

Registered - B. 900

The

# Servant of India

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

VOL. XIII No. 49. }

POONA—THURSDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1930.

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

## CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK. ... ..	581
<b>ARTICLES :—</b>	
The States and Federation. ... ..	585
The Problem of the Central Executive. By C. V. Hanumantha Rao. ... ..	586
<b>REVIEWS :—</b>	
Indian Philosophy. By D. G. Londhe. ... ..	587
All About Theosophy. By M. H. S. ... ..	588
History of English Labour Party. By S. Gopalswamy. ... ..	588
Indian Population Problem. By K. M. P. ... ..	589
SHORT NOTICES. ... ..	590
<b>MISCELLANEA :—</b>	
Mr. Joshi's Speech at the R. T. C. ... ..	590
The Personnel of the Round Table Conference. By S. G. Vaze. ... ..	591
BOOKS RECEIVED. ... ..	592

## Topics of the Week.

### A case for Clemency.

WE cordially join in the earnest appeal promoted by Mr. M. C. Chagla to the Governor of Bombay to exercise his power of clemency and relieve the death sentence passed on four leading citizens of Sholapur who were sentenced to death in the police murder case. It is superfluous to repeat the details of the case. Apart from the objection to the death penalty on principle, especially in political cases, there are many circumstances in the particular case which justify, nay, call for the exercise of clemency. Evidence procured under the shadow of martial law is not very convincing and there were differences of opinion among the judges that tried the case. We trust that His Excellency will resist the temptation to "teach a lesson to the people", and will make due allowance for the abnormal conditions in which we live and refrain from allowing an act which is beyond recall and which time may show to be superfluous and even unjust.

\* \* \*

### Trouble in Bhore!

LAST week Bhore followed the example of Kurundwad (Junior). There was some trouble and the State authorities could not control it, and they promptly appealed to the Paramount Power to intervene, which it obligingly did. Three of the arrested citizens of Bhore are now lodged, according to the daily press, in the British prison in Poona. Under what law, under what authority and under what constitution did the British Government arrest Bhore citizens and lodge them in a British prison? The reply is that the British Government is the Paramount Power and "Paramountcy must be paramount".

Whatever be the constitutional proprieties of the action of the British Political Agent in rushing to the rescue of the State authorities, we make no complaint about it. Our complaint is why he allowed matters to develop to this pitch that he had to intervene with armed police. Perhaps it was not his fault. The Indian States are 'autonomous,' and the Paramount Power can step in only when a serious crisis threatens and not ordinarily. Unfortunately the Paramount Power readily acknowledges its responsibility to secure the Princes in their thrones, but rarely, if ever, to secure good administration in the States. The subjects are overawed by the might of the British Raj which stands by the Princes, but not by them. They cannot overthrow a corrupt government; the British Government will see to it that they do not. The only other way to cure maladministration they think, is to create a crisis which will necessitate the intervention of the Paramount Power and some good may come of that, though not always. The system of the relations between the States and the British Government is wrong: it is an open invitation to the subjects to force crises.

It is not wholly the fault of the Rulers of the States either. The great majority of the States are so small and so cut up that, given the best of Princes, good and efficient administration is wellnigh impossible. They have not the resources to introduce enlightened administration and overcome corrupt traditions of the past. If the well-being of the people is of the least account, there is no alternative to abolishing the smaller States and pensioning off their Rulers. At the Round Table Conference the Princes are claiming freedom from the supervision of the Paramount Power and unchallenged internal autonomy of the States. They have so far refrained from disclosing their plans regarding the smaller States, whether they wish to retain intact the six hundred and odd of petty States,—so petty that the salaries of their Prime Ministers and Chief Justices are more modest than those of typists in commercial houses!

As regards the nature of the trouble in the Bhore State, it appears that there has been for years great discontent with the entrenched traditions of corruption, which the present Chief is unable to eradicate effectively. On the top of it, it happens that the Chief and most of his officials are Brahmins and his subjects non-Brahmins, and the antipathies generated in British India between Brahmins and non-Brahmins have had their repercussions in the State. To this was added the antipathy between money-lenders and cultivators. These tensions were there for several years but rarely led to a breach of the public peace for the people were too dumb-driven to kick. Some British Indian politicians organised public opinion in the State and taught the people to give voice to their discontent and even to defy the orders of the State.

So much for the background. It appears that recently a Brahmin money lender, accompanied by a State bailiff, attempted to execute a decree against

a non-Brahmin debtor. The villagers resisted the execution, and expelled the bailiff. And later large crowds besieged the palace of the Chief asking for an interview and a promise to redress their grievances. This led to the requisition of the British Police and the intervention of the British Political Agent, the arrest of some leaders and their detention in a British prison.

#### The Princes' Demand.

IF the terms of the Princes' demand for joining the federation are as were reported by the Special Correspondent of the *Times of India*, our misgivings about their intentions seem to find confirmation. It is said that the Princes demand equal representation with British India, and representation in the federal Ministry. We have discussed elsewhere the consequences of the representatives of the States being nominated by the Princes and not elected by their subjects. It is difficult to see how the representation of the Princes *quo* Princes, and not members of a political party, is consistent with responsible government with joint responsibility. But the demand of equal representation in the federal legislature is preposterous. Their territories form but a third of India and their populations but a fourth. While Sir M. Visveswarayya, no mean student of the rights of the Indian States, suggested that the representatives of the States should form but 23 per cent. of the federal legislature, Sir Mirza Ismail and Col. Haksar, no mean advocates of the rights of the Princes, put it at 33 per cent. the Princes now seem to demand 50 per cent. representation, and they do not say that they should be elected by their subjects! They would make a mockery of the federal government.

Another condition they are reported to have put forward is that defence and foreign relations should be outside the scope of the federal Parliament. It is not clear whether they are to be temporary reservations or permanent fixtures. One of the reasons which persuaded Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru to support federation was that the experience of the Princes in the matter of defence would be available to the new federal Government. The Princes have evidently no such confidence in their military experience. They are thinking more of entrenching their mediæval autocracies and tyrannies in their States and do not wish defence and foreign relations to be controlled by the federal government, even though they have 50 per cent. representation in it.

#### States' Subjects' Rights.

IT seems to be too good to be true: the proposal to raise at the Round Table Conference the question of the administration of the Indian States under the Princes. It was reported that questions like the freedom of speech, Habeas Corpus, representative institutions, fixed civil list and privy purse for the Princes and efficient judiciary, were likely to be raised and the Princes requested to find answers to them. We earnestly hope the Princes will be persuaded to give guarantees of good administration. For there is no getting away from the fact that most of the States are plague spots in the matter of internal administration. It is interesting to recall that Sir Mirza Ismail, the enlightened Dewan of the enlightened State of Mysore, suggested some time ago that "the requirements for entry into the Federation shall be a fixed Privy Purse, security of tenure in the public service, and an independent judiciary and also the existence of some consultative body with the function of advising the ruler in his administration". This is exactly the suggestion made by Mr. G. R. Abhyankar, as President of the Indian States' Subjects' Conference held recently in Bangalore. The

Butler Committee also made suggestions to the same effect. In this matter there is unanimity between the Committee appointed by the British Government, the responsible Dewan of an Indian State and an "agitator" on behalf of the Indian States' subjects. British Indians will welcome the implementing of Sir Mirza's suggestions.

#### A National Humiliation.

THE news cabled out to India that the negotiations in London for the settlement of the communal claims of the Hindus and Muslims have completely broken down will be received with the deepest regret. It is a national humiliation that even in London, removed from the vitiating atmosphere of communal India, Hindus and Muslims, some of whom are among the most patriotic and influential men in India, could not settle their differences between themselves. It is small consolation that no other set of politicians in India have solved the problem. It is baffling the cleverest wits and ablest brains in India.

