

# Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VALE.

Office: SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA 4.

Vol. XX. No. 32.

POONA—THURSDAY AUGUST 19, 1937.

|         |        |       |
|---------|--------|-------|
| INDIAN  | SUBSN. | Rs. 6 |
| FOREIGN |        | 15s.  |

## CONTENTS.

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| TOPICS OF THE WEEK ... ..  | 353  |
| ARTICLES:—   |      |
| The Bombay Budget. ... ..  | 356  |
| The Salaries of Public Officials in India.<br>By D. R. Gadgil, M. A., M. LIT. ... .. | 357  |
| Indian Tenants of Fijian Landlords.<br>By P. Kodanda Rao. ... ..                     | 359  |
| Will Partition Bring Peace. ... ..   | 361  |
| Floods in Orissa. By Shyam Sundar Misra. ... ..                                      | 363  |
| SHORT NOTICE. ... ..   | 364  |
| BOOKS RECEIVED. ... ..   | 364  |

## Topics of the Week.

### Federation.

IT now turns out that the report that was put about that in his pourparlers with the Viceroy Mahatma Gandhi had offered to play the role of the fairy godmother to federation is entirely unfounded. The Mahatma himself has contradicted the story though, when so many people believe in the possibility of such a thing happening in his case, it would have been better if, in order to quieten the fears that have been aroused, he had added what vicariously Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru announced to the world, that the Mahatma was in entire accord with the Congress resolution committing all Congressmen to prevention of federation. So far as the Pandit himself is concerned, he reiterated in Bombay with the utmost possible vehemence Congress determination to overthrow federation. "Congress Ministers and Congressmen in general," he said, "want to break the front of the federation, the back of the federation, and the left and the right of the federation and throw it at the face of those who framed it." "We will resist it," he went on, "we will break it, we will tear it, we will burn it," and further added: "Any Indian going to the Viceroy to speak on the basis of the present federal scheme of the Government of India Act and its introduction in India is a traitor to the country." He then referred to the threat of the *Times of India*, which said:

They (Congressmen) must realise that federation follows inevitably on provincial autonomy as laid down by Parliament. It requires nothing more than the accession of a sufficient number of States, which are already committed in principle, to set it in motion. No reluctance on the part of individual provincial governments can affect that culmination.

Pandit Jawaharlal treated this threat with the uttermost contempt: "You will see what we can do and what we cannot do."

EVEN more remarkable in one sense was the pronouncement of Babu Rajendra Prasad. It was more remarkable because he too, like Gandhiji, incurred the suspicion of being inwardly favourable to the establishment of federation. "I am not reconciled to federation in any way," he declared in his quiet way. "I am not quite sure by what steps we shall be able to prevent it, but I should do my best to do that. Whether I succeed or fail is a different matter." He answered at great length those who argue that from office acceptance in the provinces acceptance of the federal constitution is the next logical step for the Congress and reiterated his opinion that the only way to deal with federation is to prevent it. The reasons why federation must be thrown overboard are very cogently expressed by the *Tribune*, than which no more sober journal exists, as follows:

Lastly, the provision for the accession of Indian States to the federation and the terms of their accession make it impossible for the Federal Government at any time to be a democratic government. In the first place the States' representatives in both Houses of the Federal Legislature are to be the nominees of the Princes and not to be elected, whether directly or indirectly, by any popular constituency. The States are for the purposes of the federation treated purely as personal estates of the rulers, and the people of the States are no better than perpetual minors. The provinces of India outgrew this primitive stage more than a quarter of a century ago. Even before the Morley-Minto reforms there had been some provision for a modified form of election, election-cum-nomination in regard to a certain proportion of seats in the Indian Legislatures. There is no such provision in the present case. This means in plain English that more than 33 per cent. of members of the Federal Legislature shall definitely represent not democracy but undiluted autocracy. These members along with a large proportion of the members returned by separate electorates or other special constituencies in British India can, normally speaking, be depended upon to constitute a majority in the Federal Legislature, and the Governor-General can ordinarily hope to form a stable ministry out of this undemocratic and reactionary majority. Add to this the fact that the very terms of their accession to federation would enable the Princes to claim that their connection with the British Crown, which means in effect the British Government, shall be in perpetuity what it is to-day. Some of them have, as is well known, actually gone the length of saying that even British soldiers must be kept in India for their protection, presumably against popular upheaval within their own territories or in neighbouring territories. How could anyone expect the Congress or any other popular democratic organisation ever to be a willing or even consenting party to such a federation?

### Gokak Settlement: A Doubtful Achievement.

THE recent settlement of the Gokak strike which had been in progress for nearly seven months is claimed in some quarters as an achievement of the

Congress Ministry. If by achievement all that is meant is that the Ministry has been instrumental in ending the industrial dispute at Gokak the claim may be readily granted. But if the word is used to imply an improvement in the position of the strikers, the claim will be hotly contested by those who are closely in touch with the pros and cons of the differences between the employers and the employees at Gokak.

IT should be remembered that the recent strike occurred because the Management failed to implement the terms of the agreement that had been arrived at in April last. Under this agreement the Commissioner of Labour was to investigate the cases of the 84 discharged persons, and all the other employees were free to resume work. But, contrary to the terms accepted, they refused to take back 15 clerks into their service and offered to give only temporary employment to 400 permanent workers. It does not appear from the terms of the new settlement negotiated by the Congress that these grievances of the workers which were the cause of the trouble have been or are to be redressed.

ONE of the demands of the workers when they first went on strike was that the Management should recognise their Union. On this head the settlement arrived at is as follows :

The Company will accord recognition to a Union of the workers if its constitution provides, and the Union undertakes, that it would adopt only peaceful and legitimate means, and that disputes arising between the Company and the employees will be settled by negotiation and conciliation and, failing that, by arbitration. This method of settling disputes is also accepted by the Company.

Those who have any knowledge of labor disputes are aware how compulsory arbitration in every case of outstanding difference operates to the serious disadvantage of the workers. A writer in the *Congress Socialist* well says on this point :

The worst feature of the agreement is that the fundamental right of labour to strike has been taken away. In future, every industrial dispute at Gokak will be settled through arbitration. It is well-known that the Congress has given recognition to Labour's right to strike. But here is an agreement between Labour and Capital brought about by the mediation of the Congress Ministry which has deprived the 3,000 Gokak workers of their right to strike. What has been given to the workers in theory has been taken away in practice.

