

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XVI, No. 13. }

POONA—THURSDAY, MARCH 30, 1933.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	145
ARTICLES :—	
The Princes.	148
The White Paper and Franchise.—I. By R. R. Bakhale, M.L.C.	149
ROUND THE WORLD. By Madame L. Morin.	151
OUR LONDON LETTER.	152
REVIEW :—	
Depression and Its Cure. By C. V. Hanumantha Rao.	154
MISCELLANEOUS :—	
Views on the White Paper. By Messrs. Kunaru and Joshi.	155

Topics of the Week.

Supply for Reserved Departments.

IT will be noticed how the provision in the White Paper regarding the supply for reserved departments in the central government differs radically from the provision in the existing Act regarding the supply for reserved subjects in the provincial governments. Once it is admitted that certain branches of governmental functions are to be reserved for some time to official as distinguished from popular control, it is necessary that the official or non-popular part of government must be given the right of obtaining necessary legislation and supply for those functions. This does not mean however that bills and demands for grants concerning them should be excluded altogether from the vote of the legislature. Indeed, it is provided in the White Paper that any bills that may be introduced in the federal legislature for securing affirmative legislation for the reserved departments will be voted upon by the legislative chambers; only the final decision will rest with the Governor-General, who is given overriding powers.

But what obtains in the case of legislative proposals does not obtain in the case of financial proposals. Neither chamber of the federal legislature will have the right to vote supplies. Demands for grants for the reserved departments will be merely discussed but not voted upon. This restriction upon the competence of the legislature is wholly unnecessary. In the provincial governments at the present time de-

mands for grants for reserved subjects are both discussed and voted upon, though the vote can be set aside by the Governor, and this arrangement has not been found in practice to have caused any difficulty in the Governor implementing his responsibility in respect to law and order. Why then it was found necessary to exclude the supply for reserved departments from the federal legislature is difficult to understand. To allow the legislature to vote on demands for grants and then to take power to restore the demands, if refused, would after all be only a slight improvement. Perhaps, Sir Samuel Hoare has kept it up his sleeve in order to be able to show at the end that he has made concessions in deference to popular representations.

Supply for the Political Department.

IF proposals for the appropriations for reserved departments will not be placed before the House of Assembly at all for vote, those for the appropriations for transferred (or non-reserved) departments will in effect be subject to the vote of both chambers. For the executive government will have power, in the case of demands for grants refused by the House of Assembly, to place them, with the help of the Council of State, before a joint session of the legislature. The upper chamber which is a comparatively large body and consists of a large nominated element is thus going to be endowed with almost co-ordinate power.

But there is still a third type of subject, expenditure on which will not only be not voted upon but will not even be discussed in the legislature. "Expenditure required for the discharge of the functions of the Crown in, and arising out of, its relation with the rulers of Indian States," or, in other words, political expenditure, will not be open to discussion in the legislature. For Political Relations is not, like Foreign Relations, a subject reserved temporarily to the control of the Governor-General, but is a subject which has been removed right out of the sphere of the future Government of India and placed altogether beyond its jurisdiction. Nor is there anything to show that this curtailment of the Government of India's ambit of authority will be or even can be remedied at any time in future. For it follows from the constitutional theory of the States having direct relations with the Crown, and no change in political circumstances will call for or even justify a change in the theory.

But the question arises why the Indian exchequer should bear the charge for the Political Department at all if this department is to be controlled, not by the Governor-General as the executive head of the federal Government, but by the Viceroy as

a representative of His Majesty the King-Emperor, in a capacity other than that of sovereign of his Indian dominions. If the British Crown maintains relations with the Princes in the capacity of the paramount power in India the Government of India in power for the time being must have authority to implement responsibilities in connection therewith. If, however, the British Crown has entered into relations, with the Princes in any other capacity, India has no responsibilities to fulfil in the matter. The Crown must discharge whatever obligations it has incurred on this account without drawing upon India's help. If, for instance, it is a matter of sending military aid to Kashmir or Alwar, the Indian Army cannot be used for the purpose, nor can the monies required in giving this aid be charged to the Indian treasury. The Crown may as the sovereign of England use English troops and defray the expenses out of the British Exchequer. Having nothing to do with Political Relations, India can have no responsibilities to carry out on this score.

* * *

Safeguards.

COMMENTING on the White Paper the *New Statesman* is reported to have stated that once the federal government came into being it will develop a vitality of its own and that if only Indians would enter the legislatures and use the powers boldly they would find that the British, fully occupied with their own troubles, would increasingly leave them to their own devices. Prof. Berriedale Keith has taken a similar line and showed conclusively how external safeguards have failed to be effective in the case of the British Dominions. The constitution envisaged by the White Paper differs fundamentally from those of the British Dominions. Here the external safeguards are meant to be effective; here safeguards not only reign but rule. The retention of the control of the services and the army in the hands of the Secretary of State rule out any hope to the contrary.

There is however a possibility of these safeguards going into cold storage in course of time if, as the *New Statesman* suggests, Indians will enter the Councils and use the powers boldly. But this prospect is made practically impossible on account of the composition of the federal legislatures. Forty per cent. of the seats in the Upper and one-third in the Lower Chamber have been made over to the Princes and they are free, and even expected, to fill them by nomination. There are some influential British Indians themselves who do not feel appalled by this prospect. They cherish the hope that intimate contact with British Indian politicians and political parties and collaboration with them during the sessions of the Indian legislature is bound to liberalise the outlook of the Princes and make them progressive. It is a far-fetched hope. If contact and collaboration can soften Indian autocrats into democrats, there is no reason why a similar process should not be depended upon in the case of the British autocrats as well who after all inherit democratic instincts and traditions. The Government of India would by now have been democratic in substance, notwithstanding its autocratic character in form. It is good to keep smiling even in adversity but there is no need to deceive ourselves that it is not adversity.

Even the British Indian quota of the federal legislature will be composed of representatives of communities elected under separate electorates far too numerous to make for cohesion and concerted action. There are again influential Indians who believe that the nationally-minded among the reli-

gious and racial communities have a chance of being returned under separate electorates. It again is a vain hope. The electoral system has been so fashioned,—not wholly through the fault of the British, it may be admitted,—as to make the federal legislature the cockpit of conflicts.

It will be seen that a bold exercise of power by progressive and democratic Indians has been rendered impossible both by the internal and external safeguards in the constitution. It is very likely that the internal safeguards will be so effective as not to call for the exercise of the external. In that sense, England may not be called upon frequently to overrule India.

If the British Government for its part is determined on making the safeguards effective for its own purpose, there is the lamentable fact that on the Indian side numerous interests, communal and otherwise, demand that safeguards for their own individual interests shall be embodied in the constitution and guaranteed by the British Parliament. The Princes, the Muslims, the Anglo-Indians, the European commercial interests, the Depressed classes and a host of others ask for guarantees from the British Government. In the circumstances, even if the British were too pre-occupied with their own immediate problems to meddle in Indian affairs, Indians themselves, of one section or other, will not allow them to put safeguards in cold storage. Safeguards are to be effective and will stay for a long, long while.