It is reported that the Muslims have stated that Mr. Jinnah's fourteen points were the irreducible minimum of Muslim demands. Some time ago it was said that they had yielded on some points and a solution was in sight. Apparently, the Muslims, unable to come to a settlement with the Hindus, on some one point or two, went back on all their concessions, which were, of course, provisional.

Some solution will have to be found, if not by the parties concerned, by outside impartial arbitration. We hope efforts will be made to secure it. And whether the award be accepted or not by both parties, it will serve the purpose of indicating to the world what an impartial arbitrator thinks of the rival claims. That is itself a great moral gain. This is an occasion which calls for the highest motives and qualities in the arbitrator. The situation almost invites the temptation to "divide and rule". We hope the arbitrator will be above this temptation and be moved by the contemplation of the high mission of Great Britain than by British vested interests in India.

#### Government and No-tax Campaign.

THERE are two features in the reply of the Bombay Government to the Indian Merchants' Chamber which seem to call for comment. The first is their denial of police *zoolum*. It is true that complaints are not preferred by the parties affected and their co-operation is not forthcoming in the investigation of alleged excesses. And there is an element of truth in their statement that the sufferers are more anxious to embarrass Government than seek redress. But it is also true that the sufferers have no faith in the impartiality or dispassionateness of the magistracy. The magistrates are themselves collectors of land revenue and they are in control of the police. A person who is responsible for the collection of revenue and who is balked in his attempt to do so and has to depend on the police to thwart the thwarts, is not likely to maintain his judicial temper for long when the parties to the quarrel are the tax-resisters and the police. The recent decisions in the High Court setting aside several of the judgments of the magistrates are a convincing proof of it. A complainant must be prepared to go to the High Court to obtain justice, and it is not all that can afford the time and the money to do so. To many it is a lesser evil to take no part in the trial, expedite the trial, escape police lock-up and seek in the jail comparative freedom from police harassment, than to take their precarious chances of getting justice in the magistrates' courts and appeal to the higher courts. Failure to prefer complaints is not, therefore,

a proof that there was no sufficient cause for complaints. Government will do well to restrain their police, rather than rest content with discrediting the complaints.

The other point is the advancing of the time for the collection of land revenue in the Kaira district. Government themselves admit that there are other means to combat the no-tax campaign as, for instance, precautionary measures adopted in other districts. It may be unnecessary, as the Government would have it, to discuss whether precautionary measures or the advancing of the time for the payment of the land revenue instalments is less inconvenient to the cultivators. But it is very material from another and more important point of view to enquire whether Government were justified in taking either course just now. The position of the Government would not have been worse if they had held their hand till January or February next. It may be the crops would have been reaped and disposed off; it may be that the people might have migrated with their movables and left nothing for the Government to seize. Still, the cultivators could not have taken their immovable property with them. And it was open to the Government to proceed on them, if necessary, as they are doing even now in some instances. Was it necessary, was it wise and tactful to take up the cultivators' challenge just at this time in view of the Round Table Conference? Would the action of the Bombay Government, and the stories, may be distorted and malicious propaganda, that will be cabled to England, help to create a favourable atmosphere for the Conference? The Congress may be intent on wrecking the Conference. Should the Government abet them in it? Was it not a possibility that if the Round Table Conference evolved an acceptable scheme, the no-tax campaign might be called off before next year?

It may be difficult for the Government now to retrace their hasty and ill-advised step for fear of loss of prestige. Nevertheless, we would advise them to do the right thing, and postpone the demand for revenue till February next.

#### Get it right.

It is gratifying to note that even before the Round Table Conference met and the Indian delegates made their claims and aspirations unequivocally clear, some of the leading newspapers were fully seized of the Indian demand and were in full support of it. The *Spectator*, for instance, has done a great service to the cause of India and Britain by publishing special contributions on India during the last three months. And in a leading article written before the Round Table Conference met, it said that the Indian demand for "Dominion Status, with safeguards, here and now" must be met. "Until this preliminary act of reparation to Indian self-respect is performed, there is no hope of grappling with the concrete issues which are to be the subject-matter of the Round Table Conference." It further says, "one thing we must do—transfer from Whitehall to Delhi as much responsibility for internal administration as is possible in the circumstances of India as she is today, and as she will be tomorrow." It pleads for responsible government in the centre. "It is essential to make the form of the Central Government in India appropriate and adequate to the form of the provincial Government. Granted provincial autonomy—and no one surely pretends after the Simon Report that we can go back on that—this means then that the Central Government must also be a responsible government. It is, as it happens, the only way of making provincial autonomy safe for India." The only reservations it would make are defence and foreign relations, "until such time as Indians are

equal to the responsibility and duties attaching to full Dominion Status." It winds up the very helpful article by the admonition: "Let us have the courage to grant to India Swaraj, in the sense of Dominion Status, and responsibility.... Idealism apart, the interest of this country, of the Empire, is to establish a constitution for India on a permanent basis, conferring on a federated India, without further procrastination, the right of India to control her own affairs."

#### India and the League.

THE proceedings of the Round Table Conference are followed by public opinion abroad, in America and on the Continent of Europe, with the same interest as in the case of every event in India ever since the appointment of the Statutory Commission. The general line of comment is that the abstention of the Congress representatives vitiates the effectiveness of the Conference, but there is the recognition that even so, the Conference will determine the future of India, if only because it will decide the course of Congress politics. That the national movement has come to stay and the appearance of Indian Nationalism will profoundly influence the political relations between Asia and Europe are widely acknowledged, more unreservedly than it was only some six months ago. Monsieur William Martin, the well-known foreign editor of the *Journal de Geneva*, who at the time of the Lahore Congress wrote some articles on the Indian question, little sympathetic towards India and possessed of even less insight into the problem concerned, now writes differently. He takes, as usual, the League point of view, and his comments in that regard are particularly significant.

"IN any case", he says, "the argument that consists in saying that an independent India will be as chaotic as China must be used with a certain amount of caution. First, this is perhaps not true; at bottom, we know nothing about it. Was not this said of Ireland and of every State which aspired for independence? Moreover, for the British the choice is not between order and chaos. That would be too simple and too good. The choice is between two kinds of chaos. Because, it is certain that the failure of the Round Table Conference, the refusal of Britain to confer Dominion Status on India will be the signal of trouble without end. Why should the British prefer trouble directed against them to the quarrels of Indians among themselves? So far as we are concerned, we wish, against every reasonable hope, that the Conference may be crowned with success. We wish it in the interests of England and in the interests of Europe, more weakened by the revolt of the East than its liberation. Above all, we wish it in the interests of the League of Nations into which India was admitted only in anticipation and where she could not stay so long without anomaly and even without scandal, if she did not acquire the juridical characteristics of an independent State and equality with other members, in fact."

What M. Martin means by "anticipation" may be explained in his own words:

"It is known that following the War the government of Mr. Lloyd George, in order to recompense Indians for the help that they gave Great Britain on the fields of battle in Europe and Asia, had given them to understand that the purpose of British policy in India would be to make this country a Dominion. This promise was confirmed and underlined by the immediate admission of India into the League of Nations and by the

engagement to constitute a Commission to re-examine the question after ten years so as to give effect to that promise."

M. Martin significantly adds: "the Liberals on whom the (British) Government depends, after having been the originators of the policy of Dominion Status, do not want to hear of it and have become *vis-a-vis* India more intolerant than the Conservatives themselves."