In the end he pointedly asks : Is this how Congress in office going to strengthen the organisation of the masses ?

NOT only is the Union to give up the right of collective bargaining, but it is also provided in the settlement that clerks shall not join with the workers even in this emasculated Union. "Clerks in the service of the Company," says the settlement, "may have a separate Union, but they will not join the Union of the operatives." A policy of *divide et impera*, against which the Congress protested vehemently till now but which it has now begun to practise itself against the labourers. We are amazed that the Congress took up this strange attitude. These are definite losses ; as far as gains are concerned, they are nil. There is no improvement in any respect on the April agreement or on the situation created thereafter on account of the management having refused to abide by their undertakings.

*Independent India* edited by Mr. M. N. Roy also takes the same view of the Gokak settlement as the Trade Unionist writer in the *Congress Socialist*. No increment in wages, no improvement of living conditions, no recognition of the Union—that, it says, is the net result of the settlement. The settlement makes the recognition of the Union by the employers contingent upon its constitution being made acceptable to them. To this part of the agreement the paper takes very strong exception, as it feels it enables the employers to dictate in a matter which is the sole province of the workers. Similarly too the clause about compulsory arbitration, which was forced on the workers by the owners, is bitterly resented by the paper.

#### Cawnpore Strike Settlement.

WITH the settlement of the industrial strike at Cawnpore, the whole of U. P., and for that matter the whole country, may well heave a sigh of relief. A strike of such magnitude was unknown in the history of that city, nearly 50,000 workers and almost all mills being involved in it. It can be easily imagined how serious a menace to civic peace the existence of such a large discontented and unemployed element constitutes. No wonder that the peaceful life of Cawnpore was disturbed more than once during the pendency of the strike. That such a dangerous situation was not fruitful of calamitous results to a greater extent was due to its tactful handling by the local officials to whom the Premier recently paid a well-deserved tribute.

THE non-recognition by the employers of the local labour union, mazdoor sabha as it is known, inadequate wages and unsatisfactory working conditions were the causes principally responsible for the strike. The settlement signed by both parties in the presence of the Premier provides for the unqualified recognition of the labour union by the employers. This is a distinct gain to the workers, for which they must remain indebted to the Premier more than to any other individual. For in a statement to the press Sir T. Gavin Jones, Chairman of the Employers' Association, publicly acknowledges the "pressure" brought to bear on them by the Premier in order to make them agree to this condition of the settlement, though they felt all along and do still feel that the union does not enjoy the confidence either of one party or the other. The employers' dislike of this part of the agreement is fully reflected in their unequivocally throwing "the responsibility for the future on the Government."

THIS belief about the union's inability to deliver the goods has for its basis one day's delay on the part of the workers to return to work. This delay is put down by the employers as being due to the labourers' want of confidence in the union. If the union had fully enjoyed the workers' confidence, argue the employers, it would have made them go back to their jobs without a moment's delay. It may be noted that the reasoning fails to take due account of the difficulties in the way of the union getting into touch with a vast number of workers in a short time. The agreement was signed about mid-day on the 9th inst., and though an attempt was made to explain its terms at a labourers' meeting attended by 30,000 persons that very evening it was impossible to reach all concerned due to lack of loud speakers. But if the workers did not go back to work the next day they did so the day after that. Would this have been possible if, as stated on behalf of the employers, the workers had no faith in the union ? Anyway the small delay in their returning

to work is too slender a basis for the superstructure of the labourers' want of trust in the union which the employers are anxious to raise on it.

IT has to be admitted that the Premier's intervention did not meet with equally spectacular success with regard to the other demands of the strikers. These are going to be gone into by a committee consisting of a representative each of the employers and the workers with a maximum of three nominees of the Government and with instructions to take not more than two months for the completion of its work. One cannot foretell whether the committee's labours will result in full justice being done to the workers, but one hopes that they will. The U. P. Premier's strong line in getting the labour union recognised by the employers stands out in bold relief against the weakness and spinelessness shown by the Bombay Premier's secretary in the Gokak strike settlement in which the workers were made to sign away their valuable right of collective bargaining.

#### Detenu Problem in Bengal Assembly.

IN the Bengal Legislative Assembly the release of all persons detained or otherwise placed under restrictions without a judicial trial was urged by the Congress by means of a resolution, which, however, was rejected. The result is by so means surprising, looking to the present character of the Legislature. What will, however, come as a very disagreeable surprise to most people is the typically bureaucratic nature of the Home Minister's utterance in opposing the motion. His whole speech was couched in such standard bureaucratic style that it might well have come from the lips of any of his irresponsible predecessors. Its tone and tenor hardly differed from those of speeches the public was accustomed to expect from the members of the Reserved half of the dyarohic government on similar occasions.

THE Home Minister was at considerable pains to make his hearers believe that all possible care was being taken to see that nobody was unjustly detained. Information sent in by police agents against any person is in the first instance subjected to very close and careful scrutiny by more than one police officer. It is also scanned with care by two special judges, after which comes the turn of the additional secretary to test its veracity. When the case thereafter goes up to the Minister he satisfies himself that the judges regard the evidence placed before them as conclusive. If they hold otherwise, the release of the person concerned follows as a matter of course. It may be supposed that the accused person comes nowhere in this picture. But the fact is that side by side with the information being placed before two judges, the accused is also supplied with a copy of the charge-sheet and allowed an opportunity to reply. There can be no doubt that all this is satisfactory so far as it goes, but even the Minister cannot deny that it cannot adequately take the place of a judicial trial. We are sure the judges do all that is humanly possible to come to a fair and equitable judgment, but even they will be unable to guarantee, in the absence of means to test evidence available only in an open trial, that there has been no miscarriage of justice in any case.

#### Landlords becoming Concerned !

IT is a sign of grace for the Bihar Congress Ministry that the zamindars in that province are somewhat agitated as to what the Ministry may do to curtail their privileges. Abolition of the perma-

nent settlement and of the system of landlordism is in the air; the zamindars of course are not afraid that anything so drastic will come soon, but they seem to feel a genuine anxiety that a nibbling process will be set on foot which, if allowed unchecked, will result in their position deteriorating considerably.