* * *

Some Sovereignty That

REPLYING to a question in the Assembly the Foreign Secretary stated that troops from British India were sent to Alwar to put down the recent disturbance not at the request of the Alwar Durbar but under orders of the Governor-General-in-Council in fulfilment of the responsibilities of the Paramount Power for peace and tranquillity in India as a whole, as the Government were satisfied that there was immediate danger of grave disorders in that State. This is a wholly unsatisfactory position. If the Paramount Power has responsibilities for peace and tranquillity in the Indian States, it has likewise, implicitly, if not explicitly, the responsibility to ensure good government in the States and the removal of legitimate grievances of their peoples. It is highly deplorable that the Paramount Power should look on with folded hands until the people, exasperated with legitimate grievances, rise in revolt and threaten grave disorders, and only then step in to put down the disturbances, and proceed to remove grievances. Some other means, of a peaceable and constitutional nature, should be found for the discharge of the responsibilities of the Paramount Power. It should either take a more lively and intimate interest in the good government of the States or "advise" the Princes to introduce representative and responsible institutions in them. The latter is by far the better course.

The despatch of troops by the Paramount Power to Alwar even without the Durbar asking for such aid is a significant commentary on the "sovereignty and internal autonomy" of the Princes, which has been so much emphasised at the Round Table Conference and the Chamber of Princes. Untaught by this bitter lesson, the Princes still appeal to the very Paramount Power to entrench them in their autocracies, their autonomies and sovereignties!

* * *

Condemnation of the White Paper.

THE White Paper is still being discussed in the Central Legislature, as we go to press, but all the Provincial Legislatures that have finished their discussions have condemned it in almost unmeasured terms. The first Council to consider the subject was that of Bihar and Orissa, and the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Sachchidananda Sinha, at one time member of the Executive Council of the province, gave the lead to all legislators by analysing the contents of the White Paper and showing up its utter hollowness. In his opinion the scheme adumbrated in the White Paper is not merely insufficiently progressive, but is distinctly reactionary, and he for one would welcome for it the fate which actually befell a similar constitution framed for Ireland and which Mr. Asquith foretold for it at the time in the following words:

"For the hybrid system which the Government is about to set up, a system which pretends to be that which it is not and is not what it pretends to be, there is inevitably reserved the inexorable sentence which history shows must fall on every form of political imposture."

Mr. Sinha thinks that the reform proposals contained in the White Paper are no less a political imposture and deserve no less a sentence of death. For, in his judgment, they would only "perpetuate British domination in this country, enthrone pure and unadulterated autocracy and render the people far more helpless to resist the despotism of the new Government than they are even at present." "Far from there following in its train," he said, referring to the White Paper, "any political appeasement or any general satisfaction and contentment, it will aggravate the already difficult situation in this country, intensify discontent and widespread struggle for freedom, deepen serious unrest, beget bitterness of strife and generate acerbity and ill-will even where they do not exist at present." Similar uncompromising opposition was offered in the speeches of members of the progressive parties in other legislatures as well—of Bombay, Madras and North-West Frontier Province—and members of other parties also, including communal, took up an attitude of bitter criticism and general hostility to the scheme of the White Paper. And it must be remembered that the dissatisfaction voiced within the legislative chambers is only a faint echo of one voiced without. There is hardly a warm friend of the White Paper to be found outside the ranks of Anglo-Indian papers and representatives of European commerce.

Unitary and Federal.

AT a time when all our constitutional discussions have a federal form of government for their starting point, it is of the utmost importance to know what opinion prevails among those who follow political science as a profession as to the comparative merits of the unitary and federal constitutions. A federal system has always been recognised as possessing very serious disadvantages, and political scientists are being confirmed more and more in this conviction by the experience which countries like U. S. A. have afforded of the practical working of this system. Modern conditions have tended steadily to accentuate the inherent defects of the federal constitutions. Mr. W. F. Willoughby, who is known as an eminent thinker on constitutional matters, writes in the February number of the *American Political Science Review* as follows:—

It is a significant fact that practically all countries which in recent years have adopted new constitutional systems have after a careful study of the relative advantages and disadvantages of the unitary and federal types

of government, decided in favour of the former. The difficulties that our country (U. S. A.) has had, as the result of its having a federal form of government, in the handling of such matters as the detection and prosecution of crime, the control of transportation, the securing of uniform legislation in respect to many matters in regard to which uniformity is desirable and the co-ordination of the activities of the national government and the governments of the states when their operations are in the same field are well known.

Mr. Willoughby suggests that an inquiry should be undertaken into the ways in which the difficulties of a federal constitution, to a certain extent unavoidable, can be minimised. And he says:—

It may well be that the American people are not prepared to abandon their federal form of government. It is desirable, however that they should have a clear knowledge of the disadvantages that this form of government presents. A dispassionate study is needed of the manner in which this form of government operates at the present time and of the means that have been resorted to to overcome its disadvantages. Such a study would be especially valuable in considering proposals constantly being made to amend the federal constitution with a view to enlarging the powers of the national government and in the further development of means for securing uniformity in legislation and co-ordination in the administrative work of the different governments where such uniformity and co-ordination are desirable.

One of the matters in respect to which the need for enlargement of the powers of the national government is most sorely felt is that concerning civil and criminal law, which is left to the states in U. S. A. We in India are also leaving this most important subject to be dealt with by the federating States, not minding the lesson which U. S. A. has to teach us in this respect.

Capitations.

REPLYING to a question in the Council of State, the Finance Secretary stated that the Government were considering the Report of the Capitations Tribunal as well as the question of its publication. When asked what the publication of the Report had to do with the Government's consideration of it, he answered that the decision on both points must be taken together. We confess we are unable to see the relevancy of this contention. It is true that it has been the general habit of the Government to publish reports of committees and commissions along with their decisions thereon. But even this practice requires justification. There is no reason why the Government should not publish reports in the first instance, and then take into account public opinion thereon, before taking their own final decisions. Such a practice is the more necessary in India under the present constitution inasmuch as it is not open to the Opposition in the legislature to dismiss a Government whose decisions it disapproved. Public opinion in India can only influence the Government and that is best done before the Government takes decisions. This is specially necessary with respect to matters such as the one which formed the subject of investigation by the Capitations Tribunal, over which Indian opinion has long been deeply exercised.

Even if such a procedure is a breach of convention, there are well-known precedents for it. The Sken Committee Report is a case in point. We join with the *Leader* in insisting on the early publication of the Report, pending the consideration of the Government thereof and the Government carrying out their promise to give the legislature full opportunities to discuss the Report.

Articles.

THE PRINCES.