\* \* \*

#### Democratic Delamere!

In the debate on East Africa in the House of Lords on the 12th of November last, Lord Delamere made the confession of faith that he was "one of the greatest believers in democratic institutions" and expressed himself shocked that any body should opine that Parliamentary institutions were unsuitable in East Africa. Lord Delamere has not ceased to surprise and shock. His definition of democracy is somewhat different from the one ordinarily accepted. The less than 1 per cent. of the white colonists should rule over the more than 99 per cent. of the non-whites—that is his democracy. He was such a great believer in democracy that he strongly objected to the publicity given to the White Paper on Native Policy in East Africa in the Native areas, though there was nothing new in the policy which was merely a reiteration of the policy of "paramountcy of Native interests" enunciated in the first instance by the Duke of Devonshire as Colonial Secretary in the Conservative Cabinet of 1923 and accepted by Lord Delamere and his fellow-democrats. What he disapproved was the new interpretation that the Labour Government sought to give to the old phrase, an interpretation which, he said,

would meet with the strongest possible political obstruction right through the whole of the East African territories, from the local Governments, from the officials, and from the colonists in those countries.

That was some threat of disloyalty from officials! We fear the British Government has been driven back by these threats of obstruction. For Lord Passfield was more apologetic than firm in his reply to the debate, though it preceded Lord Delamere's outburst. He assured the House of Lords that the Government, due solely to the "natural weakness" on their part to wish to "maintain the principle of continuity of policy as far as which could," had simply repeated the Declaration that the Duke of Devonshire made in 1923, and that "there was no notion in our minds of interpreting this in any new way." If the Labour Government had not interpreted it in a different way, there would not have been all this bother from the handful of white immigrants. Further, Lord Passfield denied that Government took steps to distribute copies of the White Paper among the Native populations, forgetting that it contained express instructions that it should be given the widest possible publicity. Again, he had instructed that the recommendations of Native Policy should be given immediate effect to and that they would not be subject to review by the Joint Select Committee. And now he has gone back on it and was at great pains to assure the House that the Memorandum on Native Policy would not be excluded from the scrutiny of the Committee. It is clear that the idealism and determination of the Labour Government have greatly weakened, and Lord Passfield ate the humble pie when he said:

I entirely agree with the noble Lord that we want to secure the good will of the people on the spot and whatever may have been the faults of myself and my colleagues in the matter, surely one of the best ways in which we can make amends is to call them to council in this Joint Committee.

#### Separation of Burma.

THOUGH the Round Table Conference has accepted the principle of separation of Burma from India, opinion in Burma is apparently not as decisively in favour of separation from India as her representatives at the Conference are trying to make out or the proceedings of her Legislative Council during the last two years or so might have led a good many people to suppose. The fact is now placed beyond the possibility of doubt by the closely-reasoned and well thought-out representation opposing separation which the General Council of All-Burmese Associations has recently submitted to the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for India and other officials. It is pointed out therein that the Burma Legislative Council is unrepresentative, it having been boycotted owing to the people's dislike of dyarchy, so that any opinion expressed by it on this point can by no means be said to represent Burmese opinion. As stated in the representation, Burmese opinion has repeatedly been expressing itself against separation ever since 1925 in their annual conferences and what is now favouring separation is "nothing but a created or organised tune of the interested parties." It is also significant that at the all-Burma mass meeting under the auspices of the Separation League, a resolution to send a deputation to England to urge separation was thrown out. The Indian menace is put forward as a ground in favour of separation. The representation effectively makes out that this bogey is somewhat over-done. "The so-called formidable community of Indians" is, according to the representation, confined mainly to Rangoon and its suburbs and is non-existent in the districts. The representation incidentally affords an insight into the working of the mind of the independence-wallas, whose opinions are embodied therein. No doubt they stand for independence, but would "naturally be moved to consider a scheme of government provided that it would give them complete autonomy within their own province." We trust the British Government will take note of this fact, especially when the Indian problem is seriously engaging their attention. The representation sets forth as many as 83 reasons why separation should not be carried out and claims to speak for "millions of Burman Buddhists." It makes it clear that there is not much ground for the complacent belief of the Simon Commission that if separation were not carried out immediately it would endanger the working of the reforms that may in due course be granted to Burma. The fact, from what the G. B. C. A. write in this representation, seems to be the other way and it appears to us necessary that before any steps are finally decided upon, Burmese opinion should be properly sounded on the matter. It should be borne in mind by the authorities that though the legislative council, technically speaking, is supposed to represent public opinion, it would be wrong in the special circumstances of Burma to rely solely on its opinion on this matter vitally touching the whole of the Burmese people and refuse to consult the vast mass of opinion which has consistently refused to be associated with it all these years. The Burmese representatives at the Round Table Conference seem to think that Burma's separation from India would hasten the attainment by Burma of Dominion Status. Let them make sure that this will follow separation; and that in the framing of their constitution the Burmese people will have a real voice. It is needful to utter this warning, for the appointment of a purely Parliamentary as distinguished from a mixed Commission for the purpose is being officially supported.

\* \* \*

## Articles.

### THE STATES AND FEDERATION.

WHILE we welcome the offer of the representatives of the Indian Princes at the Round Table Conference to come into closer union with British India immediately and enter a federation, it is essential to know, among other things, how the Princes propose that the Indian States should be represented in the federal structure. There is every reason to apprehend that the Princes will ask that the representatives of the States should be nominated by themselves and not elected by the people. If this demand were accepted, we fear it will go a long way to render dominion status of India illusory, if not impossible.

Supposing that the Princes were content with their due share of about a quarter of the representation in the federal legislature and the representatives were their nominees, it is obvious that there will be in the legislature a big *bloc* which will correspond to the "official *bloc*" of to-day. It must be remembered that the Princes claim that their relations are with the Crown through the Viceroy and are independent of the Government of India. They look to the Crown and the Viceroy, which means Britain as against India, to guarantee them in their autocracies. Wishing as they do to depend on Britain for their security, they are bound to be more amenable, if not subservient, to British interests. And it is doing them no injustice to say that they will pull their weight on the side of Britain and against India. Their nominees in the federal legislature will, therefore, act as the present official *bloc*. All the reasons which go against the retention of the official *bloc* apply with almost equal validity to the introduction of the Princes' *bloc*. The handicap will be greater if the Princes are given larger representation; they are reported to be demanding equal representation. In which case responsible government will be utterly impossible.

The introduction of the nominees of the Indian Princes in the federal executive is equally incompatible with responsible government. A Cabinet with about a quarter or more of its personnel imposed on it by the Princes, irrespective of parties and policies, will render any kind of joint responsibility or unitary government practically impossible—as impossible as the introduction of an official Minister in the Provincial Cabinets, as recommended by the Simon Commission.

The necessity for communal representation, by convention if not by statute, is enough handicap to the growth of responsible government in India. But in extenuation of its temporary retention it can be urged that the representatives represent the interests of millions of the people of India. But the nominees of the Princes will not only not represent the 70 million subjects of the States but not even the interests of the six hundred and odd Princes and Chiefs. For as we ventured to point out, depending as these do on British bayonets to secure them in their

autocracies, they will be more inclined to support British interests in opposition to those of themselves, or of their subjects or of India as a whole.

In extenuation of the Princes' proposal it may be urged that their nominees will give the necessary ballast to the new federation and give it the necessary stability while it is feeling its way and shaping itself. There is yet no danger however that the federal legislature will be dominated by the extreme Socialists or Communists. Even to-day in the purely British Indian legislature there has been enough ballast contributed by the stable elements and vested interests. The inclusion of the representatives of the people of the Indian States will, far from tilting the balance towards extremism, bend it the other way, for, on the whole the subjects of the States are more conservative than the people of British India.

Again, it may be urged that the Princes will, in course of time, sooner rather than later in view of the rapid march of political education even in Indian India, will shake off their subservience to foreign interests and take their place by the Indian nationalists. Even so, the nominees of the Princes will represent at most the interests of the Princely Order and no more; the subjects of the States will go unrepresented, if not misrepresented. And we have no instance of a federation in which a quarter of the population has no voice in the federal elections.

