

The

Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA.

VOL. XVII, NO. 51. } POONA—THURSDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1934. { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN SUBSN. 15s.

COMMUNAL CONCORD:

ITS SUPREME NEED AND ITS ESSENTIALS.

NO one denies the fact that the greatest weakness in our political struggle is the absence of unity among the different communities, especially between the Hindus and the Mahomedans, and the so-called untouchable castes, and the rest of the Hindu community. This weakness can be overcome in two ways: by bringing about a better understanding through constant social efforts and a higher conception of religion, and by arriving at workable pacts by mutual agreement in the political sphere. Both these ways are necessary. The first aims at permanent unity and proceeds more or less along idealistic lines. No doubt it is a practical idealism, but it may take a long, long time to reach the goal. The world is moved more by practical than by idealistic considerations. The progress of political events will not wait on the realisation of political unity; nay, the latter may be indefinitely postponed on account of the complications caused by the former. On the other hand, a patched-up unity owing its existence to exigencies of situation alone and utterly void of idealism is bound to be short-lived, a small quantity of internal combustion being enough to explode it. Thus it is clear that the problem must be attacked from both the sides. We are relying too much, I believe, on our idealistic methods and neglecting the practical side altogether. The patient must be saved from the crisis or the immediate danger which threatens his life. These remedies may not bring about a permanent cure, but it would be sheer folly at such a critical moment to belittle these remedies, vehemently insisting on a permanent cure.

IDEALS VERSUS PRACTICAL POLITICS.

It is high time our leaders turned their attention to a practical solution of the communal problem. To ignore its existence is suicidal; to believe that matters will adjust themselves in course of time is to live in a fool's paradise. The Congress decision on the communal award is a case in point. It may be wise for a national institution to keep aloof from communal squabbles or to abstain from taking sides. But the institution which claims to represent the nation cannot afford to sit on the fence for a long time without allowing the national cause to be seriously injured through internal conflicts. Howsoever fine our ideals may be, they are nothing but dreams if sought to be

realised regardless of practical considerations, regardless of the realities of the situation. That there are suspicion and distrust between certain communities is a patent fact. The suspicion and distrust can never be removed by following an ostrich-like policy. The swaraj scheme in the Nehru Committee's report was wrecked on the rock of communal mistrust. Pitching the demand to the highest key, i. e., independence, makes the problem no less difficult. Again, the communal problem was allowed to remain unsolved till the Round Table Conference was held and the dirty linen of communal differences was washed in London. The second R. T. C. was attended by Mahatma Gandhi as the sole representative of the Congress. The settlement of the Hindu-Muslim differences remained as distant as ever and, in addition, the differences between the Hindus and the depressed classes became acute. Gandhiji was misled by sentiment and undue self-confidence from the path of practical politics in communal matters, with the result that a golden opportunity for presenting a united demand was lost. I do not want to rake up old controversies, but it cannot be forgotten that the failure on the part of our leaders to reach an agreement on communal matters brought us the greatest humiliation and was the main cause of the extremely unsatisfactory nature of the White Paper scheme and the recommendations of the Joint Parliamentary Committee. No settlement by mutual agreement could have been more unfair to the Hindus than the communal award and an amicable settlement would have paved the way for a united demand.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL MOMENT.

Now the Congress has decided on the rejection of the proposed political 'reforms' and has appealed to the other political parties in the country to join it in the agitation for rejection. The proposed reforms are in the eyes of the responsible leaders of the Mahomedans and the depressed classes unsatisfactory and also unacceptable to such of them as care to look at them from the national point of view. Mr. Mahomed Ali Jinnah and Sir Mahomed Iqbal have already given expression to their utter dissatisfaction with the J. P. Committee's report. His Highness the Aga Khan is also dissatisfied. He had taken a leading part in presenting a joint memoran-

dum on behalf on the Indian Delegation for alterations in the White Paper scheme and, since scant attention was given to the memorandum and since, instead of improving the scheme accordingly, it has been made far worse from the Indian standpoint by the J. P. Committee, he cannot afford to be indifferent to the result. Sir Mahomed Iqbal, an extreme communalist as he is, has gone so far in condemning the proposed reforms that he has not only hinted at the desirability of presenting a united front in opposing the reactionary proposals but also signified the willingness of the Mahomedans to join the Hindus for the purpose, provided the latter would agree to the demand of the former. These are welcome gestures from two prominent Mahomedan leaders and it is to be hoped that the Congress and the Hindu Maha Sabha do not fail to take note of them. As regards the other minorities, especially the depressed classes, it may be taken for granted that they too have been greatly disappointed by the reforms scheme as embodied in the White Paper and the J. P. Committee's report. Compared with the differences between the Hindus and the Mahomedans those between the Hindus and the other minorities are very simple and can be easily settled in a give-and-take spirit.