THE last session of the Chamber of Princes recorded no progress in the discussion of constitutional reform of India. The Princes marked time. They once again paid homage to the ideal of federation. But they would not make up their minds to join it. Their principal fear, as mentioned by the retiring Chancellor, the Jam Sahib, was that, notwithstanding the safeguards adumbrated in the White Paper for the internal autonomy of the States, democracy would invade the States and undermine the autocracies that had so far flourished there. The Jam Sahib frankly summed up the purpose of the British in promoting the entry of the States into the federation. It was to provide the elements of stability and experience. (By the way, it is easy to understand the stability that the Princes could furnish the federation with, but it is difficult to guess what experience worth having they can contribute to it.) This contribution of stability and experience could be secured only by maintaining intact the monarchical form of government in the States. Hence, in the opinion of the British authorities, federation was bound up with the maintenance of the monarchic system in the States. The Jam Sahib thought that the White Paper did not provide adequate safeguards to preserve it. The British authorities did not know how to secure effectively what they considered the most vital desideratum of the federation: the maintenance unimpaired of autocratic monarchy in the States. The Jam Sahib feared that federation and the democratic tendencies it would generate would gradually but effectively and inevitably destroy "the very principle of Indian kingship and both economically and politically the monarchical principles will suffer."

The Jam Sahib is indeed a King Canute. It fell to the Maharaja of Bikaner to lecture the assembled Princes on the futility of attempting to stem the tide of democracy in modern times. And he did it in a vigorous speech. The Maharaja was more keen on the sovereignty and autonomy of the States than on the maintenance of autocracy of the Princes. Even if the Princes kept away from the federation, "are we serious," he demanded, "in thinking that the democratic influences of the world and of the British, specially when our States are intermingled, are not already affecting our States and will not in increasing measure affect our States?" This is perhaps the first occasion that the august monarchs and autocrats of the Princes' Chamber have been told some wholesome truth to their very face. Again, the Jam Sahib recalled that it was the tendency of all federations to encroach on the domain of the units and ultimately swallow them up and thought that the White Paper constitution had not provided adequate safeguards

against such contingency. The White Paper has, one would think, too many of them. One of the "special responsibilities" of the Governor-General is the protection of the Princes from a possible interference from the federation. Then there is the federal court. But they are not enough for the Princes. They complained that they would be in a minority in the federal chambers; that the States would be subject in ten years' time to federal direct taxation and the federal government would have the right to step into the States to supervise the administration of federal subjects in the States. These are deductions from their internal sovereignty and autonomy which they wish them removed. It is clear that the Princes are in reality opposing federation for all their homage to the ideal.

Though it has not been expressly stated in so many words by any Prince in the Chamber, part of the dissatisfaction with the White Paper was undoubtedly due to the fact that federal responsibility was not real. The Princes and their ministers who at the first R. T. C. enthusiastically supported the federal idea did so on the express condition that federal India would enjoy Dominion Status, subject to safeguards for a transitional period. The Maharaja of Bikaner, who was the principal spokesman of the Princes, stated clearly that the Princes supported the demand for Dominion Status put forward by British Indians inasmuch as the Princes themselves wished to be rid of British domination. In internal affairs they would retain or regain their autonomy; in federal affairs they would share responsibility with British Indians and only in personal and dynastic matters would they submit themselves to the authority of the Viceroy, distinguished from the Governor-General, as the representative of the Crown, the Paramount Power. Even in this last respect, the Princes would qualify the Viceroy's power by interposing a Council of Princes to advise him. What powers they were prepared to surrender for federal purposes they would surrender to the federal legislature in which they would have a potent place. But in the scheme envisaged in the White Paper, which vests the final authority in the Governor-General, acting under the orders of the Secretary of State, the federal government would not be responsible and autonomous. The Princes would, therefore, be surrendering their powers in federal matters not to the federal legislature in which they will have a potent voice, but to the British Parliament in whose actions they will have no effective voice. If today they are *de facto* subordinate to the Government of India, it is against their claims under their treaties and because of the might and power of the Crown. They submit to *force majeure*. Now in accepting the White Paper federal scheme, they shall for the first time accept subjection to the British Parliament in the federal sphere. The Princes had agreed to form part of a self-governing India and not of an India governed ultimately by the Secretary of State and the British Parliament. The whole weight and influence of the Princes is likely to be cast on the side of expanding the scope of the responsibility

of the federal government. This is the common objective of both the Princes and British Indians.

Unconnected with federation but one of the major problems of the Princes is the question of paramountcy. The Princes are desirous that the scope of paramountcy should be delimited, and in effect demand that justiciable matters should be referred to the Supreme Court and others to a Council of Princes whose advice should be taken by the Viceroy and his Political Department. The Viceroy, Lord Willingdon, who presided over the Chamber, categorically declared that he could not support the proposal as it would destroy the personal tie between the Viceroy and the Princes. Nevertheless, the Princes passed a resolution reiterating their demand. This is perhaps the first known occasion when the Princes mustered enough courage openly to go against the express wishes of the Viceroy and in his very presence.

The third great problem of the Princes is the distribution *inter se* of the quota of seats in the federal Chambers allotted to them. Every federating Prince would like to have at least one seat for his State. But that is impossible, considering the number of States is over six hundred. Grouping of some is inevitable. The greatest difficulty has been experienced in evolving some principle for the distribution of seats acceptable generally. The Government's proposal to adopt salutes of the Princes was as objectionable as any other. General agreement is impossible of attainment, as was the case with the communal question in British India. There is no help for it but for the Government to impose an award.

It is clear as day-light that the ambition of the Princes generally is that they should be allowed unlimited and unchecked power in their States: neither an external paramount power nor an internal democratic electorate nor a lateral federal government, consisting partly of British Indians, should fetter their autocratic power. All that they can be persuaded to do was to delegate some functions, each Prince according to his discretion and pleasure to the federal Government, in which also they must have effective power. It is as well for the Princes to realise at once that this is an impossible objective. Much as the British Government want them to counter-balance the progressive and in some respects and for the time being anti-British tendencies in British India, they have not the slightest desire to relax their own hold over the Princes. It is pathetic to see the Princes asking the Crown to release them from the grip of British paramountcy and in the same breath asking it to safeguard them from the inroads of democracy from within or without their States. Whether the Princes join the federation or not, they cannot succeed in keeping out for long the inevitable influence of democracy from their States. If they seek British help for this unworthy purpose, they will have to pay the price for it: paramountcy will remain paramount. The wiser course for the Princes is to make common cause with their own subjects and the people of British India and together strive to eliminate British domination and secure Dominion Status for India. To the extent that the federation becomes real, broad-based and democratic, to that extent shall India attain autonomy.

THE WHITE PAPER AND FRANCHISE.

I

"IF a system of responsible government is to work, the electoral system must be such as is likely to produce legislatures, both provincial and federal, which will contain the elements required to form both stable ministries...and oppositions capable not only of criticism but of forming an alternative government....It is therefore essential...that under a system of responsible Government the electorate should be so widened that the legislatures can reasonably be said to be representative of the general mass of the population."

— Indian Franchise Committee.

This is the criterion by which the proposals of His Majesty's Government as contained in the White Paper with regard to franchise and composition of the legislatures should be judged. They seem to be based largely upon the recommendations of the Indian Franchise Committee which, apart from their failure, in certain essential and fundamental respects, to come up to the sound and healthy principles laid down by itself, were, it must be acknowledged, conceived, on the whole, in a liberal spirit. In judging the White Paper proposals, it should be the concern of the reader to ascertain how far they have been

able, if at all, to remove the anomalies in the recommendations of the Lothian Committee, whether they are an improvement upon the latter and whether they have been able to maintain the liberal spirit which inspired to a large extent the recommendations of that Committee.

