

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XVI, No. 12. }

POONA—THURSDAY, MARCH 23, 1933.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	133
ARTICLE :—	
The White Paper. By the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P. C., C. H., LL. D.	136
OUR LONDON LETTER.	140
Review :—	
Civilization of Asia. By S. S. William	142
SHORT NOTICES:—	142
MISCELLANEOUS :—	
Liberal View of the White Paper	143
The Maharajah of Alwar. By H. J. Laski	143

Topics of the Week.

Sine die.

IN winding up the last meeting of the third session of the Round Table Conference, Lord Sankey said, "I believe Sir Samuel Hoare's name will go down to history as the great Secretary of State during whose tenure of the office India realised, in the life time of a single Parliament, nearly all her ambitions." The Lord Chancellor's intimate and prolonged study of the Indian question and association with Indian leaders must be in vain if he thought that the White Paper fulfilled "nearly all" of India's ambitions. Or, in the alternative, Sir Samuel Hoare's tenure of the India Office and the life of the present Parliament must be prolonged indefinitely if India is to realise "nearly all her ambitions" through their good offices.

Far from hastening federation, as Sir Samuel Hoare solemnly undertook to do, he has postponed it. In the White Paper he pleaded that the Princes could not make up their mind to join the federation till after the Constitution Act was passed. He had however stated in his closing speech at the last R. T. C. that "we have clearly delimited the field upon which the future constitution is going to be built." Certainly, the Princes know all that they need know regarding federation, except perhaps the distribution of the seats that fall to their share in the federal legislature. There is no need to wait till the Act is passed for them to signify if they will join or not.

Some Conundrums.

THE White Paper distinguishes between federal and provincial subjects and subjects in which both the federal and provincial governments will have concurrent jurisdiction, but no mention is made of purely British Indian subjects as opposed to the fede-

ral. Income-tax is one such subject, which applies to the whole of British India but not to the States. It is not made clear whether the nominees of the Princes in the federal legislatures will be free or not to vote on income-tax proposals. It will be most objectionable if they are free to vote on taxation proposals which will affect only British India but not the Indian States.

It has been said that each Indian Prince who wishes to join the federation will be free to delimit the range of federal subjects over which he will accept the jurisdiction of the federal government. But it has not been made clear whether the right to vote of the nominee of a Prince will be limited to the subjects he has federalised and extend no further. For instance, will the nominee of a Prince who refused to accept federal jurisdiction over his postal department be free to vote on proposals concerning the post office brought up before the federal legislature?

The position will be even more complicated if a number of small Princes are, under the grouping system, represented by a single nominee and all the States he represents have not submitted themselves to federal authority over a uniform range of subjects. Supposing half a dozen small States have between them a single representative, and one of them refuses to submit to federal jurisdiction in the matter of customs, another railways and a third posts, what will be the rights of the representative in voting on federal proposals on these subjects?

Joint Parliamentary Committee.

THE Joint Select Committee of Parliament to which will be remitted the White Paper just issued will, it is explained, be free to recommend what modifications it likes therein. This statement of the Committee's status and functions has created misgivings in certain influential quarters lest His Majesty's Government should use this body as a means of retreat from its old pledge to include in the India Bill all the agreed conclusions of the Round Table Conference and to stand by them even to the point of quitting office in the event of their being rejected by Parliament.

There is no doubt that a Joint Select Committee, even though it is to be coupled with an Indian auxiliary committee, does not fit in too well with the Round Table Conference. It was conceived at first as a sort of compensation for the exclusion of Indians from the Simon Commission. But the situation underwent a radical change when the Round Table Conference was announced. A compact was then made as it were between England and India to discuss in full all the possibilities of constitutional changes and to effect such of them as may be mutually agreed to. After this there would not appear to be

much point in letting a Joint Select Committee supervene upon a Round Table Conference, and indeed there is some danger of the Committee being employed to queer the pitch for the Conference.

But, whatever the theoretical merits of the question may be, a Joint Select Committee is in fact to be appointed, and, as Sir Samuel Hoare stated in the House of Commons on 27th June last year, His Majesty's Government looks upon the coming inquiry by this Committee as "probably the most important stage in the shaping of the constitutional reforms." It is not a matter of practical politics therefore for Indians to be discussing at present the propriety or otherwise of interposing between R. T. C. and Parliament another investigation, even if it be by an Indo-British agency. Their clear duty is to use to the full this fresh opportunity of stating their views assuming that, in their opinion, the White Paper proposals are capable of being so improved as to be acceptable to the public.

From this point of view it is perhaps for the best that the Joint Select Committee will have the freedom, not only in theory but in fact, to suggest variations in the proposals contained in the White Paper. For it is only thus that Indians can have any hope of having these proposals enlarged in the direction of democratic self-government.

His Majesty's Government must be held strictly to the promise given by it to give official support to the R. T. C.'s agreed conclusions, and, in spite of certain recent events, which have given cause for apprehension to the contrary, we do not believe Government will depart from it. This being ensured, Indians will stand to lose nothing, but gain something (though the possibility of this is remote) by the Joint Select Committee being given the liberty of modifying Government's proposals. Only the Indian auxiliary committee to be associated with the Parliamentary Committee must be truly representative of Indian opinion (including even the ultra-radical) and must be given a status which in substance, though not in form, will be fully equal to that of the Joint Committee.

Non-co-operation with a view to Co-operation.

THE *People* has poured out phials of anger in its last number on the devoted heads of the Liberals for their refusing to take part in the remaining stages of constitutional discussions. As a matter of fact, their attitude has not yet been finally decided on this question, though no one can say that there is no possibility of their taking a decision which will be unpalatable to our contemporary. Holding as it does that the White Paper is fit only for being consigned to the W. P. B., we cannot understand how the *People* can support Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar's suggestion that the Liberals should abstain from co-operation *provided* Gandhiji and political prisoners are not released. Consistently with the views it holds on the results of the R. T. C., it must say, on the contrary, that Liberals and others must non-co-operate even if the political prisoners are released and that Gandhiji must himself non-co-operate when he comes out of gaol. There can therefore be no force in Mr. Rajagopalachariar's plea, so far as the *People* is concerned, that the Liberals should non-co-operate with a view to enabling Gandhiji to co-operate. Our own feeling in the matter is this: the Liberals should co-operate or non-co-operate as one or the other course may appear proper to them on the merits of the reforms question. But they need not non-co-operate for the purpose of securing release of Mahatma

Gandhi; and our reason for taking this line is this: if the Congress wishes still to pursue civil disobedience the Liberals cannot ask for release; if it does not wish to pursue that course, it can itself secure release without non-co-operation on the part of the Liberals.

Moonje on Congress Policy.

