

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XVI, No. 9. }

POONA—THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 1933.

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

CONTENTS.

| | Page |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| TOPICS OF THE WEEK. | 97 |
| ARTICLES :— | |
| The Commons Debate. | 100 |
| League's New Firmness. | 101 |
| Central Responsibility—III. By Prof. D. G. Karve, M. A. | 103 |
| OUR LONDON LETTER. | 105 |
| REVIEW :— | |
| Indian Women Workers. By Prof. N. V. Godbole, M. A. | 107 |
| SHORT NOTICES. | 107 |
| BOOKS RECEIVED. | 108 |

COPIES OF THE WEEK.

Neither the one nor the other.

THE Acting President of the Indian National Congress, Mr. M. S. Aney, had altered the dates for the next session of the Congress to the 31st March and 1st April next. It has been given out that the reason for the change was the prospect that the British Government's White Paper on Indian constitutional reform would be issued about the 20th inst. and that would give the Congress adequate time to gauge the reaction of the country to the White Paper. The Congress, far from ignoring the White Paper, meant to take notice of it. According to the New Delhi Correspondent of the *Hindu*, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru expects good support from the Congress to his point of view, and it is even anticipated that political prisoners will be released simultaneously with the publication of the White Paper. Some time ago Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, an authoritative spokesman of the Congress, was reported to have stated in a press interview *exropos* Congressmen entering the legislatures, that the Congress would not hold to any policy fanatically but would consider the question when it arose. In the meanwhile he has been doing more than the average legislator to promote the passage through the Assembly of the temple-entry bill. All these are unmistakable indications of a wholesome change in the attitude of Congressmen. And the Government have time and again insisted on guarantees being offered that civil disobedience would not be revived if political prisoners were released. A decision of the kind could be taken only by the Congress in formal session. From every point of view it was both right and desirable that the Congress session should be permitted. But the Government chose to put a ban on it.

It was only natural that public disappointment and indignation should have found voice in the

Legislative Assembly. A motion for the adjournment of the House to discuss an "urgent matter of public importance" was promptly tabled on Monday last. The Government spokesman raised no opposition to the motion. Nevertheless, the motion failed to secure the support of twenty-five members of the Assembly. The action of the Assembly was at first sight most amazing, nay shocking.

But on second thoughts, it is not surprizing. It was part of a deliberate plan approved by Mr. C. Rajagopalachari himself. The Congress ban could in the last resort be discussed during the budget debates which comes off next week. But it was necessary to save time to permit of the temple-entry bill being reached on that day. The bill was somewhat low down on the Order Paper of the day. The plan was to eliminate or hustle through the earlier items on the agenda and reach the first temple-entry bill and secure the rest of the day for its discussion. There were lions in the path; the Sanatanists and the Muslims had bills in which they were interested and they could not be persuaded to drop them in order to permit the temple-entry bill being reached. And the bill may not be reached by 4 p. m. If the adjournment motion on the Congress ban had been admitted, it was due to be taken up at 4 p. m. and it would engage the House till the end of the day. In their desperate anxiety to reach the temple-entry bill, Mr. Rajagopalachari and his Assembly friends sacrificed the adjournment motion on the Congress ban. But in the event, the sacrifice was in vain; the bill was not reached at all and was crowded out.

Mr. Rajagopalachari must have felt very sad as he rose to leave his seat in the President's gallery in the Legislative Assembly on Monday last. He has been, and presumably is, one of the staunchest among the staunchest "no-changers" among the non-co-operators; he has religiously shunned contact with the "satanic" Government which was untouchable. Paradoxical as it may seem, at the instance of Mahatma Gandhi himself, the originator and high priest of non-cooperation, and with the view of saving the life of the Mahatma from a possible fast unto death, Mr. Rajagopalachari spent the last few weeks in assiduously cultivating the goodwill of the Government, lobbying members of the Assembly, which no "no-changer" may yet enter as a member, and had actually suffered himself to darken the portals of the Assembly Chamber to promote, by manoeuvres and sacrifices of cherished objects, the passage of the Untouchability bills, on which depended not only the solution of the untouchability problem involving the status of forty millions but also the life of the Mahatma himself. In the pursuit of non-cooperation, he sought the co-operation of the Government; he is now disappointed that his "enemy" did not befriend him and afford special facilities for his temple-entry bill. He stooped but did not conquer.

* * *

Welcome change.

APROPOS the attitude of the Congress towards the new constitutional reforms, Mr. C. Rajagopalachari is reported in the press to have said that the question would be considered when it arose. "If it is necessary for the political fight for Swaraj to refuse to enter the legislatures, they will be boycotted. * * * *If it is satisfactorily proved that the boycott of the legislatures will do immense harm to the country, the Congress will not boycott the Councils.*" The most significant part of the pronouncement is the one which we have put in italics. Mr. Rajagopalachari, if he is reported correctly, will not make Council entry conditional on the reforms being satisfactory in the sense of giving India the "substance of power"—a positive condition,—but on his being satisfied that boycott of them will do harm to the country—a negative one. He had had sufficient opportunity to satisfy himself whether boycott of the Montford constitution did or did not do harm to the country. Swaraj will not be promoted by boycott of the legislatures. If the right type of persons boycott them, the wrong type will get in and monkey with the constitution, under which both will have to live and suffer together. In this connection the following remarks of Mr. Jamnadas Mehta at the recent Trade Union Unity Conference at Delhi will be found apposite. "In spite of these obvious limitations, Labour must elect to make the fullest possible use of the new constitution. The decisions of the legislatures control our lives in a thousand ways. If the new constitution is good we can derive some benefit; if it is bad, we can fight its mischievous tendencies, and there is the additional advantage that we can turn the legislatures into so many platforms for the ventilation of the labour point of view."

The Alwar Situation.

THE situation in Alwar which was mystifying for some time past has now clarified. The Meo disturbances are now well under control thanks to the presence of British troops in the affected area and peace promises to return to the distracted parts of the State before very long. The work of pacification is entrusted to Capt. Ibbotson, the officer whose services have been lent to the State for the purpose. Soon after the disturbances he was sent on his mission of peace but had to give up his task owing to the failure of the State to afford him the requisite facilities. The co-operation of the State seems to have been since ensured and will, it is hoped, enable him to go ahead with his peaceful mission unhampered by avoidable obstacles. Another British officer will, besides being the Prime Minister, be in charge also of the Revenue portfolio. Both these officers are to be looked upon as State servants, but in the circumstances in which they enter upon their difficult task, may be expected to enjoy wide latitude in the discharge of their functions. At the Durbar held a few days ago the Maharaja announced further remission of revenue and other concessions to his subjects, which indicates the existence of real grievances urgently crying for relief. If these had been attended to in time, the disturbance of peace that was recently witnessed in the State would very probably have been avoided, and what is more, the intervention too of the Paramount Power in the State affairs, so distasteful to some nationalists in British India. But, as has happened on many occasions in recent months, it is really the Paramount Power which has been found by State people to be their only ultimate safeguard against being misgoverned and oppressed.

Constitutional Anomalies.

