

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XVI, No. 44. } POONA—THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1933.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	517
ARTICLES :—	
States' Subjects and Federation.	520
Working of Bombay Industries Department.	521
Shall We Reject White Paper Now ? By Sir M. V. Joshi.	522
OUR LONDON LETTER.	524
REVIEWS :—	
Interpretation of St. John's Gospel. By Prof. P. A. Wadia.	525
Bombay Land Revenue System. By An Ex- Revenue Officer.	526
Growth of Socialism. By S. Gopalswamy.	527
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
OBSERVER'S Reply to Mr. Kodanda Rao's article on "Federation."	527
BOOKS RECEIVED.	528

Topics of the Week.

Lord Lloyd's Plea for Delay.

LORD LLOYD'S latest stunt is a plea for a year's interval between the presentation of the Joint Select Committee's report on the White Paper and the introduction of the Reforms Bill in Parliament. In his opinion, the period is needed for the education of the British democracy with regard to the Indian problem. His Lordship must indeed be having a poor opinion of the intelligence of his countrymen if he means what he says. The education of the people of England on the Indian constitutional problem dates back to the day on which the Simon Report was published and the three sessions of the Round Table Conference that followed have intensified the process. It is true that the White Paper was published only about eight months ago which his Lordship probably feels is too short a time for the British people to get a close grasp of its provisions; but it has been claimed for it by the British Government themselves that the White Paper does nothing more than cataloguing the conclusions reached as a result of the R. T. C. confabulations. It thus contains nothing that was not previously discussed or has been sprung as a surprise on an unsuspecting public at the last moment. Its detailed examination by the Joint Select Committee in consultation with the Indian delegates has moreover contributed to public education to an extent to which nothing else can. The British public must really have a fearfully confused mind if after

the Indian constitutional discussions extending over nearly four long years it still finds itself unable to see its way clearly before it. Not that the delay, even if it took place, would matter much from the Indian point of view. The fact really is that the White Paper is universally considered so hopelessly out of date that hardly anybody worth his salt in India at all bothers about what happens to it. Not being in the confidence of the Secretary of State, we do not know what his future plans are; but we should be greatly surprised if, like Lord Lloyd, he too felt that the British people needed more time to study the merits and demerits of his constitutional scheme. It is clear that if Lord Lloyd is bent upon obstructing the passage of the White Paper scheme to the statute book, he must scratch his fertile brain for more plausible reasons to support that course.

* * *

Separation of Terrorist C. I. D. from Police.

ONE of the points stressed by witnesses representing the non-official Europeans before the Joint Select Committee was that the constitutional arrangements for the provinces should be such that they would make it possible for the Governor, in case of need, to take under his wing without any fuss that branch of the C. I. D. which is told off to handle terrorist and anarchical crimes. An ex-Inspector-General of Police, and that too from Bengal, by name Mr. A. E. O'Sullivan, writing to the *Morning Post*, dwells upon the difficulties surrounding the effectuation of the suggestion. He points out that the section of the force which deals with the terrorist crime does not constitute a separate entity but is selected from the regular police force, with which it works in close co-operation. In these circumstances the separation of the terrorist branch from the general police presents practical difficulties too formidable to be lightly passed over. Should however the separation be carried out in defiance of these practical considerations, he is afraid that it would put a stop to the spirit of co-operation which at present actuates both sides and so largely makes for harmonious working. From absence of co-operation to passive or active hostility between the two sections "under distinct and, not improbably, opposed controlling authorities" is, as can be easily realised, by no means a very long step which Mr. O'Sullivan would apparently give anything to avoid. In thus putting his foot down against the suggested bifurcation Mr. O'Sullivan is virtually supporting the stand taken by the Secretary of State towards it and that too for the very reasons advanced by him. We hope that after Mr. O'Sullivan's telling testimony based on practical experience of the working of the police in the terrorist-stricken province of Bengal we have heard the last of the proposal to sever the terrorist branch from the general police force.

* * *

Kanara.

WE fear that both the Government and the people have too long neglected the district of north Kanara, whose conditions, never satisfactory, are particularly deplorable to-day. For two or three years a campaign of non-payment of land revenue was being conducted in the talukas of Siddapur and Ankola there. The campaign was undoubtedly political to a certain extent, but it is claimed on behalf of the people that it was largely a case of Khatedars being unable to pay owing solely to economic reasons. At a time when a political propaganda is going on dissuading people from paying up their dues it is difficult to sort out those who cannot pay from those who will not, and perhaps the petty officials of Government were not too eager to separate the goats from the sheep either. But, whatever it may be, the mass campaign in Kanara as in other places is now over, and from all we hear a large proportion of even those who joined the no-tax campaign from political motives are now anxious to get back on to their land and carry on their normal activities. In such a situation we would earnestly beg the Government to do all in their power to restore the former good relations between themselves and the agriculturists. One thing that appears to us to be necessary above everything else in this connection is that Government should declare their willingness to give back forfeited but unalienated lands to their owners if the latter have given up unlawful activities. It is no gain to the Government to keep the lands unoccupied on their hands, or to give them away to third parties. Those who have lost their lands have, it may at once be admitted, no legal claim to them, but if the Government will return them to the owners, without imposing any hard or humiliating conditions, they will have taken the first preliminary step towards a reconciliation on which they should themselves be no less keen than the public at large. Another thing that is needed is large remissions of the land revenue demand. Government recognise the need for this; they have already moved to a certain extent in this direction, but we imagine that they will have to go further along this line. Action of this nature will not promote unlawful activities; it will disarm them effectually.

* * *

Cochin and Federation.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL may be wholly wrong in his assertion that the Princes are being coerced by the British Government to join the federation. But, according to Dr. T. K. Krishna Menon who recently spoke on "Cochin and the Federation," the pressure is being exerted from another source. The British Government having made the grant of self-government to British India contingent upon the formation of federation, British Indians look upon any Prince who may be inclined to stand out of federation with such extreme disfavour that he is practically forced to fall in. "In order to avoid the fury" of British Indian leaders, Mr. Menon says, the Princes have no other alternative but "to link their fate with it (the federation); they, some of them at any rate, have to do so at the cost of great sacrifice of the interests of their countries".

Mr. Menon himself sees so many anomalies in the proposed federation that he has no enthusiasm for it at all. He would not object to his state, viz. Cochin, joining the federation but would insist upon certain conditions being fulfilled before favouring this course. His main condition is that, instead of being made to surrender certain sources of revenue to the federal government like import and

export duties, contributions from railways and major ports, income from excise and inland waterways, corporation tax, &c. Cochin should be allowed to make over to the federal Government a fixed proportion of its yearly revenue subject to a maximum amount, say, two lakhs. She has been paying two lakhs just now in the form of tribute and her contribution should not be in excess of this. The tribute however as such must be stopped at once; her own separate Anchal system of post offices must be retained; railway administration must be in the State's hands, legislative jurisdiction alone being ceded to the extent that her Instrument of Accession may provide; the proposal regarding the corporation tax cannot be accepted; salt tax proceeds which amount to more than 4½ lakhs cannot be foregone; inland waterways should not be given up to the federal government; customs duties, which form the mainstay of Cochin's revenue, must continue to be collected and retained by her. The Diwan has declared that the acceptance of the proposals of the Federal Finance Committee (although the Committee was favourable to the retention by each State of the value of the duties imported through its ports for consumption by its own subjects) "would almost certainly involve the extinction of the State as a separate unit, and anxious though the State is to enter the federation it could hardly do so on such terms." Mr. Menon is wholly at one with the Diwan.

Thus it comes to this, that if Cochin is not required to part with any of her existing powers and is not made to contribute to the upkeep of the federal Government anything more than what it is now paying to the paramount power, Mr. Menon will see no serious objection to her joining the federation. Not that by joining the federation she will gain, but she will be saved the worry and irritation incidental to a position of isolation!

