

# The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO. OFFICIATING EDITOR : S. G. VAZE.

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

VOL. XV, No. 17. }

POONA—THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1932.

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

## CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.     —     —	... 133
ARTICLES :—	
Two Lions in the Way.—II. By S. G. Vaze	... 135
India and Japan                     ...	... 136
REVIEWS :—	
Land Policy. By D. S. Modak, M.A., LL.B.	... 137
Indian Citizenship and Civilization. By Prof. R. V. Oturkar, M.A. ...	... 138
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
Election in States? By Sir Mirza M. Ismail	... 139
Fergusson College. By Prof. R. Sadasiva Aiyar, M.A. . . . .	... 140

## Topics of the Week.

### Congress Session.

THE attempt to hold the Congress session at Delhi in defiance of the Government's orders has resulted in the rounding up of 700 Congressmen, among whom are such leaders in the front rank as Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, Pandit Malaviya, Mr. Gangadharao Deshpande, and Mr. Konda Venkatapayya. In spite of all the elaborate precautions made by the police a session was held for ten minutes, which, it is said, adopted five resolutions. The resolutions have not been published in the press, and must therefore be presumed to have endorsed the civil disobedience campaign and perhaps laid down a programme for execution by Congressmen in future. It was believed in some quarters that Congress leaders, if allowed to meet in regular session, would give a new and, to Government, less objectionable turn to the movement and would perhaps even make a gesture of peace. These anticipations, which were never shared by Government, have apparently not been realised, and the session was perhaps designed to further the civil disobedience movement. If the actual happenings bear out what has been presumed above, the action of Government is only such as might have been expected. Prior to the holding of the session, the *Tribune* wrote: "If the Subjects Committee does decide to endorse the policy of civil disobedience, the Government will be entitled to treat it as an unlawful association under the Criminal Law Amendment Act, but not before". But the Government

has all along been taking preventive action to put down the civil disobedience movement; and it was too much to hope that on this occasion it would act differently. But reaffirmation of civil disobedience and the planning of such a campaign for the future, assuming that this represents the substance of what was done at the Congress session, would furnish, in the eyes of the authorities in India and England, a *post facto* justification for the action they have taken. Until the so-called dual policy now in force gives place to a single policy of conciliation, such events cannot be prevented.

### Need for a Conciliatory Approach.

IF it be true that the Congress session was intended to be held to further civil disobedience it proves that neither the Congress nor the Government is willing yet to explore a *via media* with a view to the termination of the present impasse. We have often urged Government in the past to be ever on the watch for a suitable opportunity of dropping repression and relying solely upon conciliation. Time must come when this process will have to be commenced, but the danger is that it will be too long delayed. However, the need for a conciliatory approach must equally be urged upon the other side, and we are very glad to see that the London correspondent of the *Hindu* in his despatch of the 8th inst. takes this course. He says: "I must add that it is rather regrettable that the Congress leaders have on their part not shown a little more readiness to approach the other side with a view to peace." "I agree", he continues, "that every possible obstacle has been put in their way; but they would not have weakened their position if they had given some indication of a desire to suspend civil disobedience provided the Government were willing to withdraw the more objectionable Ordinances. Negotiations will have to be resumed sooner or later. In a struggle like this no party remains the exclusive victor. So much suffering could be avoided by the exercise of a little reasonable common sense." We had hoped that the Congress session to be held, under the guidance of Mrs. Naidu and Pandit Malaviya, would have given some indication of a willingness to make advances. The Congress session would hardly have been prohibited if such were the purpose of holding it. The net result of the attempt to hold the session and its suppression is to add enormously to the existing bitterness, which will greatly increase the difficulties of those who would seek a way out of the present deadlock.

### Reforms Side of the Dual Policy.

IN two respects considerable progress is being made with the reforms side of the Government's dual policy. The North-West Frontier Province has already been made a Governor's province and put on a footing of equality with other Provinces. It need hardly be said that the reform is of an exceptionally

liberal nature, the province having obtained at one bound the advance made by other provinces through several decades. Not only this, but the Province is to share in the further advance which all Provinces will make about a year hence. This good luck would hardly have fallen to the Province's lot, if its constitutional reform had not been made, by the insistence of the Muslim community, a part of the general constitutional question in the country at large. The second step taken in this direction is the assembling of the Sind Conference under the presidency of Mr. Brayne. An expert committee having found out what the deficit would be in the accounts of Sind as an independent province, it is now the duty of the people of Sind as a whole to show whether they will be willing to meet the deficit and if so, how. This Conference is certainly not a packed body, the ablest representatives of those in favour of and opposed to the separation of Sind being included in it. To some the phenomenal progress being made in implementing promises of reform in which Moslems are more interested than Hindus would appear to be invested with a sinister meaning. It would be to them additional evidence of the Government's determination to pursue a divide and rule policy. This fear was voiced by Mr. Attlee in his speech in the Commons the other day. We do not share in this fear. We only wish that constitutional progress in other directions also were as expeditious as in these.