IN his recent speech at Vizagapatam on the

future Indian constitution Babu Ramananda Chatterjee, the well-known editor of the *Modern Review*, touched upon some anomalies which threaten to disfigure the constitution. An uncompromising opponent of weightage, he is unable to tolerate any departure from the well-understood and very salutary rule that representation in the legislatures granted to different communities or interests should be strictly in proportion to their strength in the total population. Needless to say that the proposal to allow to the States one-third of the total number of seats in the federal legislature though their population is less than one-fourth of the population of this country and to the Muslims an equal proportion though they number no more than a fifth of the Indian population was strongly objected to by him. Another anomaly to which he referred was the fact that in the constitutional discussions the destinies of the people of the Indian States numbering 81 millions were altogether ignored. To them he pressed for the grant of free citizenship rights. In this connection he had the following thoughtful remarks to make:

"If most of the States were governed as at present according to the will of the ruler, and if, as was hoped for, the provinces had a somewhat democratic constitution with elected legislatures, then federated India would present the strange spectacle of an assemblage of parts dissimilar and opposite in structure. That was not the case with any other federation at the present day. A notable feature of some of the important existing federal constitutions was a declaration laying down in general terms the form of government to be adopted by the States forming part of the Federation. For example, the constitution of the United States of America contained a provision guaranteeing to every State of the Union a republican form of government. In a Federated India the provinces are to have a more or less advanced form of representative government. Such should also be the form of government in the States. Similarity of forms of government in the States and the provinces was not demanded for the sake of artistic symmetry. The States' people should have free representative institutions in their own interests. It was necessary in the interests of the provinces also that the States' people should have citizens' rights."

Bengal Budget.

THE Bengal budget presented to the legislative council last week discloses a deficit bordering upon two crores. This is due in the main to the abnormal fall in the prices of jute and rice, the inelasticity of land revenue and the heavy expenditure involved in the suppression of the terrorist and the civil disobedience movements during recent years. The additional expenditure on this account which stood at Rs. 21½ lakhs in 1931-32 will have risen to Rs. 53¾ lakhs during next year and aggregates nearly Rs. 1¼ crores during the years ending with the close of the next official year. To enable our readers to appreciate the havoc caused by the drop in prices, it is enough to mention that the value of the jute and rice crops alone, not to mention any other crops, has been reduced by as much as Rs. 122 crores. Thanks to the permanent settlement, land revenue receipts are incapable of any expansion, so that while everybody else is contributing his mite to relieve the present financial crisis in the province, the pockets of the wealthy zamindars of Bengal who are in a position to help to a considerable extent in lifting the present financial gloom, remain practically untapped. But this is bound to continue to be so until the basis of their land revenue settlement with the Government is altered, of which there appears to be no hope in the near future. The Retrenchment Committee appointed last year had, it will be re-

membered, suggested economies amounting to nearly Rs. 2 crores; and if all their suggestions had been put into effect, the deficit would certainly have been much smaller. But for one thing, every one of its suggestions could not be expected to commend itself to the Government, and for another, some of the suggestions made by such bodies take time to be fully effective and are useless from the immediately practical point of view. Recommendations amounting to Rs. 126 lakhs in their financial effect are, we are told, of this nature; while the balance of Rs. 59 lakhs is not fully realisable, seeing that only some of the recommendations made by the Committee find favour with the Government. Even so we are unable to persuade ourselves that the Government have gone as far as they could on the road to retrenchment. The only ray of hope in the deep financial gloom with which Bengal finds herself surrounded is the impending revision of the constitution leading to the grant of more favourable financial terms to her.

Madras Budget.

THE Madras budget is a veritable oasis in the desert of deficit budgets. It not only shows no deficit but a small surplus amounting to a little over half a crore. This circumstance does not however fill us with unmixed joy, because this improvement in the provincial Government's finances is achieved at the cost of increased drink consumption. Nor is the disposal of the surplus such as to make us enthuse over it. In anticipation of the improved financial condition of the Government, public opinion without distinction of race had pressed on Government the desirability of running first to the relief of the general tax-payer. Relief to the agriculturist by a reduction of 12½ per cent. in the land revenue demand was also asked for by the local legislature only a few weeks ago. The Madras Government fly in the face of this unequivocal expression of public opinion by fully restoring the 10 per cent. cut in the salaries of their servants. Their defence of this action is based on the desirability of honouring their pledges to their employees. While nobody wants any pledges to be wantonly broken, it is also possible, as in the case of the Madras Government, to make too much of them. A restoration of the cut in services' salaries has always been understood to be contingent upon the Government's financial position showing a substantial improvement so that some relief to the tax-payer as also to the services would be simultaneously possible. We cannot help feeling that the Madras Government's attempt to justify their favouritism of their servants is anything but convincing.

Demand for Freedom of Speech in Hyderabad.

A DEPUTATION recently waited upon the Police Member of the Nizam's Government to plead with him for the grant of the elementary civic right of freedom of speech to the people of Hyderabad State. Lest it should be thought that the demand was engineered by the disgruntled Hindu subjects of the Nizam and did not command general support, it may be mentioned that the deputation included two of His Exalted Highness' co-religionists. This shows that the inconvenience resulting from the restrictions on public meetings that are enforced in the State is felt no less keenly by the Muslims than by the Hindus. The principal complaint of the deputationists was that whatever the intentions of the Nizam's Government may be, the practical effect of the enforcement of the rules governing the holding of public meetings has been to make any kind of public meeting impossible in the Nizam's territories. In the first place, no

meeting, however innocuous, can be held in Hyderabad without the previous permission of the authorities for which an application ten days in advance is necessary. Those who have anything to do with the organisation of public meetings will have no difficulty in realising how it is sometimes physically impossible to comply with this requirement. But even in cases in which the submission of the prescribed application is possible, there is no guarantee of its being accepted. Indeed if past experience is any guide, the tendency of the Hyderabad officialdom has been in the direction of discouraging such public activity by withholding the requisite permission. The case would have been different if these stringent regulations had been imposed as a result of any seditious or objectionable activity in the State. According to the deputationists, however, no judicial proceedings for any seditious or inflammatory utterance or writing have so far become necessary. And these restrictions on the people's right to assemble for the discussion of public affairs, which helps forward their political education as well, are looked upon by them as a slur on their loyalty to the Nizam and his house. The restrictions, it is officially claimed, are designed to strike at the holders of political meetings. Apparently the Nizam's Government is not subtle enough to detect any distinction between seditious meetings and political meetings; to them both are synonymous and therefore equally undesirable. But why need anybody be so harsh upon the Nizam for denying this elementary right to his people since the restrictions on free speech prevailing in Hyderabad have their counterparts in most Indian States?

Feetham Commission.

IT is a pity that the South African Indian Congress advocated the boycott of the Feetham Commission, and in doing so, went against the advice of the Indian Agent in South Africa, Sir Maharaj Singh. The Congress could have been in no doubt about the sympathies of Sir Maharaj Singh, nor of the Government and peoples of India, who are certainly not enamoured of the Asiatic Land Tenure Act. Nevertheless, it was wise that evidence should be led under protest and a strong case made out to leave Indian occupation of proclaimed areas undisturbed. If and when the final action of the Union Government on the report of the Commission was known it was time enough to consider the Indian reaction to it. It appears now that in spite of the ban laid by the Congress, as many as 4,034 forms of information have been received from Indians by the Commission. Considering that the total Indian population in the Transvaal is about 17,000, it is clear that the great majority of Indian occupants of residential and business premises on proclaimed areas have filled in their forms. According to a statement issued by the Commission, they are satisfied that "the response from the Asiatic community may be regarded as fairly adequate, the great majority of the Asiatics concerned having filled in the forms supplying the necessary information."

