

Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA.

VOL. XVII, No. 45. } POONA—THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1934. { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN SUBSN. 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	... 529
ARTICLES :—	
Sage Counsel. 531
Not Playing Fair! By A. V. Patvardhan.	... 533
Supervision and Land Mortgage Banking in Co-operation. By Prof. V. G. Kale, M. A.	... 534
OUR LONDON LETTER 535
REVIEWS :—	
Indian Constitutional Problem. By Prof. Gurumukh N. Singh....	... 538
Prof. Radhakrishnan's Philosophy. By D. G. Londhe 539
SHORT NOTICES.	... 540

Topics of the Week.

A Game of Hide and Seek.

BABU RAJENDRA PRASAD, in his statement on the States' question, tries to show that the prohibition by the Travancore Darbar of Congress activities in its State is something abominable. He says in effect: "These activities are mainly of a constructive nature and are wholly inoffensive. They need not be stopped. The Congress leaves the States alone. Should not the States in their turn leave the Congress well alone?"

BUT, in thus pleading, Rajendra Babu shows ignorance of the position taken up by the Travancore Darbar. What it says is: "Let the States' people form their organisations in the States. Such organisations they will not discourage at all. But the States' people must not have anything to do with British Indian organisations. And the Congress, on its own showing, is such an organisation. Does it not, by asking its members to keep aloof from the States, confess that the Congress is a purely British Indian organisation. Well, if it is a British Indian organisation, the States' people must keep aloof from it."

THE Travancore Darbar has really caught the Congress in a vice. It says to Mahatma Gandhi and other Congress leaders: "If you contend that the Congress is a wider organisation, comprising both British Indians and the States' people, and, on that ground, request the Princes to allow their subjects to

join it, why do you ask Congressmen not to take part in the States' affairs? If the Congress is an all-India organisation, then it would be right for British Indian members of the Congress to interfere in the States' affairs, as you claim it is right for the States' people to interfere in British Indian affairs. By prohibiting British Indians to go into the States for the purpose of giving active support to the States' people's agitation, you virtually declare that the Congress is meant only for British India, and if it is so meant it is but right that the States' people should not enrol themselves in it and should refuse to participate in its activities."

"If the inhibition laid by you on British Indians against their participation in the States is justifiable, surely an inhibition laid by the Princes on their subjects against participation in British India is equally justifiable. We must not allow our people to engage themselves in civil disobedience in British India for the very reason that you do not allow your people to engage themselves in milder movements in Indian States. Reciprocity requires, on our part, just the opposite of what you ask for. You are only playing hide and seek with our people. We cannot permit such bamboozling on your part."

Occasion has arisen!

TOUCHING the Calcutta resolution of the Congress, which Babu Rajendra Prasad offers to the States' people as their sheet-anchor, the *Tribune* observes in its issue of the 10th inst. :—

This was no doubt both a clear and adequate statement of the policy of the Congress in 1928. But since then the position has been completely transformed. The idea of federation, which was at the time still a somewhat remote cry, has now become part of an actual official scheme. The question which the people of the States are entitled to ask, and which they have as a matter of fact been asking with increasing earnestness and emphasis is, whether and how far the Congress is prepared to change its old attitude of mere sympathy into one of active support in view of this change in the situation. Babu Rajendra Prasad, therefore, is hardly right in saying that no occasion has arisen since 1928 to make a fresh pronouncement of the Congress attitude. The occasion is undoubtedly there, though on account of its preoccupations the Congress has not been able to make necessary pronouncement. Sooner or later, sooner rather than later, the Congress will have to definitely make up its mind as to whether it is going to advise the Provinces to agree to federate with the Princes without making any condition whatever regarding the internal administration of the States and without the people of the States themselves being brought into the picture in any manner or to any extent.

Illogical.

REFERRING to Mahatma Gandhi's draft of a resolution on the Indian States, *United Bengal* of the 3rd inst. writes as follows —

The policy of non-interference in the internal affairs of the States which Gandhiji has advocated and followed so long is now officially approved of by the Congress. At the same time it is laid down in the resolution that the citizens of the States should not be debarred from being enlisted as members of the Congress. We do not see as to how these two may be reconciled with each other. A British Indian citizen becomes a member of the Congress with the object of freeing his country from alien domination by peaceful and non-violent means. But it passes our understanding as to why the subject of an Indian ruling prince will become interested in this ideal when he cannot do anything in an active way as a member of the Congress for liberating himself from the immediate thraldom of the local despot. He must necessarily be more interested in popularising the administration of his State than in freeing India from the ultimate control of the British. It is true that the Congress in this resolution has made an appeal to Their Highnesses to democratise their government and reform their administration. This appeal, however, will out no ice as long as it is not backed up by some active agitation on the part of the Congress. The subjects of the Indian States are thus practically left to their own fate. This soft corner of Gandhiji for princely despotism is both inexplicable and unjustifiable.

United Bengal assumes that Mahatma Gandhi's draft was accepted by the Congress. Fortunately it was not, and non-interference cannot yet be said to be the Congress's official policy. Our contemporary's criticism of the Mahatma's position is, however, entirely just.

A Champion of Autocracy.

A SECTION of opinion, by no means unfriendly to the proposed federal constitution for this country, presses the view that a modicum of representative and responsible government in Indian States should be insisted on as a condition precedent to their entry into the Indian federation. The suggestion is however brushed aside in certain influential quarters as introducing a needless complication in an already complicated situation and as delaying the advent of federation indefinitely. It is pointed out by the spokesmen of this school of thought that if a definite obligation were thrown upon autocratic rulers of Indian States to democratise their administrations to a stated minimum extent before they are allowed to join the federation, they may resent it as an unwanted interference with their unfettered control in relation to the internal affairs of their States and may even wash their hands of the whole federal business. On the other hand, if they are allowed to come in without any conditions, say this class of politicians, they cannot remain immune for any considerable length of time from democratic influences in British India owing to their close association or that of their representatives in the federal legislature with popular British Indian representatives and will soon have to introduce democratic government in their States. Those who take this view are so confident of the future course of events that they speak of this almost as inevitable.

APART from the fact that on account of the natural unwillingness of autocracy to part with its power unless forced so to do by pressure of public opinion, the supposed inevitability may in actual fact turn out to be no better than a dream, there are special circum-

stances in this country which should caution everybody against entertaining such a fond hope. In exercise of their rights of paramountcy which remain intact under the new regime, the British Government will continue to wield immense control over the members of the princely order. And he would be a bold man who could assert that the representatives of the Government, through whom such powers would be exercised, would go out of their way to impress upon the States' rulers the advantages of democracy or to encourage them to liberalise their constitutions in the direction of enlarging popular control over their administrations.

IF Sir Malcolm Hailey is to be taken as a fairly representative type of this class of official, the Princes will on the other hand receive no end of advice as to the benefits flowing from autocracy. In his recent speech at the banquet given by the Maharaja of Benares, Sir Malcolm Hailey sung the praises of autocracy and openly advised his friends amongst Indian rulers to give autocracy its full chance. Are not Indian rulers here asked not to permit their States' administrations to be contaminated by any kind of popular control till the very last? Even supposing that the Princes were themselves anxious to liberalise their administration in the direction of democracy, is it at all an unwarranted fear that their intentions would more often than not be frustrated by the intervention of administrators of the type of the Governor of U. P.? Would it not therefore be a better arrangement to demand from them the conferment on their subjects of at least the stated minimum rights of control over their own affairs?