\* \* \*

#### Non-Violence and Repression.

THE *Indian Social Reformer*, commenting upon Lord Sankey's defence of the dual policy of Government, including repression of the Congress campaign, makes an observation, which will be accepted everywhere, viz. that British opinion must be taken to stand solidly behind the present policy. Even more than Lord Sankey's statement, the clear condemnation of civil disobedience by Col. Wedgwood, who is under no sort of obligation to support Government and who would regard himself as very happy if he could conscientiously side with the Congress, must be taken as representative of radical opinion in England. There are of course many who would wish the Government as a matter of expediency to follow a policy of conciliation instead of repression, but it is difficult to come across any Englishmen who support the renewal of civil disobedience by the Congress and who would therefore deny moral justification for repressive action on the part of Government provided it was strictly limited to the necessity of the case.

The *Reformer* denies moral justification for repression on the ground that civil disobedience is a movement of non-violence. This, we fear, is too wide a proposition. We have not seen it maintained by any one, that because a movement, as designed by its originators, eschews the use of force, it must be allowed to go on uninterrupted in its course. The *Reformer* itself has not consistently maintained this position. Just now there are two satyagraha movements afoot in India. One is conducted by the depressed classes and high-caste champions of the depressed classes in Nasik, with a view to asserting the right of these classes to enter temples. This in its intention and origin is at least as peaceful as the wider satyagraha movement carried on by the Congress. The non-violence of some of the acts of Congressmen in pursuance of their movement such as raids on salt pans, cutting down trees in jungles is not quite obvious. Yet we never found the *Reformer* protesting against repression used against these satyagrahis when this repression was no less severe than that used against Congress satyagrahis. We are aware of the *Reformer's* view that the

depressed classes are not justified in carrying on this satyagraha. If for this reason it thinks that this particular satyagraha may be put down, then it follows that what entitles a movement to be carried on without let or hindrance is not its non-violence but the moral basis underlying it. The Government's present policy of repression can be impugned on many grounds, but the ground on which the *Reformer* impugns it appears to us to be a little shaky.

\* \* \*

#### Federation Essential to Swaraj.

IN spite of the reiteration in official circles and in the circles of responsible politicians of the indispensable necessity of federation for the attainment of Swaraj, suggestions still continue to be made that, in view of the uncompromising attitude of the Princes, federation should for the time be suspended and such an advance should be made in the British Indian constitution as may be possible without it. Mr. Jinnah is even more explicit now in this sense than before. But he is a Moslem and does not count. Among the Hindus, Mr. Chintamani, Sir Kurma Reddy and Sir A. P. Patro, have definitely placed themselves among the irresponsibles. Their ranks are now swollen by the addition of Mr. C. V. Hanumantha Rao, who writes in the *Leader* of 23rd April: "To couple federation with central responsibility if the Princes are willing to exhibit a reasonable frame of mind may be legitimate enough; but when it is discovered that they intend to drive home the opportunity thus offered them by insisting, as has been pointed out, on difficult conditions, the best thing would be to separate the two and to proceed with the implementing of central responsibility as expeditiously as possible, leaving federation to be established later, when the States become reconciled to their responsibilities and obligations as co-equal partners with the British Indian provinces in the all-India federation. It is to be hoped that means to this end will be explored in the very near future." How dense these people must be not to understand that to scrap federation now is to give the go-bye to all hope for reform in British India. It is time British Indians taught themselves to look upon any terms that the Princes may make as reasonable.

\* \* \*

#### Jallianwalla Bagh.

INDEED a new light is now thrown upon what is known as the Jallianwalla Bagh massacre. It was generally believed that General Dyer intended a massacre to take place. But Mr. Miles Irving who was Deputy Commissioner of Amritsar in 1919 recently told Mr. Edward Thompson facts about the firing which put a new complexion upon the tragedy. We all know that Jallianwalla Bagh is shut in by buildings which afforded no outlet to the crowds gathered there on the fateful day. Now it appears that Dyer "never knew that there was no way out." Nor was he proud of the wholesale slaughter that took place there, as perhaps he himself was led to believe later. He was ashamed of the whole business. Mr. Irving said to Mr. Thompson: "Dyer came to me all dazed and broken up", and Mr. Pinkle, Financial Secretary, told Mr. Thompson that six months later Dyer came through his station and dined with him and said to him; "I haven't had a night's sleep since that happened. I keep on seeing it all over again." Dyer explained that he never knew that there was no way out, and that when the crowd did not scatter but held its ground he thought it was massing to attack him; so he kept on firing. The story that Dyer himself later related made him out to be almost incredibly inhuman. What now comes out is more in consonance with human nature.

\* \* \*

## TWO LIONS IN THE WAY.

### II.

**I**F it is true that the demands of Princes offer a more formidable obstacle to the attainment of democratic Swaraj than the demands of Moslems, it is still more true that our nationalist leaders are far more alarmed at the latter than at the former. Whatever be the reason, they are at least as tender to Princes as they are hard upon Moslems.