The divergence between the policy of the Congress and the action of the Transvaal Indians will not add to the prestige of the Congress as the most representative body, at any rate, in the Transvaal. Already criticisms have been levelled against Sir Maharaja Singh, and the Government of India that they had taken advantage of the divergence, and were splitting the Indian community. The attack is most undeserved and deplorable. The Indian community in South Africa have no greater friend than Sir Maharaj Singh who is doing his very best in various directions to help the Indians. Public opinion in India and

the Government of India and their successive Agents in South Africa have always stood by the Congress and did not a little to add to its representative character and prestige and influence with the Union Government. It is the last thing that the Indian Agent will do to part company with the Congress. Undeserved attacks on him will not rally public opinion in India to the perfectly understandable but none the less unwise policy of the Congress, which has been repudiated by the action of the great majority of the Indians most concerned in the Transvaal. In the delicate and difficult task that Sir Maharaj Singh is handling with such devotion and mature judgment he has the full support of discerning public opinion in India. And we may add that India is no less appreciative of and grateful to Lady Maharaj Singh for the splendid way she has been serving the cause of Indians, particularly the Indian women, in South Africa.

Articles.

THE COMMONS DEBATE.

THE public in India have no reason to be sorry for the debate that was raised by the die-hard section of the Conservative party in the House of Commons on Wednesday of last week. They know now that, although this section has such powerful champions as Mr. Winston Churchill in Parliament, India does not stand in any serious danger of the reforms scheme that will be formulated by Government being whittled away or emasculated by it. This will be poor consolation for India, it is true; for the scheme that Government itself will sponsor, and of which we shall know the lineaments in full on the publication of the White Paper, does not promise to be very satisfying. Still it is an advantage for our publicists to be able to take the vapourings of Mr. Churchill and his friends at their real worth. The reversion which these die-hards urged to the Simon Report (*minus* even the camouflage of transfer of law and order that was recommended in the Report) was definitively turned down by the House which stands committed to the grant of central responsibility without the latter being separated by too long an interval from full responsibility in the provinces.

Sir Samuel Hoare pleaded for being allowed to continue to work on this basis, the exact proposals that he may put forward in this behalf being subjected to scrutiny in Parliament at the proper time. The fear that is entertained in die-hard circles is lest even before the proposals are laid before Parliament Government should be too heavily committed for any subsequent alteration to be possible in any but unimportant matters and they recall the circumstances in which they were encountered by a *fait accompli* in the Anglo-Irish Treaty. Sir Samuel Hoare had to skate on very thin ice in answering this objection. There is no question, he said in effect, of imposing the Cabinet's will on Parliament. The Cabinet will first of all remit its proposals to a Joint Select Committee which will adopt what procedure it may like for securing a full and impartial consideration of them and adopt whatever modifications

may commend themselves to its judgment. Even this is not all: the proposals with the Committee's modifications will then be in the hands of Parliament, and it can accept or reject them at will. There will thus be no coercion at any stage. Parliament shall be the final determining authority. We do not think that the die-hards were quite convinced by this reasoning. Juridically, of course, the position is as Sir Samuel Hoare described it. The *de facto* position is however little different from that of the Anglo-Irish Treaty. Parliament will be no more free now to reject Government's proposals on Indian reforms as it was more than a decade ago to reject its proposals on Irish reforms. Government is under an obligation to India to stake its life on the passage of these proposals. There has been no going back from this solemn undertaking. That being so, unless in the meanwhile by some mischance Government loses the confidence of the overwhelming majority which supports it in Parliament, the translation of its proposals into an act is assured. And the proposals themselves are to be based upon the agreements reached at the Round Table Conferences. The value of these Conferences indeed consists in the fact that the conclusions arrived at by agreement between official and popular representatives attending them were no longer matters of mere academic opinion but were to form the basis of Governments' legislative proposals. That Government will agree to no far-reaching reforms is another matter, but what causes alarm to ultra-Conservative members is the fact that the agreements should have a binding force at all. Nothing that Sir Samuel Hoare said in reply could have in the slightest degree allayed this fear.

It was expected that in this debate the precise status of the Indians who would be associated with the Joint Select Committee would be defined, but unfortunately this hope has not been realised. Official references to this subject so far have been of the vaguest kind. All that has been said is that they would be taken into consultation by the Committee. How far will this consultation go? In this connection it should be remembered that the setting up of an Indian auxiliary committee is no new plan; it formed part of the machinery of investigation which was contemplated by Lord Birkenhead at the time of the appointment of the Statutory Commission. This committee was then intended to be exclusively composed of members of the Indian Parliament as the main body was to be composed exclusively of members of the British Parliament. That intention has evidently now been abandoned. But the original scope of the functions of this committee will probably be maintained intact. Government's statement regarding this subject made on November 8th, 1927, was as follows:—

When the (Statutory) Commission has reported and its report has been examined by the Government of India and His Majesty's Government, it will be the duty of the latter to present proposals to Parliament. But it is not the intention of His Majesty's Government to ask Parliament to adopt these proposals without first giving a full opportunity for Indian opinion of different schools to contribute its view upon them, and to this end it is intended to invite Parliament to refer these proposals to

consideration by a Joint Committee of both Houses and to facilitate the presentation to that Committee of the views of the Indian Central Legislature, by the delegations who will be invited to attend and confer with the Joint Committee, and also of the views of any other bodies whom the Joint Parliamentary Committee may desire to consult.

Later Lord Birkenhead said:—

We invite the Central Government to appoint a Committee to come and sit with our Joint Committee. They can examine the Report of the (Statutory) Commission. They are even given a function, if they could only understand it, more important than that of the Commission itself.

It may be broadly stated that the Indian auxiliary committee was intended to bear the same relation to the Joint Parliamentary Committee as the Central Committee did to the Statutory Commission. If this statement is even approximately correct, it will not give us too exalted a notion of the status of the Indian committee which is to sit and confer with the British Parliamentary Committee. For our experience of the Central Committee has been exceedingly unfortunate. It occupied a distinctly inferior position, not only *de jure* but *de facto*. Not only was it made clear that Parliament would have concern only with the Report of the Statutory Commission, and *not* with that of the Central Committee, but the latter was in fact afforded no opportunities of influencing the recommendations of the only report which was presented to Parliament. If the Indian auxiliary committee is in no better case it will indeed be small advantage to India. On this vital question no light has been thrown on this occasion, contrary to the hopes generally cherished in this respect. It is to be hoped, first of all, that all the different schools of thought (including ultra-radical, both in British Indian and States matters) will be represented on the committee and, in the second place, that it will be afforded full opportunities of co-operation in the final shaping of conclusions.

The question of the release of political prisoners not convicted for violence was also raised in the debate by Labour members. The composition of the Indian committee can never be satisfactory until this question is boldly tackled. But Sir Samuel Hoare did not show any disposition in the debate to tackle it boldly. In fact he refused to take any risks in the matter, and without taking risks release of civil disobedience prisoners is not possible. It is no use pointing forever to the failure of the Gandhi-Irwin pact. The pact was worth while even in spite of the failure. Because of it we have at any rate a rough idea now of the view that the Congress will take on the question of reforms. We know what it thinks of federation and of the terms on which the Princes will join federation. But for its participation in the second Round Table Conference we should have been in the dark about its views on the basic structure of the constitution. The pact therefore served a very important purpose while it lasted, though we all wished that the armistice were converted into a permanent treaty of peace. The opinions then expressed were however tentative and are likely to undergo change in important directions as in fact it is known that there was no little discontent in Congress circles with certain views expressed by Mahatma Gandhi. It is a matter of paramount importance therefore that in the next stage of constitution-making the Congress should play its full part, and no risk that will be incurred in paving the way to it will be too great. We ourselves do not believe that the risk is serious, but our view will probably be questioned in official quarters. We had therefore better put it this way: Take the risk, whatever it is, and set free the political prisoners; allow them to have their proper share in framing the constitution, so that when it gets into a working order it will receive the necessary amount of co-operation.

LEAGUE'S NEW FIRMNESS.