INCREASING pressure is being brought to bear on the Congress authorities to call off voluntarily the civil disobedience movement and turn their attention to the constitutional problems. Dr. Moonje has told the press the substance of the advice he tendered last week to the Acting President of the Congress, Mr. M. S. Aney. He advocated both direct action from outside the legislatures and constitutional action from within, in order to put pressure on the Government for the purpose of securing the "substance of independence." But it is clear from what he said that his reference to direct action was more a matter of form; he would not rule out direct action "as and when needed." It was not needed now, and he would wish the Congress, without admitting defeat, to suspend civil disobedience, at any rate, not pursue it with "vigour and push." He had no use for the goal. The operative part of his advice was that the Congress should suspend civil disobedience and capture the legislatures for what they were worth and exploit them to gain more power. At the same time, he did not advocate entry into the councils in order to wreck them, but merely to use them for winning greater power. It is difficult to improve on Dr. Moonje's advice and we trust the Congress authorities will give it due weight to it in their deliberations.

Let Burma Separate!

REPLYING to a question in the Commons last Monday Sir Samuel Hoare made an important announcement concerning the British Government's policy with regard to the future of Burma. It was for the Burma Legislative Council to decide unequivocally if Burma should separate or federate. A separated Burma would not be given a constitution any better than what was promised to Burma at the Burma R. T. C. or what India would get; nor would a federated Burma be free to secede from the federation if and when she wished. If a final decision between these two alternatives and these two only was speedily taken, the Joint Select Committee would be asked to consider a new constitution for separated Burma or the modifications which the Indian federal constitution would require if Burma joined the federation.

It is clear from this that, separated or federated, Burma will not get a constitution in advance of what is being vouchsafed to India in so far as the transfer of responsibility from London is concerned, whatever be the extent of the transfer. Under the circumstances, even the separationists in Burma may choose to federate. Much as India would wish to maintain intact the tie that now binds India and Burma, we cannot help feeling that, considering what is in store for India, perhaps Burma will be better off separated. Burma will then be a unitary state and not a unit in a federation; and a unitary constitution is any day better than a federation. It is one of the tragedies of India that the unitary state of British India is being broken up into a federation. Further, the Indian federation has many unsatisfactory features. The chief among them is the incubus of the over-weighted authority of the Indian Princes in the federal government, which will tend to make

it most undemocratic and unprogressive. A separated Burma will escape this blight; whatever be the extent of the transfer of power from London to Rangoon, it will be controlled by a Burmese democracy and be responsive to progressive opinion. It will also escape the communal curse of India. Bad as is the autocracy of the British, it will not be augmented by a combination with the Princes and the communalists. We have no desire to drag Burma down to the unfortunate position of India under federation.

* * *

His Highness of Baroda.

HIS Highness Sir Sayajirao Gaikwad, the ruler of Baroda, has been recently the recipient of many addresses and other manifestations of honour and esteem at the hands of the public on the occasion of his entering upon his seventy-first year. For a long time after his accession to the gadi, the Gaikwad's was a name to conjure with in all parts of India and particularly in Maharashtra. His reforming zeal made itself felt at the time in many departments of public activity and he was the pioneer in his State of several progressive movements which the British Indians longed to see introduced into British India but which for want of power they could not get introduced. Compulsory primary education, separation of judicial and executive functions, prevention of early marriages were among such movements which, because they seemed possible only in an Indian State, made many Indians prefer Princes' rule to British rule. No denunciation of the British Government would at that time be complete until a contrast was drawn between Baroda and British India in regard to these matters to the disadvantage of the former. But the promise of the early years of the regime was unfortunately not sustained to the end. Sir Sayajirao has never been a believer in democracy. His State even now has but rudimentary organs of popular government. The Legislative Council of Baroda is miles away from that of Travancore or Mysore. It is in fact hardly better in structure and powers than that, for instance, of the tiny State of Miraj constituted only the year before last. But even the reforms in which he showed keen interest in the beginning seem now to have arrived at a standstill stage, and his long absences from his State have become a veritable scandal. But, even so, there is no doubt that he is at bottom a progressive ruler, and the hope is universally expressed that in the remaining period of his rulership, which we pray will be a long and happy one, his early progressivism will be more in evidence.

* * *

The Bhil Seva Mandal.

THE tenth annual report of Bhil Seva Mandal issued recently is a record of the beneficent activities conducted by the Mandal for the uplift of the Bhils who number nearly $1\frac{1}{4}$ crore in India and about $17\frac{1}{4}$ lakhs in Bombay. For obvious reasons the Mandal confines its attention to about one lakh Bhils residing in the Dohad and Jhalod talukas of the Panch Mahals district, though given more plentiful resources it has every intention of bringing the whole Bhil population of Gujerat under its civilising influence. The reforming activities of the Mandal have so far taken the form of schools and ashrams for Bhils, and the provision for medical relief to them. During the year under report the Mandal could boast of eighteen institutions for the uplift of Bhils—8 residential primary schools, one dispensary, 1 primary school, 6 grant-in-aid schools and 2

grant-in-aid night schools. The year witnessed the opening of a new Ashram at Sarda in Baroda territory, which, like the other institutions of the Mandal, is getting popular with those for whose benefit it is intended. It is seen from a statement appended to the report that very nearly 600 children of both sexes were in receipt of instruction at the institutions for which the Mandal is responsible; and that its expenditure was over Rs. 18,000 for the purpose. There can be no two opinions as to the highly useful nature of the Mandal's work. It is a pity the Mandal is unable to extend its good work for want of adequate funds. It may not be generally known that the Mandal has nothing by way of a permanent fund and carries on a more or less hand-to-mouth existence. [This is not the most effective way of ensuring its permanence. It is therefore, to be hoped that these who value its nation-building work will do their best to place the institution on a sound financial footing and in any case prevent contraction in its work taking place owing to lack of financial support. As is well known, the Mandal has for its president Mr. A. V. Thakkar of the Servants of India Society who is ably associated in the Mandal's work by its 9 life-members.]

* * *

Madras Sanitary Welfare League.

IT appears from the second annual report of the Sanitary Welfare League of Madras that it has a creditable record of work in the matter of rousing the sanitary conscience of the people of Madras. The principal activity to which the League set its hand soon after its birth was an intensive study of the Madras slums, especially those inhabited by the untouchables. This survey saw its end during the year under report and its results are embodied in a separate pamphlet, which is supplemental to the report. The number of *cherries* thus studied was 181, which comprised 40,600 families or roughly two lakhs of human beings. Even a cursory glance at the pamphlet is enough to give one some idea as to how badly these people fare in the matter of the supply of such a prime necessity of life as water, not to mention such municipal amenities as street lighting, latrine accommodation, drainage, street cleaning, etc. There can be no doubt that a large part of the credit for the public interest recently evinced in Madras in the well-being of the population of these neglected localities must go to this carefully planned socio-logical study. But the League's activities do not stop here. Since the completion of the survey it has been devoting its attention to the preparation of a model housing scheme for these people—a scheme "that shall be economically sound and meet the needs of the poorest." It would appear from this scheme that the gross building cost for a dwelling would not exceed Ra. 359 and that the economic rent for it would be as low as Ra. 2-8-0 per month, which after 18 years would drop down to Ra. 0-11-0. The scheme is so far advanced that such a model hut is already under construction on land loaned for the purpose by the Madras Municipal Corporation. Funds for the purpose have been found by the Local Rotary Club, students' social service organisations, the International Fellowship and a few individuals. The accounts statement appended to the report bears witness to the ideally economical manner in which the League's activities are conducted, its expenses for the year amounting to not even, Rs. 100. It may be mentioned that Mr. S. R. Venkataraman of the Servants of India Society who is working as the League's secretary is its heart and soul and devotes his undivided attention to its work.