The Congress wants the constitution of the country's government to be settled by a Constituent Assembly. Since a Constituent Assembly in the real sense of the word is out of the question, I take it that the Congressmen who use the word really mean to say that the constitution is to be framed and presented to the British Government by an All-Parties Conference or Convention consisting of representatives of the people elected on as wide a franchise as possible. Even supposing that no parties are to be recognized for the purpose of convening the so-called Constituent Assembly, in practice that Assembly is bound to be an All-Parties Convention, if it is to be a genuine affair at all. If the elections are boycotted by the Muslims, the depressed classes, the Indian Christians, the Sikhs, the Parsees, the Anglo-Indians and other minorities it will only be a Congress show, and the demand that may be made will suffer from the same weakness as is witnessed in the present demand of the Congress. In short, no Constituent Assembly can be convened without there being an understanding between the different communities. The claim of the Congress to represent the whole nation can never be sustained so long as the Moslems and the other minorities do not owe allegiance to it but choose to remain aloof from it as communities. The Congress may not make any difference between one community and another for political purposes and may profess to be above such differences, but the fact cannot be denied that the differences do exist. It is also an indisputable fact that certain important sections of the population of the country are not at present prepared to authorise the Congress to speak on their behalf. The Muslim Congressites do not count for much in their own community. The Hindus are also divided in their allegiance to the Congress. The communal award has caused a split among the Hindu followers of the Congress.

Therefore the Congress policy of ignoring the communal award is short-sighted. The thorn, if not taken out, will continue to rankle in the flesh. No progress is possible until the communal problem remains unsolved. Attempts on the part of the Congress to ignore the communal differences, to ride roughshod over minorities' claims for special recognition, to try to usurp their leadership without caring for their consent, will only tend to make them more and more antagonistic towards the Congress. No doubt, Mahatma Gandhi sometimes talks about giving a blank cheque to the Moslems, but how far the genuineness of the offer is believed by the Moslems themselves is a question. But this is certain that when he says so, the Hindus feel inclined to disown him as their leader; at least they will not let him give a blank cheque.

Thus it is plain that the communal award has to be replaced by an agreed solution of the communal problem. This is the moment when both the Hindus and the Mahomedans are in such a frame of mind that they may come to an agreement. The same also can be said about the depressed classes and the rest of the Hindus. All are in a more or less chastened mood at the present moment.

TOO MUCH BARGAINING FATAL.

If a proper understanding is to be reached between the Hindus and the Muslims and an agreed solution of the communal problem is to be found, the parties must meet together in a spirit conducive to peace and unity. Too much bargaining and higgling is sure to lead to the break-down of negotiations, or to the continuance of bickerings afterwards even if some agreement is reached. In the first place, the parties must disabuse their minds of certain things. The Hindus must remember that the Mahomedans do really entertain suspicion and distrust regarding the attitude of the Hindus towards their political, economic and educational aspirations and therefore want safeguards against being submerged by the majority community in the country. The Congress must also remember the same thing and should not, therefore, make a fetish of joint electorates. The Mahomedans, on the other hand, must cease talking of extra-territorial patriotism. No agreed solution of the communal problem is possible if the Mahomedans cherish a pan-Islamic dream and aim at establishing a Muslim zone in India. Also no negotiations can be started if the Muslim leaders insist on the acceptance of their fourteen points by the Hindus in advance. It is as foolish and as perverse for the Mahomedans to make a fetish of their fourteen points as for the Hindus to make a fetish of joint electorates. Let the responsible leaders of both the communities approach the problem, not with the desire to solve the question on pre-determined lines, but in a spirit of give-and-take, and with a will to peace and not with a will to power. Let them clear their minds of either a Hindu *raj* or a Muslim *raj*.

ENVISAGE THE FUTURE.

Any deviation from the system of joint electorates may be a deviation from an ideal system of

electorates. But nothing in this world is perfect. Rightly or wrongly, the Mahomedans believe in separate electorates and that fact must be recognized. It is feared by the Congress that separate electorates will perpetuate the differences between the Hindus and the Mahomedans, and between the depressed classes and other Hindus. The fear is not quite groundless. There are, however, other forces at work. Political divisions on communal or religious lines are unnatural. The consciousness of economic differences and the pressure of economic interests are sure to tell in the end. In the meantime we have to choose between two evils, one of agreeing to separate electorates and the other of allowing the atmosphere of suspicion and distrust between one community and another to pervade for an indefinite time, rendering any united demand or action impossible. If we are wise we should prefer the former course, which is a lesser evil. The present position is intolerable. Let us not be led away by exaggerated fears. Let Indians have substantial power in their hands, as much free from outside interference as possible, and be sure that the present party lines will begin to change quickly. Economic considerations will gain more and more strength and the conflict of interests between the Have's and Have-not's, between the classes and the masses, will tend to obliterate the present divisions on religious, racial, communal and caste differences. It is our inability to visualise the future as a logical outcome of the transference of political power, that is coming in the way of our making up our present differences. The hopes of the educated Mahomedans are as illusory as the fears of the leaders of the Congress are exaggerated.