AT last the League has shown some firmness in dealing with the aggressions of Japan against China. In this issue the future of the League itself and of the whole system of collective security is at stake, and yet, under the influence of the great powers on whom the burden would chiefly fall of imposing sanctions upon Japan, itself a great power, which has, according to Professor Toynbee, "manifestly broken the public law of the world and violated its own solemn pledges in respect of three diplomatic instruments of first-class importance," viz. the Covenant, the Anti-War Pact and the Nine-Power Treaty, the League exhibited so far a woeful lack of strength in handling this affair. In its first phase the question was referred to the League under Article 11 of the Covenant. The League's function under this Article is now recognised to be one of bringing about a cessation of hostilities if they have already broken out and stopping bloodshed, without going into the rights and wrongs of the dispute or apportioning blame or

even finding means of adjustment. Its first business is to obtain a withdrawal of the invading forces and re-establishment of the *status quo ante* so that the points in controversy may later be discussed in a peaceful atmosphere. This essential preliminary has not yet been carried out though more than a year and quarter has elapsed since Japan's *coup de main*. On the contrary the Japanese army went on continually extending and consolidating its illegal occupation on several fronts until now some 200,000 square miles of Chinese territory has been stolen from China, and the invading army is threatening Peiping itself. Not only has she filched the whole of Manchuria, but she has set up a puppet state in that country and secured from it the legal (!) right to maintain the military occupation permanently, thus regularising what might appear to sticklers as somewhat irregular. Never did Japan refuse to withdraw her troops when called upon to do so by the League. On the contrary she was ever anxious to recall her army to the railway zone, but has been waiting all this time for

the hour to strike when she could safely issue orders to that effect. She would do so immediately some kind of security was restored for Japanese life and property. That moment has not yet arrived.

Sensing the delay that would take place in the completion of the process which is a pre-requisite to the final settlement of the dispute, China had to invoke Article 15 of the Covenant, which empowers the League first to try conciliation, and, in the event of its failure, "to make and publish a report containing a statement of the facts of the dispute and the recommendations which are deemed just and proper in regard thereto." Conciliation having failed, the time came for the League to consider the merits of the issue and to deliver its verdict. Japan did not show the slightest reluctance in having the whole situation inquired into by an impartial tribunal, and in fact she took the lead in the setting up of the tribunal. The Lytton Commission's Report is almost wholly condemnatory of Japan and yet this makes no difference whatever to her attitude. She is as recalcitrant as ever. Nor is the League yet prepared to brand her as an aggressor, for if it did so, Article 16 would at once come into operation, and would require the Member States to inflict upon her sanctions which may take the form either of the withdrawal of diplomatic representatives, or a trade boycott, or exclusion from loans or expulsion from the League. These sanctions have been kept studiously in the background so much so that there is grave doubt whether they will ever be brought into action. On account of the unwillingness of the great powers to adopt coercive processes, they hesitate to say that Japan has "committed an act of war against" China, although the latter has lost three provinces and will probably lose more in consequence of the former's military operations.

This is the first time in the history of the League when Article 15 has been applied to any of its members, and the world in general, and the smaller States in particular, whose security depends upon the effectiveness of its peace machinery, are watching the developments of the conflict with anxious attention. The Lytton Commission has plainly stated that the bombardment of Mukden, with which the conflict commenced, cannot be justified at all on the ground of self-defence. "The military operations of the Japanese troops on this night (i.e. the night of September 18-19, 1931)," it says, "cannot be regarded as measures of legitimate defence." But whatever may be said about the incidents of that day, can it be contended with any show of reason that all the later extensions of the occupation were rendered necessary by considerations of self-defence? It is true that both the Covenant and the Peace Pact leave it to each individual State to determine for itself what the requirements of its own defence are. But, whatever Japan's special difficulties may be and whatever may be the provocation on the side of China, no reasonable person can assert, though the Japanese Government is asserting it to-day, that the occupation of the whole of Manchuria was a matter of "necessity, instant and overwhelming, allowing no

choice of means and no instant for deliberation," as Daniel Webster described the circumstances justifying the exercise of the right of self-defence. The Peruvian delegate put it very well at a meeting of the League Council when he said that the following principles must be recognised as lying at the base of the League's activities for the preservation of peace, viz. that "1. No State has the right to effect a military occupation of the territory of another in order to ensure the execution of certain treaties; 2. No State is entitled to oblige another, having invaded its territory, to enter upon direct negotiations (as Japan wanted to do) on the bearing and legal value of treaties previously existing between the two States; 3. The exercise of the right possessed by each State to ensure the protection of the lives and property of its nationals must be limited by respect of the sovereignty of the other State; no State being entitled, in order to provide such protection, to authorise its military forces to penetrate into the territory of the other for the purpose of carrying out police operations."

If Japan has a complaint to make against China she cannot just take the law into her own hands and put her army into the field. She has pledged herself not to do so under the League Covenant and the Kellogg-Briand Pact. As Sir John Simon said at the Special Session of the Assembly in December last, the crucial fact for the League is this: "That when this unhappy dispute reached its climax the methods of the League were not employed. That is the central fact for us, and it is therefore, as I conceive it, our duty as members of the League to defend its Covenant and to see as far as we can that the League methods are employed in future cases." "For all of us alike the Covenant of the League of Nations is our constitutional law. It is the reason why we are here; it is the fundamental law, it cannot be set aside by some light or thoughtless gesture, because it is the very basis upon which international co-operation is founded. We are not at liberty to disregard it. We are bound to sustain it." Japan not only disregarded the law, but plainly maintains that it cannot be obeyed: because the League is ineffective and powerless for the redress of grievances among nations. M. Matsuoka, the Japanese delegate, observed at the Special Session of the Assembly: "The question is asked why the Japanese Government did not seek protection from the League. The answer is that, in view of the present structure and scope of the League, effective protection could not be expected from that body promptly. In the situation that existed in Manchuria, Japan had to deal, first, with the imminent danger; secondly, with a country whose authority did not extend to Manchuria; and, thirdly, with a Government which had adopted a policy of unilateral abrogation of treaties and conventions. In so exceptional a situation, was it possible to expect protection from the League?" Of the three reasons given here only the first would be a sufficient reason, if it were founded in fact, for Japan to take the law into its own hands, and this justification the Lytton Report shows conclusively

is not available to Japan. The hollowness of the other two reasons was well exposed by the Swiss delegate, M. Motta:

May I say with all diffidence, that I fear this reasoning would, if approved, rob the two essential principles of the Covenant of all meaning? The first of these principles is explained in Article 10, and is called the undertaking to respect and preserve the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League. The second principle is defined in Article 12 and is called the undertaking to submit any dispute of any kind to a procedure of pacific, judicial, arbitral or diplomatic settlement.

I know this undertaking always to submit disputes to pacific procedure may sometimes, especially to great powers, appear to be a hindrance. Those who have force at their disposal are naturally tempted to use it, especially in defence of what they consider to be their rights.

The law, however, places a limitation on rights, and such limitation is a guarantee of security for each one of us. If the States Members of the League ceased to admit the maxim that none may take the law into his own hands, or that the very justification of our institution is its categorical condemnation of violence in international relations, then it would be better to say quite frankly that our hopes of achieving a new international order are vain! Right-thinking men will not readily give way to such moral bankruptcy.

Japan having refused to accept the recommendations in the Lytton Report, as desired by the Assembly, the League must now give its verdict as to whether Japan has broken the Covenant, and if it concludes that she has, it must decide what will be the pains and penalties which should be imposed upon her in order to make her respect the Covenant.