This is true of almost all schools of thought amongst nationalist politicians, the Congress being no exception.

The Congress gave complete freedom to its delegate at the R.T.C. to support such a scheme of Swaraj as he thought fit, but fettered his discretion in one respect. He must not agree to communal electorates. His mandate was that "joint electorates shall form the basis of representation in the future constitution of India", and he was true to it.

When Sir Hubert Carr defended the establishment of separate electorates for a temporary period, only so long as there persisted the present "tremendous distrust dividing the different communities", but these electorates giving place in more favourable circumstances to joint electorates which make for "unity of India," Mahatma Gandhi summarily dismissed this plea as "the very negation of responsible government, the very negation of nationalism." In doing so, there is no question that he only voiced the general sentiment in the country.

But if such vehemence is to be shown in opposing communal election, what is the degree of violence that your nationalist should exhibit in opposing stark nomination unredeemed by an element of any kind of election? Communal election is anyhow a form of election, and if that is so bad how much worse must be non-election! If communal electorates are a negation of responsible government, how is nomination to be described?

But Mahatma Gandhi, whose democratic sentiment was so deeply outraged by communal electorates was totally unconcerned about nomination. Would it be believed that this "undiluted democrat" dared not refer directly to "election" when making an appeal to Princes? Nor was he given a mandate to oppose nomination by the Princes.

It is not intended to hold up the Mahatma to any special blame. He very truly represents in his own person the average nationalist politician in this respect.

Mahatma Gandhi did not care to explain why nomination was acceptable to him in one case, when he could not bear the very idea of a certain form of election in another. He was much too astute to do it. But Pandit Malaviya in his ingenuous way laid it all bare. He was, if possible, even more unalterably opposed to communal electorates in the case of Moslems than the Mahatma, and, if possible, even more compliant of nomination in the case of Princes.

Election is good; it will come soon; and even if it carries what harm? When did it come in En-

gland itself? Are nominated people unpatriotic? And even if they are what help? A federal system is necessary for British Indian reform. Princes must be induced to come in, whatever price they may demand. Such was the Pandit's argument, and he only expressed what lay deep down in the Mahatma's heart.

It would be interesting to recall the Pandit's words. "I have no doubt in my own mind that that principle (of popular representation) will be introduced in many States at an early time; but it is neither wise nor graceful for us British Indians to insist that there shall be no federation with British India and Indian States unless the Indian States agree that the representatives who will come to represent the States in the Federal Assembly shall be elected by the popular voice. I submit that that is a matter which should be left to the judgment, the patriotism, and the statesmanship of Indian rulers."

Dr. Ambedkar here mischievously chipped in: "Why are not you similarly kind to Sir Samuel Hoare, and let him take his own time for introducing popular institutions in British India?" he asked. But Lord Sankey came to the Pandit's assistance and warded off the thrust.

The Pandit quickly went on to his next point: "We should not think that, if members who come to the Federal Assembly from the States will not be elected by some popular method, they will not be useful. We must remember that even in England it has taken a long time to arrive at the present franchise... (The introduction of election in the States) is only a matter of time... let us show patience and courtesy, let us hope that such institutions will be established in proper time, but (by our injudicious insistence) let us not do anything to create unnecessary obstacles in the way of the establishment of that all-India federation upon which now, as matters stand, our hopes so much depend."

This last sentence furnishes the reason for the marked differentiation in the treatment of Moslems' and Princes' demands by nationalist India. The reason, as expressed by Pandit Malaviya, was paraphrased with brutal frankness by Col. Haksar in this way: "The paramount consideration is to create a State in India in which no part will stand outside that State. The paramount consideration is to unite the country. If that be the paramount consideration, I say that that object should be achieved at all costs, and that nothing should be allowed to come in the way of the attainment of that object." Remember, at all costs! No price can therefore be too heavy.

What is true of nomination is true of every other demand made by Princes. We all remember the hue and cry that was raised all over the country when in pre-federation days Princes claimed that the rights of paramountcy over them could only be exercised by the Viceroy as distinct from the Government of India. What legal acumen was not displayed at the time to disprove this contention! There is now

no soul who will dare dispute it. Federation must be achieved at all costs.

How much grinding of nationalist teeth was caused in the Federal Structure Committee when it was suspected that Moslems sought to take away from the central government the power of enacting civil and criminal law! As a matter of fact a Moslem leader proposed in the Committee that civil and criminal law should be handed over by the States to the federal government, and as a reaction to it, all nationalist voices were hushed in silence. What can be asked of Moslems cannot certainly be asked of Princes.

It may be that some anti-nationalist and anti-democratic arrangements will eventually be made in the constitution as a consequence of Moslem demands. If so, they will be made in spite of a terrific opposition to them from nationalist quarters. But the far more anti-nationalist and anti-democratic arrangements that will surely come to be made as a consequence of Princes' demands will be made without any show of opposition to them from nationalists, and in a great many cases their acquiescence will be as good as active consent.