It is generally recognised that in any scheme of responsible government, the legislatures should be wholly elected and that nomination should have no place under a system in which the executive is responsible to the legislatures. A careful reader of the report of the Lothian Committee will not fail to detect the Committee's dislike for the principle of nomination. Apart from the fact that the method of nomination affords no choice to the members of the community concerned and gives them no training in political affairs, it is, according to the Lothian Committee, "inappropriate under the system of responsible Government" on the ground that it gives "the nominator the power to make or unmake Governments." It, therefore, showed its strong preference for election over nomination even in the case of aboriginal and hill tribes in whose case to set up an election machinery is not quite an easy matter. The White Paper, however, disregards this constitutional position and introduces an element of nomination in

some of our future legislatures. In the Council of State there are to be 10, i. e., 6.25 per cent., nominated seats out of 160 seats reserved for British India; and this nomination is sought to be justified on the ground of "providing an opportunity of adding to the Chamber a small group of the elder statesman type." The last thirteen years have provided the country with sufficient experience of how the power of nomination has been, in a majority of cases, abused by the nominating authorities; and there is every reason to apprehend that, when the executive becomes removable by a vote of the legislature, this power will be utilised by the ministers in consolidating their position rather than providing the legislatures with elderly statesmen. In both Houses of the federal legislature, Baluchistan is most likely to be represented by nomination. Bengal, the U. P. and Bihar are going to have 10 (15%), 9 (15%) and 5 (17%) nominated seats out of the total respective strength of 65, 60 and 30 of their second chambers. No reason is assigned for such large nominations. Apart from our strong opposition to the institution of second chambers, particularly in the provinces, we have strong objections to nominations thereto which cannot but prove to be mischievous in the working of provincial autonomy.

Similar departures from the recommendations of the Lothian Committee affecting seriously the interests of British India, have been made in the White Paper in respect of the strength and composition of the two Houses of the Federal Legislature. The Federal Structure Committee of the Round Table Conference provided for an Upper House (the Senate) of 200 and a Lower House (the Legislative Assembly) of 300 seats, of which 120 and 200 respectively were to come from British India. The Lothian Committee gave very serious consideration to this matter and reached the conclusion that, while there was no need to decrease or increase the strength of the Senate, the strength of the Legislative Assembly should be increased from 300 to 450 so as to secure for British India at least 300 seats which, in their opinion, were absolutely necessary, because the electoral system under responsible government "must make it possible for the candidate and member to get and keep in touch with his constituents." According to this proposal, the maximum and minimum areas that a candidate would have to cover, would have been reduced from 8,326 and 2,422 square miles in C. P. and Bengal respectively to only 5,550 and 1,614 square miles. Even such areas are too vast to be covered by a candidate if his purse is not long enough. It means, in other words, that the candidates of moderate and poor means have no chance of contesting federal elections. The White Paper disregards these considerations and not only ignores the Lothian Committee's considered recommendations but actually reverses it by increasing the size of the Senate from 200 to 260 and reducing that of the Assembly from 450 to 375. Of the 260 and 375 seats, 100 and 125 respectively are to go to the Princes. This decision has been obviously taken to please the Princes; but they are all the same disappointed and insist upon at least 125 seats

in the Senate. It has thus satisfied neither the Princes nor British India.

The recommendation of the Lothian Committee that the members of the Senate (which the White Paper calls the Council of State) should be elected by the provincial legislatures by the system of the single transferable vote "so as to secure proportionate representation in the Senate of the main parties and communities in the provincial legislatures," has been accepted by the White Paper, though not without a few unsatisfactory and reactionary qualifications. As the system of the single transferable vote is calculated to secure proportionate representation of the main parties and communities in the provincial legislatures, there is no necessity to provide, as the White Paper has done, that it is the intention of His Majesty's Government that Muslims should be able to secure one-third of the British Indian seats and that, if this is not secured by the method of the single transferable vote, "modification of the proposals should be made to meet the object in view." No reference is made in the White Paper as to the modification His Majesty's Government have in view. The second objectionable proposal is with regard to the method of election of the representatives of European, Anglo-Indian and Indian Christian communities who are given 7, 1 and 2 seats respectively in the Senate. The White Paper has decided that in the case of these communities there shall be formed three electoral colleges consisting of the representatives of their respective communities in the provincial legislatures and that these electoral colleges will elect their respective quotas to the Senate. As the Minority of the Lothian Committee have pointed out, "the representation in that house (the Senate) will be of states and provinces, and not of classes or communities"; and therefore this preferential treatment to these communities is highly objectionable. If, however, the latter are to be represented by a special provision, there is no reason why labour should not be represented on the Senate for, after all, it cannot be denied that seats given to Europeans as a community are seats given to European commerce and industry. By giving seven seats to Europeans by a special arrangement, a great injustice has been done to Indian commerce and industry and labour and cannot too strongly be condemned. It may also be pointed out that in their zeal to protect the interests of European and allied communities, His Majesty's Government have chosen to ignore the claims of women on whose representation in the legislatures the Prime Minister had laid considerable emphasis.

The third objectionable proposal in the White Paper with regard to the election to the Senate is that the second chambers in the provinces, wherever they exist, have been given the right to take part, along with the lower chambers, in the elections to the Senate. The Minority of the Indian Franchise Committee have affirmed their strong opposition to the members of the second chambers being allowed to participate in the election. The argument in support of election to the Senate by the provincial legislatures

is that representation in the upper house of the federal legislature should be of federating units and not of the population. The sole representative organ of each federating unit will be the popular elected house of the legislature and we cannot agree to the smaller, less representative, and therefore, less important house having any voice in the matter.

R. R. BAKHALE.

Round The World.

PARIS, March 11.

AFTER THE ELECTION IN GERMANY.

HITLER'S party has secured the expected victory. Nevertheless the other parties, in spite of the repression, got about 47 per cent. of the votes, certainly more than had been expected. Is this important minority capable of raising a certain measure of opposition? Its numerical importance might justify the hope, but practically it is at present proving totally powerless in the face of the drastic measures and rapid progress of the Hitlerian dictatorship. One realises more than ever that the Republic is really dead in Germany; democracy had perhaps grown up too fast and too recently there to be sufficiently deep-rooted and remain unshaken by other influences, which correspond in fact by their spirit and aspect to so many pre-war traditions. The German Parliament is therefore expected to be docile, and passively accept what it will suit Hitler to order.