Thus the Princes' proposal will not only thwart federation but responsible government and dominion status, to which both the Princes and British Indians are deeply committed. And the only remedy is to enfranchise the subjects of the States for federal elections. Against this it may be urged that most of the States have no representative and none responsible institutions, and it would be an anomaly to give the subjects of the States the federal franchise when they do not exercise even State franchise. Undoubtedly it will be an anomaly, but one of the many that characterise the British Commonwealth, which is itself the greatest political anomaly. Analogies for the anomaly are not wanting in the history of the Empire. In his Report of his Dominions tour, the Rt. Hon'ble. V. S. S. Sastri referred to precedents to justify the conferment of federal franchise on persons who had not the State franchise. In Canada the State of Manitoba had disfranchised the Slav voters in 1900 but the Dominion Parliament admitted them to the federal franchise. India herself attained Dominion status for inter-dominion and international purposes long before she attained internal autonomy. It is not, therefore, necessary that the subjects of the States should be denied federal franchise because they did not enjoy local franchise. The last need not necessarily precede the first. On the other hand, the grant of the federal franchise will quicken the introduction of the local franchise.

It is a pity that the subjects of the States have no direct representation in the Round Table Conference to press their point of view. But it is hoped that British Indian representatives will realise the dangerous implications of the proposals inasmuch as they negative both federation and dominion status

and in the interests of British India, if not of the States, they will resist them, and insist that all citizens of the federation, whether of British India or Indian India, should be represented directly in at least the Lower and popular chamber of the Federal Legislature. The utmost that can be conceded is that in the Upper chamber the Princes may be represented by their nominees and that too for some definite period only.

### THE PROBLEM OF THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE.

NO subject that will come up for discussion before the Indian Round Table Conference is calculated to create so much interest or give room to so much controversy as that which relates to the constitution of the central government in the future Indian constitution. And no question connected with that constitution will, it may be imagined, be so hotly discussed and debated as the one which concerns the relationship that should subsist between the central legislature, whatever may be its character, and the central executive. The Report of the Simon Commission has not visualized a time when or a situation where, the Central Government can be expected to be composed of an executive responsible to the legislature; and consistently with this position, it contains a recommendation providing for an irremovable and irresponsible executive.

The Simon Commission do not make this recommendation to apply only to the constitutional changes immediately to be introduced, but to apply for all time to come as an unalterable principle. And they assign as a reason for their firm conviction in this regard that the peculiar circumstances of the country preclude the development of the central government in India along the lines of responsibility and that the best interests of the country will be better served by the establishment of an executive quite independent of the legislature. They state more than once that the British model of a responsible and Parliamentary executive is not the best model for India to follow in view of the diversity of castes and creeds in the country, though they have been scrupulously silent in the matter of suggesting an alternative model, which may with advantage be put into practice here.

Now it may fairly be affirmed that there is a general consensus of opinion in Indian political circles that the future Central Government should be federal and even the Simon Commissioners themselves have arrived at the same conclusion. It is true that they have, for all practical purposes, nullified their recommendations in this behalf by the suggestion that federalism should not and could not be the immediate objective of Indian constitutional development but only an ultimate goal to be attained in God's good time; but that federalism is the only possible solvent of the Indian constitutional tangle, with the Native States on the one hand and the British Indian provinces on the other, and that it is the only method of reconciling the divergent forces operating in the Indian political sphere, is invariably stressed and

unanimously conceded.

The Simon Commissioners in committing themselves to the statement summarised above appear to be obsessed with the fear that it would not be possible in the present stage of our country's constitutional progress, to concede executive responsibility to a supreme legislature. And they seem to have been carried away, in their desire to ensure an indefinite continuance of the existing system of an irresponsible Central Government, by the appeal of the example of the American constitution, which provides for an irremovable executive.

In regard to the first of the points mentioned in the preceding paragraph, it may be pointed out that the Simon Commission's apprehensions are based upon an altogether incorrect diagnosis of the main course of Indian constitutional development and also upon a conviction, not justified at all by facts, that the existing differences, so-called, will continue for ever and remain permanent and ineradicable fixtures. Also they do not sufficiently take account of the rapidly changing character of India's political outlook, nor do they give adequate recognition to the equally rapidly developing tendency for political parties in India to evolve on national lines. If responsible government is a failure in some countries or discredited in others, one potent cause for such failure is necessarily to be found in the absence of a healthy, vigorous and well-organized party system, capable of running Parliamentary institutions with success. But in India parties will inevitably spring into existence following upon the introduction of the principle of executive responsibility, and, quite as inevitably the "fissiparous tendencies" made so much of by the enemies of India's progress will gradually be eliminated. There need be no fear, therefore, that a responsible government in India will be a failure or that a responsible executive, so far as our country is concerned, will prove a weak executive.

As for India copying the American example, it has to be remembered that the American constitution is a peculiar one having an individuality all its own, since it endeavours, and may be said to have succeeded considerably in the attempt, to reconcile the two apparently conflicting forces of the independence of the executive and the omnipotence of the legislature. The President of the American Republic, the supreme executive head of the Nation, is, no doubt, elected by the popular vote and is the representative of the Nation as a whole; but even he is guided in the selection of members of his Cabinet by considerations of party strength and the need of securing of the support of the Legislature, while one branch of it is actually associated with him in his executive capacity. These considerations are very much similar to those guiding the appointment of cabinet ministers by a constitutional monarch in a country governed on Parliamentary lines. Moreover, in any consideration of the advantages or otherwise of the American type of the executive, the point should not be lost sight of that the American Constitution was established at a time when constitutional monarchy and responsible government were still unborn, and

the supremacy of the legislature was still not acknowledged. Thus the circumstances and the times had more to do with the institution of the peculiar type of a Presidential Executive than anything else; and it is not too much to suppose that if the American Constitution had been drafted a quarter of a century later, it would not have followed the plan it did.

That the American model is a singular one is more than proved by the fact that no other country professing to practise a democratic form of Government has cared to copy it in its entirety and almost every republic emerging into view after the war has followed the British model only. There are, of course, some very definite and distinct advantages associated with a Presidential Executive, but in view of the developing tendency towards a democratic control of government, an irremovable and irresponsible executive, which the American Executive is, has come to be considered a constitutional anomaly at the present day and has lost its vogue. It is, in these circumstances, strange that the Simon Commission have gone in for such an antiquated and obsolescent system for India.

The establishment of an irremovable executive is not only anomalous but is also opposed to the whole tenor of the development of the Indian constitution up to the present day and to the whole spirit of the Declaration of 1917, which envisaged responsible self-government as the goal of British policy in India. What India has been aiming at through out and what she demands imperatively at present is the establishment of a constitution in which the federal or the central executive will be drawn from amongst the members of both houses of the central legislature and will be responsible to the latter for all their actions. It is a perfectly intelligible demand and wholly in accord with the traditions and practices of every democratic country, and many examples can be quoted of federal constitutions having responsible governments and getting on quite well too.

Before concluding, it may be pointed out that while disapproving of responsible executive in the centre, the Simon Commission have recommended the same system as being suitable for introduction in the provincial sphere; and how it could do so consistently with their idea, which was elevated to the dignity of a principle in the case of the Central Government, that the last should be a perpetually irresponsible one, is wholly inexplicable and incomprehensible, unless it be that they do not want to have any advance at all in the central sphere within any measurable distance of time. It is the duty of the British Indian delegates to the Round Table Conference to bear all these considerations in mind when the time comes for them to discuss and determine the structure and constitution of the Central Government and that they will press for an extension of the principle of responsibility to as great an extent as possible and avoid altogether any suggestion of an irremovable executive. The Simon Commission's Report is very unhelpful in the matter of giving a definite guidance as to the stru-

cture of the future central Government since it confines itself to disclaiming any intention of recommending a cut-and-dry scheme and to warning us, at the same time, against adopting the British model. This diffidence on the part of the Commissioners would have been very amusing were it not tempered by the self-conscious and self-complacent attitude assumed by it in regard to other matters. But whatever that may be, the needs of the situation are clear and the remedies for it are patent; and it is to be hoped that the Indian delegates will follow the straight path and demand a satisfactory solution of the problem.