* * *

THE WHITE PAPER.

By The RT. HON. V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI.

I

WHAT might have been the one clear gain of the Third Round Table Conference is thrown into jeopardy by the White Paper. In the spirit of hope which refuses to be killed, we looked for the glad news that the required half of the Indian States had promised to come into the new order of things and that Federation would be born soon after provincial autonomy. In vain does the *chataka* stretch his supplicatory throat before a dry cloud! The delay is thus explained:

"The final discussions with the States with regard to their Instruments of Accession and the execution of the latter cannot be undertaken until the Act which will be the basis of the Princes' accession has been passed, for until that time arrives the States will not be in possession of complete knowledge of the character and powers of the Federation to which they are asked to accede."

Have we of British India that complete knowledge? Have the Government of Great Britain and the leaders of the various parties that complete knowledge? We all reserved our final judgment alike. And yet the authors of the White Paper have made up our minds for us. Only the Princes, in virtue of their sovereignty, have suspended the whole enterprise and may in the end politely bid British India go its own way. This without doubt is one of those causes beyond the control of His Majesty's Government, which they fear might make their programme impossible. Being forewarned, they are also forearmed. Here is the remedy:

"They will take steps to review the whole position in consultation with Indian opinion."

Quick and sure! Recall the agony of the 1932 session of the R. T. C. and that of the two previous sessions. Indian opinion is at the best unsure and divided. What will it yield in the exasperation of failure and dark suspicions engendered by it?

Danger lurks in another quarter also. The Reserve Bank may not have been started; or financial, economic or political conditions may render it impracticable to start the new Federal and Provincial Governments on a stable basis. Mark the phrase 'political conditions'. Who does not know the acute political distemper which now taxes the wisdom both of Britain and of India? Who does not know that Federation is the one remedy which has been hit upon as promising relief? It is a curious fear that the application of the remedy may be made impossible by the disease itself or by some new and virulent form that it may assume. If a sinister turn should happen, reasonable persons would only say that delay or denial of the remedy was responsible. The soil and the circumstances of India are likely to throw up fresh turmoil every now and then. History will not exonerate those who give time for the malady to grow worse with the medicine locked up in their chest. No plea of lack of warning is possible.

It has been sounded without end, for a long time, and in every accent and pitch. Allow no interval except the briefest between provincial autonomy and central responsibility; if the second step be not sure to follow, do not take the first.

After three years of close and frank consultation round a table the British and Indian standpoints still present a sharp contrast. The Secretary of State and his political compatriots compare the scheme of reconstruction with the present posture of things and profess to be astonished at the great advance. The Indian politician has the vision of Dominion Status shining in full lustre before his mind's eye and cannot help being chagrined as he sees the tremendous distance between it and what is shown to him as the next stage of his journey. His chagrin is deepened when he realises that the White Paper does not define the further stage or stages, or even foreshadow them. The Montagu-Chelmsford scheme contained the means of its own fulfilment. Even the Simon Report paid homage to the principle of automatic progress, though it failed lamentably to translate it into practical suggestions. In the document before us the only hint that finality has not been reached is contained in a phrase in the opening paragraph, "The responsible government so established must, *during a period of transition*, be qualified by limitations in certain directions." How long this period is to last and when the transition will be finished are questions to which no answer is to be found in the many pages that follow.

At this point another omen of evil may be mentioned. When Lord Irwin comforted our despairing hearts in 1929, he used the words 'Dominion Status' to describe India's political destination and added that they were sanctioned by His Majesty's Government in London. During the protracted discussions of the three years that have passed since then, one yearned with all one's heart to hear those comforting words in an official pronouncement. But in vain. If the authorities, in making immediate readjustments, had this goal in view, they showed no signs of it. But the *mantra* has been chanted in our ears and we shall not forget it until we have probed its significance to the full.

II

In repeating the policy of Great Britain towards our political aspirations, the White Paper which we are examining is careful to observe this rule of silence as regards the expression 'Dominion Status'. Its departure, however, from the terms of the 1929 pronouncement is not merely negative. There is a positive deviation, of which the sinister import is clear, but no explanation is forthcoming. Lord Irwin promised that the safeguards inserted in the new constitution would be in the interests of India.

It is admitted by the authors of the White Paper that the safeguards proposed in it "have been framed in the common interests of India and the United Kingdom." These new words may mean one of two things. They may mean that the two countries have become so intertwined that what is good for one is good for the other as well. This idea, however, is too idealistic to be true and may be dismissed. The intended meaning, then, is that, while such interests as are safeguarded are common to both countries, none are safeguarded which are exclusively those of India or those of the United Kingdom. In a constitution for India there could be no harm in safeguarding her interests, though they be hers alone; in fact, if the constitution be devised by her children or their well-wishers, that should be the case again and again. It is strange that the intention, so nobly prominent in Lord Irwin's declaration, is to some extent expressly disavowed. But are there no safeguards exclusively in the interests of the United Kingdom? Let us examine a few. Take provisions 122 and 123 on page 59. The first begins:

"The Federal Legislature and the Provincial Legislatures will have no power to make laws subjecting in British India any British subject (including companies, partnerships or associations constituted by or under any Federal or Provincial law), in respect of taxation, the holding of property of any kind, the carrying on of any profession, trade, business or occupation, or the employment of any servants or agents, or in respect of residence or travel within the boundaries of the Federation, to any disability or discrimination based upon his religion, descent, caste, colour or place of birth."

But the words "any British subject" include the white people of the Dominions and of Fiji and Kenya, in which the inhabitants of India are subjected to disabilities and indignities. Is India to be deprived for ever of the power of retaliation? She has already taken legislative power for the purpose, though she has forborne so far to exercise it. Then there is the famous resolution of the Imperial Conference of 1921, empowering India to restrict immigration into her territory as it may suit her and discountenancing the disabilities to which her nationals are subjected in parts of the British Commonwealth. No Indian can claim to speak for the people of the United Kingdom. But no Indian will admit that it is in the interests of his country to take away by an express provision in her constitution the power to retaliate that she has, though it be unimplemented, and the benefit of the doctrine of inter-commonwealth propriety, though it be only a pious hope.

Before leaving this topic it is worth while to take note of another distinction made between India and the Dominions, though it be purely academic. It has been claimed by the Dominions that they have the right in certain circumstances of excluding even the people of Great Britain, and the right seems to have been exercised once or twice. The Imperial Parliament, of course, is proverbially omnipotent, there being only one facetious exception. There is no conceivable circumstance in which the people of India would wish to keep out those of the

United Kingdom, if the power was left to them by implication. To deny the power in terms to any people is to discriminate against them and to imply that it might not be safe to entrust them with it. Provision 123 wears the aspect of reciprocity between India and the United Kingdom and goes back to an idea agreed upon at the 1930 session of the R. T. C. But then the subject had to be settled by negotiation between the two parties, and a convention had to be reached regulating the equality between the two communities. It certainly was not intended that the present constitution should lay down the principle in unqualified terms without giving our experts an opportunity of examining how the principle would work out in practice and how, if it led to actual hardships, these could be mitigated. So long as India is not fully self-governing, her power of negotiation with Great Britain is limited. Provision 123 therefore is somewhat in the nature of an *ex parte* arrangement, and the claim cannot be sustained except verbally that it is framed in the common interests of India and the United Kingdom.