III.—CENTRAL RESPONSIBILITY.*

FEDERATION and responsible government at the centre were the two principal objects aimed at by those who helped to initiate and develop the Round Table Scheme. An attempt was made in the last two articles to examine the administrative and financial provisions of that scheme from the standpoint of federal requirements. Unless the suggestions for reform made in the two articles are incorporated in the constitutional statute the so-called Federation in India will turn out in fact a hybrid and weak organisation which will creak and jar in every joint. Does the scheme, as it stands, provide any more of responsible government than of federation? In fact most British Indian politicians, with the prominent exception of Sir Tej Sapru, have come to look upon the federation as a necessary and unavoidable price to be paid for the attainment of the much longed-for responsibility. The price we are called upon to pay is heavy, even if all the reforms suggested by critics are incorporated in the Act. At its best the new federal government will be a very unprogressive and cumbrous body and will in all probability remind observers of the machine that it was all brakes and no steam. But do we even at such a cost reach anywhere near responsibility in the R.T.O. scheme?

It must be frankly confessed that Indian members of the R.T.O. achieved a definite advantage by getting the principle of central responsibility unequivocally accepted by the representatives of all the British parties. The Conference assumed as a basis of its work the formula that, *except in so far as otherwise provided*, the representatives of the Crown will be

* The first two articles appeared in the issues of 9th and 16th February.

guided by the advice of their Ministers, and the Executive will depend for its legislative enactments and for its supply upon the legislature. This statement explicitly mentions both the essentials of responsible government, namely, that the Governor-General, or in the provinces the Governor, is to be as a rule a constitutional ruler, without any responsibility and authority except such as he shares with a Minister, and that the Ministers themselves are to depend upon the vote of the legislature for their existence. But the words that we have taken the liberty to italicise contain an important exception to the rule which must be duly assessed. Many members of the Conference spent a large part of their time in London working out this constitutional arithmetic: What remains of responsibility when the exceptional provisions are deducted from it? What are these exceptions that, in our opinion, reduce the strength of the legislature *vis-à-vis* the executive and still keep the Great Moghul on the throne at Delhi?

RESERVED DEPARTMENTS.

In all there are four categories of these exceptions. Firstly there are the Reserved Departments. These are to be three in number: (1) Defence; (2) External Affairs; and (3) Ecclesiastical. These are to be controlled by the Governor-General on his sole responsibility and the expenditure incurred on these is not to be submitted to the vote of the legislature. Without in any way reducing the responsibility or the discretion of the Governor-General, the Instrument of Instructions, to be issued, on his appointment, to each occupant of the Viceroyal post is to press upon him the prudence of frequent consultations between the reserved and responsible parts of the administration. British politicians have a knack of condemning a principle and then adopting it straightaway as a practical solution. The Montagu-Chelmsford Report denounced the Congress-League Scheme, which then held the field, on the ground that it was based on the division of the executive into two halves, one elected, the other nominated. They, however, adopted dyarchy, as the only form in which the policy of partial responsibility in the provinces could be made operative. The universal opinion on the working of dyarchy has since been crystallised in the findings of the Simon Commission. That Commission observes: "... the two halves of Government have been thrown into each other's arms through their relations with the legislature, no less than by the impossibility of conducting the administration in compartments." It is, however, this very attempt at conducting the administration in compartments that is being now made with regard to the central government of the country and it is bound to prove as 'impossible' as the provincial one.

In the matter of effective political power there can really be no half-way house between official government and responsible government. The government of a people both in respect of its burdens and benefits is a unit and cannot be divided into compartments without detriment both to freedom and efficiency. So also in the Government as a whole the people either are, or they are not, the ultimate masters. To say that the transferred departments are under the control of the representative assembly and that the reserved departments are controlled by the official government is misleading. Under the present distribution of powers, the essence of power and initiative rests with the official government all the same. In the central government the failure of a dyarchical scheme, or, what is the same, of a scheme based on divided responsibility, can be safely predicted as a certainty. Defence of the country, which absorbs more than 55% of the central revenues, is to

be a reserved subject, without even the power of discussing the budget being allowed to the legislature. Even a cursory knowledge of recent constitutional history of this country should suffice to strengthen the conclusion that no federal assembly will care to shoulder any financial responsibility so long as it can point its finger towards the huge military expenditure, for which the Governor-General alone is to be responsible. The reserved departments in the provinces have at present to depend in the first instance on the legislature for the grant of their demands. Only if essential grants are thrown out the Governors have a right to restore them. If at all, in spite of the discouraging experience in the provinces, dyarchy, whether called by that name or not, is to be adopted in the centre, at least the budget of the reserved departments should be presented to the legislature along with that of the other departments. This will be beneficial both to the executive and the legislature. The latter will have constitutional opportunity to raise discussion about general and detailed military policy, and the former can hope at least in some matters to carry a substantial portion of the legislature with itself. As it is, the arrangements are calculated to produce the utmost irresponsibility and friction.

The suggestion of Sir Tej Saprú and some others that the minister in charge of the reserved departments should be appointed from among the elected members of the legislature, though he will continue to be responsible exclusively to the Governor-General, is most practical and is undoubtedly based on an intimate knowledge of the inherent defects of dyarchy. To this suggestion the Secretary of State has as yet given no definite reply. At its best the system of divided responsibility is bound to turn out a failure; if this suggestion which will secure some uniformity and harmony in the composition of the central executive is not adopted the failure will be all the greater and quicker. The Instrument of Instructions can be no substitute for statutory provisions, and we have had enough of exasperating experience as to how these instruments are ignored by unsympathetic representatives of the Crown. The practice of appointing elected members to reserved ministries and that of joint consultation among the two sides must be provided for by the constitutional statute itself.

External relations are a counterpart of defence and are in a peculiar sense the function of a sovereign authority. It is but natural that when defence is reserved to the unfettered control of the Governor-General foreign relations should also be classed with it. But it is of the utmost constitutional and political importance that the Minister in charge of this department should necessarily be chosen from amongst the elected Indian members. Surely Indians of the requisite ability and responsibility will be found among the members of the federal legislature. The Conference itself recognised that commercial treaties will affect the policy of many of the departments so vitally that in their conclusion the Governor-General will have to consult the opinion of his responsible Ministers. In fact this applies in some measure to all external relations of India. It is a cause for the utmost humiliation for this country that it is represented in international relations and at international gatherings by non-nationals taking their orders from a non-national government. If the policy underlying the preamble of the Government of India Act and the Premier's announcements at the Round Table Conference has any genuineness about it, it is imperative that an Indian minister should be put in charge of the foreign relations of the country, though for a few years to come he might continue to be responsible to the Governor-General in those aspects of his duty where unity of Imperial policy

is desired. In all other respects, including commercial agreements, the Minister should act as the other responsible Ministers would do. This distinction between the Imperial and Indian aspects of foreign policy and the differing control to be exercised on the Minister in that behalf should be provided for by the statute and should not be left to be regulated by the Instrument of Instructions, much less by a mere convention. The Ecclesiastical Department should be entirely abolished. It embodies the idea of a governing class in India and must be removed with the dawn of a popular government. In any case it should not be with the consent of any of the Indian delegates to the Conference or the Joint Parliamentary Committee that it should be continued.

GOVERNOR-GENERAL'S DISCRETIONARY POWERS.