Cypher Bureau.

IT may be inconceivable to many, but is nonetheless a fact that in this country with its heart unalterably set on the attainment of self-government at the earliest possible moment there exists a Government department in which, there is an express ban on the employment of Indians. That department is the Cypher Bureau of the Political Department under the central Government. Such an anomaly is possible only in India with her irresponsible and unresponsive system of government. Had it happened in a self-governing dominion, it would have been enough to unseat the Government in power. This is unthinkable in this country for years to come with the result that though the inequity has been brought to the notice of Government by popular representatives on countless occasions, it still continues to persist!

THE matter was recently the subject of an interpellation in Parliament when the explanation was officially vouchsafed that since some of the cyphers handled by the Political Department were not the property of the Government of India, no change in the conditions of their use was permissible without the concurrence of the owners of the foreign cyphers. It is an open secret that the foreign cyphers belong to the British Government. According to the Secretary of State's reply, there is a possibility of the discontinuance of these cyphers before long. This is doubtless a matter of some relief. But what does "before long" mean? Indian opinion would have felt thankful if Sir Samuel Hoare could have given it some definite idea of the period of time within which such discontinuance was to be looked forward to. If, as is sometimes claimed, his responsibility for India's well-being had been real and genuine, he would have taken the people of

this country into his confidence as regards the steps already taken, or contemplated with a view to securing such disappearance as soon as practicable. All that Indian opinion can in the present circumstances press for is that arrangements for the discontinuance of the British cyphers should not be delayed.

* * *

Quinine.

THE Government are reported to be in a fix as to how to get rid of their accumulated stock of quinine. This is said to be about 300,000 lbs., worth more than Rs. 50 lakhs. In their anxiety to get this large stock of the drug off their hands, they are believed to be in negotiation with a Dutch Company. At what stage these negotiations are at the present moment it is not given out. But according to the *Statesman*, the idea seems to be to make the Dutch Company a sort of middleman who would take over all the quinine now in stock and also that which would be manufactured hereafter and sell it either to provincial Governments, Government departments or to the general public. We have been taught to believe that the present-day trend of commercial opinion is in the direction of eliminating the middleman. And, frankly speaking, the logic of introducing him in a business which has so far succeeded in doing without him is incomprehensible to us.

* * *

THERE might have been something to be said for the new arrangement if it was the case that there was no market for quinine in this country. As a matter of fact, while its quantity lying with the Government is growing, the yearly imports of quinine come to nearly 120,000 lbs., which naturally costs the consumer more than the home-produced drug. Where is the difficulty, we wonder, in the way of the Government making their own quinine available to those that need it? It is nothing more than a matter of proper distribution for which Government with their unlimited resources in expert advice should easily be able to arrange. If with such a ready market for the drug as India provides, they go and bring in a foreign business firm to help them in the disposal of their quinine stock nothing will better show up their bankruptcy in business method and organisation.

* * *

IT is well known that nearly 20 per cent. of the mortality from fevers is attributable to malaria. And one need not be a medical man to assert that the easily available remedy against malaria is quinine. The Government would be looked

upon as a saviour by the poor if according to the quinine policy now in force, the drug is distributed gratis to those unable to pay for it and cheapened in the case of others. That seems to be a way of quickly disposing of the accumulated stock and incidentally avoiding some avoidable deaths. The figures of quinine stocks and imports given above also suggest the possibility of the country being made self-sufficient in regard to its quinine requirements—a matter which should receive the attention of Government without needless loss of time.

* * *

Kenya in 1933.

THE total population of Kenya Colony and Protectorate, according to the Kenya Blue Book for 1933, was 30,65,400, of which nearly 17,000 was European and 57,000 Asiatic. European immigration into Kenya numbered 4,634, while the number of Europeans who emigrated out of it was 4,439. It will thus be seen that more Europeans entered the Colony than came out of it. The position is reversed in the case of the other two non-native communities, viz. the Indian and the Goan. The immigration and emigration figures for the former were 5,662 and 8,254 respectively and for the latter 828 and 926. At this rate while the European population in the Colony will go on increasing, the Indian and Goan population will show a consistent decline.

* * *

THE number of European voters for election to the Kenya Legislative Council was 4,604 who were entitled to elect 11 representatives, the smallest constituency counting no more than 73 electors. The Indians in the Colony on the other hand, who number at least three times the Europeans, can return only 5 representatives to the Council and their electoral roll is 3,119!

* * *

THE European community occupies the same privileged position in regard to the provision of educational facilities. In the Government, aided and private schools maintained specially for its benefit, there are 1,639 scholars, the smallest Government school having only 15 pupils. The contribution of the Kenya Government to European education was nearly £27,500, each pupil thus costing the State more than £16. In the case of Indian schools, the number of scholars was in the neighbourhood of 6,000 with a total Government expenditure of £26,059. The cost per Indian pupil out of Government funds thus works out to £4½ or nearly one-fourth of that required for educating a European child!

SAGE COUNSEL.

IN view of its annual session at Christmas, the Indian Liberal Federation is advised by the *Pioneer* not to reiterate mechanically the resolution passed by it at its former sessions on the official reform proposals, nor even to flaunt the Joint Report of the British Indian delegation in the face of His Majesty's Government, as the Federation may be tempted to do, but to review the proposals as they will emerge from the Parliamentary Select Committee in the light of the existing political situation in England. The main factor in this situation is of course the hardening of opposition in Conservative circles to the White Paper scheme, and the *Pioneer's* advice to the Liberal Party in India amounts to this, that it should so scale down its demand that the

White Paper scheme, or something short of it, may be saved to India from the wrecking tactics of the Churchill-Lloyd group. It is right for every political party, says our contemporary in effect, to put its claims at their highest at the start of the negotiations. The Liberal Party, too, naturally put them very high, and no blame attaches to it for doing so. But no negotiator, who wants to pull off a bargain, can afford throughout the negotiations to stick fast to his original terms. He must be prepared to move them up and down as occasion may require. The Liberal Party unfortunately has shown itself to be rather slow in reacting to the changing moods of those to whom it now belongs to concede or withhold political power. It is too hide-bound in its own ideas and

principles to secure for itself the best bargaining position. The result is that it often sacrifices solid advantages on the altar of a sterile consistency. Here is a splendid opportunity for it to show that it has the gift of a realistic appreciation of the situation that is in front of the country and of a quick adjustment of its own programme in response thereto. It is no doubt the misfortune of India that her politicians have to submit to a progressive lowering of their demands as the diehard section in England gains greater and greater strength. It is even a humiliating position for them to find themselves in. But does not the supreme test of statesmanship consist in suffering humiliation if it be necessary for the sake of promoting national good? Other parties may not be far-sighted and sagacious enough to satisfy this test, but the Liberal Party, a party *par excellence* of statesmen, must surely now cease talking of its maximum demands, but must only talk of its minimum.