C. V. HANUMANTHA RAO.

## Reviews.

### INDIAN PHILOSOPHY.

**SAMKHYA AND MODERN THOUGHT.** By J. GHOSH. (The Book Co., Calcutta.) 1930. 21cm. 141 p. Rs. 2/-.

IN this book Dr. Ghosh has made an attempt to present, in an untechnical and popular fashion, the main ideas of the Sāmkhya which is one of the most ancient and influential systems of Indian Philosophy, with a view to help the reader to judge for himself 'how far he might look to it and similar creations for inspiration and guidance in a general way, though not, of course, for clear-cut maxims which might be immediately applied to the novel problems that he has to tackle to-day.' The book is, thus, the outcome of the author's belief that if we turn to our culture for light and guidance, it is sure to give an 'organic unity to our life and work.'

The aim of the Sāmkhya is the removal of suffering. If it be asked how a philosophical enquiry can remove suffering the answer is given that philosophy by its searching analysis traces all evils to their source which is mental and helps men to realise that suffering is foreign to our nature, being due to our illegitimate association with what is not our true nature. Philosophy is thus shown to be the remedy of all evils, inasmuch as it makes for deliverance and deliverance is the cessation of suffering. But the claim of philosophy as a sure means of deliverance is uncritically accepted as valid and our author has not shown how this claim is rationally justified.

The soul, according to this system, is pure and simple; that is, it is free from suffering and not divisible into parts. It is consciousness and nothing but consciousness. The doctrine of the plurality of souls is justified by the temporal differences of births and deaths and also by the diversity of contents in the experience of different individuals. The teaching of Sruti as regards the unity of the soul is interpreted as the unity of pattern, the diversity being attributed to 'forces and principles that are really foreign to souls but are attributed to them.' But then this will make the plurality unreal and accidental and the unity real and essential. This objection is answered by reiterating the consideration that the births and deaths of individuals do not occur simultaneously and the dissimilarity in the matter of experience is an undeniable fact. With all this, we think, that the question is not satisfactorily solved. For, birth and death pertain to the body and not to the soul, and the diversity of content of experience must be traced to the objects of experience and not to the nature of experience as such. But taking the argument of the diversity of content as it is offered, we are surprised to

read the following, immediately after this discussion: "The Sāmkhya conception of the soul is thus widely different from what the uncritical mind usually takes it to be. For, it is not the personal consciousness, the concrete I or *you*, that is given directly in experience. The personality of this type resolves itself, when analysed, into reminiscences of the past and the anticipations of the future." (p. 25). If this contention be true, it definitely detracts from the validity of the argument advanced in support of the doctrine of the plurality of souls.

Further, the stages of the cosmic process of evolution are described. "The cosmic process starts with the evolution of the power of comprehension and control..." This first evolute of *prakriti* is designated by the term 'thought'. In our opinion, the word 'thought' is quite inappropriate here as thought always suggests the relation of subject and object, and the *Mahat* or *buddhi* for which the word 'thought' is to stand is both logically and psychologically prior to the principle of individuality with which the distinction between the subject and the object emerges.

After individuality there comes the bifurcation, between the senses and their respective sense-qualities. Thus the cosmic process implies the unity of thought and thing, nature and soul, or mind and matter. This justifies the characterisation of Sāmkhya as a form of Idealism. But it is, nevertheless, quite distinct from subjectivism as it recognises the reality of the external world.

The doctrine of deliverance seems to be slightly overemphasised while the theory of causation known as the Sātkārya-vāda which is of vital importance to the Sāmkhya cosmology is but barely mentioned in the 'Conclusion'. The reader who is metaphysically minded will not get in the book what he is likely to expect. All the references to 'modern thought', whether scientific or philosophical, seem to be rather vague and not precise.

The main merit of the book, however, is its clear and lucid style. Whatever material is presented is expressed in a neat and elegant manner. The book, therefore, will serve as a valuable help to beginners in Indian Philosophy and to general readers interested in Indian thought and culture.

D. G. LONDHE

#### ALL ABOUT THEOSOPHY.

**HOW THEOSOPHY CAME TO ME.** By C. W. LEADBEATER. 20cm. 162 p. Re. 1/-.

**THEOSOPHY PAST AND FUTURE.** By ANNIE BESANT AND OTHERS. 20cm. 116p. Re. 1/-.

**THE YOGA SUTRAS OF PATANJALI.** (2nd Edn.) By M. N. DWIVEDI. 1930. 20cm. 131 p. Re. 1.

**LECTURE NOTES.** By C. JINARAJADASA. 20cm. Re. 1/-.

**A BIRD'S EYE VIEW OF INDIA'S PAST AS THE FOUNDATION FOR INDIA'S FUTURE.** By ANNIE BESANT. 20cm. 66p. As. 12/-.

(All published by the Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar, Madras.)

It is a bold man who can say with perfect equanimity in the year of our Lord 1930, that he first came into touch with Theosophy in the year 504 B. C. But this is just what Rev. Leadbeater says. His straightforwardness is alarming, and he simply does not care whether one believes it or not, his fascinating narrative. His business is just to tell, in very simple, direct and extraordinary forceful words, how he came into touch with Theosophy, and he tells it very well. He lives many lives since 504 B. C. into which we need

not go here. He met Madame Blavatsky for the first time in London, in a brilliant company when there were gathered men like A. R. Sinnet, the Frederick Myers, and S. M. Oscar Wilde. Then comes the great call and his starting for Adyar and the life at Adyar, and the Theosophy, as he saw, understood and lived it.

A fascinating book, and a good introduction to another, "Theosophy, Past and Future", in which four thinkers review, from their own view-point, 'Theosophy'. Dr. Annie Besant talks of the past and the future, the Rt. Rev. C. W. Leadbeater on the two paths, Dr. Josiah Wedgwood on the gaining of the spiritual experience and Mr. C. Jinarajadasa on a year's travel in Latin America. People who have heard these lectures and listened to them can well remember their magic and charm and to see them again in print, word for word, as if they were delivered is a double attraction.

The *Yoga Sutras of Patanjali* is a book of absorbing interest and edited with great care by Professor Dwivedi of Nadiad, based on the original Bhāṣya of Vyasa, the commentaries of Vachāspati Misra, Bhoja, Ramanath Saraswati, and the Vijñāna Bhikṣu. A very useful translation in English and a somewhat lengthy introduction add to the interest of the book, which is the basis of the Indian Yoga system. Patanjali is famous for his brief *sutras* or codes, and Professor Dwivedi's has been no mean task in making so tough and deep a subject come within the grasp of the ordinary man.

*Lecture Notes* are an interesting collection of notes, points, data and jottings, collected and published by Mr. C. Jinarajadasa of his many lectures, both in India and in Europe. They make very interesting reading and incidentally show the amazing wealth of detail which characterises Mr. C. Jinarajadasa, not to speak of the thoroughness with which he tackles the subject of his lecture. This small lecture is bound to be useful for all aspirants, who dream one day to stand on the pulpit, and make the world listen to their words. A very fine illustration by Moneshi Dey on the fly leaf is an attraction by itself.

India's future in the light of her past is an absorbing little pamphlet by Dr. Besant, which is a powerful plea for a free India.

M. H. S.

#### HISTORY OF ENGLISH LABOUR PARTY.

**FROM CHARTISM TO LABOURISM. HISTORICAL SKETCHES OF THE ENGLISH WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT.** (MARXIST LIBRARY SERIES NO. 2). By Th. A. ROTHSTEIN. (Martin Lawrence.) 1929. 22cm. 365p. 7/6.