THEY are therefore organising themselves. An extraordinary meeting of the landholders of Bihar was held in Patna on the 12th inst. under the presidency of the Maharajadhiraja of Darbhanga. The Maharaja (if we may curtail his rather elongated title since we cannot curtail the privileges of the men of his ilk) made in the beginning a conciliatory speech, in which he said that the landlords would be found ready to make any sacrifice which might be shown to be required in the interest of the peasantry. He tried to disarm criticism by admitting that the landlord class was not without defects. He also made an attempt to ingratiate himself with the Ministry by claiming that in national politics they were not reactionary. "We are not foreigners. Our weal or woe is dependent on the weal or woe of our country"—a sentiment which is calculated to make a strong appeal to nationalism.

BUT what about those to whom social justice appeals more than nationalism? To them he would argue thus: "Better yield, better price for produce, economic holdings, credit facilities are to my mind the chief items that will contribute to the agricultural prosperity of the country." That is to say, the Congress should concentrate its attention on enlarging the total output to be shared and not worry about whether the shares of the different classes who contribute to the present output are fairly fixed. He thus wants to avert Congress attention from the privileged position of the zamindars.

IF the Congress, however, were foolishly to seek to do justice between the different classes engaged in production by increasing the share of the peasantry at the cost of the landlords instead of trying to increase the productivity of land which would benefit all classes, the Maharaja's answer was clear. "We will not easily allow ourselves to be robbed of our just rights and privileges in deference to the wishes of any other class, howsoever numerous and vocal... I do not favour either tinkering with tenancy legislation or encroachments on agricultural income." In the Maharaja's opinion, of course, the just right of the landlords consists in all their privileges being maintained intact. Commenting on this speech, the *Searchlight* truthfully says, "If he will not agree to what he calls encroachments on agricultural income, it seems to us that there will hardly be a basis left for discussion and negotiation."

IN this connexion the *Searchlight* calls public attention to extracts from the Government of India's publication "Land Revenue Policy of the Indian Government" of 1902 concerning Bihar, "which is permanently settled at a very light revenue estimated as equivalent to a concession of at least 80 lakhs a year to the inhabitants." "These advantages, however," says this document:

have been monopolised by the land-owning section of the community while the Bihar tenants remain among the most heavily rented in India and, as the experience of two famines in the last 30 years has shown, have shown the least capacity of resistance to the shock.

The end of a long and careful enquiry into the condition of the cultivating classes in India was the conclusion that nowhere did rents press with such severity on the people as in the permanently settled districts of Bihar.

\* \* \*

OUR contemporary remarks on this authoritative pronouncement of Government of 35 years ago as follows:

As far back as 1902 Bihar was a rack-rented province and nowhere did rents press with such severity on the people as in the permanently settled districts of Bihar. Do the Maharajadhiraj and his fellow-zamindars realize that if rack-renting afflicted the Bihar Kisans so far back as 1902, the position is ever so much worse to-day? We have had since then enhancements galore, as many times as the law has permitted. We have had likewise commutation of produce rent into cash at a time of extraordinarily heavy prices and these rents have been authoritatively declared to have become unconscionably onerous and inequitable. We have on the top of it all seen an unprecedented depression reducing the prices of agricultural produce by about 50 per cent. but without any relief whatsoever to the Ryots. In short, while the Kisans have been ground down under the increasing burden of rack-renting, and crushed by depression, the Maharajadhiraj and his kind have continued to mark time, unmindful of their duties and obligations and the rights of the suffering people.

We have no doubt that the Maharaja of Darbhanga counts among the progressive zamindars, as zamindars go, but unless they change their entire outlook they are likely to have hard times in store for them. They must be prepared to be stripped of their privileges.

\* \* \*

#### Encroachments on Civil Liberty.

IT is greatly to be regretted that even with the advent of provincial autonomy the bureaucratic invasions on civil liberty are continuing. In Bengal the publication of any information or proceedings of meetings organised in connection with detenu day observances still continues to be officially tabooed. Far from lifting the ban on such publication, as desired and expected by public opinion, the present supposedly popular government has sought to enforce the ban issued by its unpopular and irresponsible predecessor over two years ago. A Bengalee gentleman is being prosecuted because he happened to have in his possession a book to which the police objected. The charge against him is not that he had actually used the book for preaching terrorism, but that it could be so used! In Poona two persons were arrested for printing and publishing what are described as anti-war leaflets under the ordinance law of all laws.

\* \* \*

DESPITE public complaints, the use of section 144, Cr. P.C., in connection with labour strikes is fairly frequent in all parts of the country. As can be easily imagined, this gives an undue advantage to the employers as compared to the workers and must, therefore, cease. The strike in the mills at Indore has led to the issue of orders which are quite in keeping with the autocratic nature of the rule in the State. The new procedure laid down for dealing with inconvenient persons is, to say the least, extremely one-sided. If the police desire it, a summary inquiry would at once be started in the case of any man resulting in his immediate arrest in the first instance. The arrest would be followed by inquiry at which he would not be entitled either to appear or to be heard. On the report of such a futile inquiry the persons concerned may be deported from the State either for all time or for a short period. There is really nothing shock-

ing or surprising in all this, because an Indian State is concerned in it. What, however, one fails to grasp is the need for the farce of an inquiry. If the man is not to be at all heard at it, why have it? Why not, instead, make the procedure openly summary by cutting out the inquiry altogether and incidentally saving time?

## Articles.

### THE BOMBAY BUDGET.

THE Budget for the current year introduced in the Legislative Assembly by Bombay's "first responsible Cabinet" and by the first Congress Cabinet in any province is, as the Finance Minister himself admits, thoroughly conservative. In fact, the Ministry during the next six or seven months aims at doing nothing more than carry on. The difficulty with which it was faced was real, shortness of time required to prepare well-considered schemes of relief of distress and reform and expansion of beneficent activities, and the problem as the Finance Minister envisaged was only one of doing just a tiny bit in these directions with what little money he found in his hands. Even this bit was possible only because he had the good fortune of being presented with an unexpected surplus of 40 lakhs from last year. For the rest he proposes to effect savings of 10 lakhs for the current year. The measures that are proposed to be financed out of these amounts are naturally of a diminutive size. They are:

5 lakhs—remission, as a special case, of the arrears of land revenue more than one year old;

5 lakhs—remission, as a permanent measure, of land revenue in areas where the assessment is particularly high;

2 lakhs—introduction of prohibition in three areas;

5 lakhs—abolition of fees on grazing;

10 lakhs—improvement of village water supply;

1½ lakh—development of village industries;

40,000—scholarships for depressed classes;

20,000—adult education and physical culture;

17½ lakhs—revenue deficit for the current year.