To be fair to the *Pioneer*, we must add that while recommending to the Liberal Party a downward revision in drastic fashion of its former demands, it concedes that the Party may at the same time ask that the demands which it has thus to jettison temporarily shall be fully met by the British Government "within a specified period of time without further inquiry." The compromise that our contemporary suggests therefore is only in regard to time. Instead of insisting that the constitution outlined in the Liberal Party's resolution coming into force immediately, the Party should now demand, in view of the thickening storm of opposition in England, that it shall come into force a few years hence, but come into force automatically. This would be a suggestion quite well worth considering if it were practicable. But what chance is there that the British Government could, even if it would, agree to all the Liberal Party's demands here and now, as it must if the *Pioneer's* suggestion is to be carried out, and say to Parliament: "Let us enact the whole constitution as the Indian Liberals want it, but keep some parts of it in abeyance for five years or so, bringing into operation the other parts forthwith, and giving effect to the entire constitution at the end of the stated period"? In the first place the British mind does not work in this fashion; it is only the Americans who work to a time-table, agreeing to let go their grasp of Cuba or Haiti in a particular year in the future. But even supposing that His Majesty's Government accepted this novel method, of which we envisage no possibility, would the Lloyd-Churchill group, on account of whose opposition the plan is recommended, allow it to do so? Will not this group offer as violent an opposition to a liberal constitution's coming into effect, say, five years hence as to its coming into effect at once? And will not the *Pioneer* itself say, in such an event, to the Liberal Party: "It is extremely sad that the British Conservatives are making a dead-set against such an eminently reasonable proposal. But now, in face of such opposition, the Liberal Party's duty is clear. It must throw overboard its time-table proposal, for

only so will any constitutional advance be possible. After all, political parties in all countries live from hand to mouth. They cannot take a blue-print of future progress and put it forward as a practical programme to be carried out in a long series of years. And after all the Liberals need not ask for a guarantee of future advance; this advance will come on account of forces unconnected with the wishes of British political forces. Let us take care only of the immediate present; the future will take care of itself." The Indian Liberals will again be called upon to take a statesmanlike view of the situation and to place compromise above principle. In fact there can be no minimum in the *Pioneer's* scheme of things. Even if the White Paper proposals be evacuated, as the British diehards desire, of all their substance, the *Pioneer* may still appeal to the Liberal Party to accept cheerfully this watered-down version on the ground that some advance, however little, is always better than none. To take this argument still further, even if the new constitution be, by all accounts, more backward than the present one, the *Pioneer* need not cease making a call upon the apparently inexhaustible capacity of the Liberal Party to make a compromise and ask it to accept the reactionary constitution. Its plea then would be that, unless this is done, the reactionaries in England would force upon India a still more retrograde constitution. "There are always ups and downs in political struggles," it would say. "India must now retreat—only to make future advance more certain." Will the *Pioneer*, one wonders, stop at any point on this inclined plane?

If it will, why should not the Liberal Party stop at the point which is indicated in its resolution? Why should it not say to the British Government: "We have told you what we want. Our demands have been framed, not in a bargaining spirit, but strictly in the light of what we honestly regard as the immediate necessities of the political situation. We do not pretend that our demands are absolutely incapable of alteration even in the smallest detail. But we can discuss the reforms question only on that basis. You are in no mood to consider the matter in the spirit in which alone a consideration would be useful. We know too that you are bent upon forcing upon India a constitution which she does not want. Very well, do so and take the consequences. We refuse to share responsibility for your action in any manner whatever." If we have not wholly misjudged the Liberal mind, this will be the upshot of the Liberal Federation's proceedings at its next meeting. Let there be no mistake too about this, that in saying so, it is at one with all the other progressive parties in India. It is no use the *Pioneer* appealing to the Liberal Party's spirit of compromise and trying to draw it away from the Congress and the Nationalist Party. It is immaterial whether or not it uses the word "rejection" in respect of the White Paper proposals. It will not adopt the attitude of acceptance or acquiescence in order to save them. The present election propaganda affords clear proof of it. The Congress candidates are wooing the

electorates on the cry of rejection. Which Liberal candidate has put himself forward as a champion of the anti-rejectionist policy? In electoral contests the tendency is to invent differences of policy even where there are none. This then is the time when the Liberal Party's candidates would emphatically express their opposition to the most crucial plank in the Congress platform if they were at all opposed to it.

The *Leader* is the most faithful exponent of Liberal policy. We have not yet seen one article in it, which shows any concern whatever for the rejection of the official scheme for want of Liberal support to it, and it has not even once called upon the Liberals to rush to its rescue. The *Pioneer*, we are afraid, will be disappointed in the Liberal Party.

NOT PLAYING FAIR!

IN his statement on the Congress attitude to the Indian States, the President of the Congress, Babu Rajendra Prasad, refers the States' people to the resolution passed by the Calcutta session of the Congress in 1928, which he says is unrepealed and therefore represents the accepted Congress policy on the question of the States, adding further that "no occasion has arisen since then to make any pronouncement" on the subject. To be sure, Rajendra Babu cannot say that since 1928 no occasion arose for the Congress to make known its policy. Two events of cardinal importance happened after the Calcutta session, which have put an entirely new aspect on the States' problem. Reversing the order in which they happened, we shall speak first of the proposed federation. No one realises more keenly than Babu Rajendra Prasad himself that this federation has no place at all for the States' people. It is to be, if the proposal goes through, a federation between the Indian States' rulers and the British Indian people. Is it not then necessary that the Congress should state whether it agrees to this kind of federation? Unless it expressly dissociates itself from such a federal scheme, the presumption will be that the national organisation is in favour of it. The reason for this presumption is that Mahatma Gandhi, as the Congress representative, has already agreed, in his pact with Lord Irwin, to federation as the basis of the future constitution, and that he did not oppose, but indirectly supported, at the Round Table Conference, a scheme of federation between the British Indian people and the States' rulers, by raising no objection to nomination by the Princes in the federal legislature. The Swaraj Party, which is now known as the Parliamentary wing of the Congress, has also committed itself to follow the same policy in respect of constitutional reforms that Mahatma Gandhi outlined in his speeches at the Round Table Conference. Unless therefore the Congress repudiates this kind of federal union between the democracy in one part and the autocracy in other parts, one cannot get away from the conclusion that the Congress favours it.

Do not say that the Congress, by rejecting the White Paper, also rejects inferentially such a federal union. For even the White Paper contains some good proposals. For instance, it recommends direct election for the British Indian part of the federal legislature. The Congress will not reject this recommendation because it rejects the White Paper and itself propose indirect election when time comes for it to frame its own constitution. Similarly, if

Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress see nothing objectionable in a federal legislature consisting, as to the States' part of it, of the Princes' nominees, who knows that the Congress members of the Assembly, even in rejecting the White Paper, will not still support princely nomination? Even though the White Paper is rejected, the Congress cannot, merely by reason of such rejection, be presumed to reject nomination by the Princes. It must do so in express terms. If it does not, it will be taken, on account of its previous commitments, to be in favour of it. Nor does the Congress say who will represent the States in the constituent assembly, which is to be formed after the rejection of the White Paper. Whenever such a question is raised, it is said: "The time for answering it has not yet arrived. We will decide the matter at the proper time." It is obvious that this is not a fair answer to make to the States' people. The Congress thinks it necessary, here and now, to give minute details of the composition of the British Indian part of the constituent assembly like adult suffrage and so forth. It does not consider it premature to determine such details in regard to British India, but when it is called upon to speak of the composition of the States' part of the constituent assembly the Congress thinks it would be premature even to say whether this part will consist of the States' rulers or the States' subjects. There is no doubt whatever in the mind of the States' people that the prevarication to which, under Mahatmaji's guidance, the Congress resorts on this question is due to the desire of the Congress authorities to deal with the Princes over the heads of the States' people in settling the details of federation. Babu Rajendra Prasad, I am convinced, personally does not want to give a slip to the States' people, but in the Congress the personal desire of minor leaders, even if they happen to be Presidents, to take a decision does not count where the Leader himself, though physically out of the Congress, wishes to evade an inconvenient question. The States' people too do not wish unnecessarily to incommode Rajendra Babu, but it will not do for him to take shelter behind the plea that "occasion has not arisen" to define the Congress policy. Occasion has arisen long since, and the President cannot put away the States' people on such flimsy pretexts.