The key to the whole situation lies in this. Federation must be formed **AT ALL COSTS**, and no cost paid in the shape of concessions to Princes can be counted too great; but apparently Moslems are not a necessary part of federation, and no concession need be shown to them.

S. G. VAZE.

## INDIA AND JAPAN.

(Contributed.)

**T**HE intense interest felt by the political-minded in questions of Indian reform makes them unmindful of some of the most vital events going on in other parts of the world. It is, however, not only the duty of our leaders to add their weight to the general liberal opinion in the world, but it is also to the interest of Indian progress that developments in other parts should take place on sound lines and not from precedents which may be damaging to the Indian cause. It is thus a great pity that the League of Nations and other international activities do not appeal to our leaders who are sometimes prone to speak sneeringly of Geneva and occasionally even to doubt the reality of the advantages India derives from its membership of the League.

Two matters of great moment are being considered by international statesmen at present, on both of which Indian opinion deserves to be focussed. One of these, viz. the Disarmament Conference, is of direct interest to this country which is feeling the effects of high cost of armaments which have necessarily to be maintained to ensure the peace of the land, both internal and external. But it is proposed to speak here at some length only of the other question now confronting the world, viz. the high-handed action of Japan in China. Public opinion in Europe is slowly coming to realise that the policy of Japan, if crowned with success by tacit acquiescence in *faits accomplis*, will inevitably lead to another great

war and undo for ever the work that the League of Nations is trying to achieve by replacing the arbitrament of war by a peaceful settlement of international disputes. But there are powerful influences at work in Europe on the side of Japan. For one thing Japanese propaganda appears to be well organised and has captured some of the great organs of public opinion. The powerful interest of armament manufacturers who make enormous profit by selling the instruments of destruction to the belligerents is against the policy of peaceful settlements. The economic depression and the heavy weight of taxation in all countries makes their people anxious to do nothing which may add to these burdens if international good behaviour on the part of Japan is insisted upon by the nations of the world.

It is unnecessary to enter into the rights and wrongs of the Japanese case against China. Japan solemnly accepted three years ago the Briand-Kellogg Pact and has bound herself by divers other engagements to agree to settle her disputes by peaceful methods. But she is obviously acting against the letter and the spirit of all these solemn engagements. She has practically driven the Chinese out of Manchuria and has set up a new puppet government there. At Shanghai also she has been taking action which but for the economic depression and the natural lassitude caused by the Great War would have led to strong action on the part of the great powers. On neither of the points in dispute is she prepared to abide by the decision of an impartial commission of inquiry and she is therefore the aggressor by every accepted canon.

Japan seeks to justify her strong action by pointing to the disorganised state of China, forgetting that her own intrigues are not a little responsible for this state of things. Recently, however, there has been going on some propaganda for the purpose of excusing the Japanese Government because the War Office in Tokyo is too strong for the nominal heads of Government, who have perforce to defend the actions of hectoring hot-heads in order to escape the fate of some of the prominent men in Japan who have been recently murdered for their pacific opinions and inclinations. But if this is a fact, does it not amount also to a want of proper organisation in Japan itself? The war-lords of China are paralleled by the irresponsible war-office of Japan and Chinese bandits by the gang of youthful political murderers. The only difference is that Japan has an efficient military machine which she intends to use relentlessly for political ends. China has neglected this machine and makes use of the equally effective, though slow-acting, weapon of economic boycott. In India where the leaders have been trying to employ economic boycott as a political weapon, the contention of Japan that the Chinese boycott is the cause of her action cannot find any sympathisers. India must sympathise with a nation, weak in a military sense, which is up against an unscrupulous bully, the successful outcome of whose bellicose policy will throw back all modern movements for the peaceful advance of all nations.

Although India is an original member of the League of Nations its foreign policy is for the moment dictated by the British Government, and it cannot therefore do anything decisive in the political sphere. But Indian public opinion can, all the same, make itself felt in this matter. Japan depends for its prosperity and even for its military effectiveness on its industry and trade and its growing hold on the Indian markets, while a serious menace to the growth of Indian industries gives India a powerful lever to make its opinion felt in Japan. If the League of Nations were to take a strong line and to bring into operation some of the steps contemplated in the Covenant for bringing pressure on aggressor countries, the Indian Government will naturally have to put an embargo upon all Japanese imports and this will open the eyes even of the war lords of Tokyo who are at present running amok. At present perhaps they are counting upon the actual political conditions in India when the boycott of British goods is giving the opportunity of a life-time to Japanese industrialists. But we would appeal to our merchants to show Japan that Indian opinion is distinctly against her in this Sino-Japanese conflict by using the weapon of boycott against Japanese goods. Indian merchants are making great sacrifices in order to carry on the boycott against British goods. They would be doing a great service to the peaceful progress of the world if they were to give a clear warning to Japan that a continuance of her present hectoring attitude against China will greatly reduce her trade with India as Lancashire trade has been reduced during the last few years. Such a demonstration will redound to the credit of a country which prides itself on its devotion to ideals and which is connected by old religious associations with the ancient land of China. Such a demonstration will moreover slacken the stranglehold which Japanese goods are getting on Indian markets and will strengthen the Swadeshi movement on which the future prosperity of India so vitally depends.