One cannot but deplore the standstill position of all the nation-building activities in this province for all the remaining months of the year, and if it is due entirely to the Ministry coming into office almost when it was time to introduce the budget one cannot help blaming the Congress for unnecessarily wasting time in negotiations about assurances from the Governors which eventually it did not succeed in receiving in any shape or form. To the extent to which the province is robbed of an opportunity of making an immediate advance in several directions of vital importance to the progress and prosperity of the people, the Congress is responsible, though of course the Finance Minister personally is not. Even if the Bombay Ministry had delayed presenting the budget for three or four weeks, which was quite possible, it could have introduced somewhat bolder measures. For look at what the Punjab Ministry, to

which, being a non-Congress Ministry, the Congress would not give any credit for progressiveness, did within two months. It suffered a loss of 17 lakhs on account of the application of the principle of sliding scale assessment in the Lyallpur district and in one circle of another district, provided 25 lakhs for revenue remission and other relief to agriculturists, and on top of it increased the grant on what are known as beneficent departments by 20 lakhs.

We take the case of the Punjab, for that province like Bombay did not benefit to any extent from the Niemeyer award. In this respect, indeed, Bombay is at a considerable advantage, for though it did not better its financial position from the Niemeyer report it has added to its resources by 76 lakhs every year on account of the separation of Sind. Bombay ought therefore to have been able to make a much better showing both in respect of relief of agriculturists and expansion of beneficent activities. Take agriculture. While Bombay will spend only 14.14 lakhs this year, the Punjab will spend 36.24 lakhs, more than 2½ times as much. On the allied Veterinary Department Bombay's expenditure will be a poor 4 lakhs, while the Punjab's will be 14.76 lakhs, or more than 3½ times as much. On industries and co-operative credit Bombay is to spend 9.35 and 6.57 lakhs, respectively, while the Punjab is to spend 18.41 and 13.03 lakhs or nearly twice as much. The Punjab's total revenue expenditure is less by 128 lakhs than Bombay's but the amount of money that the Punjab spends on nation-building departments is more by 39 lakhs than that which Bombay spends, the percentage of expenditure on these departments to total expenditure being 28.44 in the Punjab and 22.24 in Bombay. In spite of its larger resources, Bombay has to make much lee-way compared to the Punjab, though the Congress Ministry in Bombay will refuse to accept the Punjab as any-

thing like an exemplar. The Punjab has also given a lead in introducing reduced scales of pay for new entrants into the Provincial and Subordinate Services; the reductions ranging from 18 to 33 per cent. The Bombay Ministry could at least have done some of these things if it had a little more time, and the Punjab Ministry too had barely two months in which to frame its budget and supply copies to members of the Assembly, which it did in the beginning of June.

As for the future schemes which the Finance Member has adumbrated, like taxation of agricultural incomes, nationalisation of certain business activities like the supply of electrical energy, we must say that they are on sound lines and will receive whole-hearted support from the general public. His ideas on reform of education, overhauling the system of land revenue assessment and the system of taxation generally, and reduction of expenditure are yet in an embryonic stage and are speculative, and nothing can be said about them till they take a more definite shape. He is fully alive to the two basic facts of the situation, which make the solution of the problems of general welfare extraordinarily difficult, viz. a stupendous increase in the costs of general administration in this province and almost a limitless growth of expenditure that is required on measures directly benefiting the masses. In tackling these problems it is the duty of all to give constructive help to the Ministry and the Ministry has asked for it. The role of critics should be, while making such contribution as they can to the devising of proper and adequate measures, not to let the Ministry become slack for any reason. There is none, we are sure, who will approach these national problems of high moment in a partisan spirit and withhold from the Ministry the sympathy and goodwill which it needs in attacking them satisfactorily.

## THE SALARIES OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS IN INDIA.

WITH the advent of Congress Ministries salary reduction has suddenly become practical politics and the problem has naturally attracted considerable attention from publicists. Some years ago I published a brochure examining the merits of this question in some detail and had no desire to write afresh on it. Prof. B. P. Adarkar has, however, written an article on this question published among other papers in the SERVANT OF INDIA which makes at least a brief comment necessary. Prof. Adarkar's article contains no new points but the authority that his name as an economist may carry and the assurance with which he dares other economists to challenge his conclusions compel me, however differently, to enter the field. This article is thus concerned merely with a brief examination of Prof. Adarkar's view.

Let us first examine Prof. Adarkar's contention that the maximum for public officials' salaries indicated by the Karachi resolution is the result of the working of Gandhian ideas of simplicity and the socialistic doctrine of equalisation of wealth. I have no knowledge of the inner history of the Karachi re-

solution but I am definitely of opinion, an opinion I expounded in two articles in the SERVANT OF INDIA a few months after the Karachi Congress, that the resolution itself cannot be called socialistic. It is just progressive or reformatory in the sense in which progressive policies were followed in the more advanced countries of Europe even before the Great Depression. In the same way I hold that the limit of Rs. 500 laid down in the Karachi resolution is not of a levelling character. Prof. Adarkar himself admits that the present ranges of salaries at the top are too high and seems to suggest a maximum of Rs. 1,500 as appropriate. What is the evidence and what are the principles back of this figure of Rs. 1,500? I have gathered together some data regarding salaries in foreign countries and India in the brochure mentioned above and have no hesitation in saying that that data leads one to believe that the Rs. 500 limit is nearer being appropriate than Rs. 1,500. Taking into account such relevant factors as the level of our national income, the wages of manual workers, the degree of inequality that obtains in all non-socialistic countries

between the salaries of the manual workers, the lower clerical grades and highest officers, it is not difficult to prove that the Rs. 500 limit represents neither an ideal of simplicity nor an attempt at equalitarianism. It just reflects fairly correctly the underlying facts of the Indian economic situation. That salaries of certain services cannot be reduced by the existing Indian Governments is also no reason why proper adjustments in the scales amenable to our control should not be made. An increased disparity between the Imperial service scales and others can have no other effect than proving to the world that their controlled recruitment and pay is nothing else in reality than a political impost.