Secondly, the conduct of two civil disobedience struggles in British India with the help of people in the States has surely made it necessary now for the Congress authorities to say whether or not the Congress will actively participate in the struggle

going on in the States for the attainment of popular government. It is no use referring the States' people, when this question is raised, to the Calcutta resolution. The Congress no doubt expresses sympathy enough with their political aspirations. What is, however, required at present is not verbal sympathy, but actual support. It is true that the Calcutta resolution offers both sympathy and support to the States' people, but they are bidden to look only for such support as is consistent with the policy of non-interference, to which they are told the Congress still adheres. Support, when joined to non-interference, reduces itself to empty sympathy. Why does the Congress appeal to the States' people to take active part in satyagraha campaigns in British India and enjoin upon British Indians a policy of abstention from the States' people's constitutional agitation in the States? One can understand British Indians practising non-interference in the States and the States' people practising non-interference in British India. But the Congress is a body neither of British Indians nor of the States' people, but of both together. There can be no non-interference for it in either part. It must interfere both in British India and Indian India. It may be that its ability to interfere in the two territories may vary. It may be able to interfere more in British India than in Indian India. But to say that it will not interfere at all in the States while it will interfere every time in British India, and interfere with the help of the States' people too, is to say that while it will receive help it will give none. Moreover, it must be remembered that the Congress constitution was of set purpose altered to allow of interference in the States' affairs. This amendment was effected in the very year, 1928, in which the resolution was passed to which Babu Rajendra Prasad refers the States' people as a final solution of all their problems. Is it open now even to the Congress President to say that the Congress cannot interfere in the States' affairs? Is he not acting in a grossly unconstitutional manner in taking up this position, obviously in deference to Mahatma Gandhi's wishes?

The request of the States' people is very simple. The Congress should declare, first of all, that non-interference in the internal affairs of the States is of the past. It has the right and also the duty to interfere on all suitable occasions as well in Indian India as in British. Let it decide at its discretion when it can in fact interfere usefully and when it cannot. But, as a consistent and uniform policy, non-interference in Indian India must be given up. This is not only the right thing to do; it has become necessary, first, on account of the amendment of the Congress constitution, and, secondly, on account of the support the Congress has actually received from the States' people in the satyagraha campaigns in British India. Then it must declare that the only federation it can favour is a federation, not of the British Indian people with the Princes, but of the British Indian people with the States' people. Such a federation will be possible by agreeing to the minimum demands of the States' people, not otherwise.

And, finally, it must declare, as the Congress President (Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru) declared in 1929, that, in all constitutional negotiations between British India and the States, the States must be represented by the people, and not by the Princes. Applying this principle to the proposal for a constituent assembly now put forward, the Congress must declare that this assembly will be composed, in respect of the States, only of the States' people, even as, in respect of British India, it will be composed exclusively of the British Indian people. These three demands are exceedingly modest, and the Congress cannot turn them down without violating the principles for which it stands. But the States' people will not even mind the Congress refusing these demands. What they cannot put up with is the attempt which is being constantly made by prominent Congressmen to put the States' question on side lines and to ignore it altogether. This is not playing fair! Will not even Rajendra Babu muster enough courage to play fair? Let the Congress reserve diplomacy for its dealings with the British Government. Its dealings with the States' people ought to be open and overboard.

A. V. PATVARDHAN.

SUPERVISION AND LAND MORTGAGE BANKING IN CO-OPERATION.

THE Government of Lord Brabourne deserves to be congratulated on its decision, recently announced, to accept the main recommendations of the Land Mortgage Banks Committee and to give effect to them as early as practicable. It is proposed not to start the Central Land Mortgage Bank immediately, but to ask the Provincial Co-operative Bank to work out the scheme for one year, during which period efforts will be made to form primary mortgage banks in suitable centres in the various parts of the Province. This arrangement is calculated to save avoidable expense since a central bank, if one were launched forthwith, will have no work in the absence of the requisite number of primary banks, which are bound to take some time to materialise. The Provincial Bank, already financing and looking after three primary mortgage banks in Gujarat, Khandesh and Karnatak, can conveniently adjust itself to the work of expansion and development during the years of transition. Government having undertaken to guarantee both the principal and the interest on the debentures to be floated by the Central Land Mortgage Bank, it is to be hoped that the practical work of starting the primary banks in suitable areas will be taken in hand without any delay and that as little time as possible will be lost over administrative and other technicalities. The Central and Urban Banks' Conference, which met in Bombay last month, has made certain very useful suggestions in respect of the mortgage banks and we have no doubt they will receive proper consideration at the hands of Government.

Another very important problem on which the Banks' Conference has pronounced a very decisive judgment and which the Government of Bombay have carefully to tackle, relates to the recommendations of the Committee appointed to deal with the supervision of primary co-operative societies. The discussion of this question at the Conference, which was attended by the Registrar of Co-operative Societies, cannot but have proved an eye-opener

to that officer in respect of the strength of feeling aroused among responsible and experienced co-operators by the departmental attitude towards the recommendations of the Supervision Committee. A majority of the members of the Conference upheld the view which has been adopted by a minority of the Supervision Committee. The belief appears to prevail in certain quarters that if support for the majority recommendations were whipped up in rural areas, especially with the threat that the alternative would be the adoption of the Registrar's scheme under which supervision of societies affiliated to unions would be handed over to departmental sub-auditors, financing agencies and experienced and tried co-operators could be compelled to tow the line. The Banks' Conference has dealt a rude shock to this complacent dream of easy victory and effectively showed up the objectionable features of the scheme of supervision adumbrated by the Registrar and his supporters in the committee. The Conference was too courageous to be cowed down by threats, too conscientious to compromise its principles and too businesslike to accept conclusions not based on cogent reasoning and relevant facts and statistics. The Supervision Committee's scheme is vulnerable on two points. In the first place, the financial resources for supervision by general agreement having to be pooled by districts, the scheme insists on the financing agencies contributing to the district fund to the extent of annas four per cent. on their out-standings with societies irrespectively of whether there is otherwise a deficit or a surplus. On the face of it, this is highly objectionable since it means a senseless piling up of unwanted funds at the cost of central banks to the extent of about Rs. 16,000 a year in the aggregate in districts where no contribution would be required from financing agencies to balance the accounts of the district boards or only very small contributions from them would suffice. It would only mean a wasteful and foolish annual gift of a large amount to the Department. The Registrar and his supporters could not meet this devastating objection at the Conference and their silence was a telling demonstration of the utter futility of the basic estimates of their project and a shattering of the superstructure of their dreams. In districts where it is not possible to meet the necessary expenses of the union boards with their ordinary income the deficit can be conveniently met out of the surplus from the realisations of audit fees without trenching upon the Rs. 25,000 which Government have decided to carry to general revenues. So, that is that.