The "Führer's" anxiously awaited speech at Koenigsberg on the eve of the elections has been duly broadcasted for the edification of all the German people. The ideas expressed therein are not new, either politically or otherwise. What is most worthy of notice about this speech is, we believe, its general tone and inspiration: it sounds like a sermon, like the announcement of a (would-be) God-sent messenger. Some French papers comment on it by quoting the Moslem motto, slightly altered for the purpose: "God is German, and Hitler is his Prophet." Hitler spoke on "how to deserve the help of God," and of his "providential missions." He declared that it was "God's own will," and concluded: "We are all proud to have become real Germans again, through the help of God." One can hardly help feeling a bit sorry for God's fate in this adventure, and returning to a more human plane, one is also led to wonder whether God is not called to the rescue so many times, in fact almost at every word, simply because Hitler, left to his own resources, would fail to inspire the necessary enthusiasm. It is evident in any case that this religious and prophetic tone has very largely contributed to conquer German opinion. Whether religious, political or social, according to the given circumstances, mysticism always appeals to a people crushed down by humiliation, misery and despair. The sources of free criticism are quenched, and men are ready to follow blindly any determined person who will bring to them either the hope of prosperity, or even simply a decisive formula, a promise, a pleasant illusion. This psychology reveals to no small extent the secret of Hitler's success, and especially the lack of opposition to his authority.

Otherwise the rapidity of events since the last elections, in the span of a few days only, would appear almost incredible. Hitler's daring has reduced

almost everyone of his countrymen to fear, obedience, silence, or flight. Those who are an exception to this general rule have been sent to jail, or otherwise reduced to silence. The South of Germany was expected to revolt, but the show of force has kept it quiet. Several papers, including the "Berliner Tageblatt", have been suppressed. The Communists and the Jews are being ruthlessly persecuted, and a great many of them are leaving Germany. Crowds of Jews are arriving in France every day and being received by their more fortunate compatriots on our soil; relief organisations are being created for these refugees. Einstein, at present in America, has declared that he shall not return to Germany so long as the present conditions prevail.

The occupation of Kiehl by the Nazi troops, the incidents in Hamburg, together with several other symptoms, appear to clearly indicate the fact that Hitler's power will not be questioned in Germany at present and that he can venture to do almost whatever he likes.

All apprehensions are concentrated on a possible incident in the Polish corridor, the consequences of which might prove terribly fatal to world peace. But the subject is so well known that we need not dwell on it here.

AMERICAN BANKS.

The banking crisis in America seems to have reached its culmination at the very moment when President Roosevelt came to power. It is fair to acknowledge that the new President lost no time in dealing with the situation.

The banks have been closed, an embargo put on gold, and the gold-standard suspended, not abandoned, as some had too hastily said. At present, a certain number of Banks have been allowed to open again and to resume a limited activity, the scope of which is subject to strict and definite reservations. The value of the dollar has gone up, and confidence has been restored. It is impossible to disregard the importance of those short days during which nobody knew what would be the course taken and the ensuing consequences. At the outset, panic prevailed; to-day general monetary stability seems firmer than before. The English are alluding again to an eventual stabilisation of the pound. If pound, franc and dollar maintain their value, the world depression and the coming world conference do not appear so hopeless.

It is natural that President Roosevelt should be chiefly concerned at present with the complicated difficulties that he has to solve in his own country, but is it not the very urgency of the American crisis that has led him to converse both with the English Ambassador, Sir Ronald Lindsay, and the French Ambassador, M. Claudel? This fact, together with certain declarations in the President's recent speeches, justifies the hope that the United States may gradually abandon the policy of isolation which has been so unfavourable both to their interests and to the progress of international understanding and co-operation.

Faced not only by economic depression, but also by the menace of a growing number of tendencies to arbitrary government and military dictatorship, the old democracies of the world are feeling the need to unite and defend their liberties. Thus a very noticeable current has been running of late between France, America and England. The value of an agreement between these three powers has generally been envisaged up to now, chiefly from an economic point of view. Its political significance and possible consequences are becoming more and more apparent.

DISARMAMENT AT GENEVA.

Pesce! Disarmament! What fond hopes have those beautiful words not awakened in human hearts all over the world since 1918?

Nobody will doubt that the delegates to the various international Conferences have not done their best. Yet, war is going on at the present time and creating the usual moral and physical havoc, both civil and international war. And threats of other wars are becoming every day more menacing.

The Disarmament Conference has reached such a difficult stage by now that it is not certain whether it can be saved except by momentary suspension of by some manner of conventional compromise. The plan for a pact of mutual assistance among European nations has been practically abandoned. After a general discussion, only 19 powers out of 68 have taken part in the voting. Five nations, including Germany and Italy, voted against the Pact. England voted favourably but after having carefully specified that the Pact did not concern her. Russia abstained on the ground that she belongs to two different continents. Belgium and Poland did not vote either. The French Plan has been severely hit by all this, since the pact of mutual assistance was one of its basic principles. France will consent to a substantial reduction in armaments only if she is given an equally substantial certitude of security as a counterpart.

The contemplated momentary suspension and postponement of the Conference itself offers grave difficulties and dangers owing to the present state of things in Germany and to the fact that the Germans might feel themselves called upon by Providence to consider the suspension as a failure and deem themselves free to act as they please and increase their armaments without any restriction whatever. The Conference has not been able to obtain any assurance from Germany on that point as yet. Herr Nadolny, the German delegate, says that he has no power to express an opinion. He can but transmit suggestions to and orders from Berlin.

THE NEW FRENCH LOAN AND THE SOCIALISTS.

The new French loan of 10 milliards of francs has been voted, thanks to the support of the Socialist members and in spite of the opposition of part of the former majority. A large part of the Socialist members in Parliament seems therefore more and more inclined to Government "participation." It has voted, not only the new loan, but the budget. Nevertheless a general Socialist Congress is in preparation, and is even expected to take place sooner than it had been anticipated. It is not unlikely that it will try to restore unity to the party and check the tendencies of the latter's moderate elements towards the so-called "bourgeois" policy.

The loan is being rapidly subscribed, which testifies of the nation's confidence. Yet it is undeniable that loans always constitute a heavy load on a country's finances.

Parliament will still have to discuss the budget for the coming months. It is hoped that emphasis will be laid rather on new economies than on further taxation of any kind.

When will the vote of the new budget take place? Some are of the opinion that it should be delayed till after the Socialist Congress as the latter might bring about a change in the majority. Others, on the contrary, favour the idea of an early vote, which would spare the nation the anxiety and nervousness of suspense, restore clarity and confidence in the country's financial status and give our statesmen a

freer mind to study the present international emergencies and cope with their eventual consequences. The motto, they say, ought to be: Budget first.

L. MORIN.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, March 17.

THE UNCOMMITTED COMMONS.

THE rift in the Tory Party over the new Indian Constitution is becoming deeper every day.

Hitherto the two sides have been rather unevenly balanced and the Government has appeared to be overwhelmingly dominant. That was because it was only the extreme section of diehards who had come into the open at the instigation of Sir Michael O'Dwyer and a few of the more reactionary Tories in the House. These men were opposed to reform root and branch. Even the Simon Report went too far for them in certain respects.

In estimating Parliamentary probabilities it is as well to bear in mind that as yet there has been no opportunity for a definite vote to be taken on the principles involved in the Government's proposals, and even the three days' debate arranged for the week after next will not determine any vital issue. The House will only be asked to agree to the setting up of a Joint Select Committee to consider the contents of the White Paper. It will be possible for members of very different views to vote for a motion in that form. The crucial test will only come when the proposals themselves have to be voted upon—for or against.