AGREED SOLUTION NOT IMPOSSIBLE.

The communal award given by the British Premier can be got changed if the parties agree to modifications. It is unacceptable to the Hindus, but the Mahomedans have accepted it. Can it be so modified as to satisfy both the parties? My answer is in the affirmative, provided the Mahomedans are prepared to forego a few of the gains they have secured through the award for the sake of justice and in order that both the communities may benefit by making united efforts possible. The Hindus can help the solution of the problem by abstaining from sticking too much to abstract principles.

The main issues are: the number of seats to each community, the nature of the electorates through which the representatives of the general constituencies are to be returned, and the guarantee of a statutory majority of seats.

WEIGHTAGE.

As regards the number of seats given to the Mahomedans in the communal award, the objection taken by the Hindus to the weightage allowed to the Mahomedans in the provinces in which they are in a minority is not really so serious. Similar weightage is given to the Hindus in the communal award in Sind and the North-West Frontier Province. The principle of weightage cannot be called unsound and it has been applied in the award both to the Muslim and Hindu minorities, where

the other community is in an overwhelming majority. The Hindus have, in my opinion, no reason to complain on this point. They should, moreover, consider the question as to how their co-religionists would fare in Sind and the N. W. F. Province if no weightage was given to them.

JOINT VERSUS SEPARATE ELECTORATES.

What the nature of the electorates should be is a thorny question, no doubt. A solution is not, however, impossible to find. A *via media* has been suggested by Dr. B. R. Ambedkar who has given thought and study to this problem such as few others in the country have done; and his suggestion reconciles principle to practical considerations. It is this, that it should be left to the choice of a minority in each province to decide whether it is in its interests to have separate or joint electorates. If a community which is a minority thinks that separate electorates would serve its interests better it should be allowed to have them. It is not the business of the majority to dictate to the minorities what kind of electorates they should choose. It is a minority's right of self-determination and the Mahomedans can claim to exercise it only where they are a minority. That right does not belong to any particular community. No community can claim it throughout the country irrespective of its being a majority or a minority in a province. Thus if the Mahomedans in Bombay, Madras and other Hindu majority provinces want separate electorates they should be allowed to have them and, extending the same principle of self-determination, the Mahomedans in Sind, the Punjab, the N. W. F. Province and Bengal should accept joint electorates if the Hindu and other minorities in those provinces prefer them. If the Mahomedans are afraid that in a province where they are a minority their true representatives would not be returned through joint electorates let them have separate electorates by all means. Similarly, if the Hindus think that in the provinces where they are a minority their interests would be better safeguarded through joint electorates it is their business and the Mahomedan majority has no right to interfere with that choice.

STATUTORY MAJORITY.

The question regarding the guarantee of a statutory majority of seats is intimately connected with that of the nature of electorates. The Mahomedans are given statutory majority in the Punjab, Bengal, Sind and the N. W. F. Province in the communal award. This means that the Mahomedans will always be in power in these provinces. The Mahomedan representatives will be elected through their separate electorates, and it goes without saying that the more fanatical a candidate is, the better chances he would have for success in a purely communal electorate. The provincial legislative council and the ministry supported by that council will thus be ever dominated by fanatical communalists. The Hindus are naturally afraid of the treatment that would be meted out to them under the new Muslim *raj* which is bound to be far worse than even Muslim autocracy. The Hindus only hope of getting the rule

of religious fanatics or aggressive communalists tempered with a thought for the interests of the minorities lies in mixed electorates. The proposal for giving the Mahomedans seats in Bengal and the Punjab in proportion to their ratio of population by separate electorates was turned down by the Simon Commission in their report, on the ground that it would give the Mahomedans "a fixed and unalterable majority of the general constituency seats in both the provinces." In the Minorities Committee of the first R. T. C., the late Sir Muhamad Shafi had, while submitting the Muslim demands, made two alternative proposals: (1) statutory majority of 51 per cent. for Muslims in the Punjab and Bengal on the basis of joint electorates throughout India, or (2) 49 per cent. representation for Muslims in the Punjab and Bengal on the basis of separate electorates throughout India. He had not asked for both. The Muslim delegates insisted at the R. T. C. upon separate electorates for the purpose of bargaining with a view to securing a statutory majority in the said two provinces. They had really no hope of retaining separate electorates in the new settlement. The communal award gave them, however, more than what they had actually asked for. The Lucknow Pact, 1916, did not contemplate the existence of a statutory majority together with separate electorates. Nor is the demand for separate electorates sacrosanct as it is sought to be made out. In 1927 an agreement was reached between the Hindus and the Mahomedans on the basis of joint electorates. It is another matter that unfortunate incidents intervened and this agreement remained a dead letter.

As regards the number of seats the Bengal Hindus have a genuine grievance against the communal award. It must, however, be remembered that the Mahomedans in Bengal have not secured more seats than the number they are entitled to by their ratio to the population. The Hindus have been deprived of their due share by giving a lot more to the Europeans, far beyond what they are entitled to. It is a question between the Government and the Hindus, and the Mahomedans can have no reason to support the award in that behalf.