* * *

Scandalous.

THE report of the Madras Services Commission for 1932-33 reveals a state of affairs which is nothing short of scandalous. It appears there were 23 cases in which the appointments to the Madras Ministerial Services were made in violation of Statutory Rules, which includes the one concerning the communal ratios. Not only that, but the Government made an irregular appointment contrary to the recommendation of the Commission, failed to report it to the Commission as required by the Rules, and met the protest of the Commission by subsequently amending the Statutory Rules to suit the appointment and gave them retrospective effect! The Commission none too strongly protested against such framing or amending of the Rules to suit particular individuals and stultifying the Commission. There were other cases in which the Government ignored the recommendations of the Commission. "The Commission regrets that there should be cases in which the Government disagreed with the Commission's recommendations and would point out again that if the Commission is to fulfil the objects for which it was established and if the personnel of the Services is to be placed outside the pale of political influence, it is desirable that its recommendations should be accepted in almost all cases." Further comment is superfluous.

* * *

Pension Safeguards.

THE services' demand for greater safeguards for their pensions was espoused by some Tory members of the Joint Select Committee when the Secretary of State was under examination. The talk of repudiation of debts indulged in by some Congressmen a few

years ago has created the fear, at least so it is made to appear, in the mind of the services, that should the extreme elements in Indian politics succeed in capturing the constitutional machinery, the services' pensions would be unsafe. To avoid this possible contingency it is suggested that the amount of their pension should be invested in England. Authoritative assurances given first by the Labour Government and since repeated by the present one that such repudiation would never be tolerated have not served, as in fact they should have, to set their doubts at rest. But these assurances, far from being the wordy ones that they were when made, have, on their incorporation into the White Paper, been in fact transformed into constitutional guarantees. In the first place, under paragraph 18 (b) the Governor-General is made specially responsible for safeguarding India's credit which precludes the possibility of his lending countenance to anything, e. g., repudiation of pensions or debts, which would be calculated to prejudicially affect that credit; and he is given ample powers to make his special responsibilities fully effective. Then again, under paragraph 49 these pensions are removed from the purview of the legislature and made non-votable. Moreover, it has been provided by paragraph 186 that wherever an officer may be serving, his pension will be regarded as being a charge against the federal revenues, it being left to the Federal Government "to make any necessary adjustments with the provinces." These arrangements should really suffice to reassure even the most conservative elements among the services that the contemplated constitutional changes place their pensions in no jeopardy whatever. But the services are apparently not to be so easily satisfied. In reply to Lord Salisbury who pressed for consideration of "the susceptibilities of the expectant pensioners" and asked that it be made "abundantly clear to them that they are in as absolutely a strong position as they were before the passing of this Act, if it became an Act," Sir Samuel Hoare said:—

"I am quite aware that many of them are very anxious. I think, if I may say so in passing, they have been made more anxious by the very active propaganda that has been carried out to stir up their anxieties; but realising the depth of their anxiety, I still say that they are safe and we have taken effective steps for ensuring the security of their pensions and I do not think anything further is needed."

Poona Seva Sadan.

THE Seva Sadan at Poona and with branches at important places deservedly takes very high rank among institutions striving for an improvement in the moral, material and social condition of Indian women. Sir Leslie Wilson, ex-Governor of Bombay, was not guilty of the slightest exaggeration when he said that he knew of no organisation in the Bombay Presidency that could be compared with it. Nay, more. He had also heard it stated "more than once on very high authority that there is no other Society like it in the whole of India." The nature of the Sadan's activities is so varied and the activities themselves so extensive that any reference to them on the present occasion is precluded by considerations of space. Nor is it really called for in view of the nation-wide publicity which its beneficent work has received during nearly a quarter of a century of its existence. What is pertinent to note is the highly nation-building value of the work in which the Seva Sadan, under the direction of Mr. Devadhar assisted by a number of helpers of both sexes, both honorary and paid, is engaged. This is

greatly facilitated by the finely-got up and beautifully printed album recently brought out by him. The album enables one to get an idea of the institution's work literally at a glance; and those who wish to know something about the Sadan cannot do better than turning to it for information.

We cannot however close this tribute of our admiration to the Seva Sadan without drawing pointed attention to some of its urgent needs. Its finances, like those of many of our public institutions, have never been in a sound condition and for years past the organisers have found great difficulty in making both ends of the institution's budget meet. This is not surprising in view of the expanding nature of its work. The result has been that they had to run into debt to the extent of about Rs. 70,000. Over and above this they badly need a sum of Rs. 10 lakhs to meet several pressing needs. Among these may be mentioned a permanent fund, endowments for scholarships and prizes, school-apparatus, museums, provision for promotion to the teaching staff, its provident fund and pension, etc. But by far its most pressing need is additional housing accommodation at Poona for the different departments of its work and for its six hostels. As the album convincingly points out with the help of figures, this has not kept pace with the growth in the number of the inmates. The amount for which the appeal is made may at first sight appear to be almost prohibitive, especially in times like the present; but what is it really in comparison to the very commendable work of the institution from the point of view of national progress? We do hope those who can will do their very best to help the institution out of its financial difficulties.

* * *

Slum Welfare in Madras.

THE Thonder Sangham (Workers' League) of Myslapore run by the Ramakrishna Mutt is an institution unique of its kind. The membership of the Sangham is based on actual service of at least one hour's labour of love per week. There were, during the year 1932-33, twenty-five members who gave 3,500 hours of devoted service to the institution. The expenses of the Sangham are met from public subscriptions.

The work of the Sangham is highly commendable. It runs night schools in three poor quarters for children, youths and adults, helping the deserving with necessary text books, note books, etc. Important Hindu festivals are celebrated and the occasions are utilized for inculcating in the minds of the slum-dwellers ideas of fellow-feeling, co-operation and healthy moral living. Bhajans are conducted every week. Lantern lectures on health and religious subjects are arranged periodically. A Thrift Society is started and the number of the share-holders has increased from 33 to 60. Panchayats are also organised in the different localities, where the Sangham is working, to look to the general welfare and sanitation. The other items of interest are the physical culture activities, organising excursions for children and work among the women-folk. It is indeed gratifying to find that the Sarada Vidyalaya is co-operating in the last item of work mentioned above.

It will be no exaggeration to say that the Sangham, by its self-less work, has done not a little to bring light, cheer and hopefulness where there were darkness, misery and helplessness before. The institution deserves all encouragement from the public of Madras.

* * *

Articles.

STATES' SUBJECTS AND FEDERATION.

IT was most natural that Mr. G. R. Abhyankar, the redoubtable and vigilant champion of the rights of the subjects of the Indian States, should devote the great bulk of his Presidential Address, delivered to the Kathiawad States' People's Convention held at Amreli last week-end, to the White Paper and the federal constitution propounded therein. With his usual ability and thoroughness, he subjected the federal constitution to an impressive and wholly deserved criticism and ruthlessly exposed its inherent defects and its serious departures from established precedents and right canons. The vesting of paramountcy in the Viceroy as distinct from the Federal Government, the denial of federal citizenship, the nomination by the Princes of the States' representatives to the federal chambers instead of their election by the subjects of the States, the retention of individual sovereignty of the States even in the federal field and a host of other features of the White Paper are anything but federal in the accepted sense. Not only that, but they are most unsatisfactory and disappointing.