THOSE that have read the writings of Rothstein know what to expect from him. A Russian by origin, he came over to London in 1890 and till his return to his native land in 1920 actively interested himself in the politics of the Labour Party besides working on the staff of several English papers.

In this book, which is a collection of essays written on various occasions in the course of 20 years and originally intended for a foreign Socialist (or Communist) public, the author traces the development of Labour politics in England from the earliest times till the present day; and in so doing has kept the pure Marxist principles in view. The object of writing some of these essays was propagandist, as in the case of the opening essay "the Social Wrongs", which was intended to enlighten the militant Russian working class then preparing for an armed insurrection. Necessarily his views are radical. He vio-



lently disapproves of any deviation from theoretical ideals. He goes even to the extent of condemning the English historical literature on the development of the Labour movement as of doubtful value because he says "they have been written from an anti-revolutionary, opportunist point of view." The author has made use of a few of the hitherto unused sources and in this respect his claim to some originality is justified. But it is hardly fair to characterise the existing Labour literature as containing misrepresentations of the great movement. That his pet theories and views are not reflected in the writings of eminent Labour authors is no justification for condemning the whole lot of them—among whom we find some with an international reputation, and accepted as the exponents of the Labour views. English institutions have developed in a manner peculiarly their own and English people have shown a preference to evolutionary rather than to revolutionary methods. The triumph of the Labour Party to-day is one of the bloodless revolutions of England. That the people did not become slaves to dogmas and theories but worked in a spirit of practical compromise stands entirely to their credit.

In the first part of the book the author deals with Chartism and other cognate subjects. Chartism was a great movement with very high ideals and one of the causes of its failure was its militant and revolutionary character. During the period of the Chartist agitation even other Labour movements which came into contact with Chartism, as, for example, the Trade Union movement, suffered in their growth on account of its revolutionary methods. The great movement failed but not without leaving traces which profoundly influenced the future working class movements. The author admits this. In fact the very doctrine of the conquest of political power by the workers as the indispensable preliminary to social reconstruction was to a considerable extent suggested by the Chartist movement. Also the revolutionary importance of universal suffrage was first appreciated by the Chartists, earlier than Marx. To quote the author, "the mighty spirit of Chartism remained alive and the ever changing processes of history continued to act as a creative force as long as the conditions which had brought it into being remained substantially the same".

In the second part of the book dealing with the period of Trade Unionism, the leaders of the movement are severely criticised for setting aside the extreme revolutionary ideals of the past. "The very rejection of the higher aims was extolled as the sublimest wisdom!" exclaims the author. He calls this change as opportunism and the distinguishing feature of this mental outlook was the acceptance of capitalist society, which acceptance found its expression in the rejection of political action and the recognition of the harmony of interests as between the employers and the working class.

Here we notice the imperceptible change of Evolutionary Socialism—a change which has worked its way gradually until we see the culmination of the process in the coming of the Labour Party to office. To-day the Labour Party—in spite of the violent criticisms of the Left wing—must be credited with having achieved something distinct in conformity with the ideals of the movement. This is not the only achievement. What about the change the movement has been able to effect in the outlook and the attitude of the other parties and classes? The latter is from the national point of view a more substantial achievement than the former. This recognition of the harmony of interests between Capital and Labour has been attributed by the author to the recognition of the teachings of "Vulgar Political Economy": the early association of Labour with other parties—particularly the

Liberal party as examples of the lengths to which the opportunism of the Socialists of the Independent Labour Party were prepared to go.

The English mind, though conservative, has never shown a tendency to be rigid. In the several social, economic and political movements in which she has led the world, England has always shown her great adaptability to changing circumstances. Ideals are necessary to ensure progress and emancipation of the masses; but constructive work of a lasting and permanent character is difficult of achievement without taking the realities into account. The author has taken great pains to marshal facts leading to conclusions which may be logical but never convincing. Criticism of what has been achieved without practical alternatives is of little value. The example of Russia is of doubtful value. The best may not have been done. But the author has not established that conditions would have been better if the revolutionary methods had been adopted.

The book is tiresome reading; and, except to a special student of the subject or a propagandist, is not likely to prove of interest.

S. GOPALASWAMY.

### INDIAN POPULATION PROBLEM.

POPULATION PROBLEM OF INDIA. By B. T. RANADIVE. (Studies in Indian Economics Series). (Longmans, Bombay.) 1930. 22 cm. 216 p. Rs. 6/-.

THE book is the fruit of the research work of the author made as a post-graduate student in the Bombay University and is now presented by the publishers as the latest addition to the Series of Indian Economic studies which are familiar volumes to most students of current Indian Economics. Mr. Ranadive in this work attempts to establish theoretically the general Malthusian proposition that population increases faster than means of subsistence. In his attempt to apply this theory of population to Indian conditions, he considers the principal checks to the growth of population in this country and computes the normal birth-rate on the one hand and statistically takes stock of the available Indian food supply on the other. The disparity which is thus disclosed in the rate of growth of Indian population and India's food resources lead the scholarly author to arrive at the main thesis of his work, namely, that here in India a grave danger is threatening, consequent on a much too rapid growth of population. The author does not spare himself the pain of examining the possibility of an equilibrium being established from industrial development. But his reading of the future economic development even with the maximum speed of industrialisation does not sufficiently relieve the gloomy and morbid view he takes of an overgrown Indian population. Mr. Ranadive rounds off his survey by a somewhat impassioned appeal for birth control delivered, unless we are mistaken, with something of a propagandist *flair*. Academically, the author has done good work in his dissertation. He has not attempted to make a short cut to his conclusion. Every stage in the argument that he has gained has been reached by a logical process and with the aid of a mass of statistics and facts at his command. All this is creditable. But after all, a reader of Mr. Ranadive will probably be tempted to suspect that the theoretical ground on which he takes his stand is not as firm as he seems to assume. It is only with reference to *food supply* that Malthusian theory was originally framed and the problem of the population *vis-à-vis* the food resources can be studied today only as an international phenomenon. As the author has applied the

theory in his present work, the problem has been broadened into one of population in relation to national income. That, we venture to feel, is a distinct subject which can be examined without reference to any Malthusian terminology or Malthusian preconceptions. The economic poverty of India may justify birth control. But the conversion of public opinion in its favour would depend less on economic reasoning than on an altered outlook on life under the new economic conditions. On ultimate analysis, birth control may be an ideal remedy against growing economic stress of certain classes. But so far the great bulk of the Indian population is concerned, the problem of poverty resolves itself into a new ordering of society on a new basis of distribution of income.

K. M. P.

### SHORT NOTICES.

**BAPU GANDHI.** By A. B. PIDDINGTON. (Williams and Norgate.) 1930. 20cm. 54 p. 2/6.

THIS chatty sketch of the impressions of Mahatma Gandhi formed by Mr. Justice Piddington is written in lucid, simple, picturesque and captivating style. The author holds the attention of the reader from the first page to the last. Though the author is an admirer of Mr. Gandhi, still he does not seem to have caught the spirit of M. Gandhi's teachings. The author is not much hopeful about the success of the *khadi* movement, as, in his opinion, the instinct of the masses in India is greatly in favour of fancy-coloured cloth.

The author lays the blame for India's economic misery and poverty at the door of the social and religious shortcomings of Indians. He has practically nothing to say against the British policy of exploitation of India. He has only a pious and distant sympathy for the goal of Dominion Status and does not seem to have studied deeply the political question. We wish the author had studied Gandhiji and Gandhism in a less superficial manner and though the general tone of the book is sympathetic enough, it does not present India's case for freedom, economic and political, with that accuracy and completeness which are indispensable for a proper understanding of the momentous problem.

D. V. ATHALYE.

**OUT OF BONDAGE: CHRIST AND THE INDIAN VILLAGER.** By STEPHEN NEILL. (Edinburgh House Press.) 1930. 18cm. 143p. 2.

THIS is not, as the title might suggest, a book either on the Satyagraha Movement or Divorce, but is a missionary book about the villagers of South India. It exhibits occasional traces of an independent mind.