When the question of Public Services was first considered at the Round Table Conference, Indian delegates agreed that a certain measure of recruitment in Great Britain should continue, but they stipulated that the entire control should vest for the future in the Government of India. The White Paper declines to make this transfer without a word of explanation. The Secretary of State's Council is to be kept in being for the one purpose of protecting the Services, and the Government of India, in command of the lives and fortunes of 350 millions of people and purporting to march forward to Dominion Status, must appear before the world as not competent to appoint, punish and dismiss their own servants. The personal concurrence of the Governor-General and of the Governors is required before the India Government can censure, transfer or lower the emoluments of a member of certain services. Can this humiliating position of the Government of India be described as subserving the common interests of India and the United Kingdom? Paragraph 101 on page 53 embodies a safeguard of an unusual nature on behalf of European and Anglo-Indian education. A reduction of grant-in-aid in this sphere, unless it is a reduction *pro rata* with the general educational grant-in-aid, requires a three fourths majority in the Provincial Legislature concerned. Is this discrimination in the common interests of India and the United Kingdom?

Paragraph 119 enumerates the subjects in respect of which legislation in the Federal Legislature would require the previous sanction of the Governor-General. Among these subjects are the coinage and currency of the Federation and the powers and duties of the Federal Reserve Bank in relation to the management of currency and exchange. It is well known that these matters have given rise to much suspicion and recrimination in the past and that it is peculiarly difficult for British authorities to act in this sphere without the imputation of being influenced by British more than Indian interests. Is it wise

that the Governor-General, who can withhold assent from any measure at the final stage, should also have the power of prevention at the very beginning? And is it necessary that this requirement of previous consent should be permanent? If the intention of His Majesty's Government to enact this provision be inflexible, why should they not adopt a suggestion that has been frequently made and that has received influential support among British leaders to the effect that the Instrument of Instructions should contain a direction to the Governor-General to use these special powers only in the interests of India? It is highly desirable to avoid all suspicion of subordinating the financial interests of India to those of the United Kingdom.

It is proposed to create by the Constitution Act a statutory Railway Board and to preserve the rights of Indian Railway Companies to have access to the Secretary of State in regard to disputed points and, if they desire, to proceed to arbitration. It is not quite clear why, if the Reserve Bank can be constituted by Indian legislation, the Railway Board should not be similarly constituted. It is equitable that the existing rights of Companies should be maintained. Freedom from political influences and vexatious interference by politicians is as desirable for the Reserve Bank as for the Railway Board. These can be secured in both cases through Indian legislation. In both cases the ultimate control should vest in the Government of India, who are hereafter to be the real custodians of the interests of the country.

III

It is necessary at this point to cast a glance at the other reservations and safeguards, so that we may form a more or less accurate idea of their aggregate. To the bigger items the representatives of India at the Round Table Conference have in the main consented. Defence naturally takes first place under this head, not merely on account of the huge sums that it involves, but on account of its vital importance to national self-respect and to the Dominionhood which sums up the aspirations of India. The Instrument of Instructions will direct the Governor-General to frame the military budget in consultation with his Ministers as well as with the Counsellors responsible to him. We pleaded more than once at the Round Table Conference for such branches of the Defence subject as Indianisation and the development of a citizen army to be actually transferred to the control of the legislatures. Before the Joint Select Committee these pleadings will be repeated without a doubt. Without prejudice the suggestion may be made that, in case a division of responsibility for the subject of defence be ruled out, the Instrument of Instructions should contain a direction that the Governor-General should take counsel with his Ministers on these branches as well as on expenditure. When it is remembered that this Instrument is to be invested with unusual importance in the new regime by being made both

parliamentary and statutory, it will be realised that such a direction to the Governor-General will be a *valuable safeguard in the interests of India*. From our standpoint perhaps the greatest danger is the failure to provide for the termination of the reservation of defence, that is, to indicate the time when the army will be completely Indianised and turned over to our control. The people of India, no less than their leaders, have to watch this subject with the utmost vigilance possible. Let them be warned that the complete Indianisation of the army and its eventual transfer have not yet become part of the accepted policy of the British Government. We cannot rest till this consummation has been reached. The only statement in the White Paper upon the point is to the effect that "the Instrument of Instructions will also formally recognise the fact that the defence of India must to an increasing extent be the concern of the Indian people, and not of the British Government alone." In the face of this unsatisfactory pronouncement, only a child can rest with confidence in the phrase "during a period of transition" occurring in the enunciation of policy with which the White Paper opens—an enunciation, by the way, which carefully omits the words "Dominion Status", which are our inspiration and our hope.

The advent of the Princes into the Federation scheme involves material deductions from Dominionhood, which go far to neutralise the advantages of Indian consolidation. In the first place, they demand the protection of the Crown in case of trouble from their subjects, as though there were forces at the command of the Viceroy as distinguished from the Governor-General. The fantastic nature of this supposition will be apparent the moment one remembers that defence is a federal subject though at present reserved to the Governor-General. Some States seem to have asked even for the retention of British troops for the purpose. Apart from the military aspect, the partial character of Indian Federation takes for granted the continuance of their dependence on the Crown for all non-federal matters so that their allegiance will be divided between the Viceroy and the Government of India. Constitutionally therefore there will be hereafter two parallel sources of authority in India, both deriving from the Crown, but in different capacities. This cannot conduce to smooth working. Though we hope for much from the political ingenuity of the next generation, it is difficult to envisage the complexion of the future Dominion of India unless the scope of Federation is enormously extended and the Princes look to it for protection, for the settlement of succession disputes and other such purposes. By itself this hindrance in the march of our country to Dominion Status is a tremendous price to pay. One could only wish the Federation we get in return will have substance enough to justify it. The process of weakening the Government of India may be said to begin with the separation of the capacities of Viceroy and Governor-General. Hitherto by virtue of section 33 of the Government of India Act, the Governor-General in Council has been

master of all India, including the Indian States. The States portfolio is in the hands of the Governor-General as a member of his own Cabinet, and though the rule has been for his colleagues not to interfere in his administration, cases have occurred in which they have taken a share in the decision.

Apart from erecting the Viceroy into a separate entity with powers and functions abstracted from the head of the Government of India, the Governor-General will in future be exalted at the expense of his Cabinet. He will control the reserved subjects of Defence, External Affairs and Ecclesiastical. He will have power to gather up in his own hands all governmental functions and responsibilities when there is a breakdown of the machinery. Besides, he has various special responsibilities which impinge on the transferred sphere, thus giving rise to occasions when he may direct his Cabinet to do certain things and in case of their non-compliance, do them himself. This setting aside of the Ministry is open to him in all three departments—those of legislation, administration and finance. The items in respect of which he can take this threefold action in supersession of his colleagues make a formidable category. Here are the heads in compendious form:

The prevention of grave menace to the peace or tranquillity of India or any part thereof; the safeguarding of the financial stability and credit of the Federation; the safeguarding of minorities; the safeguarding of the Services; the protection of the rights of States; the prevention of commercial discrimination; any matter in the transferred sphere which affects the reserved departments.