There is no doubt that the Princes have gained in the scheme. They have the negative advantage that their autocratic rule will not be subjected to reforming pressure from the more democratic (save the word!) federal government. They have the positive advantage that in federal matters they will have a voice and a disproportionately large voice, which they had not hitherto. The only gain that they have not yet secured is the limitation of paramountcy of the Crown. The gain of the Princes is the loss of the British Indians. If in the central legislature of today there is the official *bloc*, in the federal chamber of tomorrow there will be the Princes' *bloc*, which is worse. As Col. Wedgwood graphically put it, twenty British Tories are better than one Indian Prince. British India stands to suffer by the incursion, nay, invasion, of the Indian Princes into its polity. True there are equally undemocratic and therefore objectionable features in the White Paper as, for instance, the communal electorates and weightages, the Poona Pact and the British safeguards. It is but small consolation that most of these defects were there already and not introduced for the first time in the White Paper. They are thoroughly bad, though they do not make the existing position worse. But the entry of the Princes on the terms they secured makes it decidedly worse.

But it is somewhat difficult to follow the thesis that the political status of the subjects of the Indian States will be worsened by the federation. It will be granted readily, and with deep sympathy and sorrow, that their present status is by no means even tolerable. The Princes, save one or two, deny their subjects the most elementary rights of citizenship. With a solitary exception of one or two they are not even enlightened autocrats. The reign of law is

foreign and even repugnant to them. Against their misrule their unfortunate subjects have no collective and constitutional remedy. Neither a free press nor a free platform is tolerated by the Princes in their States. Rebellion against a ruler is practically out of the question, because the British Government as the Paramount Power is under an obligation to sustain these impotent autocrats on their petty thrones with all the might and main of the Empire. Within the States, therefore, neither a reformatory nor a revolutionary movement has much chance. The Paramount Power, which has an obligation to ensure good government of the subjects as sacred and binding as its obligation to sustain the rulers on their thrones, hardly ever takes them seriously unless Imperial interests are touched. The only hope of ameliorating the status of the subjects was the sympathy and support of British Indians. The British Indian press and platform have consistently helped the cause of the States' subjects as far as was open to them. But the British Government, on the other hand, has been, at the instance of the Princes, attempting to choke off that source of help. The Princes' Protection Act was passed by the Viceroy by certification in 1922 against the vote of the Legislative Assembly, which was so opposed to the measure that it took the unprecedented step of refusing its very introduction in the Assembly. And now it is proposed to enact the States' Protection Bill equally obnoxious to British Indians and the subjects of the States. It is meant to rivet the more firmly the fetters of the Princes' tyranny over their hapless subjects, even as it is meant to cement the stronger the unholy alliance between the British bureaucracy and the Indian autocracy to defeat Indian democracy.

It will be also admitted readily that the federation does not in the least improve the status of the subjects of the States. There is no guarantee that the increased jurisdiction that the Princes get will in any way benefit them. On the other hand, their hopes of betterment under a federation have been dashed to the ground. They have been rigorously excluded from having a voice or share in the making of the constitution. They were not invited to the Round Table Conference nor even allowed to tender evidence before the Joint Select Committee. They are to be the helots and not the citizens of the federation to be.

It is however difficult to understand how the status of the subjects of the States will be materially worse under the federation. The power of the Princes over them has not been increased or made more tyrannical, if that were possible. They will continue to be ruled by their Princes, subject to the supervision of the Paramount Power, as ever before. The Princes have not shaken off the control of the Paramount Power and there is no reason to suppose that the Paramount Power will be less solicitous (save the word!) of the welfare of the States' subjects than it has been. It would certainly have worsened their position if paramountcy had been limited. Fortunately for them, it had not been; nor is it likely. At any rate,

that would be a real calamity, to be guarded against if possible. Federation contemplated by the White Paper does not worsen the status of the subjects of the States except in the sense that it extends the scope of the power of the Princes and that thereby it raises them in power and prestige and that, therefore, relatively to the Princes the subjects will be worse off. The subjects are not kicked down, but the Princes lifted up, so to say, so that relatively to the Princes the subjects will have a lower status. It may also be urged that the exercise of supervision by the Paramount Power over the Princes, infrequent as it has been when in the interest of the subjects, will hereafter be still more infrequent and weaker because the Paramount Power will have to depend on the Princes' bloc in the federal chambers to promote schemes which it has set its heart upon but which are outside the powers reserved to the Governor-General and within the powers assigned to the federal legislature. These arguments are theoretically valid. But they do not amount to much in practice. All matters of any importance in the federal sphere are either reserved to the Governor-General or he has the previous or ultimate veto over them and the sphere really transferred to the Federal Government is comparatively small and inconsequential. The British Government retains, through the safeguards, such a dominant position in the federation that it will hardly need the help of the Princes to have its way.

The power and prestige of the Princes gathers momentum not so much because of their joining a federation with British India but because of their coming together themselves, as, for instance, in the Princes' Chamber, irrespective of the federation. The federation is not a combination of like with like; autocracts will face more or less democrats and their outlooks will be not identical. They will only weaken each other. But the Chamber of Princes is like a trade union; its members are more or less similar in outlook and interest and it gives each member the strength of all its members. The Princes thus gain strength through their trade union; the subjects weaken by the enactment of the Princes' and Indian States' Protection Acts. But neither has anything to do with federation. If anybody actually suffers and becomes worse on account of the federation, it is the British Indians.

And yet it is noteworthy that subjects of the States have been more insistent and unanimous than British Indians in urging the rejection of the federation. On account of similarity of outlook and aspiration between the British Indians and the subjects of the Indian States, it is only natural that the latter should feel as disappointed as the former with the White Paper federation and wish to save the latter from the unsatisfactory imposition. But when they urge its rejection on the ground that it worsens the present status of the subjects of the States, it is not convincing. They neither gain nor lose by the federation. At any rate, they will not gain by the rejection of the White Paper.

Some ardent advocates of the rights of the sub-

jects of the States have, due no doubt to the intensity of their disappointment and anguish, not hesitated to take British Indians, and particularly the nationalists among them, to task for their misfortune and even to accuse them of having sacrificed them. Let it be a consolation to these ardent critics that British Indians cannot sacrifice the interests of the States' subjects without sacrificing their own in the first instance. If the latter sacrificed their own interests, it could not be because they wished to let down the subjects of the States, for British Indian nationalists stand to gain nothing by sacrificing the subjects of the States. As a matter of fact, they have not. They have sacrificed their own interests but not of the subjects of the States. The real fact is that they were powerless to help. The will is there. But the power is lacking, as witness the White Paper itself. They could not ensure the presence of the States' subjects at the R. T. C., but they invited them to the Nehru Committee. They were not able to stave off the Princes' Protection Act—it was passed by certification—but they fought against it.

Let it be another, though distant, consolation to the subjects of the States that the disproportionate concessions which the Princes secure in the White Paper will in the fulness of time accrue to them, the subjects. If and when—it may be sooner than later, let us hope—the administrations of the States become liberalised, the States' quota of representation will be transferred from the Princes to their subjects. Let them hasten the day by constitutional agitation, such as is possible, within the States themselves and by appeals to the Paramount Power and the British electorate. And within the limits allowed to them, British Indians will whole-heartedly support the dawn of democracy in the Indian States.

WORKING OF BOMBAY INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT.

THANKS to the Thomas Committee, the Bombay Industries Department was threatened with extinction not very long ago, but fortunately escaped that fate. The Committee which was called upon to recommend the adoption of new policies or the modification of old ones with a view to economising public expenditure as much as possible hit upon the abolition of this Department as a means of reducing the burden on the tax-payer. The closing down of this useful Department would have been looked upon as a public scandal in any province; but it would have been far more so in an industrial province like Bombay. The scandal was, as is well known, averted owing to the strong pressure of public opinion brought to bear on the Government with a view to making them desist from translating the Committee's recommendation into action.