## Reviews.

### LAND POLICY

**LAND PROBLEMS AND POLICIES IN THE AFRICAN MANDATES OF THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH.** By NICK P. MITCHELL, (Louisiana State University Press.) 1931. 23cm. 155p.

WHEN the Great War came to an end in 1918, the colonial and other possessions were lost to the Central Powers and the problem before the peace diplomats was how to dispose of these possessions. The pre-war method of partitioning the conquered territories of the defeated powers among the victorious nations was considered too antiquated to suit the new ideas of administration and international relations which came to be realized after the war. The Versailles diplomats of 1919, therefore, devised a new form of colonial tenure under which the lost possessions of the Central Powers were placed in the custody

of the League of Nations on the ground that the native peoples inhabiting those territories were, by themselves, unable to stand the strain of modern civilization. By the terms of the treaty, these possessions were assigned by the League to particular nations for administrative purposes for some fixed periods. The territories so assigned are in no sense the property of the Powers administering them but are a sort of trust from the League to which periodical reports are to be submitted as regards the nature and system of government employed and general policies pursued. In the book under review, we are concerned with the African territories of the Central Powers which have been assigned to the British Commonwealth for administration. The object of the book is to see how far the Land Policy of the new Government is true to the idea of trusteeship; how far in fact it affords the natives the economic welfare and protection which they so badly require in their struggle against the non-natives.

The plan of the book is simple. After explaining what Mandates are and how they differ from colonies and crown-colonies, the author gives a brief description of the African territories involved. Then follows a description of the native systems of land tenure, the restrictions placed on the alienation of lands to non-natives and the provisions made for acquisition of land for public purposes. The restrictions on alienations are undoubtedly in the best interests of the natives and are bound to be very beneficial towards keeping the natives on the soil. The cases for and against the policy of native segregation pursued in South-West Africa are then set forth in brief but in very clear details. The next chapter discusses the miscellaneous land problem such as the Land and Agricultural Bank of South-West Africa, the agricultural education of the native people, survey and registration and the disposal of the ex-enemy property. The book concludes with a restatement of the land problem and a brief description of the value of the Mandates System. There are several maps given of different territories and they are very helpful in ascertaining the situation.

The main characteristic of the native land tenure is communal or tribal ownership of land. Occupation of land by families and individuals is permitted to a more or less extent, but fulfilment of tribal or family obligations is still a pre-requisite to freedom of occupation by individuals. The author's sympathy for natives is visible on every page and though Government's land policy in the mandated territories except South-West Africa has been stated by him to be on the whole not prejudicial to native interests, he is afraid that the administration of South-West Africa has betrayed a regrettable tendency to subject the major portion of the area to exploitation by non-natives.

The value of the book will be enhanced if the necessary details which are at present lacking in the maps are incorporated in them.

It is also strange that in a book purporting to show how far the Mandates policy is conducive to native interests, the authorities consulted should be almost wholly non-native! In the case of a book like the one under review, one naturally desires to know what the persons experimented upon think of the experiment. But to say this, is not to detract from the value of the book; for one can never be too grateful to the author and to many of those "white" experts from whom he quotes for their sympathetic insight into the problems of the natives of Africa.

D. S. MODAK.

## INDIAN CITIZENSHIP AND CIVILISATION.

## AN INTRODUCTION TO INDIAN CITIZENSHIP AND CIVILIZATION. Vols. 1 &amp; 2.

By S. V. PUNTAMBEKAR. (Nand Kishore Bros., Benares.) 1928. 19cm. pp. 353, 262. Rs. 3-8 & 3.

IT was, we believe, R. C. Dutt, who in the beginning of this century, first drew attention to the greatness and glory of ancient Indian civilisation. Since then a host of writers mostly from Bengal have distinguished themselves by writing a number of books on this subject, or on different parts of this subject. Calcutta University has a special chair for Ancient Indian History and Civilisation, which the Bombay University has not. This can sufficiently account for the paucity of students studying this subject with interest and enthusiasm on this side of the country. The book, learned as it is, has no proper place in the curriculum of the Bombay University, although it deserves to be studied by every one, who desires to qualify himself for Indian citizenship. We take this opportunity to urge upon our University authorities to rectify this defect as early as possible.