To allay the fears caused by this long list, it is stated that the Governor-General and the eleven Governors who will have corresponding powers will all be men of commonsense and goodwill and a conciliatory disposition. We are assured that in actual fact they will not be found constantly interfering with the administration of the transferred departments by the Ministers. This may or may not be so. But it is certain that the Ministers in charge can never feel at ease so long as they know that they are being narrowly watched by the heads of Defence and External Affairs, by the Financial Adviser, by the leaders of the minority groups, by the senior officials serving under them, by scores of Princes, by the representatives of British commerce, and that some of these may at any moment invoke the exercise of the Governor-General's special responsibilities. The fear of interference will oppress the Ministers and hinder the growth of a sense of responsibility.

The White Paper proceeds on the assumption that the time is come for entrusting large powers to the elected representatives of the people and creates large constituencies for the purpose. One would expect that the existence of these trusted legislative bodies would obviate the necessity of other machinery for the purpose of legislation. It is strange, however, that the power of making laws is to be exercised in future by more agencies than before. The Governor-General and the Governors are to enjoy

the power of certification as hitherto, only the resulting laws will be distinguished on the statute book by being designated Governor-General's Acts and Governors' Acts. The power of making Ordinances for six months is continued. To obviate legal doubts that have arisen, it is to be expressly enacted that an Ordinance is renewable for a second period of six months. This power could hitherto be exercised only by the Governor-General. Hereafter it is exercisable by Governors as well. A wholly new development is the extension of the Ordinance-making power to the Government of India and the Provincial Governments in their collective capacity, but under stringent restrictions. One of these restrictions is that the Ordinances may be repealed at any time by the Governor-General or the Governors. The very brief and precarious life which such Ordinances can enjoy makes it more than doubtful whether they would be really required. The sum of these safeguards and restrictions is so large that the scope of responsible government is unduly narrowed, the machinery of government becomes cumbersome and the people feel that they are not fully trusted. This is the more difficult to understand because the Federal Legislatures are composed, as the *London Times* has admitted, in large measure, of representatives of minorities and representatives of the States, all having a weightage and the latter being in addition nominated by the Princes.

IV

A few minor points call for remarks. The appointment of a Financial Adviser to the Governor-General may not be open to serious objection so long as he is charged with the difficult duty of maintaining the financial stability and credit of the Federation. When the Finance Minister and his department have acquired a fund of experience and the Reserve Bank has functioned satisfactorily in its own sphere, the Governor-General may well be relieved of his special responsibility for finance and the post of Financial Adviser be abolished. It should, therefore, be made only for a definite period, say, five years. The suggestion made in the White Paper that this officer's advice must be available to the Finance Minister is not without its drawbacks. If their mutual consultation becomes frequent and intimate, an undue ascendancy will come to the officer who has the ear of the overriding authority. His wishes and suggestions will acquire excessive importance; and if they be not heeded, it is only human nature that a sense of grievance should be produced. The view is worth consideration that the Finance Minister should not seek the previous advice of the expert.

The proposal of the White Paper on the subject of the Secretary of State's Council cannot commend itself to Indian opinion. If it is to become mostly advisory and its only proper function is to approve of service rules and decide appeals from aggrieved officials, it seems superfluous. It is utterly indefensible to create new 'provinces like Sind and Orissa' unless they are willing to cut their coat according

to their cloth. There is no saying where this process will end. Demands for other provinces, more or less plausible, have already been heard, and it would be difficult to resist them, once the principle of subventions from Federal revenues for deficit provinces has been accepted. Our representatives will, it is hoped, resist the tendency to the utmost. In paragraph 73 of the Introduction a proposal is mentioned for building up gradually separate sterling funds in connection with the contributions now made by officers for family pensions. One remembers a fantastic proposition somewhat on these lines made recently by a retired I. C. S. officer. The resulting scheme must receive the careful scrutiny of our leaders when they are confronted with it at the sittings of the Joint Select Committee.

It is a small gain, but one may be thankful that certain provisions, such as respect due to personal liberty and rights of property and the eligibility of all for public office, regardless of differences of caste, religion, etc., will find a place in the Constitution Act. Some other matters unsuitable for statutory enactment may be embodied in the Royal Proclamation inaugurating the new constitution. Our leaders will, we are confident, endeavour to enlarge the list of these rights as far as possible. One would wish to add a further recommendation that such fundamental rights as may be recognised in these two ways should be extended to the subjects of Indian States, who have been left too much in the cold.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, March 10.

THE JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.

TO-DAY, "The Times" announces that the full Cabinet is to meet to consider the White Paper on the future constitution of India, which, it is hoped, will go into the hands of the members of the House of Commons next Friday, the 17th, and be available for the Press the following day. The motion approving of the Joint Select Committee to consider it will, it is stated, be taken early in April. From the replies given to Mr. Churchill's questions in the House of Commons on Tuesday, it is now understood that the Indian associates will not be named and invited until the Committee itself has been set up and has decided upon its procedure.

The terms of the resolution to be moved by the Government are not yet known, but apparently the Committee will have full power to confer with Indian representatives in whatever way it deems best. This makes the composition of the Committee all the more important and explains why so much pressure is being put upon the Government in regard to its personnel from the Ministerial side of the House.

According to Sir Samuel Hoare's statement, nothing has so far been done to select the Indians who are to come to London for this fourth Conference (which is what it amounts to) beyond some informal correspondence between the Viceroy and the Indians who, it is thought, "would be useful to the Commit-

tee." The Secretary of State said in so many words that no commitments of any kind had been entered into that would embarrass the Committee's liberty of action.

Exactly how the consultations will proceed and to what extent the functions of our latest Indian visitors will exceed those of mere witnesses or "pleaders," we are not to know until the Committee itself is in being. The desire of the Government is understood to be that the deliberations between the Committee and its associates shall be full and free; but, of course, there will be no question of the Indians voting on any issue that may arise, nor will they be in any way responsible for the report which the Committee will eventually submit to Parliament.

Suggestions have been made that some, at least, of the Indian delegates should be nominated by the Legislative Assembly, in which case that body would presumably expect a report from its own representatives. The Assembly, however, has not evinced any particular desire to be directly represented in these discussions, and the choice will probably rest as before with His Majesty's Government in consultation with the Viceroy.

REACTIONARY WIRE-PULLING.