Not that it is meant to be understood that the Department, during nearly fifteen years of its existence, has ever been in a very flourishing condition. Abundance of funds has never been its lot; while unsympathetic direction joined to an illiberal industrial policy of a foreign Government has always retarded its proper working. The situation has

however improved with the appointment of the present incumbent of the Director's post with the result that the Department, within the limited resources at its disposal, is making itself as useful to the public as it possibly can. A look at its expenditure figures shows that it has more than trebled itself during the last four years; but even the amount of Rs. 3,37,000 expended by it last year can by no stretch of imagination be regarded as erring on the side of extravagance; and seeing that quite a considerable part of it had to be spent in scholarships and grants to municipal and private institutions imparting technical education the amount actually available for its real work of promoting the development of industries by other well-known means dwindles down considerably. Even in the Punjab, by no means an industrial province, the Industries Department, we find, was responsible for an expenditure nearly three times that of its Bombay counterpart, or less than Rs. 9½ lakhs. Now that it has been decided to continue the Department in this presidency, it is up to Government to see that its activities are not unduly restricted by financial considerations. Any outlay on it will not be an unproductive one; but will be repaid several times over by the increased industrial activity as a result of its more vigorous working.

As for the work of the Department in 1932-33, nobody knowing anything of the present economic depression had any reason to look forward to any development of its activities. All that it could aim at was to carry on on the old level. The principal activity of the Department during the year as in previous ones was to assist industries with technical and other advice and to conduct experiments intended to improve the quality of the products and to lessen the cost of production. Under this head must be mentioned its work on the preparation of a substitute for imported animal tallow from vegetable oils, the manufacture of peppermint oils, straw boards, extraction of starch from Jowar and of strychnine from Nux Vomica. Another activity in which the Department engaged itself was the preparation of estimates for the establishment of different industries. Such estimates were prepared during the year for small handloom factories, factories for the manufacture of electric lamps for which with the growing use of electricity the public demand is daily increasing, small grinding mills and woollen hosiery manufacture. It appears from the report that these estimates were found very useful by those considering the possibilities of starting such industries.

Hand-weaving being an important cottage industry of this presidency, it has all along naturally claimed a good deal of attention of the Department. Last year too the Department continued its propaganda of helping and advancing the industry. Two types of weaving schools, viz. weaving schools for bona-fide weavers and weaving schools for agriculturists, were maintained, schools of the former variety numbering seven and of the latter two. The schools give training in the use of modern methods and improved implements, which appears to have been much appreciated. 11 cotton weaving demonstrations were also maintained and were responsible for the introduction of a large number of fly-shuttle looms at important weaving centres in the presidency. The wool weaving and dyeing demonstrations also seem to have done well.

The investigations of the Department in regard to cottage industries relate for the present at any rate only to hand-weaving and bangle-making. We have no doubt that the information that is being collected will have important reactions on the development of those industries. At the same time it may be suggested that the inquiry, instead of confining itself

to one or two specified industries, should exhaustively cover particular areas, as in Madras, from the point of view of bringing to light the possibilities of cottage industries therein. The process may perhaps prove to be less costly and, what is even more important, may bring to the surface industrial potentialities which might otherwise lie hidden from the public view, one does not know for how long. It is true that the whole presidency cannot be covered in this manner at one jump, and that the investigation must proceed from district to district as funds become available. Anyhow the chances of starting such work on the lines followed in Madras may be carefully considered.

Unlike some other provinces, Bombay does not yet boast of legislation authorising State aid to industries. This has however apparently not been allowed to stand in the way of the Government giving help in deserving cases. During the last year no applications for State aid were received; and the two that were pending for want of adequate information were rejected, as the schemes intended to be financed out of the aid that may be received from Government were found to be commercially impracticable. The Punjab Industries report has however more cheerful news to give on this point. Out of the 63 applications for loans received by it, 23 amounting to Rs. 75,000 were passed, the corresponding figures for the previous year being 23 and Rs. 1 lakh respectively. The loans advanced since the Loans Act came into force total Rs. 5,39,950, of which Rs. 3,33,341 were outstanding on the last day of the last official year. Repayment had fallen in arrears in several cases with the result that legal action had to be taken against 33 defaulters in respect of about Rs. 50,000.

SHALL WE REJECT WHITE PAPER NOW ?

I NOTICE in your paper the arguments of 'Observer' and your remarks on them. Indians who advise total rejection of the White Paper seem to think that there will be a united front on this question of rejecting. If it is to be rejected, all important interests must agree to discard it and now at once. It is well known however that those who represent communal interests, the Mohamedans and depressed classes for instance, feel that they stand to get a good deal under the White Paper and will not join in discarding the White Paper. How then is this united front possible and if this is not going to happen what are the chances of a more liberal constitution being given to India in the near future? National Government is just now in the saddle; the Labour party is already dishevelled and Liberals as a party in England have little hope of coming into power. It is only a good political stunt to say that India would rather be where she is than accept the White Paper. If it came to an argument based on reasoning the utmost that may be proved is that the White Paper scheme is far from Dominion Status and is a very meagre advance on present conditions; that no political party in India will be satisfied with it and a great deal of harmonious working may depend on how the safeguards in the scheme are worked out in practice.

There are again two points to be considered in connection with rejection at this stage. Is there a likelihood of an agreed constitution, agreed to by all political parties in India, being adopted in the near

future, and secondly, if this is improbable what are the chances of the adoption by all of a common platform from which to bring pressure on the British Government to surrender more than the White Paper? The Nehru Report has been scrapped, not even Mr. Gandhi has been able to get all political parties to agree to the adoption of a constitution for India and it is highly problematical if lesser lights like Malaviya can bring about such a unity. Unity has been repeatedly asked for, but it has always receded into the background and one can definitely pronounce that any attempt at adopting a common constitution is bound to fail at present. If anything, the proceedings of the R. T. C. should make this clear to all. The second point must also be answered in the negative. On all hands rebellion is out of question; civil disobedience as a measure of N. C. O. has been tried and failed; it has been definitely shown that unless large masses are prepared and trained for it no form of N. C. O. is likely to be adopted by the whole of India to exert pressure on the British Government. Indeed the impossibility of the adoption of a common constitution leads to a logical consequence that common united action to bring pressure on Government is also improbable. Common action presupposes a common agreement on a constitution and the absence of the latter can only result in no common action being possible.

Throughout I am assuming that the minimum in the White Paper scheme will be embodied in an Act of Parliament and confining my argument to the only point as to how Indians should act in the present juncture. According to the White Paper scheme, all subjects in the Provinces will be under the control of the Ministers and there being no Government nominees or any other Government block in the Councils, executive action will be more responsive to the majority in the Council. Patronage and power will be with the Ministers and if these have definite ideas and schemes of advancing public interests, they can do so. All attempts so far directed in Councils to wrest power from the British Government will hereafter lie in the direction of constructive action. Public opinion could be and will be developed gradually so as to be insistent on legitimate demands and can be developed to be a powerful check on any abuse of the extraordinary powers of a Governor or of the safeguards. In the Central Government there will be Diarchy, but there will be more power in the Central Assembly to enforce conformity to the majority will. There are thus definite chances for the new scheme to be worked out for the people's advantage and even for solidifying public opinion for demanding further advance in the constitution. Time is certainly an element in the development of political consciousness amongst those who will now get the franchise so as to enable them to demand more in time. Viewing it from this point of view, it seems wiser to advise the working of the White Paper scheme, however unsatisfactory it may be as presented therein.

An entirely different question may arise if the

White Paper is whittled down to a substantial extent. Every one in India has appreciated the Herculean efforts of Sir T. B. Saprú to improve the White Paper, but as things at present show possibilities there is no knowing that Indian interests may not be thrown to the wolf to avoid a split in the Conservative Party and the White Paper scheme may be so far whittled down that it may not be worth having as an advance, howsoever meagre, on the present. Till that contingency arises, we need not consider what action Indians should take to get a further advance. Time and circumstances then existing can alone determine this question and one can only wait and watch till an Act of Parliament actually defines the advance to be made.