The Government have so far played the game against the extremists on their own side of the House rather astutely. They have managed to get the various stages of the procedure endorsed by large majorities, despite the attacks of their Tory critics. But it should be borne in mind that questions of procedure alone have been decided. Parliament remains uncommitted to any of the proposals discussed at the Round Table Conference, and it has to be recognised that very little support has so far been expressed on the Ministerial side for the Constitution outlined by Sir Samuel Hoare at the closing sittings of that Conference. There has been no affirmation as yet in favour of the vital principle of responsibility at the Centre. The Government is certainly pledged to establish that principle—no doubt with all sorts of reservations and drawbacks—but no vote of the House of Commons has hitherto confirmed it.

GOVERNMENT BETWEEN TWO FIRES.

The point is that it would be folly to assume that the 50 or 60 Tories who have formed themselves into what they call "The India Defence Committee" are the only people whose opposition will have to be overcome in the forthcoming debates. These are the noisiest and most active of the Government's critics in this matter; but they are not the most dangerous from an Indian point of view. The intangible factors consist of that considerable mass of Conservative opinion, both in the House and outside, which is generally loyal to its leaders but has no enthusiasm for or special interest in the Indian reforms on which the Government are proposing to embark.

We must not forget that this body of opinion is likely to exert very considerable pressure when definite decisions have to be taken. The fears of

these people have already been excited to some extent by the propaganda which Mr. Churchill and his henchmen have been carrying on in the Press and on the platform. Consequently we hear of many protests flowing into the Conservative headquarters from local associations of that party up and down the country and criticisms of the Government's proposals are being uttered by a number of members of Parliament who have not identified themselves in any way with the diehard organization.

It follows that the Government are likely to find themselves between two strong fires as soon as the Joint Committee gets to work. It is not to be expected that a Constitution based upon Sir Samuel Hoare's public utterances will satisfy the claims of Indian Nationalists or Indian Liberals. Strong demands for more advanced measures must therefore be looked for from that quarter, and if the Labour members of the Committee are true to their professions they cannot help taking up a similar attitude. On the other hand the diehards, who are sure to be strongly represented, will mercilessly attack the Government's scheme, and they will probably secure some degree of support for their criticisms from those who will be regarded as moderates.

The Government may take the line that these rival oppositions on the left and on the right rule each other out. But obviously the Government have more to fear from the critics within their own party than they have from a weak Socialist Opposition, and they are much more likely to yield to pressure from the former than the latter.

LABOUR'S DIFFICULTY.

It is often very depressing to face facts, but nothing is gained by not doing so. As time passes one has more and more to realise that the struggle here is not so much between those who demand full self-government for India and those who would withhold it, but rather between those who are prepared to go some distance in that direction and the obstructionists. Labour may desire to give much more than the Government scheme proposes, but in her weakness she will have no option but to support the Government or strengthen the wreckers by withholding her support. Her few strong men have been so tied up with domestic problems and so embittered by disappointment that the problem of India often seems to an onlooker to be a more academic one than a real living one of tremendous importance. That the few who may be elected to the Committee will put up a fight to take the scheme in a strong democratic direction we all know, but in face of the great activity of the diehards no work seems to be done to counteract it from their side. They may say their party is so entirely convinced of the need for self-determination in India that there is no object to be served in wasting time and energy in propaganda, but their voice should be heard in a very decisive way, since all other voices are raised and demanding a hearing.

THE TORY REVOLT AND WHAT IT PORTENDS.

If we took any notice of such papers as the "Morning Post" and the "Daily Mail" we should conclude at once that the Conservative Party was split from top to bottom over this Indian question, and that Ministers will be driven in the end to give way to the pressure from their own ranks. There are, in fact, those who say that something like the downfall of the Lloyd George Coalition will happen again on this occasion, with Mr. Churchill playing the part which was then taken by M. Bonar Law and Mr. Baldwin. The diehard organs are telling the public day by day that the revolt is spreading, that many of those who have hitherto not declared themselves are coming

out against any policy of central responsibility in India; and that before long what appears now to be a minority of the Conservative Party will become a substantial majority. It is said they will "get the wind up" to such an extent that the Government will be obliged either to withdraw the substance of their proposals or to face actual defeat in Parliament. It is not likely that the majority will vote against the Government, for the Government intends to treat the voting on the appointment of the Joint Select Committee as one of confidence and the more moderate elements which constitute the great majority of Conservative members will be chary of bringing about the downfall of the National Government.

The Churchill elements may seek to bring strong pressure to bear on the Committee by emphasising the safeguards and buttressing them by every possible anti-democratic device, but it is very questionable if they will succeed in any marked degree. We shall probably, in spite of all the discouraging factors surrounding us, witness the attainment of one more stage, and a very important one, in India's march to freedom.

SOME PEERS AND THEIR VIEWS.

The effect of reactionary pressure from within is already being seen in the utterances of Ministers who are the principal supporters of what is called the Round Table policy. Their speeches for home consumption have recently emphasised more strongly those aspects of the Government's policy which appeal to reactionary minds, evidently with the idea to placate them if possible, or at least, to some extent, to disarm them. In a recent speech which Lord Irwin made, he gave his audience a few welcome home-truths to digest. To those who said there was no serious problem in India and that the educated minority there would yield under a few years' firm administration, he frankly stated that this complaisant view was not shared by a single Governor, nor by any responsible official, nor by representatives of the great business houses in the country. "We delude ourselves", said his Lordship, "if we suppose that Indian Nationalism to-day is not strong and will not become stronger." He had something to say also to those in this country who dismiss the desire of Indians for the management of their own affairs as a double dose of sin. But, referring to the sufferings of Lancashire, he warned them that it would be a great mistake to suppose that trade could be won by coercion. The right method of approach was rather that pursued at Ottawa, where valuable benefits were obtained.

Remembering the trade interests of his hearers, Lord Irwin made the most of his favourite plea for bringing India into what he calls partnership. But he put his idea of partnership over against the theory that India could be indefinitely retained by a system of ruling her from the top.

Lord Irwin also had a straight word or two for Mr. Churchill, who, by the way, never conceals his disdain for the ex-Viceroy. The member for Epping had made a reference to Indian politicians "who had learned to speak English and hate England at the same time". Lord Irwin admitted that there were those in India to whom that description applied, but remembering how hundreds and thousands of Indians had collaborated with Britishers in peace and war, he expressed amazement that any statesman in this country should permit to pass his lips anything so injurious and so untrue. "Let us by all means, according to the angle of our minds, have our fears, but for heaven's sake do not let them be such as to strangle our faith, because no great Imperial achievement has been made by this country except by

faith." There spoke the truer and higher Conservatism!

Lord Londonderry, Secretary of State for Air, in his reply to Indian critics said, "I sympathise with much that the critics have to say on the risks we are undertaking but they are telling us nothing new. We fully recognise that we are taking risks and we have weighed them." And later: "To pursue a standstill policy to-day in India is an impossibility. In the rapidity with which events are moving in the East, India is no exception. It is idle to talk of trying to maintain a system which no longer satisfies the requirements of the Indian people."