The question between the depressed classes and the other Hindus is comparatively easy of solution. The Poona Pact suffers from the defect of compelling the depressed class candidates to pass through two filters. This defect may be remedied by replacing arrangements for elections in the Poona Pact with reservation of seats through joint electorates. This arrangement would have been possible at the R. T. C. had Mahatma Gandhi not set his face even against reserved seats for the depressed class population. I believe Dr. Ambedkar and other depressed class leaders will not object to a modification of the Poona Pact on the above lines. The Bengal Hindus have some reason to denounce the Poona Pact, in that the depressed classes in that province have been given a larger number of seats than their fair share. The number allotted to the depressed classes in that province may be reduced to the right proportion including weightage due to them as

a minority, and the total number of depressed class seats in all provinces may be retained by increasing the number in other provinces. It is not impossible to find some such way out of the difficulty.

Considered from all points of view, a solution of the communal problem should not prove impossible. Only there must be the will to achieve unity on the part of the respective communal leaders. I appeal to the Congress to leave it alone no more. It is no doubt a ticklish question, but at the same time it is vital to the progress of the nation. I appeal to the Congress Nationalists to think, not twice but a hundred times, before they launch a whirlwind campaign in the country against the communal award without first offering a fair chance to the Mahomedans to come to an agreement. And, lastly, I appeal to the Mahomedans to realise the futility of communal gains without a transference of a substantial power to Indians. It is desirable for all parties to translate this problem from the dream-land into a reality.

P. G. KANEKAR.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, 14th December.

THE INDIA DEBATE.

THIS has been an arduous week for all who are keenly interested in Indian affairs. With the debate running simultaneously on Wednesday in both Houses of Parliament, the situation was particularly difficult for conscientious followers of political sagacity on the subject of India. One had, too, to distinguish between the different currents of wisdom emanating from various sources and having different objectives. Of these there were at least three, of which two alone had been crystallised in the form of motion and amendment in the Lords debate, where Lord Salisbury proposed what Lord Halifax described as a purely dilatory amendment, serving no other purpose than to prevent the House from taking a decision upon the question of principle in relation to which all the material was already available and all the authority both for and against was already known.

The situation in the Commons, however, was different. The diehard group not only knew their minds, but were willing and able to tell the world so in the clear-cut language of the amendment that stood in their name. The Labour Party, which had no amendment on the paper in the Lords, where they were satisfied to leave the running to Lord Salisbury and his cohorts, were not quite so self-abnegating in the Lower House, for they as the official Opposition had put down an amendment which for debating purposes took precedence over the diehard amendment, which in fact was not moved, having regard to the exigencies and limitations of the debate. At the time of writing the Commons debate is at an end but we are still in the middle of that in the Lords, the outcome of which, though unknown exactly, is likely to follow that of the Commons. At any rate the Government do not appear to be unduly anxious about it.

IN THE COMMONS.

One's respect for Sir Samuel Hoare's personality and intellectual gifts increases with every occasion upon which he makes a serious contribution to the discussion of Indian affairs. Granted the sort of constitution that India is going to have, it may not unfairly be said that no single compliment as to the part that the Secretary of State has played in formulating its outlines and main structure is other than thoroughly well deserved. It was once said of Sir Austen Chamberlain, when he held the same office, that he was the civil servant in politics. If that were true of Sir Austen it would be still truer of Sir Samuel Hoare, who has displayed gifts of precise detail and meticulous clarity that one associates rather with the mentality of the civil servant than with that of the statesman engaged in the larger and more general issues of public policy. Certainly his clarity of exposition cannot easily be excelled, and no one who heard his comparatively brief opening speech could have been under any illusion as to exactly what was to be the real nature of the proposals that the Government intend to embody in their Bill, which he is to introduce for a formal first reading next week. There was, of course, nothing new in his arguments, but he took occasion once more to contradict a number of tendentious statements that the diehard faction has been circulating with a vehemence and a sedulousness worthy of a far better cause.

It is unfortunate that by the very nature of the circumstances of the case and of the internal opposition which the Government have had to face, their spokesmen and those who have supported the recommendations of the majority report have often appeared to lay more emphasis upon the negative rather than upon the positive advantages that they claim for these proposals. Thus the Secretary of State himself lay great stress upon the safeguards, the reservations, the special responsibilities and the emergency powers. He was of course entitled to do so, and indeed that aspect of the proposed constitution strikes the eye almost to the exclusion of emphasis upon the other features calculated to give reassurance to Indian public opinion and to Indian national sentiment. It is true that in yesterday's debate in the House of Lords the Archbishop of Canterbury deprecated exaggerated emphasis of the emergency powers and drew attention to the fact that many of them were expressed in the Dominions constitutions, or were implied in the unwritten British constitution, and he also reminded us that some of them were inextricable from such a situation as the present transitional one that was now in preparation, and in regard to which special precautions had necessarily to be taken. It does not alter the fact that an entirely different psychological atmosphere might have been produced had it not been for extravagances on the part of irresponsible diehards here and equally irresponsible left-wingers in India.