M. V. JOSHI.

[The conductors of the SERVANT OF INDIA have apparently decided to make the paper a clearing-house of opinion on the reforms, and I would heartily congratulate them on this decision, if I may be permitted to do so. They have placed me in possession of the views of Sir Moropant Joshi and invited me to discuss them in their columns. I am very grateful to them for according to me this high privilege.

I will however make only two remarks on Sir Moropant's contribution to this discussion. I did not intend to suggest that all political parties should combine to secure the rejection of the White Paper. Such an extensive "united front" is of course impossible; communal and other special interests will never join in such a common endeavour. My plea was only for bringing all progressive sections under one banner for the purpose of fighting the White Paper.

Even such a limited co-operative effort, however, does not seem practicable to Sir Moropant. For among those, according to him, who profess to treat the White Paper with complete indifference, there are many who have at bottom a really good opinion of it; it is "only a good political stunt" with them to speak of the Hoare constitution as not only no advance, however small, but actual retrogression. I myself am inclined to think that that is the case with at least some "progressives." Sir Moropant for his part, it is clear, feels it his duty not to overthrow, but to save from possible wreckage a scheme which purports to give full provincial autonomy and a long-range dyarchy at the centre. Men who are of like mind will necessarily keep aloof from the kind of campaign I have in view. But I am sure most of the forward-looking politicians share the opinion expressed (and, I am sure Sir Moropant will agree, sincerely expressed,) by leaders like Mr. Sastri, Dr. Paranjpye and Mr. Chintamani.

Only I would enter a caveat here. Those who say that the White Paper is reactionary and that they would prefer to remain under the existing constitution must not be understood to deny that the White Paper contains several good points which may be said to mark an advance on the present position. But such advance as may be embedded in the White Paper can only be secured by a process which effectively blocks further advance. Dr. Paranjpye put it exceedingly well at the U. P. Liberal Conference the other day when he said that the proposed reforms were no good because, slight in themselves, they were the enemy of further bigger reforms. Sir M. V. Joshi gives no sign whatever of his being alive to this feature of the White Paper, and inasmuch as he ignores this fundamental aspect his estimate of the coming constitution has little value.

Sir Moropant, like the SERVANT OF INDIA, deprecates rejection of the constitution even were it possible. But he, unlike the SERVANT OF INDIA, apparently contemplates some action other than acceptance if the White Paper is whittled down in any particular. In this respect the SERVANT OF INDIA is more logical. For rejection of a constitution containing a smaller measure of advance than that indicated in the White Paper must be deprecated for the same reasons for which Sir

Moropant deprecates the rejection of the White Paper itself. For the nationalist forces will not even then be strong enough, it may be argued, to compel the British Government either by constitutional agitation or by direct action, or by rebellion, to substitute a more liberal measure; and it would be more prudent to use the reforms, whatever they may be, for what they are worth. On this reasoning, even a reactionary constitution must be worked as indeed the SERVANT OF INDIA so urgently pleads. In rejecting the rejection policy, therefore, I would beg Sir Moropant Joshi and men like him not to pretend that they would in any circumstances find it possible or expedient to reject any kind of constitution. Acceptance will for ever be the only policy open to them. They would on the contrary be using their endeavour to better advantage if, instead of holding out veiled threats which they will never be able to execute, they, like true moderates, moderated their ardour in denouncing the White Paper and went about educating public opinion in its advantages as they see them.—OBSERVER.]

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, October 28.

WHO WAS RESPONSIBLE ?

MR. CHURCHILL, who this week completed his evidence before the Joint Select Committee, has often maintained that Lord Irwin's Viceroyalty was a weak and pusillanimous one, and that it was only when Lord Willingdon exercised a firm hand over Indian affairs up to his predecessor's departure that the paramountcy of law and order was re-established. In his Memorandum to the Committee appears the following paragraph: "It would be ungrateful not to recognise the very great improvement in the tranquility of India which has been brought about during Lord Willingdon's Viceroyalty." In reply to a question Mr. Churchill said: "I consider that a very great change took place when the Civil Disobedience Movement was coped with and Mr. Gandhi was arrested instead of being invited to confer with the representative of the King Emperor." Professor John Coatman, in a letter to *The Times* yesterday insists that "this paragraph and the reply quoted above reveal a view of the Indian situation so completely mistaken, and potentially so dangerous... that not a moment should be lost in correcting it." Professor Coatman emphasises that in substance Lord Willingdon's policy has not differed from but has in fact fulfilled that of Lord Irwin. The following final passage from Professor Coatman's letter merits quotation in extenso:

"The simple truth is that the natural ebb and flow of political conditions in India caused Lord Irwin to devote the greater part of his statesmanship to conciliation and now cause Lord Willingdon to devote his attention to the maintenance of an accomplished stability and equilibrium. Different methods may be called for from time to time, but the essential policy is the same. Lord Irwin's duty to India and the Empire was to get India to the Round Table Conference, and only those who served by his side during those fateful days can understand the fortitude which his policy of conciliation demanded. It would have been easy—but ultimately ruinous—to have embarked on a policy of repression early in 1930. The fruitful policy which the Joint Committee is now completing is the reward of that fortitude. It is earnestly to be hoped that people in this country will realize that in India we are living on the political capital accumulated by two great Viceroys—Lords Reading and Irwin—and splendidly conserved by a third, Lord Willingdon. Throughout the whole

of the post-War period of Indian reforms, from Lord Reading to Lord Willingdon there has been no change in the fundamentals of policy. Lastly, let us understand that in politics there are no such things as strength and weakness. Political action is wise or it is foolish, and in our present Indian policy we are treading the path of wisdom."

MR. CHURCHILL IN THE WITNESS-CHAIR.

Mr. Churchill, with that natural modesty and gallantry that distinguish him so remarkably above the majority of his colleagues, sat in the witness chair at the Joint Select Committee and submitted himself to examination upon the amazing Memorandum that he had prepared for submission to the Committee. I do not propose to discuss the document or the scheme in substitution for the White Paper proposals that it contains at any length, as these will doubtless be examined otherwise in your columns. I have reason to believe that Mr. Churchill has not only not created any impression even upon the right-wing section of the Committee, but that in fact he has done his reputation for statesmanship little service. He preserved his good humour under the very severe cross-examination to which he was put by the Indian delegates, though now and again, as when he energetically resented the application of the term "diehard" to the group whom he represented as not being a term of art, and as being an inaccurate reflection of the constitutional position, he showed something of the old fire. Nevertheless one reads throughout his evidence a consciousness of the immense superiority of Britain in India and a conviction amounting almost to an obsession that Indians for as far into the future as he would care to peer will be totally incapable of managing their own affairs. Indeed, the welfare of the masses repeatedly fell like a parrot-cry from his lips and he could not conceive how Parliament could in any historic time renounce its supremacy and responsibility in the conduct of Indian affairs. Under Mr. Jayakar's skilful questioning Mr. Churchill admitted that his only qualification for asserting an opinion was the information that he had derived from time to time as a Minister of the Crown, from a cursory examination of documents, and from the report of selected experts. Mr. Churchill, as is only natural, claims the right to choose his own expert advisers, and just as the Court of Law has jurisdiction to deliver a wrong judgment as well as a right one, so Mr. Churchill is at liberty, if he so wishes, to choose the wrong advisers. The Archbishop of Canterbury thanked Mr. Churchill for at least leaving his own judgment unfettered. This is how the Aga Khan criticised Mr. Churchill's scheme. He said: "It has behind it for authorship a small number, probably, of experts, whose knowledge of India is not up-to-date, none of whom has had recent experience of authority, and yourself who in the midst of your many important activities could not have given anything but very slight attention to it; and you have what I may call a cursory knowledge." That, I think, is a very pungent summing-up of the whole of Mr. Churchill's evidence. That this was the general view is, I think, indicated by the fact that, having heard him at considerable length upon the motion of the Archbishop, supported by Lord Salisbury and Lord Reading, none of whom had so far examined him, the Committee, with ceremonial compliments mutually exchanged, decided not to probe Mr. Churchill's inelastic mind any further. This, one of the reactionary papers describes as the Committee's running away from Mr. Churchill, which is a little hard upon Lord Salisbury, who so far cannot be accused of having run away from anybody or anything. It was Mr. Churchill who declined to take Mr. Jayakar's sporting offer to submit to a plebiscite in India the simple question: "Do the

masses desire a Government of their own people or Government trammelled by the British."