H. V. E.

**SEX RELATIONS WITHOUT MARRIAGE. A DEFENCE OF THE CHRISTIAN STANDARD.** By A. HERBERT GRAY. (Student Christian Movement, London.) 25 p. 6 d.

**THE ROMANCE OF MARRIAGE.** By THE REV. CANNON SPENCER H. ELLIOTT. (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London.) 16cm. 78 p. 1/—

THESE small books deal with the marriage question from a Christian point of view. But, in these days, when westerners are drifting towards anarchy in every matter, it is doubtful if even Christ's teachings will be respected. However, the Church must try to preach the Gospel, even when the prospects of re-establishing the Christian Religion seem very gloomy,

and, from this standpoint, these booklets are welcome. They preach that at least for the good of the Society, if not for that of religion, the institution of marriage should be respected and preserved.

V. M. BHAT.

## Miscellanea.

### MR. JOSHI'S SPEECH AT THE R. T. C.

*The following is the text of the speech of Mr. N. M. Joshi at the Round Table Conference on Nov. 20 :—*

I propose to make a brief statement on behalf of the workers of India on the momentous problems before this Conference. The workers of India want full responsible self-government as much as the other classes. Although on account of ignorance and illiteracy they do not formulate their ideas and express their feelings in the same manner as the educated classes, those of us who are in close contact with them know how strong their feelings are and how easily they are aroused.

During my visits to this country I am often asked how the workers will fare in a self-governing India. My reply has been that I hope their conditions under self-government will improve, but that at least their position will not be worse than it is today. That is a cautious reply, but I think it is an entirely adequate one. No special justification is needed for the establishment of self-government in India, it is the retention of foreign domination which requires special justification.

While thinking over this subject, I have also asked myself what the British Government has done for the Indian workers and what it can do for them now. Though the British Government has much experience of the evils which generally follow in the wake of industrialisation, they were not able to avoid them in India when that country gradually developed industries. It is true that Factory Acts were passed from time to time, but the motives of the British Government, through whose pressure in the initial stages the legislation was passed, could easily be questioned; and, as the Government of India was also greatly influenced by European industrialists in India, these measures were very inadequate and could not effectively check the evils which were growing apace. Latterly also some legislation has been passed through the influence of the International Labour Conferences and on account of the pressure of the recently started but rapidly growing trade union movement in the country. But even these efforts fall short of the needs of the time, on account of the fact that the Government of India and the Provincial Governments are now dominated by the joint influence of the Indian and European industrialists in India. To-day the Secretary of State for India and the British Parliament have practically lost all their power of initiative in the matter, and the workers of India depend solely on the strength of their organisation and on whatever political influence they can bring to bear on the Indian legislatures.

What would have been the condition of Indian workers if British rule had never been established in India is a hypothetical question, but one can draw an inference from the fact that during the last ten years neither the Legislative Assembly nor any Provincial Council has refused to pass any labour legislation brought forward by the Government, and so it may be assumed that the position of Indian workers would not have been worse than it is to-day.

I realise that even in a self-governing India heaven will not immediately descend to earth for the

Indian workers, but their chances of success in their struggle will be greater than when they are under a Government which is really responsible neither to the British Parliament nor to the legislatures in India. The struggle will also be made somewhat easier, as the extraordinary influence which the European industrialists in India exercise today will be greatly reduced.

But this is not all my friend, Mr. Shiva Rao and myself have come to this Conference in the hope that, with the help and sympathy of the other Delegates, the constitution of a self-governing India will be so framed that the political influence of the workers on their Government will be much greater than it is to-day. For this purpose we should like in the first place the constitution to contain a declaration of the fundamental rights of workers. It is true that such a declaration has not the force of legislation, but none the less it will serve a very useful moral purpose. Secondly, the constitution must be founded upon universal adult suffrage. Much is made of the practical difficulties; it is said the constituencies would be unwieldy, but this difficulty is not expected to disappear at any time, and the Indian masses will never agree to deprive themselves of their rights of citizenship for ever. Much is also made of the difficulties created by illiteracy, but those difficulties exist even to-day in the case of persons already enfranchised or whom it is proposed to enfranchise. The possession of property added to illiteracy does not remove the difficulties which may be due to illiteracy.

Thirdly, without entering on the question of a federal or unitary form of government, the workers of India insist that labour legislation shall always remain a central or federal subject, and that the central or federal Government shall always retain to itself the power of control and supervision in its enforcement. If labour legislation and its enforcement are left to Provincial Governments or to the constituent parts of the federation, labour legislation and its enforcement will be very difficult. If the constitution does not make proper provision for this it will be utterly useless to the workers. Moreover, labour legislation and its enforcement must remain central or federal subject for the ratification and enforcement of International Conventions on labour subjects.

Here I must draw the attention of the Conference to the fact that by Section X of Article 405 of the Treaty of Versailles, Part XIII, Labour, a federal State, the power of which to ratify International Conventions is limited, escapes more easily from its International obligations on labour matters. The practical effect of this section of the Peace Treaty to the disadvantage of workers may be judged from the fact that while even a backward country like India under a unitary form of Government could ratify eleven Conventions of the International Labour Conference, advanced countries like Australia and Canada under a federal form of Government could ratify only four conventions each. I, therefore, hope that the power of the Indian Central Government, whether Federal or Unitary, to ratify international conventions and to secure their enforcement will not be in any way limited. This subject will no doubt be considered by the Royal Commission over which Mr. Whitley has been very ably presiding and although the Commission may not report before this Conference finishes its work, I have absolutely no doubt in my mind that the Commission will generally support the view that I have put forward.

I must here refer to the position of Indian States whose coming under the Indian Constitution will whole-heartedly be welcomed by Indian workers. I hope the Representatives of the Princes will agree to

a constitution in which Labour Legislation as well as its enforcement for the whole of India and the ratification of international conventions and their enforcement will not have unnecessary difficulties due to the form of the Constitution. At present the Indian States have done nothing to recognise their International obligations in Labour matters which I hope they will not hereafter do. Lastly, may I say that to-day labour is not the only matter which is internationally considered. The tendency to find an international solution to our difficulties is naturally and very properly growing and occupying a wide sphere and I hope that our constitution will be so framed in this Conference that India as a whole will be able to take full benefit of the International action and India as a whole will also be able to be helpful in the international solution of the difficulties of the world. Whatever form of Government we decide to establish in this Conference let us at least do nothing to make future changes in that form practically impossible.

We cannot settle our constitution for all time. If it is found by experience that the form of government which we settle in this Conference is not suited to the needs of the future, it should be possible by constitutional means to secure such changes in the form of government as may be found necessary. If my suggestions regarding incorporation of the Declaration of the Fundamental Rights of Indian workers in the constitution and the establishment of universal adult franchise be accepted, as I hope they will be, and if the constitution is so framed that Central or Federal Government, with or without Indian States included in it, will retain in its hands full authority without any limitations regarding labour legislation and its enforcement and regarding the ratification and enforcement of international conventions and other obligations, the immediate establishment of full self-government in India will not only secure for the workers of India an improvement in their present position, but eventually will enable them to occupy the same position in their country as the workers of Great Britain are occupying in their own.

#### THE PERSONNEL OF THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE.

*The following from the pen of Mr. S. G. Vaze was published in the Spectator of November 8.*

It will be the aim of the Indian Delegation to the Round Table Conference, to be inaugurated by the King on Wednesday next, to seek the greatest common measure of agreement among its various groups. Anything in the nature of an agreed scheme that will emerge from their deliberations will then be considered by the British Government, which has already given an undertaking to embody such of it as is acceptable to itself in a Bill to be laid before Parliament for enactment. In order to appreciate how far the different interests in India are able to achieve a synthesis of their differing policies, it is necessary to understand what policy each interest stands for. One such interest is the Indian Princes, of whom all that is necessary to say is that they are expected to propose at the Conference the immediate establishment of a federation with British India in respect of matters of joint concern such as defence, customs, salt, posts and telegraphs, railways and currency. They will probably also ask that the rights of paramountcy which the Government of India as a whole exercises at present shall in future be exercised by the Viceroy acting singly in his capacity as representative of the Crown.

