His Excellency puts it in his foreword to this Brochure on its pages 3 and 4, not only on a Presidency-wide basis but on an All-India wide basis. My view is, now that agriculture is one of the transferred subjects and several heads

of Provincial Administrations are passionately keen on pushing on village improvement in their respective areas, the central Government or the present Government of India could be persuaded by ministers in charge of these subjects to call a Conference for a discussion on some of the aspects of this problem on a nation-wide basis through the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research, inasmuch as such a step is more likely to clarify ideas with regard to the organisation of these efforts on a country-wide basis. I had had already a talk on this subject in February last with some of the high authorities of the Government of India in Delhi and I was led to think that it would be easier for them to move in this matter if suggestions to that effect were received by them from 4 or 5 Provincial Governments that are keen on pushing this work and would like to have the benefit of knowing the various points of contact between Provinces and of coordinated efforts.

8. *Special Department or Specialised Agency.* Moreover, the work which is to be stressed in bringing about improvement in conditions of village life is more or less of a very strenuous nature and would try the patience of the most tolerant workers toiling in the field. Besides, it is of a specialised character like the work carried on by the Co-operative, Health, and Scout Departments. If no specialised service or a Department be brought into existence even for the purpose of bringing about a co-ordination of efforts made by the various Departments of Governments, the work will not succeed and no tangible results would be seen to flow therefrom. Need for a specialised high class officer with a regular staff and funds must be recognized as has now been done by the Government of Punjab by their recent appointment of Mr. F. L. Brayne of Gurgaon fame as Director of Rural Reconstruction.

9. *Groups of villages as units.* There is another point of a general application which I would like to emphasize at this stage and that is that considering the very large number of villages in the whole country numbering about 700,000 (seven hundred thousand) and the comparative poverty and backwardness of many tracts and the inhabitants residing therein, it would be ultimately found more fruitful and economical to begin the work of Rural Uplift in groups of villages as a unit and not in a single or a selected village. This point has been specially made by Dr. Butterfield from America in his reports on village organisation based upon his experiences in India and countries in the new far East, to the Christian Missionary Council for the benefit of those missions that are working in the sphere of agriculture.

10. *Need for Social Reform Propaganda.* Anyhow Co-operative Societies of the type known in the Punjab as "better living Societies" have not prospered in this part of the country. What was intended to be achieved by starting them in that province has more or less been secured in this or other parts of India by castes or communal organisations aiming at raising of the general level of thought and life. If, therefore, substantial results are to be achieved along this line social reform propaganda must precede the formation of any organisation.

#### CRITICISMS.

11. I do not propose to dogmatize in offering the following criticisms.

It is no use fixing up any arbitrary order of work to be undertaken. Similarly, it would be a mistake to attend too many things at a time at one place except perhaps to meet all kinds of needs partially and to satisfy all kinds of tastes.

12. *Voluntary and popular basis for organisations set up.* If compulsion is to be avoided and voluntary and popular basis is to be secured in favour of such a nationwide organisation or Provincial organisation covered by a net-work or a chain of organisations, they ought to remain strictly voluntary and non-official in character, all efforts in that direction being initiated with that spirit. The principle that is to be generally followed in starting this chain of organisations, should in my opinion be that Government servants working in their respective areas should be taken on these Committees as a rule as ex-officio members more or less in their advisory capacity, but it should not be insisted upon that they must be the chairmen of these Committees or organisations in their official position controlling the leading strings. They must be eligible for any office along with others but should, as far as possible, hold no position of responsibility or power on account of their official position. The grounds to be urged in favour of this consideration among others are (1) that the official, to quote the words of the Deputy Commissioner of Amraoti, "is the weakest link of the chain" on account of his being unable to give any guarantee of continuity in his case as Government servant, being subjected to the needs and the requirements of the Administration or the Department which has the first claim on his time and energy and which is free to shift him from one place to another wheresoever the department's convenience necessitates his transfer. Regarding this point the *Times of India* in its issue of the 7th of October 1933, while writing on the appointment of Mr. Brayne, observes as follows by way of, as the article puts it, "a warning and a lesson."

13. *A warning and a lesson.* The paper says:— "To begin with, Mr. Brayne knew that his ability to do anything in Gurgaon was limited in time by the length of his Deputy Commissionership there. He, therefore, started with an exceedingly crowded programme, involving such vastly different though connected items as the better education of girls ("train the women," said Mr. Brayne, and the village will uplift itself"), the digging of a manure pit for each village in order to improve sanitation, the provision of large numbers of Persian wheels to take the place of the ancient charras or leather buckets, the introduction of masses of improved ploughs, and the purchase at great expense to the district boards of hundreds of special bulls to improve the quality of the villagers' cattle. To push through this congested programme there was organised an intensive official propaganda campaign. Mr. Brayne admittedly backed the scheme by the whole weight of this official influence. The immediate effect was a burst of activity throughout the villages along the lines prescribed, but when Mr. Brayne was in the ordinary course of events transferred to another district at least 80 per cent of what he had set going came to an end. The Gurgaon District was left heavily burdened with debt, and when the whole position was re-examined it was found that some of the measures undertaken were unsuitable."