Among other things that once having got into his head Mr. Churchill finds it difficult to get rid of is the obsession that the Princes were stampeded into the Federation, by undue influence on the part of the British authorities. All the criticism that I remember was that whatever pressure was suspected of having been put by the authorities upon the Princes, was to induce them not to come into the Federation but to stay out of it, and it was credibly reported that the decision of the Princes to come in upon the establishment of certain satisfactory conditions, at the opening of the first Round Table Conference, came as a tremendous surprise to the British representatives. Not the most energetic refutation of Mr. Churchill's insistent reiteration that this undue pressure had been used to force the States unwillingly to enter the Federation, even though made with the full authority and upon the most insistent denial of Sir Akbar Hydari and Sir Manubhai Mehta, could chase this bee out of Churchill's bonnet, where, doubtless, it is still buzzing busily.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSIONS.

The discussions between the Committee and the Indian delegation have continued during the last two days, and will be carried on for the first part of next week. They are, of course, of a confidential character, though a certain amount of information may be deduced in ways that are familiar to pressmen. It is understood that some of the British Indian delegates have made a very considerable impression upon their British colleagues for the earnestness and energy with which they have advocated real and substantial autonomy in the Provinces, and I should now be surprised if the Committee were to report in favour of any withdrawal of the department of law and order from the portfolio of responsible Indian Ministers. Indeed, on this point I learn that there has been close collaboration of the British Indian delegation irrespective of communal differences, that these differences, however, assert themselves whenever questions affecting communal relations arise is to be expected, and as a result it is to be anticipated that the line of least resistance will be taken both by the Committee and by the Government in deciding any question in which a conflict of communal interests may appear to occur. It is nevertheless a cause for congratulation that on non-communal matters at least the British Indian delegation is acting as a unit.

BEEs THAT BUZZ IN BONNETS.

Some scientist, I seem to recall, has said that few of us are without a bee in the bonnet. With the Fascists and our diehards it is democratic institutions and liberal opinions. With the Nazi it is Jews and Marxists. This week Sir Austen Chamberlain accused Viscount Cecil of having a bee in his bonnet in the shape of an unreasoned hostility to secret diplomacy, a charge that Viscount Cecil refutes with explanations at some length. He is of the opinion that if there had been more open discussion and fewer secret sittings of selected statesmen there might have been a different story to be told of the Disarmament Conference and Germany might not have taken the disastrous step of withdrawing from it and of resigning from the League. She has since also resigned from the I. L. O., and has taken away her pending cases from the Hague Court of International Arbitration. She has reversed the old song and has substituted one of her own: "I Shan't Come and Play in your Yard."

Sir Alfred Knox and his fellow reactionaries have quite a number of bees in their bonnets, one of

these is the Union of Britain and India, which, under the able direction of Sir John Thompson, has become anathema to people of the Indian Empire Society persuasion. Another such bee is the wily Brahmin. I suppose that one of these days people like Sir Alfred Knox will come to realise that there are other wily people in India besides Brahmins, and that some of them claim to be even wiler than Brahmins.

In a letter to the *Morning Post* Sir Alfred Knox, who with his friends has always hated the Round Table Conference, attributes the responsibility for the suggestion that such a conference should be convened to that typical Brahmin, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru. He says: "Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru claims the distinction of originating the project. He says: 'the proposal of the Round Table Conference went from us to Lord Irwin' (Round Table Conference, third session, p. 74). That astute Brahmin knew that if he could only meet sentimental British politicians in a round table love feast all would be well. The ex-Viceroy no doubt made the actual suggestion, but under Brahmin inspiration in fact, U. B. I.!" Let us hope that having made this pungent jest, Sir Alfred Knox is happy and able to sit back in his chair comfortably.

Reviews.

INTERPRETATION OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL—CHRIST IN THE SILENCE. By C. F. ANDREWS.

(Hodder & Stoughton.) 1933. 20cm. 315p. 5/—

THERE is no soul to-day in India that is so dearly beloved to the educated Indian as the one that has migrated to this country in the person of C. F. Andrews. He reproduces in his own life the transition from the narrow Christianity of the early Christian missions that excludes from the kingdom of God all who refuse to enter the Church to that larger Christianity which looks back to the-fellowship in a common degree and in a common purpose which marked the Jesus of the Gospels. We have the latest expression of this attitude in the Laymen's Report of the Commission presided over by Dr. Hocking of Harvard: "The chief hope for an important deepening of self-knowledge on the part of Christendom is by way of a more thoroughgoing sharing of its life with the life of the Orient. Sharing may mean spreading abroad what one has; but sharing becomes real only as it becomes mutual, running in both directions, each teaching, each learning, each with the other meeting the unsolved problems of both." In C. F. Andrews the reflective Indian sees to-day a medium through whom the weaknesses of the organised churches that have imposed a foreign culture on the suffering East are redeemed, a link of love and affection that may prevent the final snapping of relations between the races in the secular sphere.

In the book before us we have an interpretation of St. John's Gospel by one who recognises Christ as his Lord and Master. This interpretation is profoundly permeated by the author's experiences and contacts with the East. "The thoughts which have come to me from St. John's Gospel since I went out to the East have gone deeper still. For there this Gospel has its true home in the hearts of men and is best understood."

"A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another. As I have loved you, that ye also love one another." The God of Love who gives Himself unto us from hour to hour, is interpreted unto us through every chapter—men have called it foolish—

ness when it has manifested itself in human deeds: there are pages in this little book where this foolishness breaks through in triumph, bearing witness to the healing touch of love. We shall refer only to one chapter where "Charlie" speaks of a young Sikh soldier with a fine record of service, hurriedly taken out at break of day and flogged in the presence of his fellow-villagers on suspicion of having cut the telegraph wires in the martial law days. He was completely innocent; his brooding led to signs of insanity. His friends were afraid of going near him, lest some mad act of violence might happen. His friends came to Charlie asking for his help.

"On drawing near to him my whole heart went out in pity for him. But he shunned me at first even while I spoke to him the tenderest words of sympathy and love. Then suddenly, prompted from within by a subconscious memory of Christ's act, I stooped down and touched his feet, asking from him at the same time pardon for the great wrong my fellow-countrymen had committed.

"When he saw what I had done he drew his feet very quickly away, almost with a shock; then he burst into tears. For a long time we remained together, while he cried his heart out with convulsive soughs. When at last with deep emotion I asked him if the past had all been forgotten and forgiven, he answered 'yes,' and his face was lighted up with a new joy and peace. His spirit had found its release, and his heart had become again as the heart of a little child."

As we read these lines the vision of a new society comes floating down the ages, nearer to the earth, in which racial and national distinctions will be subordinated as the love that links us together as members of one family, in which the Voice of the Beloved will speak to the disciples as it had spoken from the beginning, and may be awakened from regions of consciousness which were before unsounded. We think of a God who not only speaks to us through the lonely sweeps of the desert, and the snows of the Himalayas, but of a God likewise who assures his creatures that He will answer before they call, and while they are yet speaking He will hear.

P. A. WADIA.

BOMBAY LAND REVENUE SYSTEM.