The reserved departments and debt services being removed from the vote of the legislature, the administrative and financial powers of the latter are reduced to about a quarter of the total field of central government. Even here the legislature is not to be free from the leading-strings of the Governor-General. Several important discretionary powers are to be vested in the Governor-General. The first is the power to dissolve, prorogue and summon the legislature. Granting that as the representative of the Crown such a power must vest in the Governor-General, the most important question is as to whether the responsible Ministers have the right to recommend dissolution under identical procedure as that followed in Great Britain. This is a matter eminently suited to be regulated by the Instrument of Instructions. The Governor-General as the head of the Government should for the present continue to have the unfettered right of dissolution, but it should be provided that if the federal Ministry recommends this step he should be bound to dissolve the Parliament unless he finds it possible to get an alternative government. The collective responsibility of the responsible part of the central government should be specifically provided for by the constitution and in respect of dissolution as in other matters the advice of Ministers should be collectively sought. In fact, though not for the present as a rule, the attendance of the Governor-General at Cabinet meetings should be steadily dispensed with.

The second discretionary power is that of assenting to or withholding assent from Acts, or of reserving them for His Majesty's pleasure. Herein also it should be specifically mentioned in the Instrument of Instructions that the advice of the responsible Ministry should be binding in the matter of assent. The only alternative allowed should be reservation for the signification of the pleasure of His Majesty. 'The grant of previous permission for introducing certain classes of bills in the legislature,' which is the third discretionary power proposed for the Governor-General, should be limited within very narrow limits and as far as possible should not extend beyond foreign relations, other than commercial and cultural intercourse, with other states, and religious practices. The next discretionary power, that of summoning a joint session of the federal legislature in an emergency, is formal; but 'the power to take action notwithstanding a vote in the legislature,' is a direct negation of responsible government. This power ought to be non-existent in a fully responsible government and even in a partially responsible administration it must on no account ravel beyond the reserved departments. This must be made explicit by statute. Equally unsatisfactory, vexatious and unconstitutional is the proposal that the Governor-General should continue to have the power to arrest the course of business in the federal

legislature. The Parliament ought to be full master in its own house so long as it is engaged in business allowed by the Constitution Act. No authority other than that of the house and its Speaker ought to dictate the course of its business. The British Commons risked a civil war in vindication of this among other rights. It is a pity that those who speak on behalf of the same noble House should now seek to restrict so narrowly the essential rights of the Indian legislature. The power to make legislative rules, in so far as this is necessary for the due exercise of his responsibilities, which it is sought to confer upon the Governor-General, is also an unwarranted encroachment on the freedom of the legislature and should be resisted. So long as there are any reserved departments the Governor-General will continue to have, in respect of those departments, affirmative powers of legislation, administration and finance, which should be enough to enable him to discharge his responsibilities even if the legislature refuses to co-operate with him. Besides this special power, there should be no further whittling down of the freedom of the legislature by the so-called discretionary powers.

HIS "SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES."

Besides the reserved departments and the discretionary powers there are other important deductions from the authority of the Government that have to be allowed for before we arrive at an idea of the measure of central responsibility attained by the Round Table Scheme. The Conference agreed that the following matters constituted 'special responsibilities' of the Governor-General. Presumably whenever the Governor-General feels that his responsibility in any of these matters justifies him in doing so he can issue orders contrary to those of the Ministers and effect shall be given to them. These subjects are: (1) prevention of menace to the peace and tranquillity of India or any part thereof; (2) protection of minorities; (3) preservation of the rights of the public services; (4) matters affecting administration of reserved departments; (5) protection of the rights of the States; and (6) the prevention of commercial discrimination. Most of these responsibilities are inevitable in the present stage and atmosphere. But we do not agree that services are on a par with minorities of citizens or with the States. The services ought to be protected, in so far as it is consistent with the needs of discipline and public policy, by the setting up of a Public Service Commission. Servants who divide their allegiance between the Secretary of State who appoints them, the Ministers who command them, and the Governor-General who protects them are not likely to be in a very happy mood or position. Commercial discrimination is too wide a term with which to restrict the freedom of a legislature and a government. As this is an important question by itself we leave it to be discussed separately.

The enthusiasm shown for federation, the indulgent attitude adopted towards many of the defects of the proposed scheme and an appeal for an enthusiastic working of the coming constitution are all based on the assumed attainment of responsibility. We have shown in this article that neither quantitatively nor qualitatively is there much room left for the free action of the legislature and of the responsible Ministers in the scheme as at present chalked out. If to reserved departments, discretionary powers and special responsibilities is added the continuance of the power to issue ordinances as at present, the size of the residue of responsibility is reduced to almost nullity. Several important changes such as those indicated in this article must be introduced in the scheme before it can be correctly described even as a partially responsible administration.

The authority to issue ordinances should be subject to the earliest possible convening of the legislature to discuss the executive laws. *With the powers of ordinance and certification, with the freedom of the reserved departments from financial review by the legislature, with a wide discretionary power and with the special responsibilities and the authority to back them, we fear that the Governor-General will, in the future constitution, be even stronger than what he is at present.*

D. G. KARVE.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, February 17.

THE BURMESE PROBLEM IN PARLIAMENT.

THERE has been a long string of questions on India in the House of Commons this week, but very little satisfaction was obtained from the replies. On Monday several interrogations had reference to Burma, on which matter His Majesty's Government appears to be in something of a quandary. It seems evident that the Ministers had not bargained for the sturdy attitude which the Burmans have taken up on this subject. Having nothing new to say, Sir Samuel Hoare contented himself with a recital of the events which have happened since the Burma Round Table Conference held its sittings last year, but added that the Government were unable to find in the resolution of the Local Legislature any indication of a choice between the alternatives offered by the Prime Minister, and were considering whether any steps were possible on their part towards the removal of this barrier to constitutional advance in Burma.

THE INDIAN COURTS SCANDAL.

The decision of the Government to drop what is called the "Delhi Conspiracy Case" was the subject of a long question from Mr. Hicks, who sits on the front Opposition bench. His question brought out the scandalous delay which had already taken place in this matter, and suggested pointedly that something ought to be done to expedite procedure in the Indian Criminal Courts in the interests both of justice and of economy to the Indian Exchequer.

The Government are already anxious to avoid the incubus and odium of another Meerut case, and Sir Samuel Hoare had to confess that he was gravely concerned at the length of these trials. In extenuation, however, he pleaded the complexity of Indian Statute Law, but agreed with his questioner that the present state of affairs was almost intolerable. He said he was in correspondence with the Government of India on the subject, so we must wait and see what comes of that.

Anyhow the accused in the Delhi case (although some of them are to be tried individually) will escape the long ordeal to which the unfortunate Meerut prisoners had to submit, although this may not bring much consolation to the latter. Their sentences were also the subject of questions from the Labour side. Sir Samuel Hoare intimated that there was no intention of sending any of them to the Andamans.

In reply to Mr. Morgan Jones' plea for clemency in this case, the Secretary of State said that as an appeal was being lodged he had better not make any statement.

A movement has been set on foot in this country by Miss Ellen Wilkinson and others to raise a fund

of £1,000 to assist the Meerut prisoners in prosecuting their appeal. Miss Wilkinson's article in the *Daily Herald* last Wednesday on Indian prison conditions should be of some service in helping to raise the necessary money for the object in view.

INDIAN COTTON AND JAPAN.

At a meeting at the Manchester Chamber of Commerce on Monday last, Mr. Nathan Laski made a strong plea that a conference of British and Indian cotton traders should be held to discuss ways and means of helping the Lancashire cotton manufacturers to secure a larger measure of Indian trade. Mr. Laski said in his speech that such a conference could be of very great benefit not only to Britain but also to India, and he thought that India could, and would, discuss the matter with understanding and sympathy.