Signs are multiplying that intense pressure will be put—is being put—upon the Government with a view to restricting the proposed Indian Constitution in every possible way. It is very significant that so many back-benchers in the Tory Party should be publicly proclaiming that in their view the scheme which was adumbrated at the last Round Table Conference goes too far. It is still more ominous that these domestic critics of the Government's Indian policy are by no means limited to those who voted for Sir Henry Page-Croft's diehard resolution a fortnight ago. It has to be recognised that the opposition to the moderate reforms such as are favoured by Sir Samuel Hoare and some of his colleagues is much stronger within the Tory ranks than the figures of the division on that occasion would appear to indicate. And during the last few weeks there has been some very vigorous string-pulling in the constituencies, the result of which is to be seen in the numerous protests made by individual members against making any substantial advance towards real self-government in India. All that these Conservative commentators seem to be concerned about is to make sure that British interests are in no way affected and, with this object in view, to see that the safeguards are as stringent as they can be made. Some perhaps genuinely believe that India would be safer and happier if still left in the hands of the strong British governing classes. They can only see themselves as divinely appointed to control the destiny of all those people who come under their sway. They are not evil in their intentions but simply egotistical and without any real foresight.

The Government, however, may be trusted to do its utmost to secure a reliable working majority for its own proposals on the Committee, but opinion in the party about India is so restive that anything may happen when the White Paper is put upon the dissecting table. In such a situation as this the Labour Members will have little choice, as Mr. Lansbury remarked to a friend last week, but support the main proposal of the Government lest a worse thing should befall.

It is as well that India should be thoroughly awake to what is happening here behind the scenes. However unsatisfactory from the Indian point of view the policy of the present Government is, it is clear that the main struggle during the next stage of the discussions is going to be, not so much

between Indian Nationalism and a reactionary Government, which is, at least from the British standpoint, progressive on this issue, as between Indian Nationalism and a solid mass of Conservatism which refuses to look ahead, or to take any but the smallest step forward.

PLACATING THE TORY CRITICS.

One disturbing feature of the present situation here is that Ministers are being driven into making statements of a compromising nature with a view to placating malcontents in their own party. As was remarked last week, Sir Samuel Hoare stood up to his critics with a fair amount of courage and determination at the meeting of the Conservative National Council, but the strength of the opposition on that occasion has not been without its effect on the party as a whole. Every effort will be made by the official leaders to reassure the doubters in the rank and file that the policy of the Government is a safe one for Britain.

The line which will be taken by Government spokesmen to steady opinion among their supporters was indicated in the speech of the Under-Secretary, Mr. R. A. Butler, on Wednesday at a meeting of the Junior Constitutional Club. He assured those who had been picking holes in the Government's Indian programme that there would be opportunity for the fullest discussion, not only in the Joint Committee, but in Parliament itself and in the country. He suggested to that section of Conservative opinion which wanted to reject the Government's proposals before hearing them that they were foolishly magnifying the risks which the scheme discussed at the Round Table would entail. Mr. Butler reiterated his faith in a democratic solution (as he conceives it) of the Indian problem, but once more he assured his hearers that the Government had not the least intention of throwing India away.

And then he went on to proclaim what great things the National Government had already achieved for the Empire in India, the inference being that nothing would be surrendered which was vital to the maintenance of the British connection with that country. On his showing India was already on the way to becoming the happiest and most prosperous country in the world. He made as much as he could of the rise in the value of Indian Government securities. He held up the Ottawa Agreement as one of the most tangible fruits of what he called tariff autonomy. Then there was the breaking of the boycott, and above all the check which had been given to the civil disobedience movement, over which he said the Government had proved themselves definitely victorious.

Surely all these were reasons enough for loyal Conservatives to have confidence in the determination of their leaders to make no undesirable concessions. On the strength of such achievements he appealed to them not to lose this opportunity of finding a national solution to the Indian problem.

This kind of appeal, in conjunction with the increasing emphasis which will be put on the safeguards, will no doubt go a long way in satisfying the main body of the Conservative party that the constitution proposed for India, with its checks and reservations, will do no great harm. Is it not better, many of them will say, to set up a stable well buttressed Government in India with every possible constitutional guarantee, than to leave the problem to be dealt with on revolutionary lines by the next Socialist Government?

Anyhow, all signs point to the fact that we are in for a dramatic struggle in the Select Committee; and who can tell what will come out of it or where anyone will stand at the end?

THE PURSHOTTAMDAS PARK INCIDENT.

This week's edition of "The New Statesman" has made a slashing attack upon the Indian administration in a paragraph dealing with the Magistrate's refusal, at Allahabad, to permit the meeting that was to have been held on the 6th February, to the memory of the late Pundit Motilal Nehru.

It speaks of the unnecessary petty tyranny to which all classes of Indians are subjected, and gives the main outlines of the scandalous treatment to which Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and the conveners of the meeting were subjected by an arrogant, high-handed official's action. "Like all Governments", says the paragraph, "the world over, committed to the repression of a nationalist movement for self-government, the Indian Administration is pursuing the impossible task with conscientious stupidity, and is steadily turning moderates into extremists".

One is glad to see the incident has got into print here, for practically all moderate opinion will be shocked by such exasperating treatment being meted to a man so well esteemed and liked as Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru. Perhaps it is well that these things do occur to the men most respected by us. It compels thought and strengthens the will to fight for the national freedom of a country where such blunders can occur with impunity. It is when such lamentable incidents occur to our friends that we are sensible of the significance of the evils that are inherent in a foreign domination.

MR. ANDREWS'S ENGLISH ASHRAM.

For some weeks past Mr. Andrews has made his headquarters at the Woodbrooke Settlement, near Birmingham. In talking about it to a friend, he stated that he had done so because both Mahatma Gandhi and Rabindranath Tagore have very intimate associations with this Settlement of the Society of Friends, situated in the heart of England. "The place has become," said Mr. Andrews, "a kind of English religious Ashram and it keeps in the closest possible touch by correspondence with both Mahatmaji and the Poet." Mr. Andrews by his residence at Woodbrooke thus forms a link for keeping up this spirit of fellowship between the Indian Ashrams at Santiniketan and Sabarmati and this kindred institution in the centre of England. He has often said that he feels happier at Woodbrooke than anywhere else in England, because he finds there a very similar atmosphere to that which surrounds him when he is at the Indian Ashrams.

While staying with his hospitable friends at this Settlement Mr. Andrews has had opportunities of addressing the University of Birmingham and various other bodies and public meetings on the Indian situation. He was unfortunately unable to be present at the Annual Dinner of the Indian Association owing to his being called away to London on the day of that event. Mr. Andrews rarely misses a meeting of the Indian Conciliation Group in town and he is frequently interviewing members of the Government and other leading statesmen in the interests of his adopted country.

SNOWED UP.

Mr. Andrews thought your readers would like to hear of a strange adventure which he had recently while at Woodbrooke. He went out to a farm-house in the country on the night before last month's great blizzard, hoping to stay for a day or two, in order to get on with the writing of his book "Christ in the Silence." But immediately after his arrival at the farm the snow came down and the drifts in the lanes were so deep that he was entirely snowed up for five days, and there was no possibility of his getting back to Woodbrooke. However, this proved a blessing in

disguise as during these days of uninterrupted quietness he was able to do more consecutive writing that had been possible for several previous weeks.

Mr. Andrews hopes to have his latest book ready for the publishers by the beginning of May, and its issue may be expected some time in July. Notices have already appeared in the Press of many countries relating to its advent as one of the most important religious books of the year, and many are looking forward to its publication as a sequel to his widely-read "What I Owe to Christ." In common with that volume the new book will, of course, contain many references to the author's Indian experience.