THE BOMBAY LAND SYSTEM AND VILLAGE ADMINISTRATION. By D. S. MODAK. (Author, 13, Kahn Road, Poona.) 1932. 21cm. 287, 185p. Rs. 8/-.

MR. MODAK'S work is an attempt to present in a handy volume the salient features of the land revenue administration in the Bombay Presidency. It is the first of its kind in the field and should be of great value alike to the general reader interested in the subject and to the revenue officer and practising lawyer concerned in the every-day administration of revenue law. The book covers a wide field. Subjects, highly technical, such as the system of assessment of land revenue, survey and settlement, with the details of which the public in general have but an imperfect acquaintance, have come under review, as also matters, such as the improvement of agriculture, indebtedness of the agriculturist, education and rural uplift, which are before the public eye. The history of the various kinds of land tenure in vogue has been traced, the law governing inams and watans discussed, the duties of revenue officers of all ranks enumerated, and the working of the district office described. Great pains have been taken in making

the notes on the various sections of the Land Revenue Code as complete and useful as possible without going into needless details.

A small volume dealing with such varied subjects cannot pretend to be exhaustive and it would be uncharitable to be too critical. Speaking generally, the author has been eminently successful in collecting, compiling, and summarising the existing material which lies scattered, often unnoticed, in the standard works bearing on the subjects treated and in blue books, Government orders and instructions, not easily accessible to the public. Where, however, he has endeavoured to record his personal observations or to suggest solutions of some of the burning problems of the day he has been less fortunate. For instance, the definition of an agriculturist, so pontifically suggested by him for purposes of legislation, viz. that an agriculturist is one who solely depends on agriculture and earns his livelihood and all his income from agriculture and also personally engages himself in agriculture and no other trade (p. 246) is not likely to command general acceptance. Again, his reproof of educated men and moneylenders as a class is grossly unfair, injudicious and unbecoming. At page 256, while describing the conditions prevailing in a typical village, it has been stated: "A few educated men exploit the uneducated. The educated who are conversant with the laws and procedure take advantage of the ignorance of the peasants. The Savkars, who are generally literate, have no scruples in manipulating the figures and fabricating documents." Such sweeping generalisations, which are not permissible even in carrying on propagandist activities, can have no place in a work intended to be taken seriously. Curiously enough, the remedy for mitigating the evil complained of suggested most illogically by the author is mere education. Instances of similar misstatement and over-statement of facts it is not difficult to multiply.

The work also suffers from the limitations imposed by the fact that the author is in active service. He is naturally anxious to defend the policy of his employers. In doing so, however, he has frequently overshot the mark. We are told: "Of all the provinces in India the growth of land revenue in the Bombay Presidency has been most satisfactory on account of the careful and scientific system of assessment and survey. In no other province are there such detailed rules and regulations of classification, measurements and boundary marks, as are found in the Bombay Presidency." "In no other province are the survey records so well prepared, arranged and kept and assessment so minutely and precisely worked out as in Bombay" (p. xiv). "In fact the taxation or land is heavier in England than in Bombay. (p. xvi)" "Nowhere is the farmer treated more liberally than in the Bombay Presidency" (p. xviii). The report of the Bardoli Inquiry Committee affords a complete refutation of these assertions. Remarks such as those quoted above may flatter the vanity of the Government served by the author but they detract seriously from the value of the work.

If the objectionable features indicated above were removed, the work would supply a sorely felt need. The following are a few of the suggestions made not in a spirit of carping criticism, but with a view to enhancing the utility of the work, which the author may perhaps like to take into consideration before bringing out a second edition of the work. The introduction may be rewritten. Chapters 4 to 8 of Part IV may be either omitted or rewritten with a proper sense of proportion. The subject of assessment of land revenue has not received as much attention as its importance deserves. One of the cardinal prin-

ciples of assessment is that 'bhag annas' should represent the relative values of soils based on the relative net profits of cultivation, which in their turn should depend on the difference between the value of the gross produce and the cost of cultivation. It follows that, when prices and wages fluctuate, then relative values cannot remain constant save under exceptional circumstances. It was therefore unfortunate that the classification adopted in the original settlement was not disturbed in subsequent revision settlements. (p. 18). An attempt was made to rectify the defects in recent revision settlements (p. 140); but what steps were actually taken and how far the revised classification corresponds with the relative values of soils has not been clearly brought out. Similarly, how the group rate is determined has not been explained by concrete examples. It would be difficult for laymen to understand the important principles involved unless illustrated by concrete instances. Great stress has been laid on the proposition that assessment of land revenue should be based primarily upon rental values. Non-official opinion strongly demurs to this view. It is urged that many an agriculturist is driven by competition to pay unconscionably high rents at the risk of losing his only means of livelihood even though such payment often involves a denial of the bare necessities of life. Any work dealing with such highly controversial subjects must present impartially both sides of the case.

The rules framed under the various sections of the Land Revenue Code may be reproduced immediately below the sections to which they relate, e. g. rules 114, 115, 116 should come under sec. 146. Many of the rules have been omitted altogether. It would be desirable to insert them, at least for the sake of completeness. Reference has been made to rule 76 in rule 77 but the former cannot be traced. Similarly, rules 81 to 89 should have been reproduced under section 62. Chapters VII and VIII of Part I dealing with the record of rights and boundary marks may more appropriately be included in Part II; while the section dealing with soil classification, which constitutes an essential preliminary to settlement operations, may fittingly find a place in Part I.

AN EX-REVENUE OFFICER.

GROWTH OF SOCIALISM.

WHERE STANDS SOCIALISM TO-DAY? By SIR STAFFORD CRIPPS and others. (Rich & Cowan.) 1933. 20cm. 205p. 3/6.

WHERE stands socialism in Great Britain to-day? is the question that is answered in this book from different points of view by a group of eminent English socialist thinkers headed by Bernard Shaw. The subjects dealt with formed the basis of the authors' lectures to the Fabian Society delivered in the autumn of 1932 from the socialist standpoint. Questions on Democracy, Parliament, Finance, Industry and International Affairs are discussed in order by Harold J. Laski, Sir Stafford Cripps, Hugh Dalton, Rowse and Ratcliffe respectively. Bernard Shaw, besides the preface, contributes the last chapter "In Praise of Guy Fawkes," who in his perception of the need for ending the ingenious self-defeating Parliamentary machine by an explosion of the hot air which is its chief output, was before his time. But that time seems to be coming according to Shaw.

Socialist ideas are being broadcast for the past half a century but yet the mastery of the economic life of the country has remained with the capitalistic classes. This has led some to doubt whether "Socialism without tears is not a dream and not a reality."

The hopes that were raised at the time the Labour Party took office have been completely shattered in so far as the structure of society remains capitalistic as before.

Capitalism as the basis of society has failed to answer the manifold problems of the post-war world. Is it then possible to reconstruct capitalism? This demands ability to think far more clearly and to act with a far greater degree of promptitude and unity than has been shown hitherto. It involves radical changes in capitalism itself. Besides these changes must be made speedily and thoroughly if capitalism is to stand a chance of survival. But the trend of events does not encourage any hope in that direction.

The alternative therefore is Socialism. This also makes great demands upon human sagacity and courage. Supposing it is agreed that we adopt this alternative, is Russia to be the model? Shaw replies, "As to where Socialism stands to-day, we told it to go to Russia and it has. We shall have to copy Russia presently in consequence, though Marxism was a genuine British museum export." He is impatient of the catastrophe but would rather that it were settled without violence. Mr. Rowse is concerned to postpone the catastrophe. These represent the two extremes. But the English mind is eminently practical. The English people have exhibited in the past that marvellous faculty for compromise by which the most radical changes take the form of conservative adaptations of old systems. As Ratcliffe points out, "Britain in violent revolution could play only a small and confused part in making the road from international anarchy to civilization." "We cannot go to the length of Russia," says another. Russian lessons surely are of great help in evolving British Socialism. "Any planned economy" says Hugh Dalton, "which we might create in the capitalist west in such sectors of it as we might win for socialism, would be very different planned economy in many essential respects from that which they were seeking to establish in Soviet Union." Let us not forget history. England led the other countries in her Industrial Revolution. When the Germans much later had their Industrial Revolution they did not produce slums in the way England did.