In an interview reported later in the *Manchester Guardian* Mr. Laski explained in greater detail what he meant by his suggestion at the Chamber of Commerce's meeting. For one thing, he made it quite clear that he considers the menace to prosperity, both of Britain and India, comes from Japan. Ninety per cent. of the trade we are doing with India to-day, said Mr. Laski, could not be done by India herself, so that she had not to fear us. Japan's position, however, was different. Its competition in India was unfair and hard to meet, as it was heavily subsidised by the Japanese Government. Its cheap labour alone could not produce the goods which they were selling.

Mr. Laski was right in pointing out that Great Britain with an old-established textile industry now protected by a twenty per cent. tariff could scarcely complain if India's younger mill industry claims tariff assistance.

The suggestion about holding this conference that Mr. Laski has put forward may be worthy of serious consideration. There can be no doubt that in the minds of many people here one of the greatest difficulties in the way of India's political freedom is the possible permanent loss of what they consider to be Britain's legitimate market, and to lessen this fear would be to produce a better spirit towards India, which could be used with advantage during the next critical months.

INDO-BRITISH STUDENT CONFERENCE.

A Conference between Indian, Ceylonese and British students was held in London on February 11 and 12 under the auspices of the National Union of Students of England and Wales. The purpose of this Conference was to discuss the difficulties encountered by Indian students in pursuing their studies at the Universities in this country. This was the first time that representative students from India and Ceylon had met to discuss their difficulties with the officers of the British Students' Unions. About twenty of the latter attended, together with an equal number of students representing the Indian and Ceylonese Associations. The President of the National Union was in the chair.

The first question was the participation of Indian students in athletics and games. Sport has always played a very large part in British University life and it was noted with satisfaction that at most Universities the percentage of Indian students taking part in athletics and games of one kind and another is relatively high. A questionnaire had been sent to the University Athletic Unions on this point. Of the 16 replies received 11 were from Universities where there are Indian students, and in seven of them Indian students have held the office of Captain or Secretary in athletics or one of the games. Three Indian students have received the recognition of

playing for a team of the Universities' Athletic Union, representing all the Universities, which is the highest honour that can be given to a University athlete. All the Universities replying to the questionnaire have said that in athletics and games there is no "Indian problem." Indian students are considered strictly on their merits as athletes and have often obtained their university "colours."

Despite these facts the Conference was satisfied from the evidence of Indian students that in some Universities there is a certain amount of unofficial discouragement to the participation of Indians in games and particularly against their inclusion in the higher teams. A number of practical proposals were made for remedying the difficulties experienced, and it was pointed out that as an Indian student on first coming to this country naturally takes some time to become acclimatised, he should be given the privilege of more extended trials in games and athletics than it is customary to give to British students.

COLOUR PREJUDICE CONDEMNED.

In regard to the participation of Indian students in the social life of the Universities, it was found that in the majority of cases they are freely accepted without discrimination of any kind. Where something in the nature of a colour prejudice exists in a University, it is of a transitory character and fairly readily changed under the influence of the senior students. It is increasingly recognised among British students that colour prejudice is a fruitless and negative attitude of mind and that boorishness to coloured students should definitely be placed in the category of "things that are not done." The fact was recognised that in some Universities, though these are certainly a small minority, Indian students are discouraged from full participation in University life. The tone of a University in this respect depends almost entirely on the example set by the senior students.

THE HOSPITAL PROBLEM.

Another subject discussed was the admission of Indian students to hospitals for purposes of medical study. This is a problem which is most acute in the London Medical Schools, and the Conference, while recognising the great difficulty of providing sufficient places even for British students, felt that so long as the regulations required British medical qualifications for practice in the higher branches of the Indian Service a real effort should be made to give the necessary facilities for hospital practice to Indian students.

An appeal will, therefore, be made to the British Medical Association to exert its influence on their behalf. Students from India and Ceylon paid a tribute to the way in which their professors often helped them in overcoming the difficulties that exist. It was emphasised by representatives from provincial universities that a possible solution to the overcrowding of the London Hospitals would be for more Indian students to take the medical course of a provincial University, where they would have greater opportunities for clinical practice, and they could, if they wished, still take London degrees.

HOW STUDENTS ARE BLOCKED.

A Ceylonese student of Engineering raised the question of facilities for practical training in British workshops. He pointed out the benefit that would accrue to British trade if Indian students were trained in Great Britain rather than in other countries, and for that reason he suggested that it would be worth the manufacturers' while to take students from India and Ceylon into their works more readily than they do at present.

In the matter of University lodgings, the Conference recognised that Indian students experienced a special difficulty in finding suitable lodgings in which to live. The work of the University of London Lodgings Bureau was noted with gratitude, but it was deplored that owners of lodging-houses should refuse accommodation to any student solely on the ground of his colour. The Universities were urged to extend the hostel accommodation available for Indian students. It was regretted that the bequests of endowments for some university hostels should preclude the admission of Indian students.

OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS.

It is perhaps not generally realised by British students that Indians are debarred by the War Office Regulations from admission into the senior branches of the Officers' Training Corps. Where this is realised it is resented by the British students themselves. The attitude of the War Office is that the Officers' Training Corps are intended to train potential officers for the Supplementary Reserve of Officers and the Territorial Army. Since Indians are not eligible for these commissions they are also debarred from the training corps. In view, however, of the stated policy of His Majesty's Government to expedite the Indianisation of the Army in India, the present position is felt to be illogical and unsatisfactory.

The Conference found no evidence that the distribution of Indian students among the Universities bears any relation to the problems under discussion. It recommended, however, that steps should be taken by the proper authorities in India and Ceylon to inform intending students of the facilities available in the provincial Universities and University Colleges, where, at the moment, the number of students from those countries is small.

In conclusion the Conference recommended the establishment of an Indo-British Committee to foster cultural relations between Indian and British students. It was felt that such a permanent committee might do much not only to strengthen goodwill, but to promote a more intelligent interest in your country and its problems. The delegates to the Conference were urged to carry the resolutions passed back to their respective Universities and to do their utmost towards making them effective.

It will be gathered from the foregoing paragraphs which are based upon information officially supplied by the National Union of Students, that all these questions were discussed in a very friendly spirit on both sides. Such a Conference is bound to do good in many ways. It is understood that a fuller report of the proceedings will be issued as soon as possible.

Review.

INDIAN WOMEN WORKERS.

WOMAN LABOUR IN INDIA. By RAJANI KANTA DAS. (International Labour Office, Geneva.) 24cm. 72p.

In this booklet Dr. Das outlines the development of labour legislation and suggests measures for the elevation of the political and industrial status of women. There are 46 million women workers in India; out of these only 7 lakhs of women are employed in industrial establishments. The present study refers to the latter only. About 5 lakhs of women are employed in plantations for the production of tea, coffee and rubber; and 2½ lakhs are employed in factories. The small proportion of women workers in factories is due to social custom and lack of skill.

The review of labour legislation given by the author covers a wide ground and no important item is omitted. In 1891 the hours of labour for women were reduced to eleven and after the Great War to ten. Under the head sanitation a noteworthy defect is the lack of bathing and washing facilities, dining sheds, and resting places for women in factories and even on plantations. Another serious defect is the absence of any provision for taking care of the children while their mothers are at work.

The author says that no information is available as to how much compensation was received by women under the Act of 1923; this defect should be removed by the Provincial Governments. We learn that the Second Mines Act (1923) made no provision for prohibiting underground work in mines; this is a serious lapse. This was done by Regulations (in 1929). It is creditable to the Government and the Legislature that acts have been passed to abolish night work for women in accordance with the Convention passed by the I. L. Conference of 1919; a weekly holiday is also made compulsory by an act. After remarking on the inefficiency of workers the author attributes it to lack of education and training. The average monthly earnings of women in Bombay Cotton mills is Rs. 20-4-6; the average monthly earnings of some families were Rs. 58-8-0 in Burma and Rs. 52-4-0 in Bombay. The average contribution made by women to family earnings in Burma was 13 per cent. The author's judgment is that the dietary of the working classes is very poor and that the workers' house lacks comfort and is uninviting. It is a pitiful spectacle to see that 69 per cent. families in some industrial centres are in debt. The overcrowding in the houses inhabited by workers is a common feature; even a one-room tenement is occupied by four persons in most cases.