One feature specially stressed by Sir Samuel was that, to the best of his knowledge, the Princes had in no way altered their position since they offered to enter the federation with responsibility at the Centre four years ago. It was important to have this statement in view of the attempts made by partisan propagandists to deflect some of the Princes from their original intentions upon pretexts that do little credit either to the integrity or to the perspicacity of those on either side who have participated in these activities. Sir Samuel Hoare rightly emphasised that the Princes are free agents in this matter and he declared that in his belief their rightful claims had been met in the letter and in the spirit and that there was no reason why they should not take advantage without delay of the great

opportunity, that had been opened to them now and that might not recur, of playing their important part in the administration of India.

Another important feature of his speech was the appeal made to public men in British India to appreciate the realities of the political situation in this country. He expressed the view that no other Government within any reasonable compass of time, and having regard to the exigencies of public affairs both here and abroad, and to the intrinsic difficulties of the problem, would give the time and the trouble, and incur the unpopularity of introducing another scheme. It is the mature judgment of most competent observers that unless the question of Indian constitutional reform is dealt with in the coming year and got out of the way by next autumn, it would stand little chance of any further consideration. As it is, the Government have had to face enormous practical difficulties and the possibility of involving themselves in grave trouble in respect of their own social reform commitments to the country by making up their minds as they have done that the India Bill should be fought on the floor of the House instead of, as was even so late as last week urged in many quarters, sending it to a Committee upstairs.

OPPOSITION VIEWS.

Major Attlee, who led the debate on behalf of the Labour Opposition, but who did not move the Labour amendment, which was left to Mr. Seymour Cocks to do, on Wednesday, in a competent speech dealt rather with the general humanities of the problem and naturally emphasised the specific Labour attitude towards economic and social problems, and urged that what the Labour Party were concerned with was the setting up of a government that would attract to its working the live forces of the Indian people, not the dead forces of those of vested interests. Lord Snell put the same thing in slightly different words in the Lords when he asked that the constitution to be formulated should appeal to the soul of India. He and Mr. Seymour Cocks and Major Attlee, and they alone, have emphasised and criticised that all reference to the question of Dominion Status in the report of the Committee and of any indication that the Government intend to implement the public pledges, recapitulated by Major Graham Pole in an important letter appearing in yesterday's *Manchester Guardian*, and upon which Mr. Lansbury, in winding up, in a fine and human address, specifically challenged Mr. Baldwin. It is important, in the light of the Archbishop's statement yesterday, to note the actual words used by Mr. Baldwin in his reply. He said: "The Government stand by all the pledges that have been given. They make no distinction between pledges." It will be interesting to note whether these pledges find any recognition in the preamble of the Bill whose text will be circulated next month.

THE COMMONS DEBATE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS.

I do not propose to analyse in detail the speeches delivered on one side or the other in the long and animated debate in the Commons this week. The text will be available for all to read immediately. The outstanding speeches, of course besides those already enumerated by me, were those of Lord Wolmer, the Duchess of Atholl, Mr. Churchill, and Sir Joseph Nall, for the diehards. Mr. Churchill's was perhaps one of the ablest, most amusing, and most effective that he has delivered for a long time. He largely reinstated himself in the opinion of many of those who have wondered, after the devastating failure of his intervention on the question of Privilege, whether he had perhaps reached the point where his great capabilities were beginning to fail him. I do not think that his speech, brilliant as it was, de-

aided any votes. Miss Horsburgh, Mr. Amery, Mr. Ormsby-Gore, Sir Austen Chamberlain, Mr. Isaac Foot, Sir John Wardlaw-Milne, and Lord Eustace Percy were among the most outstanding speakers in support of the official motion. Sir John Simon's speech on Wednesday was one of the best and most effective that he has made in the present House, where his prestige lately has been greatly enhanced, after a period of eclipse. Mr. Morgan Jones's speech was perhaps one of the best efforts of his career, and he loyally defended his colleague Major Atlee against the attack made upon him by Mr. Isaac Foot because of his adherence to the method of indirect rather than of direct election to the Lower House of the Federal Legislature. Colonel Wedgwood, as usual, led a party of one in an attack upon the Government's proposals based upon grounds some of which were valid, but in regard to some others there was a certain amount of confusion. As in the case of Mr. Churchill, even where members fundamentally differ from him, they hold him in very kindly regard.

There was one particularly unpleasant episode, when Major Courtauld purported to communicate to the House the details of a private conversation that he had had with the Viceroy, indicating tremendous pressure brought to bear officially upon the Princes to induce them to enter the Federation. The House was obviously surprised to hear a member of the "gentlemanly party" revealing a private conversation obviously without the concurrence of the other party to it. It therefore welcomed Mr. Baldwin's intervention, in his concluding speech on Wednesday night, with a telegram received from Lord Willingdon, in which the Viceroy, after commenting acidly upon the questionable propriety of revealing without permission the details of a private conversation, flatly denied both the statements and the implications relating to it made by Major Courtauld. The latter's apology, which in the circumstances was courteously but firmly pressed for by Mr. Baldwin, is now looked for with some interest.