The book is delightful reading and gives in a concise form an excellent idea of the modern socialist point of view.

S. GOPALASWAMY.

Correspondence.

MR. KODANDA RAO ON "FEDERATION".—

REPLY BY OBSERVER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—May I ask for some space to offer a few observations on the Editor's signed article in your last issue?

For I am one of those with whom the Editor finds fault for criticising the British Indian delegation for agreeing to nomination of the States' representatives by the Princes but not to election of British Indian representatives by communal electorates.

There are many reasons for this discrimination. One is—and this by itself is sufficient—that the progressive section of the British Indian delegation fought their hardest against communal electorates, but they did not fight the other evil they behaved on the other hand as if nomination in the States was almost the proper thing in the existing circumstances. Responsibility for communal electorates is not theirs, and it would not be fair to hold them to account for that for which they owe no responsibility. They have however incurred the

moral responsibility for nomination by reason of the fact that they never raised their voice against this evil. They cannot shuffle off this responsibility; it will stick to them for all time.

Another reason is that an agreement with minority communities may be considered a *sine qua non* of any considerable expansion of the present reforms, even if such agreement should involve the sacrifice of general electorates. But no such inevitability can be pleaded for an agreement with the Princes on the basis of nomination. The minority communities are with us any how and must be included in any constitution that we may frame. The Princes on the other hand are not in now and could be kept out till they agreed to reasonable terms. The Government of India's dispatch on the Simon Report, which contains approximately the same advance as the scheme evolved by the Round Table Conferences, is a standing refutation of the argument advanced by some that without federation central responsibility is not possible.

Still another reason is that communal election, though bad, is not half so bad, I should say not one-tenth so bad, as nomination. The first is nomination by a whole community and the second is nomination by one autocratic Prince. The difference between them is not one of degree alone, but of kind. One defect is of a different order from the other. If communal election deserves mild disapproval, nomination deserves uncompromising opposition. But our progressive politicians whom the Editor is pleased to certify as having put forth "heroic efforts" at the Round Table vowed undying opposition to the former but accorded mute support to the latter. And yet the Editor wonders why critics show such discrimination in judging these politicians. The boot is really on the other leg.

I know, however, that the Editor has already thought out some kind of justification for the discrimination on the part of the R. T. C. delegates. They disliked nomination just as much as communal election; but if they made much bother about the latter and maintained judicious silence about the former, it was only because they wanted to be "graceful" to the Princes. But apparently the Editor is not altogether happy about this discrimination. He would have much preferred our progressive delegates to have been equally "graceful" to the communal interests also and to have conceded their claims in full without any sign of disapprobation. May I suggest that the Editor urge the delegates to extend this attitude of "gracefulness" also to the British Government and to declare, not that the constitution is rotten though inevitable, as they have been doing, but that it is wholly good and that everything is for the best in the best of all possible worlds? He should really find it quite easy to do so; for, in his opinion, a constitution, even if wholly reactionary, has ultimately to be accepted and worked. If we are predetermined to work the Hoare constitution, irrespectively of its merits or demerits, why not, to use his own words, "agree gracefully to the inevitable than to submit to it after an antagonising squabble"? The note on which he ends the article therefore needs radical alteration, and I hope he will consider the suggestion. By scattering gracefulness all round he will be able to charm a discontented and disaffected people back into contentment and happiness. His "heroic" nationalist leaders had better sheathe their swords therefore rather than flourish them constantly before the British Government.

The other chief point that the Editor tries to make is that the federal constitution proposed in the White Paper will be no more difficult of amendment than the present-day unitary constitution. But to prove this he has nothing better to advance than his own assertion. He seems to think that the introduction of the Princes into the constitution will make no difference in future in respect either of the process of amendment or of the amending authority. As heretofore, the power of amendment will rest in future, he says, "in the hands of the British Government and Parliament." These authorities will hold power in so far as British India is con-

cerned, but will be powerless by themselves to insert any modifications in the constitution in so far as they relate to the Princes. The British Government's paramountcy over the States will be of no avail in this respect, notwithstanding what Mr. Kodanda Rao says to the contrary. I will give just one instance to prove that it is so. He says that federation was proposed by British Indian statesmen with the object, among others, of absolving the British Government from the obligation undertaken by it to defend the Princes, and thus forcing it as it were to transfer the control of the army to the federal government. What, however, is the actual effect of federation upon the possibility of such transfer? Sir Samuel Hoare has declared that the British Parliament will have to sanction the transfer of military control from the list of reserved to that of transferred subjects. Even under unitary government Parliament's sanction would have been necessary, but because now the character of the central government is to be changed the British Parliament's sanction alone is not enough for the transfer to take effect. In addition to this, Sir Samuel Hoare has made it clear, the consent of the individual Princes will be required. For one thing, federation cannot cut through treaty obligations; for another thing, the individual consent of States, which is necessary at the time of the formation of federation, is equally necessary under the White Paper proposals at every subsequent change in the scope and character of the federation. It is this rigidity of the constitution which is one of the chief stumbling-blocks in the way of future constitutional advance, and for the Editor of the SERVANT OF INDIA to say airily that "there is nothing to prevent the Labour Government (of Great Britain) from scrapping the Hoare constitution and fashioning another wholly different" is to ignore a capital defect of the constitution. The Government of Great Britain will by itself possess no power hereafter to effect any changes, even if it should desire to effect them.—Yours, etc.

Nov. 6.

OBSERVER.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- GOPAL KRISHNA GOKHALE. By J. S. HOYLAND. (Builders of Modern India Series.) (Association Press, Calcutta.) 1933. 20cm. 200p. Re. 1-8-0.
- WORK AND WEALTH. By J. A. HOBSON. (Allen & Unwin, London.) 1933. 22cm. 242p. 7/6.
- BRITISH BUDGETS. 3rd Series. 1921-22 to 1932-33. By BERNARD MALLET and C. OSWALD GEORGE. (Macmillan.) 1933. 24cm. 574p. 30/-.
- SOME ASPECTS OF THE EDUCATION OF WOMEN IN THE UNITED PROVINCES. By SHARKESHWARI AGHA. (The Indian Press, Allahabad.) 1933. 24cm. 28p. As. 8.
- BANKS AND THE MONEY MARKET. By B. RAMACHANDRA RAU. (Lal Chand & Sons, Calcutta) 1933. 20cm. 257p. Rs. 2.
- THE FOUNTAIN OF LIFE. By S. N. AGARWAL. (The Indian Press, Allahabad.) 1933. 20cm. 50p.
- ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI. By VERBIER ELWIN. (C. L. S. for India, Madras.) 1933. 20cm. 134p. 1/-.
- FINANCE AND ECONOMICS. By ERNEST KIRK. (Author, 6, St. John's Road, Bangalore.) 1933. 20cm. 142p. 1/8.
- THE EVOLUTION OF MORALITY. By GEORGE WHITEHEAD. (John Bale, London.) 1933. 22cm. 340p. 10/6.
- HAMMER AND SICKLE. By MARK PATRICK. (Elkin Mathews, London.) 1933. 22cm. 243p. 7/6.
- INDUSTRIAL LABOUR IN INDIA. By S. G. PANANDIKAR. (Longmans, Bombay.) 1933. 22cm. 299p. Rs. 5.
- STUDIES IN COLA HISTORY AND ADMINISTRATION. By K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI. (Madras University Historical Series No. 7.) (University of Madras.) 1933. 26cm. 210p. Rs. 4.