Infant mortality in industrial centres is higher than the average for the whole country and the author attributes it to overcrowding. Welfare work is making progress but it touches only a small part of the total labour force. The social condition of the workers is deplorable. In summing up, the author regards the organized industries as a great boon to women by giving them economic independence and by increasing their power for concerted action. He suggests raising of the minimum age of employment for children to 14 and the fixation of a minimum wage for women. He recommends a more stringent inspection in order to enforce labour legislation. Finally, he recommends the adoption of a policy tending to equalise political and industrial opportunities for men and women alike.

V. N. GODBOLE.

SHORT NOTICES.

THE SPIRIT OF WORLD POLITICS. By WILLIAM ERNEST HOCKING. (Macmillan, New York.) 1932. 25cm. 571p. \$5.00.

"The Spirit of World Politics" is a study of the relationships of the western powers to the so-called "backward" nations, written from an ethical point of view. The author upholds the rights of dependent nations, giving as examples Egypt, Syria and Palestine, where he has travelled extensively. It is a pity that he has not included in his thoughtful study India, which he visited in the cold weather of 1931-32 as Chairman of the Missions Enquiry Committee. The author admits injustice, but writes:

"So long as principles are confused, the egoisms of national conduct... take advantage of the obscurity. If we can effect valid definitions of the nation and its rights, of backwardness and its implications, of the world-order and its universal requirements, the Western world

will compel itself, however reluctantly, to take the consequences. And we may be in time to save the new life of the ancient East! To contribute to that end, through clarifying the principles of the world-order, is the object of this book."

The author adds:

"Suppose that we undertake to administer a dependency, and that we succeed in bringing about order, an improved economy, regularity of accounts and a modicum of Western education. That would be sufficient to allow any official annual report to bristle with proud points of 'progress.' But suppose that in achieving these things a national art is killed, a culture undermined and the customary moral life of a people contaminated—circumstances unlikely to figure in official annual reports, shall we still count the total result a success?"

This is a point of view which is sure to commend itself to all those who look at world affairs, not from the point of view of self-interest, but from the standpoint of high moral principles and the requirements of humanity. It is a hopeful sign of the present that, among the thoughtful men and women to-day, there is an increasing disposition to judge political questions by ethical standards.

The author not only discusses the rights and duties of nations, but in so doing has written a fascinating history of international relations in the Near East.

E. ASIRVATHAM.

DAYS WITH LENIN. By MAXIM GORKY.
(Martin Lawrence, London.) 21cm. 64p. 1/6.

LENIN is a colossal figure. He has always been the devil or the deity. His death was announced several times; yet he never seems to die out. To the Marxists, however, he is no more than an individual expression of the November Revolution. Of course Lenin was a great man. But his greatness is of a sort. It consists in that "absolute transparency of action to the agent's understanding" which is just the central characteristic of a truly socialist civilization.

Marxism, it should be noted, does not deny the existence of great men. What it does deny is only the view—implying a belief in free will—of great men as causally unconditioned, independent agents of history. A memoir of this great Marxist from another Marxist is of special significance. But Maxim Gorky, on his own admission, does not understand philosophy very well (p. 24). Naturally his account does not possess the significance which Mirsky's "Lenin" or Clara Zetkin's "Reminiscences" does. Gorky is, however, an artist and his lively little bits about Lenin—his directness of speech (p. 15); his simplicity (p. 48); his Socratic forehead (p. 48); his magnetic quality (p. 27); his love for children (p. 50); his attitude towards comrades (p. 53); and above all his passion for revolution (p. 30)—are artistic things artistically told. The book is a good addition to the long list of Marxian studies of which Martin Lawrence have made a speciality.

P. A. PADHYE.

MR. GANDHI'S ARREST AND THE EVENTS LEADING UP TO IT. By HY. S. L. POLAK.
(Friends Book Centre, Eastern Road, London. N. W. 1.) 1932. 22cm. 32p. 6d.

THIS booklet brings together all the important facts leading up to the arrest of Mr. Gandhi on January 4, 1932. Mr. Polak, as is usual with him, has done his

work uncommonly well. It is however to be doubted how far the *objective* sequence of events given by him will help the general reader to fix up the responsibility of the rupture between the Congress and the Government. The writer clearly shows that Mr. Gandhi did his best to seek interviews with and guidance from the Viceroy. But owing to the limited scope of the booklet he has not answered the argument freely advanced by the supporters of the Government that Mr. Gandhi was manoeuvring for time and that the Viceroy very properly refused to play into his hands. The book is highly useful for reference and eminently furthers the objects of the Indian Conciliation group.

A.

SOCRATES PERSISTS IN INDIA. By F. L. BRAYNE. (Oxford University Press.) 1932. 20cm. 140p. Re. 1/4.

THIS is a new volume by the well-known author of "Socrates in an Indian Village" written to further emphasise the value of village reconstruction work. The book is intended for "the Punjab villager so patient, so hospitable, so lovable, yet so heart-breaking, in the way in which he forever postpones the doing of those few simple things which he knows well enough will make all the difference to the health, wealth and happiness of his home and village," and the like of him throughout the country. The usual themes of Socrates—the pit latrine, vaccination, the scout movement, the village school, schooling of girls, co-operative hospitals, better poultry, stud-bulls, and the District Committees—are developed in these dialogues, social customs—ignorance, the costly trinkets, litigation, the general apathy, and the slavish dependence on State for everything—are the obstacles, in the author's opinion, in the way of these simple improvements which Socrates suggests for the well-being of the villages. This Socratic method is the only effective way for infusing new ideas into the minds of the villagers. Long lectures or discourses are of no avail to the villagers. Socrates, if he persists, persists in the company of such great men as Lord Linlithgow and H. R. H. the Prince of Wales, and he needs no excuses. Repetition is, so far as one can see, the only fault of the book, but that is pardonable when we see that it is intended for villagers.

N. S. S.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- INDIA'S NATIONAL FINANCE SINCE 1921. By Prof. V. G. KALE. (University of Delhi, Delhi.) 1932. 25cm. 111p. Re. 1.8.
- THE FRENCH POLITICAL SYSTEM. By W. L. MIDDLETON. (Benn, London.) 1932. 22cm. 292p. 12/6.
- THE MAKING OF THE STATE. By M. RUTHNASWAMY. (Williams & Norgate, London.) 1932. 22cm. 503p. 21/-
- PURDAH: THE STATUS OF INDIAN WOMEN. By FRIEDA HAUSWIRTH (Mrs. Sarangadhar Das.) (Kegan Paul, London.) 1932. 22cm. 289p. 10/6.
- DAYS WITH LENIN. MAXIM GORKY. (Martin Lawrence, London.) 20cm. 64p. 1/6.
- JOURNALISM AS A CAREER. By ABDUL MAJID RAU. (Commercial Book Co., Lahore.) 20cm. 138p. Rs. 2/8.
- AN ECONOMIC SURVEY OF GIJHI, VILLAGE IN THE ROHTAK DISTRICT OF THE PUNJAB. By RAJ NARAIN and BRIJ NARAIN. (Board of Economic Inquiry, Punjab, Lahore.) 1932. 25cm. 313p. Rs. 4