Lord Lothian has issued a warning to women of India and of this country to see to it that the voting strength of women in India shall not be whittled away. The proportion of one woman to five men is low enough but even this number will not be enfranchised unless the Indian women determine by one measure or another that no less a number shall immediately get on to the voter's roll when the new Constitution is formed.

THE WHITE PAPER.

The Government's long awaited White Paper has been made available too late for any analysis of its provisions, even had we wished to make it at this juncture. But the general first impression is that an attempt has been made by the Government to embody the results of the three Round Table Conferencens. Its provisions in general coincide with the prophecies of the more sympathetic and thoughtful section of those who have applied themselves to this problem.

The safeguards and reserved subjects were already known, and the Introduction makes it clear that so far as safeguards are concerned, it is an ultimate responsibility that is contemplated, not a frequent interference with the day-to-day administration of the country. The period of anticipation is now passed; the Government has stated its policy, the forces of extremism on both sides are mobilised for action, and the course of this frail bark, depending as the Government states upon goodwill on either side, will be watched with deep anxiety by all concerned, and particularly by those whose responsibility it has been to launch it.

Review.

DEPRESSION AND ITS CURE.

THE GOLD STANDARD AND THE CRISIS.

By C. RALF CURTIS. (Charles Griffin & Co., London.) 1931. 20cm. 114 p. 2/-

THE WORLD IN ANGONY. AN ECONOMIC DIAGNOSIS.

By ALFRED PLUMMER. (Charles Griffin & Co., London.) 1932. 16cm. 101 p. 2/6.

THE two books under review deal with two different aspects of the world economic depression. They are an indication of the magnitude of the present problem and the vast amount of constructive thought that is being expended on its solution.

Mr. Curtis in his book looks at the problem from one angle while Mr. Plummer looks at it from an entirely different one. He first thinks that the sole cause for the depression is a monetary one and that a solution lies in the reconstruction of the monetary system. The crisis is attributable, according to him, to maldistribution of the world's gold resources and the malaise will be cured by an equitable readjustment of the world's monetary gold. After dealing with the origin, functions and the working

of the gold standard, and after narrating the circumstances that led to the crisis resulting in the giving up of that standard by England, the author refers in chapter VI to future problems and gives a list of seven of them, three of which are purely national and the remainder international. They are: (1) the eventual stabilization of the pound; (2) the restoration of the export balance of England; (3) the relief of industry from crushing taxation; (4) the international control of gold movements; (5) the redistribution of the world's monetary gold; (6) War debts and reparations; (7) and the restoration of finances and increasing the purchasing powers of most of the small nations, both in Europe and in Central America.

In chapter VII which deals with the question of international control of gold, currency and credit. Mr. Curtis adumbrates a detailed scheme for the distribution of the world's gold amongst the six major central banks of U. S. A., Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy and Japan and that the currencies of all countries should be backed by holdings of central banks concerned with the central banks of the six countries named. He further wants an International Commission to supervise the working of financial systems and for this purpose recommends the appointment of a committee under the presidency of the chairman of the Bank for International Settlements. He also says that before a proper distribution of gold resources can be effected, it would be necessary to ensure that no further financial upheavals would be possible in the future at least by reason of gold and foreign exchange movements. This could be secured by the provision of absolute stability of currencies of the various countries, which are to be directly backed by gold.

The author recognises, as everyone who has looked at the present world economic situation cannot help recognising, that in matters of credit and currency as much as in other matters it is necessary to secure some sort of international agreement, if financial upheavals of the past five years are to be avoided in the future. And it is in pursuance of this vital principle of reform that Mr. Curtis has advocated the scheme mentioned above. But he also recognises, again as every one cannot but recognize, that there are almost unsurpassable obstacles in the way of realization of the ideal set forth, in view of the consideration that the nationalistic tendencies are as much rampant today as ever before. In chapter VIII, therefore, Mr. Curtis makes a proposal for the organization of the British Empire as a separate and direct financial unit, with its own fiscal and financial system, its own central bank and its own currency. The currency to be introduced would have the present sterling as a basis, coupled with the introduction of a decimal system. In the next chapter, Mr. Curtis discusses the necessity for and the prospects of International Bimetallism and the universal re-monetization of silver to supplement gold as a means of payment and as a method of supporting the world credit edifice. Under ordinary circumstances, that is to say, if Bimetallism is established in only one country or in a small number of countries, the system may be open to objection and may have defects; but under a scheme of universal and international bimetallism, there is no danger of one metal driving away the other from circulation or of any violent fluctuations in the ratios of their values. In chapter X summarising his conclusion, the author strikes a hopeful note, though he sees that for the time being, the required amount of international cooperation necessary for the realisation of the ideal of an international currency and credit system which would do away with financial crises in future is

impossible of being achieved. He writes:—"With universal bimetalism, an accomplished fact, and with an Imperial Central Bank, wielding the bonds which unite the component parts of the British Empire even closer together, there would appear to be no reason why the rest of the world would not see the light at last, and co-operate in some scheme analogous to that outlined in chapter VII (referred to above) but with the Imperial Central Bank substituted for the Bank of England, and with both gold and silver as note cover deposited in the vaults of the six Central Banks mentioned." One can only reiterate and echo the hope entertained by Mr. Curtis and pray for its speedy realization.

Turning to Dr. Plummer's book, he considers the present situation from the point of view of over-production and lack of purchasing power. The disequilibrium between production and distribution and between production and consumption is according to him the cause of so much unemployment, human misery and poverty. "The chief cause of this extreme economic agony," he writes, "lies in the fact that world productive capacity has expanded enormously, ever since 1896, while no corresponding improvement has taken place in the effective demand capacity of masses of mankind" (p. 3). Overproduction may be a sign of industrial advance but unless there is a simultaneous increase in the capacity of the people to consume the goods produced, it will turn out to be a curse rather than a blessing, as in the existing situation it has done. Mr. Plummer wants a thorough change in the customary and now antiquated ways of thinking about production and consumption, saving and spending, employment and income, work and leisure. In chapter III Dr. Plummer turns to another aspect of the problem of depression, i.e., the tariff problem, and says that at bottom the agony of the world is due to lop-sided growth. "In some respects we are ultra-modern, in others we are as old-fashioned as the hills." Mercantilism, once the scourge of economic Europe, has yielded place to the doctrine of free trade; but to-day we are again witnessing the revival of the mercantilist spirit in an even more intensified form. It is having such a grip on the economic outlook of nations in post-war time that even a most redoubtable Free Trade country like England has fallen a prey to it.