It was only natural that Mr. Baldwin should have addressed his arguments primarily to his own followers, for he was well aware that there was little that he could add that would satisfy the official Opposition. His purpose, as he himself said, was to obtain the largest possible majority for the Government's proposals and he could only do this if he had succeeded in carrying with him the substantial majority of the Tory Party. That he did so succeed is clear from the fact that no more than seventy-five Tories went into the division lobby against the Government, and only so many upon the assurance given by Mr. Baldwin himself that if they should do so they would not incur the risk of a breach of friendly relation with the party leaders. This no doubt accounted for the increase of fifty per cent. upon the numbers that it had been confidently anticipated last week would vote against the Government, who now know that the maximum number of those among their followers upon whom they cannot count will not exceed above eighty, a very small proportion of the overwhelming Tory members in the House of Commons. Moreover these diehard members in the main represent specifically Tory constituencies, whilst the great bulk of the Tory members represent mixed constituencies and are dependent for their majorities upon other sections of public opinion. It is therefore safe to say that the Government have behind them, to the extent to which they are prepared to go in the direction of satisfying Indian ambitions and aspirations, an overwhelming majority of the British electorate.

It is possible that in the light of the somewhat unexpected increase in the diehard figures in the Lower

House, some encouragement will be given to diehard Opposition in the Lords, but it is not expected that it will succeed in deflecting the House from passing the official motion for the Government to enable it to pursue its programme. Again, encouragement may be given for the convening of the larger Tory Party meeting in January, turned down by the Central Council last week, but which may be summoned upon a requisition of fifty local organisations. What useful purpose would be served by holding such a meeting, except to give a further opportunity for a noisy band of fanatics to pursue an irreconcilable vendetta, it is difficult to imagine, especially as it will take place in the shadow of a decision by Parliament, admittedly the final arbiter in these matters, that the Government should implement the proposals of the Joint Select Committee Majority Report by promoting a Bill embodying its general features. Nevertheless it is clear that we are not yet out of the wood, and there will be a considerable amount of determined diehard opposition until the final stages of the intended legislation have been reached, thereby leaving an atmosphere of irritation, distrust and ill-will. Nevertheless, even the diehard Tories had to reconcile themselves to the inevitable and also to the hard necessity of realising that there is a point beyond which even they will not be allowed to go in the interests of the maintenance of Party unity. All in all it may I think be fairly confidently asserted that though the Government have had their difficulties, both in India and here, the new Indian Constitutional Bill will, by next autumn, have been substantially enacted without any important changes, except perhaps in some matters of detail, for the more effective working of the new constitution.

THE LABOUR POINT OF VIEW.

The Labour Party has made its position on the proposed scheme of reforms clear, both by putting forward its own Memorandum as the basis of a Bill, and when defeated by voting against the Government's scheme. It will now proceed, upon the introduction of the Bill, to move in Committee all those amendments which it regards as important for the purpose of giving effect to its own ideals and concepts of Indian requirements, and in order to make the scheme of reforms more acceptable to Indian opinion and more readily workable by patriotic Indian public men. It is very unlikely, however, that at the end it will vote against the Bill at the third reading. Even if it should do so it will be more in the nature of a gesture. The *New Statesman* to-day puts the matter very clearly and emphatically: "In effect the Labour Party will accept the Bill on the principle of half a loaf being better than no bread. . . . As for the Indian politicians we hope that, after they have blown off steam, they will respond to Mr. Seymour-Cocks' (and Lord Snell's) appeal and see what can be made of the new constitution. If it is as fraudulent as some of them say, that will soon be apparent." It may be deduced from the foregoing that there is a very important section, and by no means negligible one, both in numbers and in influence, in the Labour party that would, whilst stigmatising the new constitution as ultra-conservative, by no means agree that it is fraudulent in the sense that it purports to be, but in fact is not, a workable scheme substantially in advance of the present one, and containing within it certain elements of growth. The *New Statesman* will be on more popular ground from the point of view of Indian opinion in saying that "What matters now is what is being said in India—and still more what is going to be done in India. The conduct of the British administration in India will count far more than anything done or said in Westminster or Whitehall."

OF INTEREST TO INDIA.

At a time when much criticism has been devoted to the subject of indirect elections for the Federal Assembly, the following figures published by the *Financial Post* of Toronto, showing the proportion of law-makers to population is of some interest.