The other important point, on which the Conference was emphatic, had reference to the proposed relationship between the district boards of supervising unions and the Institute organisation. The Conference would not approve of any scheme of supervision which did not provide for the establishment of an organic connection between the Institute and its Branches on the one hand and the district supervision boards, on the other. A minority of the Supervision Committee had laid special stress on this point and it received overwhelming support at the hands of the Conference. The Co-operative Provincial Conference had itself, two years ago, laid down that the district boards of unions should be constituted as sub-committees of the Institute Branches. These, after all, are not departmental bodies and are neither financed nor managed by officials. Why then not allow them to be merged into the non-official co-operative organisation? Why attempt to officialise them? When the principle is accepted that the predominantly non-official Institute organisation should on no account be cut off from and should be deliberately linked to

any new institutions that may be set up within the co-operative movement, it is only a matter of detail to devise an organic link which is to hold together the Branches of the Institute and the district boards of supervising unions. For instance, it may be suggested that the Board of Supervision in each district may be composed of the representatives of unions and of financing agencies on the managing committee of the Branch of the Institute and one representative of the Department, the propaganda officer of the Branch working as secretary to the Board. Corresponding to the Central Board of Education, we can have a Central Board of Supervision at the Provincial headquarters and the district boards may be linked to it. What Government have seriously to consider here is whether it will not be a grave mistake on their part to allow their officers to assume responsibility for the management and control of the supervision of societies which ultimately tends to become the responsibility of Government itself and thereby to weaken the popular sense of responsibility. What the officers of the Co-operative Department ought legitimately to do is to watch and check and control from outside and not to participate directly in the management of the affairs of the unions and their boards. It is to blink at actual facts to presume that the officers will have the time and that they will prove fit persons to look after the routine work of those bodies; and the wisest course would seem to be to leave these matters to the Institute and its workers, once the funds required by the Boards are assured and their efficient management is provided for. This is the only line of development which is in keeping with the basic principle and the past history of the co-operative movement in this Presidency, and a departure from it is fraught with grave risks to its progress. This is assuredly the opinion of leading and experienced co-operators whose views ought to count. The Registrar cannot be unaware of this fact, and the Banks' Conference has rubbed it in. Is it too much to expect that when the Departmental proposals on the Supervision Committee's report come up before them, Government will give due consideration to responsible co-operative public opinion on the subject before finally formulating their own decisions?

V. G. KALE.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, 2nd November.

THE JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.

IT was not until yesterday that the Joint Select Committee held its last meeting and completed its Report. Notice had already been given for yesterday in both Houses of Parliament that, in view of the laying of the Report, a motion would be made authorising the simultaneous publication of the Report here and in India.

Two things had been discovered upon enquiry in the appropriate quarters, the first was that the motion would not be without precedent, for some years ago similar action had been taken in the matter of the Report of the Joint Select Committee on East Africa, before which Mr. Sastri tendered evidence. The second was a question of privilege. It discovered that, though the Committee were entitled to recommend simultaneous publication, they could not authorise it without requesting authority from Parliament itself, and this they accordingly now

proceeded to do. With a view to shortening the necessary delay, the Chairman had enquired whether the air mail could not be availed of, but was informed that very little advantage in time was to be gained whilst the expense would be disproportionately large. Accordingly the motion was moved in both Houses yesterday, and was adopted without dissent. The Report, with its memoranda and annexures, will in all probability therefore go out to India ready for publication by next mail, in order to be available for distribution to the Press of both countries on the 22nd November, whilst Members of Parliament will receive it a few hours earlier.

MR. CHURCHILL'S INTERVENTION.

Mr. Churchill intimated that he proposed to intervene in the discussion, and it was at first thought that he intended to divide the House upon the motion when made by Sir Austen Chamberlain, who, in his speech, made it clear that he was speaking in the name of the Joint Select Committee unanimously, whatever other differences amongst themselves they may have had. The view held by the Committee was that it would be unwise in the extreme if prior publication in extenso occurred here, and Indian opinion had to formulate itself by dependence upon official summaries and more or less garbled or condensed telegraphic impressions. He evidently had in mind the voluminous literature contained in the commentaries before the bare statement of the law, whether religious or secular, can be comprehended either by the professionals or the laity. In all the circumstances of the case, therefore, speaking on behalf of the Committee as a whole, Sir Austen held that the soundest and most reasonable procedure was by way of simultaneous publication even though it meant a corresponding further delay before the contents of the Report were made known.

One would have thought that that was really all there was to it, since this view received the support of the spokesmen for the opposition parties joined in the recommendation. Mr. Churchill, however, having already announced his intention to intervene, could not resist the temptation to say his bit. But just as, during the debate on the Report of the Privileges Committee, he was guilty of a series of unpardonably amateurish *faux pas*, leaving a sense of anti-climax, so on this occasion he cut the ground from under his feet by asserting that he did not wish to oppose the motion on any ground of principle. His objections really boiled down to this; that it left so little time before the Conservative Associations could hold their Party gathering to express their view on the Report, in pursuance of Mr. Baldwin's promise to "take counsel" with his fellow Conservatives. As Mr. Attlee afterwards somewhat pungently remarked, Mr. Churchill was putting party tactics before the business of the nation, and seemed to be appearing to assert for the Tory Party organisation the powers to impose policy upon the Government which he would have been the first to resist were the Trade Union Council to attempt to do likewise with a Labour administration in office.

Mr. Churchill, however, improved the shining hour by issuing a string of suspicions and innuendoes, evidently designed to arouse as much as possible an atmosphere of hostility towards the Report in anticipation of its publication. He insinuated, for example, that Ministers such as the Attorney-General, who were not members of the Committee, had seen the Report and were already beginning to make speeches in its support. He also suggested that the delay in the publication of the Report had been deliberately devised before polling day in some of the Indian Provinces, and wondered what would have been thought if the same practice had been

pursued at the time of the consideration of the Constitution for South Africa and Ireland. It was unfair, he said, to the Indian democracy.

THE REPLY.

Sir Reginald Craddock, whom none would suspect of undue friendliness to the White Paper proposals, had no difficulty in showing that the unanimous decision of the Joint Select Committee in favour of simultaneous publication had nothing whatever to do with such extraneous considerations, and Sir Samuel Hoare, realising the true temper of the House, which Mr. Churchill had so obviously misunderstood, roundly denounced Mr. Churchill as an enemy of peace and a sewer of disturbance and discord. Being unable to oppose the motion upon any ground of principle, Mr. Churchill had sought refuge in innuendo, insinuation and suspicion, none of which was well-grounded. The arrangements for the holding of the elections in India had been made by him in consultation with the Viceroy last May, at a time when it was quite impossible to forecast even approximately the date of completion of the Committee's business, and the fixing of the date of publication had nothing whatever to do with the date of the elections. Moreover, if any one were responsible for the delay complained of by Mr. Churchill, it was no other than Mr. Churchill himself, whose fatuous activities, resulting in the proceedings of the Committee of Privilege, had lost the Committee, Ministers, and the House, not to speak of India, weeks of highly valuable time. It did not therefore lie in Mr. Churchill's mouth to condemn the Committee indirectly for delay due to technical reasons alone. The House was entirely with the Secretary of States for India, and duly appreciated his gibe at the Member for Epping for his use of the phrase "Indian democracy" which was reminiscent of an earlier stage in the latter's political career. In an aside, at the end of the discussion, Mr. Jack Jones reminded the House that, in the constitutional sense of the term, there was as yet nothing like a democracy in India such as there was in England, and that the British workers were very willing to extend the political privileges that they themselves enjoyed to their Indian fellow-workers. Observing the discomfiture of his political chief, Sir Henry Page-Croft tried to soften the asperities and the obvious irritation of the House, but without obvious success, by repeating Mr. Churchill's arguments in a minor key. As above stated, the motion was adopted without a division.