We may next examine the arguments put forward by Prof. Adarkar. There is initially the claim of vested interests. Some families, it is argued, have put their all in educating their sons with expectations of high rewards and these expectations should not be defeated. Arguments of this character can always be brought against most measures of social reform. All considerable reforms in the social and the economic system involve changes in conditions previously taken as stable and these are bound to upset the expectations formed by one or another body of investors. If Governments were to show such solicitude towards the expectations of investors not only would any direct intervention as that involved in debt legislation be ruled out but even reforms of the character of factory legislation, minimum wage, temperance reform etc. be rendered impossible. For any regulation of labour or wage conditions upsets the previous calculations of factory owners and any steps towards temperance would vitally affect the fortunes of brewery owners. Therefore, while we would urge respecting in a proper degree contractual obligations, we attach no great weight to the sanctity of investors' expectations. It may also be noted in passing that the salary cut of 1930 and the Karachi resolution itself have been sufficient warnings to the unwary investor in education.

To pass on to the next contention: We in India possess no data regarding incomes earned in the various professions open to middle class youth. Under the circumstances the question of the scale of salaries which would be parallel to the level of incomes earned in the professions must be determined by each individual's reading of the facts. The great disparity in the economic future of a candidate who just manages to secure an official post and an equally good man who just fails to get in is, I believe, a matter of very common knowledge to the middle classes in India. In this connection wrong estimates are often made because undue attention is paid to a few exceptionally high incomes among the professional classes and no note taken of the vast numbers of failures. The income of the legal profession, for example, in India is not to be reckoned by the very high incomes earned by a few distinguished advocates. It is rather indicated by the large mass of pleaders and lawyers in the numerous cities, district towns and taluka places, the large majority of whom, we venture to think, do not pay any income-tax. Recruitment in

the beginning is contingent on the average expectation of an income and even with Rs. 500 p. m. as a maximum the average expectation of income in the services will not compare unfavourably with the incomes at present obtaining in the profession; this without taking account of the fact that a lowering of service scales is bound to have an effect on the charges made by the professional classes in the country for their services. For, it may be remembered that in India it has always been the service scales that have set the measure for the general level of earnings of the educated classes and not as elsewhere the earning in the other occupations determining the level of service scales. Even so it may be admitted that there will be a certain amount of readjustment in the flow of recruits to Government service. Services will not prove quite as attractive as they do today. But we consider that this will in no sense be a national calamity. Services are far too attractive at the present scales of pay and the emphasis on Government employment needs to be considerably diminished.

Prof. Adarkar's third contention is on the moral plane. This is the danger of increasing corruption in the services because of a lowering of salaries. I believe this fear to be greatly exaggerated. The presence or absence of corruption depends almost entirely on the moral tone of the services and of public life as a whole and very little on the absolute level of pay. Prof. Adarkar's own statement that a large percentage of public servants today from the "village patel to the burrasahib have their price" would itself prove the inability of a high scale of salaries to check corruption. There is no salary so high that it will keep a man from accepting a bribe if he has the will and the chance. As long as the public servant has no reason to be dissatisfied with his economic position as compared with persons similarly equipped—socially and educationally—outside the services, the salary scale cannot be said to be a cause of corruption. If corruption exists in spite of a comparatively satisfactory salary in this sense it cannot be cured by keeping up the salary scales at an artificially high level. It will have to be dealt with in other ways.

Prof. Adarkar next draws the attention of Congress Ministries to one consideration of political expediency. He warns the Congress that salary reform will cause discontent among the middle classes and only earn for the Congress the hatred of the intelligentsia. It is no business of mine to consider what political policy should be followed by the Congress but I believe that Prof. Adarkar exaggerates the extent to which the middle class as a whole is against salary reform today. It is also no compliment to our intelligentsia to maintain that it hates and loves, policies chiefly in the light of their effects on its own sectional interests. If the Indian intelligentsia were truly of this character its support would hardly be worth seeking by any great political party. Even from the point of view of sectional interests, however, there is one aspect of this whole policy which Prof. Adarkar's middle classes had better bear in mind. It is that the present scales of salaries all round act as

a great hindrance in the way of any rapid extension of national welfare activities. If salary reform makes possible to some extent an increase in the educational, public health, public works etc. activities of Governments the increased strength of the personnel, required will be recruited chiefly from the middle classes. So that if the reform hits a few who are specially fortunately placed today it may be the means of benefiting a large number of today's unfortunates.

In the latter part of his article Prof. Adarkar denounces in general terms what he calls this "economy at all cost." The criticism is based on a palpable misconception. Why does Prof. Adarkar take it for granted that those who advocate salary reform do it for the sake of just effecting economies? Has not all radical opinion in the country—including the leaders of the Congress—insisted on the need of enormously increased nation-building activities at the same time that avenues for economy in the present wasteful administration have been pointed out? Does Prof. Adarkar think that the taxable capacity of the Indian people is so great that we can well afford to ignore possibilities of finding an extra crore or two? Is the problem of Indian Public Finance really so simple that all that Governments—central and provincial—have to do is to go on spending without reckoning costs for us all to be wealthier and have higher standards of living? Is not Prof. Adarkar,

while pointing a warning finger to the vicious spiral of increasing unemployment, ignoring the opposite danger of an inflationary spiral concealed in his simple panacea?

As a fact the danger of bringing about a slump would be present only if the savings resulting from economies were to be merely hoarded by Finance Members. The Great Depression has no doubt taught us all that there are times when almost any expenditure is better than hoarding. In Mr. Keynes's fanciful analogy it may then be worthwhile to conceal gold underground to employ people to dig it up all again at considerable cost. But even at such times socially useful expenditure is surely to be preferred to socially wasteful expenditure. It may be bad policy (in certain phases of the trade cycle) merely to save by cutting down bloated salaries; but it can never be bad policy to cut down bloated salaries if the money saved is to be used to employ new agencies in increasing worthwhile activities. It is, I maintain, perfectly sound economic doctrine to say that capital expenditure as that on New Delhi be better not incurred and the money used instead for building new schools, roads, or hospitals or that current expenditure on high salaries be cut down or the exodus to hills abolished so that a larger number of primary school teachers or say panel doctors for the poor be employed by the State.