Japan	law-maker for	78,275
Portugal	" "	75,843
Poland	" "	57,564
France	" "	43,853
Czechoslovakial	" "	37,724
South Africa	" "	36,466
Great Britain	" "	33,907
Norway	" "	18,761
Finland	" "	18,335
Greece	" "	16,769
Sweden	" "	16,290
North Ireland	" "	16,109
Denmark	" "	15,780
U. S. A.	" "	15,049
Irish Free State	" "	13,953
New Zealand	" "	13,311
Australia	" "	12,812
Netherlands	" "	12,208
Canada	" "	11,778

BRITISH WOMEN AND INDIA.

The Women's Advisory Council on Indian Questions—a body of women representatives from various women's organisations—held a meeting on Wednesday in London to bid farewell to Mrs. Corbett Ashby and Dr. Maud Royden who leave in a few days by air for India to be present at the All-India Women's Conference, whose guests they will be.

The meeting was very well attended, and it showed how intensely interested British women are in questions relating to women in other parts of the world, specially in India. Social workers, women graduates, women doctors, women members and ex-members of Parliament combined to give a feeling of strength and a growing determination on the part of women to unite and to take their part in the affairs of the world, especially in its social re-organisation.

It was expected that Lady Halifax would be in the chair, but she was detained in the House of Lords, listening to her husband's speech there. In her absence Lady Layton presided.

Lady Abdul Quadir gave an earnest and excellent little speech and struck the note that prevailed throughout the meeting, the need for women to come together from various parts of the earth, irrespective of race and nationality, and to work for the common cause of humanity. She afterwards garlanded the two principal guests in, as she said, the approved custom of India.

Among the other speakers were Lady Astor, who in her dynamic, breezy manner, urged the women of India, no less than the women of this country not to be "put off their stroke" by specious promises by their menfolk. Men, she said, with a sweeping gesture, are the same everywhere, whether in India or in England, and the things you want done, get on and do them; do them; don't rest on promises from the men. Don't also, she said, play the extreme party game to please any section. Keep to the path that can get things done in, and above all be practical and get on with the job. Miss Eleanor Rathbone, M. P., analysed the various stages, and gave interesting statistics, of the history of the movement for the women's vote in India.

Mrs. Corbett Ashby, one of the best known women workers for international peace and Dr. Maude Royden spoke seriously, but cautiously. It was evident they did not wish to be hampered by any-

thing that might be said previously in London. Both women are of the best type of ethical humanitarian workers, thoughtful, broad-minded, practical, and with an intense passion for truth and justice. They should be able to do a great deal to cement bonds of close friendship between the women of India and the women of Great Britain.

Reviews.

PROBLEM OF EDUCATION.

THE SCHOOL AND A CHANGING CIVILISATION. By W. B. CURRY. (John Lane The Bodley Head.) 1934. 20cm, 132p. 2/6.

THIS volume forms part of the Twentieth Century Library edited by Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon. It is perhaps for the first time that any reputable British or foreign publishers have entrusted the editing of their library series to an Indian. Mr. Menon should need no introduction to Indian readers. His recent book on the "Theory of Laughter", a publication of Messrs. Allen & Unwin, displays his critical studies in psychology. Mr. Menon has also distinguished himself by his active educational and cultural work in Britain. The publishers' choice for the general editorship of the Twentieth Century Library is thus a happy one. Amongst the contributors to the series are writers of renown like J. A. Hobson and C. Delisle Burns.

The author of the book under review is an experienced educationist. The Darlington Hall School (Devon), is one of the newest and most interesting experiments in the new education. Education, from the very nature of the subject, affords scope for perennial research. The problem is not so much one of instruction as of fundamental attitudes, intellectual, social and religious. It is inevitable that there should be a continual readjustment, however imperceptible, between education and social values. The author has discussed educational problems from a radical view-point—a view-point necessarily determined by the "changing civilisation" as he terms it. The problems chiefly pertain to (i) school organisation; (ii) examination of the criteria of academic proficiency; and (iii) co-education. The treatment of the problems is governed by an international outlook with all-round peace and co-operation definitely in view. In the author's opinion "the existing educational system produces people incapable of perceiving, much less of solving, the grave problems confronting civilisation. We shall need, not merely more, but different, education, if education is to be in time to prevent catastrophe."

The author has in a short compass indicated what this different education should be. Very few will agree to differ from the author in respect of the view-point from which the subject has been dealt with. Those sticking to conventional ideas on education will find here a lot to stir their thinking. That the school should be "a miniature copy of the world as we would love to have it" is the ultimate ideal on which the treatment of every aspect of the subject evidently hinges. The fact that a certain distance inevitably must and does separate the "ideal" from the "actual" has however to be reckoned by those who have to shoulder the practical responsibility of imparting and organising education. Education in a sense must wait on public opinion, and the author has done well in recognising this.

Special schools on the lines suggested in this volume could be conducted by way of experiment, by

expert teachers soaked, so to say, in educational psychology. And though none will contest the supreme importance of "tackling the roots of behaviour," yet in practical education deterrent action is not certainly without its wholesome effects.