In the Lords, Lord Linlithgow moved a corresponding motion, and Lord Lloyd, who does not possess the picturesque arts of Mr. Churchill (I believe that there is no great love lost between the two), played the part on a minor scale of Mr. Churchill in the Lower House, and with exactly the same result.

THE REPORT AND THE PROGRAMME.

The new session of Parliament opens on the 20th November and on the following evening members will have the report in their hands. In form, being the report of the Committee it will be unsigned and will bear the appearance of unanimity. As, however, it is likely that the proceedings will be summarised, it is expected, that the Report itself, which it is said will extend to some two hundred printed pages, will, with the annexures, appendices and memoranda, show marked divisions of opinion among the members of the Select Committee. I shall not be surprised, for example, if it is found that the Labour members have expressed, if not in detail, then generally, strong dissent from some of the main proposals. What exactly will be the attitude of the Labour Party, when it comes to the

final vote in Parliament, is still a matter of doubt, and I believe that it is one that has not yet been seriously considered by the Parliamentary Party. I shall, however, be surprised if, in the last resort, the Opposition parties do not support the Government in defence of the Bill against the diehard attack.

As to the programme, though the Government would undoubtedly like to do so, it seems unlikely that they will be able to present their Bill before the New Year, and of course the Bill itself will not necessarily embody every one of the Committee's proposals, or exclude matters omitted or not decided upon by the Committee. In any case the Tory Party meeting will probably be held early in December, somewhere about Wednesday, the 5th December, and only after that will it be possible to arrange the desired debates on the Report in both Houses of Parliament. It is expected that these will be held, and in the House of Commons at least last for three days, before the Christmas recess. This will leave the way clear for the introduction of the Bill, but I should doubt very much whether, even at the best, it would secure its passage through both Houses, and obtain the King's assent before next autumn, that is virtually a year hence. The *Morning Post* is suggesting that the Government may seek to buy off opposition by postponing Federation indefinitely and proceeding only with Provincial Autonomy. There seems little doubt, however, that the Government's intention is to proceed with the whole Bill, leaving Federation to come into operation when the stipulations, of which they have already given notice, have been fulfilled. As to the date of such fulfilment, that must remain for the present a matter concerning which the material is not available for any one to make anything like an accurate forecast. In the meanwhile the States will undoubtedly take further counsel and advice, which they are unlikely to do until the terms of the Report and of the Bill have been fully considered.

There is one consideration that may possibly result in the expediting of the passage of the Bill. A General Election is due between the summer of 1935 and the summer of 1936, in all probability. Whatever disputes may be engendered in the Tory Party over the India Bill must be composed as early as possible before the General Election if the Party is not to go to the polls with differences unadjusted and without a solid front against the advances of Labour, which have been again indicated by to-day's results in London of the municipal elections where Labour has made considerable gains. Moreover, this week the National Government leaders of the three parties represented therein, have again insisted upon the continued necessity of a National Government and the subordination of party demands to the national need. Obviously, therefore, the Government cannot, with any pretence of consistency, surrender to the Tory right wing. Next year, too, a new atmosphere of national unity will be created as the time approaches for the celebration of the King's Silver Jubilee. All going well, it should be easier for the Government to capitalise this good will in regard to measures such as the India Bill that have put a certain strain upon party and political loyalty. There are, indeed, in the wicked minds of some political opponents, dark suspicions that the Government then intend to take advantage of this general good-will to precipitate next autumn a General Election. This, however, may be merely the dark suspicions of cynical opponents.

BRITISH WOMEN AND INDIA.

Your readers will already have learnt that, at the next All-India Women's Conference, two distinguished British women will be present. Mrs. Corbett Ashby and Dr. Maud Royden have accepted an

invitation to attend as "honoured guests" and they will presently be leaving for India by air to Karachi in order to be present at the Conference. It had been hoped that Mrs. D. Lankester and Mrs. E. Pethick-Lawrence could also have gone out, but other engagements have prevented them from doing so. Both the ladies who have accepted the invitation have a very wide and honourable reputation, Dr. Royden, in particular as a religious leader, especially in the peace movement, and Mrs. Corbett Ashby through her work in international spheres, on the Disarmament Conference, the International Alliance of Women for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship, and the British Commonwealth League. The wide outlook of these two Britishers and their generous humanism should make them in truth honoured and welcomed guests wherever they go in India. They are visiting the country, Dr. Royden for the second time, to receive as much as they can give in the way of encouragement, help and support. The visit is intended to establish a closer collaboration between the women of the East and West for humanity, and a demonstration from the women of England of their admiration for the women's movement in India. There never was a greater need for closer mutual understanding between the two nations, and I can think of no persons better qualified by experience and by sentiment than these to establish, at least in part, these friendlier and more intimate relations. They are in every respect representative of the best that this country has to give in public life and effort, and I am sure that they will receive a hearty and spontaneous welcome during their stay in India.

MAHATMA GANDHI'S DECISION.

It seems fairly safe to deduce from the many messages received here during the last week that the Mahatma has in fact left the Congress, both as leader and as member, though the otherwise excellent dispatches from the *Times*' Special Correspondent do not bring this out quite clearly. I suppose that the reason is that, there as here, there is a general disposition to assume, in the circumstances that have occurred, that though not *in* the Congress he yet remains *of* it. Seeing that Congress accepted most of his demands, it is a little difficult to understand why he should have thought fit nevertheless to shake the dust of the Congress camp from his feet. It is to be supposed that, having had a vision of the larger freedom, his political soul could not rest until he had realised it. Having regained his liberty of action he can now devote himself to the movement in which he is primarily interested, and in this he will have the hearty support and sympathy of a large number of friends who could not follow him in his narrower activities. It looks very much as though the *News-Chronicle* is right in saying "he was at least a leader; and one of the greatest that the world has ever seen. It is not only difficult to point to a real 'successor' to Gandhi; it is almost impossible even to imagine one." There can, of course, never be a successor in the true sense of the term to a unique personality; and, as other newspapers have pointed out, the Mahatma has indicated the possibility that he may once again resume his leadership of the Congress in name as well as in fact, and thereby solve the problem of its succession.

OF INTEREST TO INDIA.

Preceding the motion regarding the simultaneous publication of the Select Committee's Report, a discussion arose yesterday in the Lords on a motion of Lord Strickland, in which he sought to draw an analogy between Malta and India. If the safeguards had failed in Malta, he urged, what guarantee was there that they would not fail in India? Lord

Plymouth's reply was that there was no analogy at all between the two parts of the Empire, and that, in fact, the safeguards had not failed, but that on the contrary they had been put into effect by the suspension of the Constitution and the Governor's resuming sole responsibility for the administration. It would be as well for India to bear this matter in mind, in view of possible eventualities.

Lancashire again looms large in relation to Indian matters. This week the Bishop of Manchester, Dr. Guy Warman, urged Lancashire people and British citizens generally to raise the question of India and its welfare above politics and above industrial advantage. It was a very noble appeal.

Yesterday Mr. Walter Runciman gave an assurance to a Lancashire cotton industry deputation who expressed their disappointment at the absence, so far, of any trade agreement between the Indian and United Kingdom Governments to benefit Lancashire interests, that he would ask the Secretary of State for India to make an early communication to the Government of India. The industry's representations would be fully kept in mind and every endeavour would be made to conclude negotiations for a trade agreement as quickly as possible. Among others present was Mr. R. A. Butler, Under Secretary for India.