We have said that the book belongs to the tradition of Dutt and his Bengalee school, but it has a distinctive mark of its own in being exhaustive. While the earlier writers contented themselves by depicting the glory of the past, Prof. Puntambekar is not oblivious of the not glorious present. "Progress towards good life," says the author, "depends on understanding the forces of the past and the conditions of the present. . . There is political tyranny, there is social inefficiency and injustice. Man is everywhere oppressed for want of freedom—political, social, economic and religious. It is necessary, therefore, to examine these aspects of life and the forces which have moulded them in the past and are oppressing them in the present" (p. 2). Thus the author does not put a narrow interpretation upon the word "civilisation" but treats of geographical, political, social, economic, educational and a variety of forces that go to make up a civilisation. Further, to the author Indian civilisation is not simply Hindu or Muslim or Buddhist civilisation but an outcome of all these which can be called Indian and which has distinctive marks of its own.

In chapter I the author treats of the physical features and cites historical evidence to prove the fundamental unity of India. In chapter II he describes the "people" and their races, and takes a sympathetic but critical note of the influence of foreigners on India, and finally points out how a general tendency towards equality and removal of unjust distinctions is occasionally accompanied by passionate outbursts of communal claims. Having described the fundamental and distinctive cultural unity of India in chapter III the author proceeds to "aspects of citizenship" in chapter IV. His treatment of the object in this chapter testifies to his wide reading and deep scholarship. In chapter V is traced Indian social life from the earliest times when castes were not elastic, to the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries when an effort was and is made to remove something of that rigidity. Caste came into existence as an "idea of purity in food, in marriage and ritual and as a defensive weapon against deterioration of colour and conflict of customs or ideals of conduct" (p. 166). But at present the "conception of caste associated with a profession and its code of behaviour have lost its strength. Only birth element has remained." All the same the author does not appear to be an advocate of the total abolition of the caste system. Proceeding, the author treats of the origin of family, the joint family system, the four *ashramas*, the position of women and untouchability.

In these matters his views are not out of tune with the progressive ideas of the age we live in. Referring to the social life of the Muslims, he points out that the mediaeval mentality based on religion has made the Muslim society hidebound in character which "is detrimental to the ideas and needs of modern life and progress" (p. 228). Turning to the social reform movement during the last century, he divides the movement into three periods. The first is the revolutionary reform period up to 1875, in which men like Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Devendranath Tagore and Dayanand Saraswati started their campaigns. The next fifty years form the second period of evolution in which social reform was advocated by men like Ranade and Bhandarkar. From 1925 onwards has appeared the Shuddhi movement which corresponds to the counter-reformation, i. e. an attempt to assimilate the new ideas in the old structure.

Chapter VI which treats of the aesthetic life in India deals with Indian art, architecture and painting. In chapter VII and VIII, the author traces the educational and intellectual life of the people. He describes the educational system of Vedic times when the students lived with their Gurus, and of a later period when the universities such as those of Taxila and Nalanda had acquired name and fame. We agree with the author when he says that "there was always a look to the past" (p. 317). Hence there was no advance in knowledge. Coming to modern times the author not only refers to the old officialised universities but also mentions the efforts at spreading what is called "national" education.

Vol. II is largely devoted to the treatment of the economic and political aspects of Indian civilisation. The first two chapters bring out the salient features of the economic life of India, tracing it from very early times. The description however is of the most commonplace character and even an average student of economics will hardly find anything new in it. The figures given are sometimes inaccurate. E. g. the proportion of females to males in India is given as 933 whereas it ought to be 945 according to the census of 1921, and the exports of merchandise have been given as worth roughly Rs. 400 crores. The estimate is obviously too rough to be accepted as the figures of exports and imports cited on the very next page, would prove. On page 64 the author informs us that the urban guilds in India included masters, journeymen and apprentices. We personally doubt whether there were any journeymen in the urban guilds of India. Stages of industrial life quoted on page 44 will hardly bear any scientific test. Moreover, it is a wonder that the author has not referred to the bearing of economic conditions on the culture and civic life of the country. The most important economic question, which has a cultural bearing to-day, is whether we are to adopt wholly the age of machinery in India or whether we are to set our face against it and raise a cry of 'Back to Nature.' We are sorry to say that not even a passing reference is made to this question of prime importance.

The next six chapters from III to VIII deal with the political aspect of Indian citizenship.

In chapter VI the problems treated are those of Federation, Indian States and Dominion Status vs. Independence. The author generally inclines towards Federation as the future form of the Indian Constitution, although he refrains from entering into details and giving the specific form of federation that may be suitable to India. His treatment of the subject of Indian States will repay study. He classifies them into three classes based upon their relations with the British Government. With regard to such of the Indian Princes as are no better than Zamindars, the author makes a bold suggestion that "it will

be in their and country's interest if they are deprived of their ruling powers or rights of jurisdiction, as early as possible" (p. 185).

In his treatment of the question of Dominion Status *vs.* Independence, the author stands on rather debatable ground. He appears to have a feeling that the ideal of Dominion Status involves a less heavy sacrifice on the part of the people than that of independence. For he says that "Dominion Status ensures the least disturbance of old mentality and morality" while "the whole mentality and morality of our politics and worldly life will have to change before we can set ourselves properly on the path of independence" (p. 191). Personally we feel that such a belief is unfounded. The real Dominion Status is closely akin to independence. The path of Dominion Status is not a bed of roses but full of the same thorns and thistles that lie in the path of full freedom. Further, to put it frankly, India's membership of the British Empire is less natural than India's joining any League of Asiatic Nations in future to prevent their exploitation by the predatory West. But frankly these are idle discussions so long as the ideal involved in any of the two conceptions is still very far off. After all, those that believe in independence may look upon Dominion Status as a step towards it. In any case, let not the better be the enemy of the good.