After the Princes, the Hindus and the Moslems form the largest sectional interests. The latter will be represented at the Conference by an exceptionally powerful group, the most prominent members of which are the Aga Khan, a figure of international repute; Sir Muhammad Shafi, an ex-member of the Viceroy's Executive Council and this year's representa-

tive of India at the Imperial Conference; Mr. M. A. Jinnah, the leader of the Moslem party in the Central Legislature; and Mr. Mahomed Ali, at one time Mr. Gandhi's strongest supporter in the non-co-operation campaign. In politics, except for Mr. Jinnah and Mr. Mahomed Ali, this group usually takes an ultra-conservative line, but the upheaval in India is now so great that even they may be expected to support the so-called National Demand which has crystallized into the formula of "Dominion Status with Temporary Reservations," the reservations being the army, foreign policy, and relations with the Princes. These three matters the Indian people are willing for some time to leave outside the control of the Legislature, all other matters being administered by Ministers responsible to a popularly-elected Legislature. The Moslem leaders will, however, ask for drastic safeguards in the interest of their own community, the most important of which are: (1) the retention of separate communal electorates; (2) a weightage of representation in their favour in those provinces where they are in a minority, without, however, their proportionate share being reduced in the two provinces of Bengal and the Punjab, where they are in a majority, in order that the minority communities in these provinces be similarly treated on the basis of reciprocity; (3) the grant of full responsible government to the two frontier provinces where they are in an overwhelming majority; (4) the constitution of Sind into a separate self-governing province, where, too, they are in an overwhelming majority; (5) the adoption of the federal plan of government, with all unenumerated residuary power residing in the provinces, so that the possibilities of central intervention may be reduced to a minimum; (6) a proportionate reservation of appointments in the public service to members of the Moslem community; and (7) similar reservation of Cabinet appointments in the Central and Provincial Governments. There is a section of Mahomedan opinion in India which dissociates itself from these extreme communal demands, but the Raja of Mahmudabad, who was the only representative of it among those invited to the Round Table Conference, having intimated his inability to attend, this opinion will not find expression in St. James' Palace.

Moslem communalism has provoked a reaction among the Hindus, which will be voiced at the Conference by Mr. M. R. Jayakar and Dr. Moonje, members of the last Legislative Assembly, and Raja Narendra Nath, who has had experience of district administration. Their chief concern, however, is not to ask for special advantages for the Hindu community, but to see that the Moslems do not extort too many concessions which will in the long run only accentuate communal differences and foredoom Indian self-government to failure. They will therefore oppose a numerical allocation of posts in the services and Cabinets to different communities, the kind of federation proposed by the Moslems, and territorial redistribution so as to increase the number of provinces under a predominating Moslem control, and will do their level best to persuade the Moslem community to give up separate electorates or at least to limit their duration to a definite period. In general politics these Hindu representatives are progressive and will give strong support to the Liberals in pressing the National Demand. Among the Hindus themselves there are representatives of the Non-Brahmans and the so-called depressed classes who will try to safeguard the interests of their sub-communities. The former will have for their spokesmen Dewan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar, Sir A. P. Patro and Mr. B. V. Jadhav, former Ministers in Madras and Bombay respectively. At one time they were keen on having a number of seats in the Legislatures reserved for their community on account of its backwardness. This reservation has been in operation for ten years, and has been proved to be no longer necessary by actual results at previous elections. They will therefore hardly press for its retention now, and are expected to join wholeheartedly in the general political demand. The depressed classes have an exceptionally able

and strong advocate in Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, who, as your columns showed a few weeks ago, while urging the claims of his community, will not be behindhand in asking for power at the Centre as well as in the provinces. The Indian Christian community is represented, on the Protestant side, by Mr. K. T. Paul and, on the Catholic, by Rao Bahadur Panniselvam, and the Sikh by Sardar ujjal Singh and Sardar Sampuran Singh.

The only non-communal and non-sectional group in the Conference will be that of the Liberals, among whom are the Rt. Hon'ble Srinivasa Sastri, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Aiyar, Sir C. H. Setalvad, and Mr. Chintamani, all of whom, besides being tribunes of the people, have held high office under government, the first as the Government of India's Agent to the Government of the Union of South Africa and the rest as Ministers or Executive Councillors. While they have always set a face of flint against extremist methods of political agitation, they are among the most forward looking Indian politicians, and it is they who originally formulated and popularized the National Demand, subsequently adopted by the Congress politicians, who, however, later gave it up in favour of independence. They will take the strongest possible line at the Conference and will refuse to consider reforms of a lower level than those contained in this Demand. If they find that, owing to the opposition of Government, this Demand is not likely to be conceded, they will disown any further concern in the Conference proceedings and retire. On the communal question, the Liberal party, consisting as it does of members of all communities, will go the farthest length in reason to satisfy the claims of the Moslems and other minorities and the Princes, though on matters of principle they will be firm as rock.

Last, we can only mention a few of the representatives of sectional interests. the Maharaja of Darbhanga and Sir Provas Chander Mitter of the landholders, Sir P. O. Sethna, Sir Cowasji Jehangir and Mr. Mody of the Indian commercial community, Sir Hubert Carr and Mr. Gavin Jones of the European commercial community, Mr. Joshi and Mr. Shiva Rao of Labour, Mrs. Shah Nawaz and Mrs. Subbaroyan of women and Dewan Bahadur Ramachandra Rao of the people of the Indian States.

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

- CHINA'S REVOLUTION FROM THE INSIDE. By R. Y. LO. (Abingdon Press, New York.) 1930. 20cm. 307p. \$ 2.00.
- REVOLUTION IN INDIA. By JOHN DELLBRIDGE. (Kennerly, Morley & Mitchell.) 1930. 20cm. 56p. 2/6.
- SOME INDIAN PROBLEMS. Being Some Essays addressed to Patriots with the "Congress Mentality." By FREDERICK WILLIAM WILSON. (Lala Ram Mohan Lal, Allahabad.) 1929. 20cm. 108p. Re. 1/8.
- CHRISTA SEVA SANGHA. By JACK C. WINSLOW. (S. P. G. F., London.) 1930. 20cm. 62p. 1/-
- THE GARDEN CREEPER. By SANTA DEVI AND SEETA DEVI. (Prabasi Press, Calcutta.) 1930. 332p. Rs. 2/8.
- PROGRESS AND RELIGION. By CHRISTOPHER DAWSON. (Sheed & Ward.) 1929. 22cm. 154p. 10/6.
- SURVIVALS AND NEW ARRIVALS. By HILAIRE BELLOC. (Sheed & Ward.) 1929. 20cm. 288p. 3/6.
- IF I WERE JEEJEEBHOY JAY! Being the dream of a happy world, with Special reference to India. By JAL F. KALIANIVALA. (Stockwell.) 20cm. 16p. 1/-
- BEHIND THE SCENES IN MANY WARS. By GEORGE MACMUNN. (Murray.) 1930. 22cm. 370p. 15/-
- AN ELEMENTARY TEXT-BOOK OF THE LAWS OF ENGLAND. (2nd Edn.) By ALERED HENRY RUEGG. (Allen & Unwin.) 1930. 22cm. 194p. 7/6.
- BOMBAY TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW. Ed. By CLIFFORD MANSHRDT. (Taraporevala, Bombay.) 1930. 25cm. 104p. Rs. 4.