The delegation wanted in the agreement a provision to the effect that the Import Duties on United Kingdom cotton and artificial silk goods entering India shall be fixed from time to time at levels which shall be lower than those applicable to the same goods originating in foreign countries, and compatible, first, with the unavoidable revenue requirements of India, and, secondly, with the principle that United Kingdom producers of cotton and artificial silk goods shall have full opportunity of reasonable competition with domestic producers. To this end it would be necessary to provide machinery under which the United Kingdom Government could raise with the Government of India the question of re-examining the levels of duty whenever they were able to show that these levels were unduly high, having regard to the agreed consideration affecting them.

Dr. C. L. Katial, the well-known Indian medical practitioner, is to be heartily congratulated upon the result of his first adventure in civic politics. He stood for election as a Labour candidate in the St. John's Ward, of the Borough of Finsbury, at the Borough elections that took place yesterday. All five Labour candidates were returned, with Dr. Katial at the head of the poll, in the Ward. I understand that, as a result, there is quite a probability that he will in due course be elected an Alderman of the Borough. His popularity in a working class neighbourhood is beyond dispute, and here, at any rate, there is no question of colour prejudice. Dr. Katial's friends look forward to an interesting municipal career for him.

Reviews.

INDIAN CONSTITUTIONAL PROBLEM.

THE NEW INDIAN CONSTITUTION. By A. KRISHNASWAMI (Williams & Norgate.) 1933. 24cm. 230p. 10/6.

FEDERAL INDIA. By NARESH CHANDRA ROY. (The Book Co., Calcutta.) 1934. 18cm. 87p. Re. 1-8-0.

I.

THE two books under review testify to the interest that has been aroused by the proposals for the new

Indian constitution embodied in the White Paper, which, if one is to believe the press reports, are in the process of being whittled down still further at the hands of the Select Committee.

The White Paper proposals have so far found very few friends either in England or in India, either in British India or in the Indian States. They have been condemned, root and branch, by both the Indian National Congress and the Indian Liberal Federation and even those Princes who were at one time very enthusiastic about "an all-India Federation" have become very halting and hesitating in their attitude. The Muslim communal organisations also condemn the constitutional scheme although they generally approve of the "communal award" contained in the White Paper. On the other hand, the Sikh and Hindu organisations condemn the "communal award" more vehemently than the scheme of constitutional reforms. In England, the Conservative Party has been rent into two almost equal sections on the question of Indian political reforms and the Churchillian group is attacking the White Paper proposals furiously and mercilessly. The whole situation has been accurately and picturesquely summed up by "Diogenes" in the new Indian monthly, *The Twentieth Century*—whose identity is not difficult to establish from the editor's description—"an acknowledged authority on the subject of States and Federation and one of our ablest and most experienced statesmen" with the person, who, according to Mr. A. Krishnaswamy, played a decisive part in the evolution of this idea" of an all-India Federation "whose suave manners, great knowledge of constitutions, persuasive advocacy, and rich culture won the admiration of all who worked with him at the three Conferences." The passage, which will be long remembered for its biting satire as well as for its keen insight, runs as follows:—

"But what if the States do not enter? Yet this perhaps is inconceivable, if the National Government survive the Churchillian onslaught. But will the new India Act, though still unborn, by declared intention already under the crossfire of the friends of the Empire in England and the lovers of India in India, survive the murderous barrage? If not, what would be the prospects of the restoration of the *status quo ante*? So sublime is India's capacity for accommodation and so pretty her pliability that no such question can arise. Federation will come and the critics of the present scheme will work it, justifying their entry by indirect election into the two houses of legislature, probably much smaller than contemplated, on the ground that thus alone they can adopt 'blocking tactics' which must bring our irresponsible masters to their senses or to their knees."

II.

"The New Indian Constitution" is ably written and it discusses fairly comprehensively all aspects of the constitution. It analyses the different parts of the constitution carefully and clearly and brings to bear a fairly complete knowledge of the theory and practice of governments in other countries to their discussion. The author's views and criticisms are generally restrained, couched in moderate language, and are always to the point. They are, with two important exceptions, also generally sound and accurate. These exceptions relate to the creation of "an All-India Federation" and the formation of what Mr. Krishnaswamy calls "a social federation" in which the interests of all minorities in India are harmonised. The treatment of these two questions suffers from the desire to play the part of a statesman rather than a student of political affairs and science. As a matter of fact the whole book generally, but more particularly its first fifty pages or so, suffers

from the attitude of superior practical wisdom assumed by the young author, the lavish praise—not necessarily undeserved—showered upon some members of the three Round Table Conferences, and, what appears to be the studied neglect of the Indian by the national standpoint, especially as represented Congress and voiced by Congress leaders. Moreover, sentences like—"My only apology lies in the fact that the Indian point of view with regard to the new constitution has not so far been made available to the British public through any authoritative publication. In the following pages the problem has been examined from the point of view of one who desires to emphasize agreements and to promote a reapproachment between the two great countries" (italics are mine)—in the Preface are also likely to create prejudice in the minds of Indian readers.

I have made a pointed reference to this defect as I am anxious that the book should reach the hands of Indian students. In my opinion, it deserves to be read widely. It is the best book so far written on the new Indian Constitution.

III.

The chapter on the "Minorities and a Social Federation" is perhaps the weakest in the whole book. It abounds in general statements and contains remarks which show that the author is not in touch with the unfortunate realities of the situation. He appears to be carried away by certain sentiments and phrases. This will be clear from the following quotations.—

"The principle of religious toleration has been firmly implanted in Indian public life, and, notwithstanding accounts, often exaggerated, of acute religious differences in the recent past, those who are most intimate with Indian conditions feel that they are not the worst passing phases of a political ferment and not chronic problems for the future.

"But the labours of the well-intentioned many were not altogether futile. Their suggestions had ultimately to be incorporated in a decision by the Government which fixed the number of seats in the various Legislatures and the method of election for the different communities of India... They embody in essence the suggestions of reasonably minded sections of the community, and the approval which has been accorded to this award is, therefore, not so much a measure of the wisdom of the Government's decision as a testimony of the support which the nation has extended to the suggestions of the more far-seeing of their countrymen.

"The Indian solution may and has been severely criticised as illogical, but its justification lies in its recognition of the human element. Democracy reposes on the triple foundation of liberty, equality and fraternity... India, thirsting for a new freedom, might easily have focussed its attention on the grant of liberty and missed the equally important principles of equality and fraternity. This danger has been avoided, and the solution of the communal problem marks a recognition of the value of all these principles in the building up of a democratic state.

"One can reasonably hope that the subjective ties of nationalism will be strengthened and a social federation—the complement of a political federation will be gradually evolved. What the structure and fine notes of the social federation will be, it is too early and impossible to predict. Suffice it to point out, in the words of Dante :—

"Of diverse voices is sweet music made ;
So in our life the different degrees
Render sweet harmony among these wheels."

IV

The same airy optimism and uncritical support of the All-India Federation is the characteristic of

the First Chapter headed "India—A Federation." It contains observations of the type that are so often made by ministers of Indian States to justify the unreasonable, selfish and peculiar demands of the Indian Princes which are responsible for "the whimsicalities" and "the illogicalities" of the new constitution. To this Mr. Roy's brochure, "Federal India", supplies a necessary corrective.