Review.

CIVILIZATION OF ASIA.

THE HERITAGE OF ASIA. By KENNETH SAUNDERS. (Association Press, Calcutta.) 1932. 20cm. 224p. Rs. 2/-

"WHAT is it which makes India Indian and China Chinese? What does the genius of Japan choose from each? How does she blend their gifts? These are the questions which this book seeks to answer."

The erudite scholar, Mr. Saunders, applies his vast learning to the noble task of a sympathetic understanding and able interpretation of the genius of the Indians, the Chinese, the Japanese and the Koreans, in one word, the East. The author believes that in this generation Western students will study Asia as eagerly as Eastern students are studying Europe. There are no barriers between East and West that cannot be overcome by sympathy and goodwill, if informed and intelligent.

The characteristic notes of the civilisations of each of the great Asiatic nations is rather a matter of emphasis than of difference: "Asia is one; the Himalayas divide only to unite." We may say schematically that India has been more concerned with the mystical than the ethical, with the beauty of the unseen mind at play in the universe, that China has looked more to the beauty of human relations and the embodiment of cosmic harmony in society, and that Japan has blent these emphasis in her romantic cult of the Emperor and her religious nationalism, which sees her as the land of the Kamri or Gods. In the golden ages of Korea, too, something of Indian mysticism and of Chinese humanism was blent in a fine synthesis, which inspired the Japanese and sent them modds of secular as well as of religious achievement."

After giving the general characteristics of the three great civilisations, the author devotes a chapter each to develop his theme. In order that the reader may appreciate and estimate it more worthily he studies in some detail three great figures, each typical of the best qualities of his nation, all of them men who have wielded and are wielding an immense influence today, viz., the Buddha, Confucius, and Shotrku—mystic, moralist and ruler.

Having written about the heritage of Korea and the Nara Age, and the three great Scriptures, he gives a chapter to each of the great modern leaders, Mahatma Gandhi, Hu Shih, and Toyokiko Kagawa.

The author says, "That is why a Gandhi in India, a Hu Shih in China, a Kagawa in Japan, all acclaim the Sermon on the Mount as a foundation for the new order in Asia, akin to and not alien from its own great heritage. If her mystics and

theologians adore the Christ of the Johannine Sermon on the Mount the ideal of their unified life." "It competes an almost equal footing with the Gita for my allegiance," says Mahatma Gandhi. "I am attracted by it because it reinforces our own Chinese idealism," says Hu Shih. "Here is the foundation for a New Society," says Kagawa.

In the second part of the book the author gives illustrative readings from the religious literature of India, China, and Japan, which are well worth a careful perusal. "Having looked at classic books and figures and eras in Asia, and then jumped forward a thousand years to its three great modern reformers, the student is challenged to go and find out for himself all that is involved in the coming of the West—of Mongol and Mogul, of Portugese.

Dutch and English,—into the ancient East. Is it for good or for evil? What is it which can convert the evil into good? In what spirit can true partnership between East and West be achieved?

Indeed, this is a great book, written by a sympathetic scholar with a noble purpose. And not inappropriately is this book dedicated to the memory of K. T. Paul who has done his valiant part in the interpretation of East and West to each other.

S. S. WILLIAM.

SHORT NOTICES.

THE CROSS MOVES EAST. By JOHN S. HOYLAND. (Allen & Unwin.) 1931. 20cm. 160 p. 5/-

THIS book gives a short survey through the ages of the ideal of creative suffering voluntarily offered to right a wrong. It does more than this. It interprets with great sympathy the essential spirit of Indian religious devotion in the light of this principle of the Cross, which in the Modern Indian term may be called 'Satyagraha.'

The author shows how the Buddha offering his life to feed a starving tigress with her cubs, the Indian philosopher Culamus burning his body rather than obey an unjust Imperial command, and Mahatma Gandhi suffering like S. Paul many stripes for righteousness sake, are all inheritors of that same spiritual kingdom which Christ died to establish by his self-offering on the Cross.

It is a challenging book not only to Christians but to all who claim to be seekers after truth.

MARY GILLETT.

SCIENTIFIC INVESTMENT: A MANUAL FOR COMPANY SHARE AND DEBENTURE HOLDERS. By HARGREAVES PARKINSON. (Pitman.) 1932. 23cm. 228p. 10/6.

THIS is a book dealing with a technical subject and immensely useful to investors in company shares, debentures and so on. But it is a book which has an interest even for the general reader. Mr. Parkinson has analysed the subject of investment in all its aspects so lucidly and clearly that everyone, from the smallest investor to the biggest capitalist, will be able to get instruction from it. The author has many useful suggestions to make to investors to enable them to safeguard their interests. The book is to be read and digested by all those who are in any way connected with modern business, and as perhaps everyone at present comes into contact with one business or other in some manner or other involving financial investment, it will have consequently to be

read by one and all. Sir Walter Layton in his introduction says that Mr. Parkinson's book gives short shrift to many old traditions and as the reforms suggested by him are all very beneficial, they deserve adoption.

C. V. HANUMANTHA RAO.

Miscellaneous.

LIBERAL VIEW OF THE WHITE PAPER.

Following is the statement issued by Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer, the Right Honourable V. S. Srinivasa Sastri and Dewan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao on behalf of the Madras Liberal League.

ON behalf of the Madras Liberal League, we have been authorised to make the following brief statement with regard to the scheme of constitutional reforms embodied in the White Paper.

As the subject is to be considered by the Council of the National Liberal Federation when it meets in Calcutta next month and as the time we have had for the study of the White Paper has been short, we desire it to be understood that the opinions here expressed are of a tentative character and subject to the decision of the Liberal Federation at its next session. The gloomy forecast of the contents of the White Paper seems to be abundantly justified by the scheme now published. It is inspired throughout by a deep-seated distrust of the capacity and bona fides of the legislatures and treats them either as political babes or as potential enemies of Britain. The activities of the legislatures are hedged in and surrounded by so many restrictions that it is impossible for any sense of responsibility to grow up.

In effect the scheme appears to be a perpetuation of the present regime. All the restrictions imposed by the Montagu-Chelmsford scheme re-appear in the new constitution, perhaps in a tighter form. The vast powers conferred upon the Governor-General and the Governors under the heads of reserved departments, the special responsibilities, special powers delegated by the Crown not inconsistent with the Act, discretionary powers, emergency powers, powers of interference in the transferred (now called 'non-reserved') departments under the elastic formula of

"necessary for the fulfilment of any of the special responsibilities" and the powers of issuing ordinances, dictating legislation by message, providing for appropriations without the consent of the legislatures and against their votes, amount virtually to an autocracy not mitigated, but strengthened, by the unchecked control of White Hall.

The provisions envisage the possibility of a divergence or conflict of interests between Britain and India, and the autocratic powers conferred upon the Viceroy and the Secretary of State furnish a temptation to exercise the powers in a manner favourable to the interests of Britain rather than of India. Need it cause any surprise if legislation prompted by such distrust creates deep distrust in the good faith of the British Government?