In chapter VII the author enumerates the rights and duties of a citizen in a democratic state and has enumerated conditions when individual liberty might be in danger of being stifled by the inroads made upon it by the state. In chapter VIII the author refers to local self-government but does not emphasise the point that its comparative failure is due to the fact that it was begun at the wrong end. The real unit to start with was the village and the village panchayats of old ought to have been utilised while still they had not disappeared or been destroyed.

Such is the wide field covered by the author in the treatment of his subject. The variety of the topics touched upon has necessarily rendered the treatment scrappy or symptomatic in a number of places. The language of the book is uncouth and at times the reader stumbles against it. But in spite of all this the book is worthy of a place on the shelf of every Indian, whether Hindu or Muslim, that desires to be a good citizen. Everywhere the author has expressed his views in a manner that is frank, courageous and outspoken, and above all, not ordinarily met with in text-books prescribed by our University for the student world. We heartily welcome the book and wish that it is widely studied throughout the country.

R. V. OTURKAR.

## Correspondence.

### ELECTION IN STATES ?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR, — I have read with interest the editorial comments in your paper of the 14th April on the proposals made by me as regards the composition of the Federal Legislature. Your comments are said to have been occasioned by certain articles which had appeared in the Allahabad *Leader* from the pen of an ex-Inspector General of Police in Mysore. May I point out that the writer of the articles in question is not an ex-Inspector General of Police but a retired Inspector General of Education (or Director of Public

Instruction), a gentleman who, among other scholarly pursuits, takes a deep interest in all public questions ?

Your editorial suggests that I should make my views known as regards the composition of the Lower House of the Federal Legislature. I welcome the suggestion and in compliance with it, shall only quote the following remarks made by me on the subject at the meeting of the Federal Structure Committee on the 16th September 1931:—

"As regards the Lower House, the method of selection should be left entirely to the States. Conditions vary so much in different States that it does not seem either useful or practical to lay down a hard and fast rule applicable to all States alike. Each State may be left to determine for itself the best method of selecting its representatives having regard to the conditions and circumstances existing in it. The States will no doubt realise that the best and the most approved method of sending representatives to a popular Chamber is by popular election, which may be either direct or indirect. This is the goal which they should keep constantly in view, to be reached as quickly as possible. I do not think that this Committee need go further than this; the rest may well be left to time and the inexorable logic of events."

—Yours, etc.

MIRZA M. ISMAIL.

Bangalore, 19th April.

\* \* We regret the error which made us think that the writer in the *Leader* was a police man; but we meant no offence. We are sure he is a man of great cultural attainments. Still it remains true that in spite of his connection with education he is unaware of Sir Mirza Ismail's mind. The claim made by him for Sir Mirza's scheme is wholly unfounded. There will be a striking "dissimilarity of methods between British India and the Indian States in regard to the selection of members" for the lower house of the federal legislature.

But we are not inclined to blame the *Leader's* correspondent for the exaggerated merit which he was led to ascribe to Sir Mirza's scheme. He was true to his brief. The blame attaches to the compiler of the brief. Why should Sir Mirza have made two contradictory statements: first, that the States should be allowed to nominate their representatives to the Federal Assembly if they so chose; and, then, that "the Federal Assembly will consist of representatives chosen by direct and indirect election"? The writer in the *Leader* was either innocent of, or chose to ignore, Sir Mirza's statement in the Federal Structure Committee, which would make it possible for all the States' representatives in the lower house of the federal legislature to be the nominees of their rulers. It will be noted that the varying conditions in the States which appear to Sir Mirza to necessitate nomination for a time in some States have not yet made it possible for even the most advanced State to commit itself to election, even as the youngest and most backward province in British India, the North-West Frontier Province, will be required to do. Sir Mirza's advocate naturally preferred to base his encomiums upon the other statement which puts Sir Mirza's scheme in a more favourable light. This statement excludes nomination as a possible method of choosing the States' representatives in the Federal Assembly. Sir Mirza, by reaffirming the former statement, in effect repudiates his panegyrist and puts the lid upon him. Our sympathies go out to the latter—Offg. Editor.

## FERGUSSON COLLEGE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—Controversy of this kind has been so distasteful to my temper that I should not at all have cared to correct certain statements in the article on Fergusson College had they not appeared in the course of an editorial; and if, now, anything overcomes my extreme reluctance for this sort of correspondence it is the feeling that the interests of truth and fair-play require that jerrymandered statements coming officially as from the Secretary of the Board of Life-Members ought not to go unchallenged. The incidents that Prof. Shintre mentions in his reply to my letter of the 14th instant are so detached from their proper sequence as to present a distorted version of things. Kindly allow me, therefore, to state facts in their chronological sequence in order to give your readers an unvarnished account of the incidents singled out by Prof. Shintre.