Mr. Roy's small book of 87 pages is of the nature of a useful political pamphlet. It is popularly and ably written. It gives useful information regarding the nature of Federations and shows clearly that the proposed All-India Federation is not the usual type of Federation existing in other parts of the world, but something in the nature of a Confederation. Mr. Roy also draws up the balance sheet of the gains and losses of both British India and the Indian States and comes to the conclusion "that such a union will demand too much of sacrifice from British India and in return will not vouchsafe to it any real advantage."

Mr. Roy's treatment is neither comprehensive nor complete. There are aspects of the federal scheme which he does not examine. But on the nature of the proposed federation, its advantages and disadvantages to British India and the Indian States, it is fairly good. It is a timely and useful booklet for the general reader.

GURMUKH N. SINGH.

PROF. RADHAKRISHNAN'S PHILOSOPHY.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF RADHAKRISHNAN.

By C. E. M. JOAD. (Allen & Unwin.) 1933.
20cm. 269p. 7/6.

THE question 'What is wrong with Western Civilisation?' is attracting ever increasing attention of thinking minds in the West. Joad's interest in the philosophy of Radhakrishnan mainly lies in the answer which it provides to this question. The achievements of the West in science and technique are marvellous, but in the truly cultural aspects Europe betrays symptoms of spiritual bankruptcy. Western literature is realistic but uninspiring; Western morals are shocking. Science is neutral as regards the problems of life. Western ethics does not supply any definite code or creed. Western civilisation shows a deplorable lack of a sense of value as Joad makes out in the Prologue. Eastern civilisation has a tradition of five thousand years and has evinced a remarkable toughness in counteracting external attacks. But Eastern tradition lacks vitality. Now the solution which Radhakrishnan suggests to the problem of bringing East and West nearer together is that the West should learn from the East to recognise spiritual values. Renaissance of value and of a sense of value—this is Radhakrishnan's message to the West as Joad interprets it (p. 245). The West has now recognised the superiority of mind over life and matter, but not yet the superiority of spirit over mind, life and body (Kalki. p. 47).

Radhakrishnan as the 'liaison officer' between East and West, a philosophical bilingualist, thinks Eastern tradition and culture, rightly interpreted, may heal the spiritual ailments of the West, while at the same time he realises the dire need of resuscitating and revitalising the present paralytic condition of the Eastern mind and culture. Rationalisation and scientific criticism tend to deprive religion of its objective validity and to regard religion as a mere projection of human wishes. Radhakrishnan protests against this tendency and asserts that religion is not a mere wish-fulfilment but a statement of objective fact. He is an idealist, though not a sub-

jective idealist. He is moreover an intuitionist. Intuition gives direct and immediate knowledge, is its own authority, enters into its object and becomes one with it. Intuition 'jumps' suddenly, so to say, and reveals the very heart of the object. Radhakrishnan believes that the universe is spiritual unity. The world is an actualisation of one of the many possibilities into which the Absolute might have, but as a matter of fact has not, realised itself. The world is not a mere appearance but a reality. God is a "symbol in which the religion recognises the Absolute". God is "the Absolute from the human end" (Idealist View of Life, p. 344). Radhakrishnan makes allowance for change, evolution, progress and advocates the doctrine of a developing God, who is organic with the world. At the end of the process of evolution the changing elements will be reabsorbed into the primal unity—man into God and God into the Absolute. Radhakrishnan takes an intellectualistic view of ethics, inasmuch as he thinks that moral intuition is a form of knowledge. He holds that man is free and finds that the doctrine of Karma does not deny the essential freedom of man. Radhakrishnan justifies a belief in the doctrine of Rebirth on the ground that nature bears witness to a process of incessant renewal and continuity, and an individual's mission in life, viz. the perfection of personality cannot be fulfilled in a life-time, and the phenomena of infant prodigies in music and mathematics are inexplicable except on such a hypothesis. He is deeply convinced that our salvation is not individual salvation but social salvation. According to Radhakrishnan, the present world-crisis can be avoided only by a new world outlook born in religion. He thinks that religion has to perform a political function by trying to bring about a spiritual unity to match the material unity which science has given the world. Radhakrishnan sees in religious idealism a "most hopeful political instrument" for world peace. But this spiritual unity must be a rich harmony and not a colourless uniformity.

In an Epilogue, characterising the symptoms of the disease the West is suffering from, as the money-and-machine-mania, Joad complains that an average westerner does not know how to use his leisure to the good of his soul, and spends it on the Riviera in worshipping the God of a "good time." The West, therefore, must supplement its worldly wisdom and scientific technique by the religious zeal and spiritual insight of the East. This, according to Joad, is "the most notable of the bridges" that Radhakrishnan has sought to "build between East and West."

It will be recalled that Vivekananda and Tagore have in their own way tackled this very problem. But whereas Vivekananda's treatment and solution of the problem was exclusively religious, and that of Tagore poetical in spirit, Radhakrishnan may be said to have dealt with this problem of the union of East and West in a truly philosophical spirit. Joad's exposition of Radhakrishnan's philosophy is lucid, though sometimes rather sketchy and unsystematic. The book makes a highly interesting reading and constitutes a powerful corrective to the arrogant cynicism of the view that "the East is East and the West is West and never the twin shall meet."

D. G. LONDHE.

SHORT NOTICES.

THE PEOPLING OF AUSTRALIA. By Various Authors. (Pacific Relations Series, No. 4.) [Melbourne University Press.] 1933. 20cm. 327p. 6/6.

THIS is an interesting book and is supplementary to a volume on the same subject published in 1928. The research in regard to the population problem of Australia, of which this book is the result, is carried on under the auspices of the Victorian branch of the Institute of Pacific Relations. The list of the authors which includes such well-known names as Prof. Bailey, Prof. Coupland, Messrs. Egglestone, Kenyon, J. B. Bridgen, G. Taylor and others is a guarantee that the various problems that have been dealt with by them were studied thoroughly and in a scientific spirit.

The book is published in three sections in the first of which are described certain human factors which have to be taken into account in considering the rate at which and the conditions under which new-comers into Australia are absorbed. The main cause for emigration is given out to be an economic rather than a political one. It is also shown that the real idea behind the White Australia policy is the fear that any further immigration will lead to a deterioration in the standards of living of the existing population.

The second section deals with the environmental factors which are of primary importance in relation to the growth of population. The result of the survey, as stated in the introductory chapter by Mr. Philips, a member of the Editorial Committee, is that "in the immediate future the opportunities for population absorption are so very limited that they cease to be a matter of substantial political consideration."

The third and last section contains chapters on the practical methods of dealing with the problem of adjustment of the population problem. The necessity for a planned economy for Australia is discussed and rejected.

The Editorial Committee deserve to be congratulated on its getting together a galaxy of authors to contribute to the volume.

C. V. HANUMANTHA RAO.

THE WORLD COURT, 1921--1931. By MANLEY O. HUDSON. (World Peace Foundation, Boston.) 1934. 20cm. 302p. \$2.50.

THE usefulness of this hand-book of the Permanent Court of International Justice is sufficiently attested by the fact that it has now run to four editions. The third edition which was published in 1931 was reviewed in these columns at the time. The present edition has brought the book up to date and includes the judgments and orders of the Court to the end of 1933. It contains also a summary of instruments relating to the Court during the last three years.

Besides being Professor of International Law in the Harvard Law School, Mr. Hudson is a member of the Permanent Court of Arbitration. The Permanent Court of International Justice is now firmly established and the claim is well justified that its decisions make a significant contribution to the development of international law.

P. S. S.