Of the many features of the scheme which seriously detract from its acceptability, we can only refer to the multitudinous and multifarious safeguards designed to keep the ministry and the legislatures under leading strings. The absence of any provision for giving any useful voice to the legislature in the matter of defence, the imposition of conditions for the establishment of federation, the absence of any limit to the period of waiting for the removal of the obstacles to federation, the requirement of an address from both Houses of Parliament to the inauguration of the federal Government, the absence of any indication of the termination of the period of transition and safeguards either automatically or conditionally and as to the time of attainment of Dominion Status or full responsible government, the absence of any power in the federal legislature to make any amendments even in the details of the constitution, the perpetuation of the India Council on a slightly altered basis, the refusal to transfer the control of the Services to the Government of India and the prospect of permanent subventions of deficit provinces are not calculated to relieve the gloom in the political atmosphere. Unless the scheme now published undergoes radical alteration in the direction of the removal of the numerous shackles on the freedom of the legislatures and the conferment of a generous measure of genuine responsibility on the federal legislature, there is no likelihood of allaying the political discontent in India. The choice before the British Government is to placate the Tories at home or win the confidence of the people of India.

THE MAHARAJA OF ALWAR.

By H. J. LASKI.

The latest Indian Prince to seek British military aid in quelling unrest in his State is the Maharajah Sir Jey Singhji Bahadur, who rules 750,000 persons.

Born in 1832, he has been a ruler since he was 21. The yearly revenue of his Rajputana State, which covers 3000 square miles, is £300,000. He enjoys a salute of 17 guns.

TO most Englishmen the India of the Native States is a closed book. The lives of the nearly eighty million subjects whom the princes control is a matter upon which our ignorance is complete.

Vaguely, we know an occasional name like that of Ranjitsinghji, or the too-famous Maharajah of Kashmir. Vaguely, also, we hear legends of fabulous wealth.

We see an occasional colourful figure in London, as at the Round Table Conference. We have

heard, recently, a hymn of praise to them for their supposed generosity over the federal idea. But what goes on within their territories is a matter about which few of us think it necessary to concern ourselves.

Yet we are the Paramount Power in India, responsible for the preservation of law and order in the princes' dominions. It is as the Paramount Power that we have just dispatched a thousand British troops to save the Maharajah of Alwar from a rebellion of his own subjects.

It is only a few months since British troops preserved his throne for the Maharajah of Kashmir. Have we reason to be proud of our relation with the States?

Alwar himself is one of the better known princes. A man of middle age, striking in appearance, a

mighty hunter, a devout Hindu, a host who knows no limit to hospitality, something of an orator, he might easily be taken for a picturesque figure.

In fact, he is an autocrat such as Western Europe has hardly known since the feudal barons of the middle ages. His subjects have no rights save his good pleasure. The power of legislation, the control over taxation. These are absolutely in his hands.

He is a man of dominating will to whom the notion of consultation is unknown. Passionate, autocratic, unstable, by no means devoid of ability, but unable to distinguish between his own good pleasure and the welfare of his subjects, his habits must have occasioned many a difficult hour in the Viceregal Lodge at Delhi.

Among all the Native States of India, there are four in the government of which it is possible to recognise some approximation to Western standards. Two of them, Mysore and Travancore, have been really well governed, until recently, by women; Cochin, also in the South, is also a model; the fourth, Baroda, is ruled on a lower plane of competence but it stands out far above the rest. Of the others, I will only say that it is impossible to describe them except in terms of something akin to despair.

There is a good deal of savage cruelty. There is little recognition of the decencies of civilised life.

All that we exact from their rulers is that the scandals shall not be excessive.

Very occasionally, as in Indore, under Lord Reading, we interfere to the degree of deposing an impossible ruler. A little more frequently we send a Resident to act as adviser. But for the most part we tolerate a mediævalism that can only be described in the terminology of barbarism. There are few States with even a pretence of an educational system. I know of one State where ten times the cost of education was spent on the wedding of the Maharajah's son. There are few States with even the beginnings of a public health service. There is rarely a legislative assembly with any powers.

* * *

It is seldom indeed that a Civil Service exists in the modern sense of the term. The prince's will is law; things like a Habeas Corpus Act, a criminal code, an effectively independent judiciary have still to be made.

Freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of the Press—these are hardly in their faint beginnings. Those who want to criticise the incredible practices of princely administration usually do so from the safe vantage ground of British India.

One Maharajah advanced the revision of his revenue settlement—which meant the rack-renting of his tenants—by fifteen years because he wanted to build a new palace. Another, in his motor-car, drove over a dog in a small town in his State; he collected all the dogs in the town and had them burned alive for failure to realise their obligation to his car.

There are contemporary records of torture and murder which read like the horrors of the mediæval Inquisition. Largely, we close our eyes to these things. Delegations make their protests; they unfold a ghastly tale of brutality and sordid pursuit of pleasure. But the princes are semi-sovereign; we have treaties with them.

Short of scandal too hideous to overlook, we observe the obligations of our treaties. It is even

possible that the new federation—if it ever comes into being—will give the princes a new lease of authority.

* * *

For they are fervent supporters of the British Raj. None of them—outside the three I have mentioned—has any use for democratic government. Few of them would remain long on their thrones were it not for our guarantee of order in their dominions. I have met few Indians who doubt that our retirement from India would be followed by wholesale rebellion among their subjects.

And by rebellion that would be the simple expression of intolerable grievance. The Mahomedans who have revolted in Alwar, for example, are simple peasants crushed beneath a heavy burden of taxation.

For years past their complaints have been loud; for years past no attention has been paid to their complaints. They have revolted because they literally know no other way, under a despotic Prince of insisting that they have reached the limit of human endurance.

They are not wicked men, misled by agitators. They are dissatisfied with conditions of life that, did they exist in an English county, would send a government headlong from power.

Are British troops going to Alwar to make possible the retention of those conditions? Or shall we insist, as we ought to insist, that the condition of our protection for the Maharajah is thoroughgoing reform of his State?

Grant that he is a picturesque figure—handsome, capable, no doubt, of acts of individual generosity. He governs his State because we permit him to do so; we cannot escape our responsibility to his subjects behind the pretence of his sovereignty, for the Viceroy could depose him at any moment.

* * *

If the Maharanee of Travancore can build a State of which every Indian is rightly proud, why cannot we use our paramountcy to enforce similar conditions upon all other princes?

At least we could insist upon certain fundamental rights. We could demand a civil list to which there was rigorous adherence. We could demand a legislative council, freely chosen by the people. We could demand an appeal in all cases of imprisonment to the Viceroy-in-Council.

We could insist upon proof of competence before administrative appointment. If the princes want our support, they should be made to pay for it by compulsory recognition of the elementary decencies of civil government.

A rebellion in Alwar does not, I think, surprise any observer of Indian affairs. The wonder is rather that rebellion has not broken out long ago in other Indian States.

Profoundly as I sympathise with the aspirations of British India to self-government, I sympathise still more with the tragic position of those who will not benefit by its opportunities.

I hope Mr. Gandhi will not forget those dumb millions when his hour of responsibility arrives.—*Daily Herald.*