In many cases, of course, what is necessary is to provide opportunities for sublimation. But at the same time, the likely repercussions on society of a deliberately educative process, designed in the sole interests of one individual, must not be lost sight of. An abstract individual is not only a social but also a psychological myth. Educational theory purely based on individual psychology has therefore a certain limit—a limit dictated by the inevitable social considerations. Though therefore the author would like to see "caning" prohibited by law, practical educationists would go with Norwood and say that "caning by the headmaster may rightly be employed in the case of boys who are inveterate idlers or rule-breakers, of those who have cheated and of those who are bullies." Caning to be prohibited by law is rather a sentimental extreme.

Similarly though "co-operation" is in essence to be preferred to "competition" the latter is not without its advantages in the "school world," whether in the domain of studies or sports. It is difficult to agree with the author who proposes to dispense altogether with the stimulus of competition in school work. Whatever may be said against the system of competitive examinations, one cannot help sharing the doubts expressed by the Rt. Hon. H. A. L. Fisher: "It is quite possible, we imagine, for a small class of intelligent children to be managed by a staff of intelligent teachers in a way so stimulating that the vulgar inducements supplied by competitions are unnecessary.... But are we not compelled to assume that many intellects will be sluggish and that many teachers will be indifferent and if such assumption be granted, can we dispense with competition?" To read an economic meaning in this "competition" is, I am afraid, drawing a little bit too much on the educational maxim that the school should be "a miniature copy of the world as we should love to have it."

To root out patriotic instincts is again another point where agreement would never be easy. The assumption that the inherited and the acquired instincts can be "undone" and a superstructure of peace-education built up on the resultant clean basis would seem fallacious. It would take us perilously near the doctrine of *tabula rasa* discarded by psychologists once for all.

There are a few more minor points where one would like to join issue with the author. His outlook is fresh and invigorating. His conclusions are frank. Educationists can ill afford to miss this little volume. In these days of educational research—and there is always a real danger in overdoing it—it would be safe and sound for teachers interested in their profession to follow Professor Whitehead and regard right education as the one "which begins by evoking initiative and end by encouraging it."

M. S. MODAK.

RUSSIAN FIVE-YEAR PLAN.

THE STATE OF THE SOVIET UNION. By JOSEPH STALIN. (International Publishers, New York.) 1934. 20cm. 96p. 75 cents. THIS is an official version of the fulfilment of the first Five-Year Plan by no less a personage than

Joseph Stalin. The first part is devoted to a survey of the economic crisis in the capitalistic countries of the world. The inherent defects in the capitalistic system such as restricted production, unemployment, and monetary difficulties were the causes that prevented other countries from attaining their pre-war stability in commerce and trade. Stalin claims that U.S.S.R. alone of all the countries in the world was unaffected by the world crisis. We are told that U.S.S.R. was able to increase her production by 290 p.c. over the pre-war level, a marvellous achievement indeed!

The second part deals with the progress in national economy and in the sphere of culture in U.S.S.R. Large-scale mechanised agriculture, introduction of new branches of industry, creation of 200,000 collective farms and 5,000 soviet farms, and the growth of townships were some of the many achievements that stand to the credit of U.S.S.R. The national income in 1933 mounted up to 50,000 million rubles compared to 29,000 million rubles in 1929. The main feature to be noted is the phenomenal energy shown by the State in the production of implements and machinery, but the sorry feature about it was that there were not enough men to handle them. Stalin, while admitting this defect, says that during the period thousands of men and women have been trained as leaders of industry. He frankly admits that in many directions their efforts had not yielded the expected results, as, for example, in agriculture, live stock, transport facilities and communications. In these days of unemployment it is no little consolation to be told that it is totally absent in U.S.S.R. Slums have been swept away; villages have changed in appearance with their new buildings, radio, cinemas, schools, libraries, creches, tractors, threshing machines, and automobiles. The average earning of a labourer has risen from 991 rubles in 1930 to 1919. In all surface industries the hours of labour had been reduced to seven hours a day. Figures quoted in this book in respect of the progress made in U.S.S.R. in other departments of national economy make us marvel at the tenacity of purpose of the leaders and the rapidity with which things are moving in Russia.

There has been a phenomenal increase in literacy among the population in general, that is to say, 90 p.c. of the population are literate. There has been a marked increase in the number of children attending nursery schools; and more high schools, scientific institutions, clubs for workmen, cinema theatres etc. have been started during the last five years. In no other country has the circulation of newspapers reached the enormous figure of 36,500,000 copies.

The part played by women to make the Five-Year Plan a success is not a small one. They have filled with ability and distinction responsible posts in many of the farms and factories.

In the third part Stalin deals with the ideals of the Communist party and the part it has to play in the future to combat the capitalistic forces outside Russia and the still more important part that it has to play in the fulfilment of the second Five-Year Plan. Stalin suggests ways and means for weeding out the reactionary elements in the party so that there may be greater solidarity among the members of the party.

The book is informative and deserves to be read by every student of modern Russia.

S. R. VENKATA RAMAN.