D. R. GADGIL.

## INDIAN TENANTS OF FIJIAN LANDLORDS.

### I.

MR. C. F. ANDREWS, who has rendered yeoman's service to the cause of Indians in Fiji and who happily is at the moment in India, has already by his writings and speeches familiarised Indian public opinion with regard to the problem of Indian tenants of Fijian landlords. It is, therefore, unnecessary to dwell at length on the nature of the problem except to summarise briefly its chief characteristics and draw attention to certain aspects of it which seem to call for vigilant and urgent action.

It is enough to mention here that the great bulk of the Indian population in Fiji consists of agriculturists who work on land and cultivate sugar-cane. A negligible number of them owns land. The great majority are tenants, who hold land on tenancies generally for twenty-one years. Broadly speaking, the ownership of land is divided between the Fijians and the Colonial Sugar Refining Company generally known by the abbreviation of C. S. R.

In this article it is proposed to deal only with the relation between Fijian owners and Indian tenants, and only some aspects of it at that. Ownership among Fijians is still largely communal—something like the joint-family ownership in India. The consent of all the co-partners is necessary for the leasing out of land. Besides that, the consent of the Government is also necessary. The land law, while vesting in the Fijian communes the ownership of such land as had not been alienated, limited their rights of ownership,

in order to save them from signing away, in their unsophistication, their valuable rights for a song to land-grabbers. The obligation was, therefore, laid on the Government to scrutinise every land transaction and confirm it only when satisfied about its *bona-fides*.

The effect of this dual control has been what might be expected. And it has become worse with the increasing sophistication of Fijian owners. The seeker of a lease or of the renewal of a lease has in the first instance to propitiate all the co-partners, grease their palms (which is illegal), and take the risk of someone or other of the co-partners voting down the request and then lose the amounts he had bribed them all with. If he succeeds in getting the consent of the Fijians concerned, the Government may turn it down. In the case of renewals, the propitiation of the Fijian owners corresponds to the renewal fee familiar in certain tenancy systems in India. But the difference seems to be that the Fijian law does not recognise nor regulate the renewal fee; in fact, such feeling is akin to illegal gratification familiar in many business transactions all over the world.

The special point about it is that Fijian owners are increasingly learning the value of their monopoly of land ownership and are taking to exploiting the necessities of the Indian tenants who have nowhere else to turn to.

The situation has become somewhat pressing now because a great many leases were executed in the first few years since 1915 when the indenture system

was abolished, and leases were mostly for 21 years and hence most of them are due to fall in during this and the next few years. If renewals are refused either because Fijian owners do not wish to lease out their lands or because of the demand of unconscionable renewal fees, a problem of great magnitude will arise.

Is there any reason to apprehend such a situation arising? On account of the dual control, access to land depends on the policies of both the Government and the Fijian owners. Sugar-cane continues to be the most profitable crop in Fiji; most of the best sugar land has already been alienated to the C. S. R. Most of the other land in Fijian ownership has been leased to Indian tenants, as Fijians have not taken to sugar-cane cultivation these many decades. Partly on account of genuine interest in the advancement of Fijians in the scale of "civilization" and partly as a counterblast to the Indians, the Fijian Government made very strenuous efforts to persuade the Fijians to undertake sugar-cane cultivation. The few Fijians who had done so have not so far made a success of it. Perhaps they would have done better if they had the best sugar-cane land. Unfortunately for them, the best land had long ago been alienated to the C. S. R. and cannot now be recovered. The only good land that they can recover is the land now leased to Indians. In consequence, the Fijian owners, or some of them, may persuade themselves to terminate the leases when they fall in and resume their lands. The Government, having encouraged the Fijians to grow sugar-cane themselves, cannot now discourage them from resuming their lands, notwithstanding that the efforts of the Fijians at sugar-cane cultivation have been so far more heroic than successful.

In the alternative, such of the Fijian owners as prefer the more comfortable job of receiving rents and renewal fees may prefer to lease their lands but put up their price so high as to bear very hard on the Indian tenants. This latter contingency the Government will find it difficult to relieve.

There is, however, one safeguard against an epidemic of terminations of leases. The owners have to pay compensation to tenants for improvements effected by the latter and evaluated by Government officials. Even if the valuations were always fair, it would be but small consolation to the Indian tenant to be turned out of the land which he brought under cultivation with what he thinks inadequate compensation when he has nothing else to do but become a labourer. It may be added here that, by some mysterious arrangement, no Indian labourers are employed in the new gold-mining industry.

## II.

The evils of the dual control are generally recognized in Fiji. For fifty years and over the local Government and the European planters had been in favour of vesting the sole control of land in the Government and of converting the Fijian owners into rent-receivers from Government. As a matter of fact, the Fijian Chiefs in 1874 ceded their territories *unconditionally* to the British Government. The Colonial

Office in England, however, has right through been opposed to vesting sole rights over land in Government and insisted on Fijians sharing them with Government.

In September last year the Council of Chiefs, which generally meets once in three years, passed the following Resolution and communicated it to the Government:

That, in the opinion of this Council, it is in the best interests of the Native race that all lands (including leases) not required for the maintenance of the Fijian owners be opened up for settlement; that to further this end a Committee be appointed to enquire into and to determine the amount of land needed for the proper development by the Native owners; and that all land (including leases) not so required be handed over to the Government to lease on behalf of the Fijians.

To which the Ag. Governor, Mr. Juxton Barton, replied as follows:

I am most grateful to receive the evidence which this Resolution records of the confidence and trust of the Chiefs in Government. It is not a matter for hasty decision, and you must very carefully explain the Resolution and its reasons to your people. In the meanwhile, pending the arrival of the Governor, it would be premature for me to give a decision on the appointment of a Committee.

As the Ag. Governor said, no immediate effect could be given to this Resolution. It is uncertain if the rank and file will approve of it. In any event the Council of Chiefs meets only once in three years ordinarily, and it is only at its next meeting that it can confirm its last Resolution. The presumption is that it will. It remains to be seen if the Colonial Office will accept the Resolution and implement it.

If it does, a Committee has then to be set up and given ample time to finish its labours and demarcate the Fijian Reserves. It is at the moment impossible to anticipate what principles the Committee will adopt in demarcating the Fijian Reserves—whether all land already under beneficial occupation by non-Fijians will be excluded from the Fijian Reserves or not. If all land developed by non-Fijians is excluded from the Fijian Reserves, the Fijians will be permanently deprived of the best sugar-cane land and will have to be content with second class land. Some of the leading Indians fear that if, in order to satisfy the legitimate desire of the Fijians it should be decided to include in the Fijian Reserves some sugar-cane land which at the moment is under the occupation of non-Fijians, it will be the land now under Indian occupation that will be so included and not the land occupied by the C. S. R. or other European interests. Indians, and not Europeans, will be sacrificed to meet the wishes of the Fijians. This is rendered all the more easy as Indians hold land on terminable leases, while Europeans hold it mostly as freehold.