In chap. IV discussing the right way of dealing with the problem, Dr. Plummer wants a reconstruction or reorganization of the distributive system, which is highly defective, a very uncomplimentary comment on the present social order, with its immense capacity to perpetuate avoidable disparities and inequalities. It should have been the consequence of scientific developments that human beings should have been relieved of the burden of toilsome work. But what do we find as a matter of fact? The hours of labour are as many as ever; the drudgery of factory work has not to any appreciable extent been removed; and human beings are still looked upon as mere tools. It is illogical and indeed idiotic, as the author points out, to continue to demand from men just as much labour as before as a means of granting them access to the necessaries and humbler comforts of life, even after so much success that has been achieved in eliminating the necessity for human toil. A changed outlook in regard to this matter is a fundamental and overriding necessity. And it is quite in accordance with this need for a changed outlook that there should have been a demand, from the international federation of trade unions for the reduction of unemployment figures through the further shortening of the working day. The International Labour Office has supported this proposal, which has however been opposed by the Governments of Europe and the Government of Great Britain in particular,

a sorrowful commentary on the action of the 'National' Government with a Labour leader at its head. It is also a very regretful reflection on the psychology of nations in the post-war era in spite of professions and protestations of altruism. This is the "psychological dead-hand" or the dead-mind; as Mr. Leonard Woolf calls it. It is a further commentary on the present state of affairs that these conditions should obtain in all countries except in the much-maligned Soviet Russia.

In chapter V on the necessity of high purchasing power, the author expresses the opinion that the maximising of the purchasing power of the masses of the people by raising wages and lowering tariffs is the method of economic salvation on a permanent footing. The most important reform is the diffusion of purchasing power among the masses of the independent agricultural producers of the world. "The task is to translate into practice the general policy of high purchasing power, in order to counterbalance the high producing power, which is already a *fait-accomplis*." We must endorse the author's opinion that all possible suggestions to this end should be welcomed, examined thoroughly and fairly by an international authority, so that the aggregate efficiency of the whole system may be raised from time to time, just as the efficiency of production has been, and still is, continually improved. This is in contrast to the Victorian emphasis on the necessity of saving and the merits of savers and to the Gladstonian doctrine that money must be left in the pockets of the people to fructify. But changed times require and demand changed methods.

All this means a revolution; but unless there is such a revolution, the impasse in the world economic situation will not be cured. But if we face the facts squarely, the remedy lies in such a revolution, not a revolution confined to the boundaries of a single country, but an international, world-wide revolution. Dr. Plummer's thesis is, which, as Sir Arthur Salter says in his Foreword, is the central defect of our economic system, contains on the whole a very clear and convincing diagnosis of the present economic situation.

Dr. Plummer has added two appendices to the book, one on "debt and disarmament" and the other on the statistics relevant to the theme of his book, both of which add to its value.

C. V. HANUMANTHA RAO.

Miscellaneous.

VIEWS ON THE WHITE PAPER.

We give below the views of two members of the Servants of India Society on the White Paper, as expressed in press interviews given immediately after the publication of the White Paper.

PT. HIRDAY NATH KUNZRUJ

THE White Paper has amply justified our pessimistic forebodings and our want of faith in the sincerity of British statesmen. The entire constitution outlined in it is based on an utter distrust of Indians and inspired by a determination to part with as little power as possible. Such a scheme cannot allay discontent in India and unless the proposals now made are radically altered it will be vain to hope for reconciliation between India and England.

The restrictions proposed in the interests of Britain which reduce self-government to a shadow have been maintained or added to with the consequence that the completed picture is blacker than the outline. Progressive Indian opinion as voiced at the Round Table Conference has been completely ignored and not one of the important demands put forward in the Sapru-Jayakar memorandum has been conceded. The inauguration of the Federation already contingent upon a number of eventualities has been made still more difficult by the additional requirement that the federal constitution should not be promulgated without the express approval of both Houses of Parliament, presumably in order to prevent a more progressive government from waiving any of the conditions insisted on by the Tories.

It was a foregone conclusion that the Viceroy would be granted wide powers to control the financial and commercial policy of India and that the Indian Legislature would be powerless to deal with currency and exchange or to provide for the control of key industries by Indians without the previous permission of the Viceroy. It is, however, now proposed further to cripple the Federal Ministers and legislatures by the creation of a Railway Board by Parliamentary authority. The Consultative Committee which did not contain many independent Indian members recommended that the powers of the Board should be determined by an Act of Indian legislature. But this recommendation has been rejected without a word of explanation. The Viceroy has been granted enormous power to overrule the ministry and the legislature and to make responsible government a dream. Yet additional internal brakes have been provided to check the progress of democracy. The Lothian Committee's proposals envisaged a House of Assembly of 450 members and a Council of State of 200 members but the White Paper by reducing the size of the Assembly and by increasing that of the Council of State adds considerably to the power of the Council of State in joint sessions of the federal legislature. Again, Government will virtually be able to appeal to the Council of State if the Assembly asserts itself in the voting of demands for grants. The ministry will in these circumstances have to be responsible to the Council of State in practice, and the Assembly will lose even the power that it now enjoys.

Self-defence is the life-breath of self-government. Yet the White Paper is absolutely silent on the subject. No scheme has been proposed for the complete Indianisation of the army and no advance suggested on the Chetwode scheme which the Indian Sandhurst Committee was not allowed to discuss. No announcement has been made regarding the eventual elimination of the British garrison or its immediate reduction.

The policy followed with regard to the recruitment of the Indian Civil and Police services is equally imperialistic. Contrary to the recommendations of

the Services Sub-Committee of the Round Table Conference recruitment to them will be made not by the Federal Government but by the Secretary of State. They will not be Indianised. Britishers will continue to be appointed to them practically at the rate fixed by Mr. Montagu in 1919 and no change will be made in this respect except with the approval of both Houses of Parliament. The Indian Civil Service secretaries will probably continue to have the right of independent access to the Governor-General and Governors and the ministers will be as much dependent on the steel-frame as at present.

The proposals made by His Majesty's Government disclose not the maximum of agreement but the maximum of disagreement with Indian political opinion. British opinion has prevailed in every instance over Indian opinion. The safeguards which were to be in the interests of India take account of British interests only. The British Government will keep the army indefinitely in their own hands. The secretaries and district administration will continue to be controlled by their own men and the Secretary of State, the Governor-General and Governors will dominate the constitution with reserve powers of one kind or another. And even within the narrow field made over to Indians the representatives of the people will be allowed to have their way as little as possible.

MR. N. M. JOSHI

The whole scheme of the White Paper as that of the Round Table Conference is based upon distrust of the Indian people, especially the masses. The safeguards which were 'in the interests of India' have not been declared necessary 'in the common interests of India and the United Kingdom.' They have been even more meticulously defined and strengthened. The European public services will continue to be imposed upon India even against the wishes of the Ministers to whom they will owe no allegiance. For the sake of service even the R. T. C. report has been given the go-by. The interests of a few thousand Europeans are placed much higher than the interests of millions of Indians.

Next to these most favoured classes come in for preference two classes of Indians—the propertied classes and the communities based upon religion. Fundamental rights are promised in the interests of both but the poor helpless masses are not thought of in that connection. Care has been taken to provide representation to Europeans, Anglo-Indians and Christians in the federal upper chamber, but labour has been denied that privilege. Although the subject was not discussed at the R. T. C. the backward and hill tribes will be governed autocratically in the name of protection and even continue to be subjected to practices which are not very far from forced labour. They are not to have representation even in the federal lower chamber. Not only no provision has been made for common labour legislation for the whole of India, but on subjects like health insurance and old-age pensions there is not to be common legislation even for British India. Unemployment insurance is not even mentioned.