When the proposal was for the first time, on 3rd Nov. 1929, formally made in the Governing Body that the recommendation of the Board of Life-Members should be set aside and that Dr. Mahajani should be appointed Principal, one of the six (now retired), who was then a member of the Governing Body, pleaded with that body, and particularly appealed to the Chairman not to follow that procedure of "issuing edicts" but to refer the question back to the life-members for reconsideration—if necessary, even with the suggestion that the life-members should recommend Dr. Mahajani for the Principalship. Though this appeal had some effect on the Chairman his advisers in the Governing Body would have none of it. The result was the appointment of Dr. Mahajani as the officiating Principal by the Governing Body's ukase and the unprecedented flouting of a long established and jealously guarded constitutional practice in the D. E. Society. The life-members who did not want their Board to be constitutionally emasculated and virtually nullified felt that the linch-pin of the Society's constitution was being pulled off and an overt slur cast on the self-respect of their Board. Anybody who understands self-respecting human nature can realize the lacerated feelings of the life-members then. It was within three days of the Governing Body's extraordinary action (i. e. on Nov. 6) that Dr. Karve moved the resolution that Prof. Shintre has quoted. It was again moved by Dr. Karve, ironically enough, at a meeting of the Board convened on purpose for entering a protest against the treatment given to life-members by the Governing Body. And what did the mover of the resolution propose? He asked the Board quietly to swallow the wanton insult given to life-members and to go on their knees to the Governing Body and to pray that they be pleased to do the very thing that they had already done in defiance of the Board—but now, in response to the Board's request! Is it a matter of surprise that Dr. Karve's resolution fell through and that the Governing Body's screw failed to receive one more turn?

For a wonder, it was again, in this very atmosphere of rasped feelings,—this time, not within three, but six days of the Governing Body's unprecedented step—that "the efforts of well-wishers" was made, to which Prof. Shintre has made reference and which the Governing Body has never failed to trot out in season and out of season as a clincher. This much-cited attempt at "compromise" was nothing more than a turning of the knife in the wound when it was

raw, for it was but a reiteration of Dr. Karve's humiliating resolution.

Well, four months later, when the officiating Principalship was about to expire and the permanent appointment was to be made, one of us, Prof. K. M. Khadye, gave a definite assurance to the Chairman of the Governing Body that he and his friends would see to it that none but Dr. Mahajani would be nominated, if only the Governing Body referred the question back to the life-members. And actually, one member of the Governing Body formally proposed, at its next meeting, when the question of confirming Dr. Mahajani came up for consideration that it should be referred to the Board. This resolution which the Chairman, backed up by supporters with a misguided sense of prestige, ruled out of order is still on the Governing Body's records. The responsibility for the rejection of a *real* compromise—not of one masquerading as such—rests, therefore, with the Governing Body. Similar efforts at compromise were made in the Board, too. Earnest appeals were made to Dr. Mahajani and his friends to take things from the life-members as the result of their free vote rather than have them from the Governing Body as impositions against the wishes of life-members. But even these efforts failed. Life-members who had addressed these appeals were told that it was better to take things from the Governing Body than from the Board. All this naturally ended in the steady growth of the tendency to disregard the Board and to carry on affairs with the help of the Governing Body. In these circumstances, it was no wonder that the life-members concluded that the Board was reduced to nullity and that therefore it was useless to attend its meetings. When Prof. Shintre says that "Prof. Aiyar and most of his friends studiously refrained from attending the meetings of the Board", he commits himself to a *suppressio veri*, for even Dr. Mahajani's friends and the Governing Body's best supporters did not for months attend its meetings. It will be interesting to study the records in this connection.

I do say that the College authorities, assured of the Governing Body's support, became, since Dr. Mahajan's appointment, totally indifferent to what the Board said or did and ceased to care for its co-operation. I do still say that co-operation when asked for was never refused. When it appeared to be asked for, it was in the form of a *post facto* ratification without any criticism for future guidance, of the steps taken by the College authorities in regard to any question. No real co-operation was sought, because they never felt the need thereof, having learnt to treat the Board with contempt. As regards the events since the Gogate incident, Prof. Shintre has no other answer than clinging as to a meaningless *Mantra* to the Governing Body's statement, the baselessness of which, at every turn, was shown up by us in our reply in *The Times of India*.

Prof. Shintre's letter is likely to give your readers the impression that what we were concerned with was not a vital constitutional issue but merely the question as to who was to be the Principal. To put this last trifle in the foreground is to bring a red herring into the discourse, to cloud the controversy and sidetrack the real point at issue—namely, whether the Board should be reduced to insignificance—a key-board for the Governing Body to play on, according to its whims.

R. SADASIVA AIYAR.