In the meanwhile there is great uncertainty as to the renewal of leases. It has been mentioned that leases are, under the present law, generally for 21 years. If a renewal is now given, the land so leased will not be free to be included in a Fijian Reserve until after that period, should the Committee so recommend. Or, if the Fijian Reserves are likely to be demarcated earlier, renewal may have to be



refused pending that decision or given for a shorter period.

Indian tenants are very naturally greatly concerned to know if the lands they have developed are liable to be included in Fijian Reserves, should such a policy find favour with Government. And whether, in the meanwhile, leases will be renewed at all, and if so, whether the term of the lease will be the current legal period of 21 years or less.

The leading Indians are not without apprehensions as to the policy which Government itself, when once the dual policy is abolished and control over land vested solely in it, will follow regarding Indians. They fear that the better land may, by administrative action, be given to the Europeans, while Indians will have to be content with worse land or become the tenants of the Europeans.

An alternative to the policy of Fijian Reserves is tenancy legislation, giving the tenants permanent rights of occupancy, fair rents, etc. Such legislation, even if it were feasible to confine it to Fijian owners and not extend it to all owners, including the C. S. R. and other Europeans, will, it is feared, be opposed by the European interests, lest they should in time be drawn into its orbit.

### III

*To ease the situation the very first thing to secure is the automatic renewal of current leases for another period of 21 years—a kind of moratorium. That will give Government and all the other interests involved adequate time to discuss and decide whether a policy of Fijian Reserves should be adopted or a policy of tenancy legislation. As a permanent measure, tenancy legislation on modern lines is preferable to Fijian Reserves. Should the latter be ultimately decided upon, it is essential to secure here and now an assurance that land already developed by Indians shall not be included in the Fijian Reserves when they are created.*

Inasmuch as agriculture, to wit sugar-cane cultivation, is the main industry of Fiji, and inasmuch as almost all the tenants engaged in the industry are Indians, it is essential that there should be close and friendly co-operation between the Government of India and the Fijian Government at every step. Indians should be adequately represented on the Fijian Land Delimitation Committee, should one be appointed. In the meanwhile, it is of the utmost importance that the Fijian Government should have at its elbow an Agent of the Government of India.

P. KODANDA RAO.

## WILL PARTITION BRING PEACE?

**A**N anomalous situation has been created as a result of the debate on the Royal Commission's Report on Palestine in the House of Commons on 21st July. The original motion moved on the subject by the Colonial Secretary had sought the approval of Parliament to the scheme of partition proposed by the Commission, if not in detail, at least in principle. But the very principle of partition encountered stout opposition from the leading members of all the political parties in the debate, and the Government had, therefore, to accept an amendment which, while leaving Mr. Ormsby-Gore free to go to Geneva and ask leave for effecting partition, at the same time dissociated Parliament from any part or lot in the responsibility for the proposals. The effect of the motion that was ultimately passed was thus described by Mr. Herbert Morrison: "The House of Commons as such is not committed. The Government have honestly told us what their opinion is and what line they propose to pursue. We have equally honestly told the Government what we think. We adhere to the opinions which we have expressed, and the House of Commons as a corporate body is not committed upon the matter. When the Government have been to Geneva and expressed whatever views they think it right to express, something will come back to the House of Commons, and the House of Commons will then remain unfettered and will come to a proper and free conclusion upon the recommendations which then, after the discussions at Geneva, His Majesty's Government may submit to the House." Thus the Government, while proposing partition at Geneva, will not have the authority of Parliament behind it, and if agreed to by the League the recommendation

can be ratified with no little difficulty. Everyone is agreed, however, that unless some settlement is arrived at amicably between the Jews and the Arabs in the meantime, partition of some kind is inevitable.

The root of the trouble is a clash of nationalities which made it impossible for the mandatory power to introduce not only full self-government but even rudiments of parliamentary institutions which would culminate eventually in full self-government. The McMahon Pledge, in spite of the British Government's assertions to the contrary, promised the Arabs of Palestine complete independence. Even if this pledge were to be disregarded, the fact that Palestine was treated as an A class Mandate entitled it to be made independent in a very short time. But Mr. Ormsby-Gore described how all attempts of the British Government to establish a Legislative Council of a purely advisory character encountered the strongest resistance on the part of the Jews and the British Parliament. "Under Article 2 of the Mandate," he said, "we are bound to promote self-governing institutions. . . . Year after year we are asked (by the Permanent Mandates Commission) why we do not implement these self-governing institutions. The question was asked of Sir Arthur Wauchope not long ago, and we all know that, as the result of that obligation of the Mandate, His Majesty's Government made an effort. We know with what reception it met in this House and in another place. In another House only the Government spokesman supported it, and in this House only two supported it, and all efforts demanded by the present Arab majority for the introduction of self-governing institutions have hitherto failed and have been vigorously opposed by all parties in this House." And they were of course vehemently denounced by

the Jewish community. The Jews opposed because they desired to have Palestine under their exclusive control, and it appears that the Balfour Declaration, though it was interpreted differently later, contemplated it. On this point the Peel Commission say that Mr. Lloyd George, who was Prime Minister at the time, stated in his evidence :

The idea was, and this was the interpretation put upon it at the time, that a Jewish State was not to be set up immediately by the Peace Treaty without reference to the wishes of the majority of the inhabitants. On the other hand, it was contemplated that when the time arrived for according representative institutions to Palestine, if the Jews had meanwhile responded to the opportunity afforded them by the idea of a national home and had become a definite majority of the inhabitants, then Palestine would thus become a Jewish Commonwealth.

President Wilson, General Smuts, Lord Robert Cecil, Sir Herbert Samuel and Mr. Churchill—all these "wrote or spoke in terms that could only mean that they contemplated the eventual establishment of a Jewish State." Even in the present debate in the House of Commons, a Jewish member, Mr. Frankel, said that the Balfour Declaration led all the world to believe "that substantially Palestine was to be their (the Jews') home." For the time being the Jews accepted a position of equality with the Arabs, but, as Mr. Amery observed, "only because they believe that in practice and in course of time they will effectively control the whole country and its destiny."