14. *Social and Economic Survey.* In each area in which economic and social survey would be undertaken with a view to initiating rural activity a complete list of organisations carrying on Village Improvement or Uplift in various spheres of public activity as also a list of persons actively interested in them should be prepared on some well-defined basis for purposes of affiliation to or formation of federated bodies and also for the purpose of making them eligible for Government aid or recognition provided, however, they are already registered under the Co-operative Societies Act or the Charitable Societies Act or would be willing to get registered as suggested above.

15. *Funds—a Sine Qua Non or fulcrum of funds.* It goes without saying that any work, which involves organisation and administration must revolve round the pivot or fulcrum of funds and I am strongly of opinion that if the campaign of rural uplift is to be effective; it is no use ignoring to think as to from where the funds are to come as they are in my opinion the *sine qua non* for lasting results. It is not suggested, however, that the people who are to reap the benefit of such work should not and would not come forth to do it themselves on the basis of self-reliance or self-help or supply their own manual labour in the place of funds. But whatever the arrangement be, funds will form one of the principal factors to be secured. I would, therefore, propose the following, among others, as the sources of funds which should be supplemented by equal contribution by Government from Provincial revenues. If the people in the villages realize the material benefit they would derive from the expenditure incurred by them in the working out of any plan or scheme approved by them they would themselves ordinarily be ready to tax themselves to a small extent or allow themselves to be taxed. (1) The first is what they call a "Laga" on lines similar to those levied in industrial places in connection with Cotton Markets, whereby a small fee is collected at present for purposes of charity per unit of a cart loaded with grain, jaggery, other goods or a bale of cotton or a cartload of cotton arriving in the market place. This should be arranged by the village Panchayat and in a larger area of a taluka some suitable arrangement should be worked out by the Taluka organisation for the rural uplift.

(2) Some contribution from the District Local Board through its subordinate branches—Taluka Local Boards.

(3) 10 per cent of the net profits of the 20 p. c. allowed in the case of the Co-operative Society as a common good fund.

(4) Government to charge quarter of an anna per rupee of land assessment.

(5) Government contribution from Provincial funds on equal basis.

16. *Specific need must have specific provision.* I have already mentioned above that there is a distinct need for a separate agency to be in charge of this separate work, and if it is to bear fruit there must be arrangements made as in the case of departments relating to Education, Agriculture, Health, Co-operation, Scouting, etc. to give systematic training in a suitable form and to create a trained agency for special service under the designation of "ग्रामसेवक", teachers being engaged only as secondary workers but not as primary workers for Rural Uplift. Specific need must have specific provision of money and men specially trained in supplying rural needs in the spirit of a Samaj-Sevak or social worker or servant as workers are trained for all kinds of other activities. If a whole body of villagers are to be interested in such work before starting it such a provision must be made. I have already referred above to the need for a special department and for a specially trained agency.

17. *Past experience to be taken into account.* In selecting a group of villages as a centre for work past experience about the suitability of that locality should be considered a safe and satisfactory guide as absence of factions and presence of the spirit of unanimity and harmony are a precursor of success.

18. *Use of organisations already in existence.* Before starting any fresh organisations great care should be taken to recognise the existence of organisations already working with or without its branches and any work that is to be undertaken in this sphere of rural reconstruction should first be entrusted to that body or organisation working in the field provided it is willing to take up the responsibility with some adequate provision being granted, both of money and trained technical assistance, so that there should be better concentration of effort with local knowledge and self-sacrifice.

19. *A few general recommendations.* Dealing with special needs under various heads it must be recognised that there would be a great variation of means and methods, but I would suggest a few specific points below so as to meet the special needs of the case.

1. *Education in villages.* With regard to education in villages, I would suggest among others the following improvements:—

- (a) Scouting for boys and girl-guiding for girls.
- (b) Seasonal Schools.
- (c) Curriculum on the lines of folk High Schools in Denmark, and
- (d) Formation of Leagues for Adult Education on various subjects with the help of magic lantern slides and cinema films.

2. *Health in villages.* Now with regard to the needs of health, hygiene and sanitation in villages, I have discovered that health-shows and exhibitions in rural parts with the help of the cinema and the magic lantern will attract large crowds and instil into their minds lessons of personal and public health. Considering the rate of high mortality among infants, children and mothers, experience has shown that the same could be checked by introducing in rural parts trained medical assistance of a midwife or a nurse under the direction of a doctor, male or female. This could be better provided by the training of village midwives supervised by a trained and qualified health visitor.

3. *Agriculture.* In addition to the various methods of demonstration at present in vogue agricultural experiments carried into the fields of several willing and intelligent villagers will train them into the new habit of adoption of scientific methods and adjustments.

4. *Co-operative Societies.* A large number of rural workers are very keen on undertaking projects of economic improvement. But in a village or a group of villages to bring about the economic improvement the additional factor of a Co-operative Society conducted on suitable lines is bound to prove of immense value provided the officers of Government in the Revenue Department lend a helping hand when there is need for bringing home to the people the true principles of co-operation applied to their daily life touching it at all points.

20. The above in brief summarizes my views, suggestions and criticisms with regard to the construction of the scheme adumbrated in Chapter XV of the Brochure on pages 48 to 53 of the same.