Is it then to be wondered at that the Arabs resolved at all costs to prevent the Jews becoming a majority? In this connexion it must be remembered that the Arabs were exceedingly hospitable to the Jews as long as the latter had not conceived political ambitions. Mr. Crossley said in the Commons debate: "I would remark in passing that there is no people who have treated the Jews right up to the time of this Mandate with such consideration as the Arabs throughout all their lands." But "the creeping conquest" of the immigrant Jews, as Mr. Crossley called it, they determined to resist at all hazards; for the last four years there was a rising spiral of Jewish immigration—in 1932 with its immigration of 10,000, 1933 with its immigration of 30,000, 1934 with its immigration of 42,000, and 1935 with its immigration of 62,000." If the Jews became a majority the Arabs would become an entirely subject people, and till this happened not even a beginning in self-government was possible. For, in the words of Mr. Crossley, "there has never been the slightest chance of self-governing institutions being granted to the Arabs because they are in a majority—for no other reason." It was hoped that, in view of the prosperity which Jewish capital, enterprise and organisation would bring to the country, the Arabs would consent to let the Jews become a majority and dominate the country. But to the Arabs life is empty without independence. They would prefer poverty under self-rule to prosperity under other-rule. The Peel Commission has recorded their answer in magnificent words :

You say that we are better off. You say my house has been enriched by strangers, but it is my house and I did not invite the strangers in or ask them to enrich it. I do not care how poor or bare it is, if only I am master of it.

While the Jews are undoubtedly responsible for a considerable economic betterment of the country as a whole, it must be admitted that, in the view of those who are competent to judge, Jewish help was not indispensable. Sir Arnold Wilson, who always speaks with authority on Asiatic questions, said in the debate :

Propagandists, with the utmost good faith, are always pointing out the vast improvements which the Jews have made in Palestine, and comparing them with the miserable state of Palestine before they came there. I have lived in Arab-speaking countries, in Persia and Turkey, and I can testify that just as great and beneficent changes have taken place where there were neither Jews nor Britishers. Persia has advanced just as much in the last 20 years as any country. So also have Bagdad and Mosul. Since Iraq has attained complete sovereignty they have made great progress. There is just as much progress as in Basra, as much in Bagdad as in Jerusalem and as much in Mosul as in Tel-Aviv. Those who have seen Tel-Aviv should go to Ankara and Istanbul, Tehran and Ispahan, Kabul and Kandahar. The Arabs are as capable of development as Englishmen or Persians or Turks. They are not an inferior, unintelligent race, incapable of progress. I know by experience that they are as capable of progress, as any race in Asia. They do not accept much which we ourselves accept, sometimes questioningly, as being synonymous with progress and civilisation. They do not regard a miniature Piccadilly set down in the desert as a mark of progress, nor for that matter do the best Jews. They know that progress means something deeper, and that westernization is not necessarily true progress.

The only result of allowing an inundation of Jews into Palestine on account of their persecution in Europe, for which Arabs were not responsible in any way, is, in the words of Mr. Amery, that the British Government has "reached a deadlock which cannot be overcome, so far as carrying out the original mandatory policy is concerned, except by measures of resolute and ruthless coercion that we, as a nation, are incapable of carrying out." In the circumstances partition appears inevitable as it affords, to use the picturesque phraseology of Sir Arnold Wilson, "a better prospect of justice to both sides than one can hope to obtain by the present state of an indissoluble marriage of incompatible spouses." Partition involves, as Sir Archibald Sinclair said, "two racially-totalitarian States side by side in what we now call Palestine—with all Jews extruded from one State and all Arabs from the other." The Jewish objection to it is not very considerable; it was put thus by Mr. Amery: "An area as large as England was whittled down to something like the size of Wales (by Trans-Jordan being excluded from the ambit of the Jewish National Home), and that again has been whittled down to something like the size of Norfolk (in the report of the Peel Commission)." And Sir Archibald asked: "Is it just or reasonable to the Jewish people that the provision of a National Home for the 16,000,000 in world Jewry should be whittled down to a territory the size of an English county?" But who ever believed that even if the whole of Palestine were reserved for the Jews, it would give refuge to all the Jews in the world? At best it could accommodate 3,000,000 people, and there are some 18,000,000 Jews in the world. Earl Winterton, now under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, gave an effective answer on this point. He said, referring to the oppressed Jews in Europe: "I should say that the total number on the

Continent would not be far short of 5,000,000 or 6,000,000. Is it seriously believed by anyone on those benches or on these that it would be possible in present conditions, or in any conditions, for that number of Jews to be absorbed into Palestine? . . . It is utterly fantastic to suppose that the problem (of finding a home for all the persecuted Jews) can be solved by Palestine. I would add that the mere fact that world Jewry suffers much, in some cases terrible, persecution has always seemed to me an utterly insufficient reason why its members should be allowed to go in unlimited numbers into Palestine irrespective of the wishes of the Arab inhabitants. There has been a general assumption underlying many of the speeches that the Jews can go to Palestine as a right. That is not so."

The Arab complaint has far greater substance in it. It is admitted by the Jews themselves that they will get the most fertile portion, and it is just because of this that they fear that they will in such a position be very insecure. The Arabs, Sir A. Sinclair said, "envying the fat lands of the coastal plain, fertilised by Jewish gold, will feel the natural urge to win their way back to the coast." The Arab Higher Committee, in its memorandum submitted to the Permanent Mandates Commission, draws attention to the fact that, as a result of partition, the Arabs will have to give up all their orange cultivation, which in extent is equal to that of the Jews. The Committee says: "It has been assessed that 7/8ths of the total area of orange groves owned by Arabs are on lands designated for the Jewish State." "In the northern sector of this area (given to the Jews) there are districts which are entirely Arab. An instance is the Acre district where there are 50,000 Arabs and 63 Arab villages, but only one Jewish village with 300 inhabitants. In the districts of Tiberias, Safad and Haifa in the same region the Jewish inhabitants do not number one quarter of the total population (Arabs 171,000; Jews 35,000). In the plain and coastal areas to the south there are a large number of Arab villages, and the Arabs own some four times the amount of landed and immovable property which the Jews possess. Out of a total of 8,000,000 dunams of land in that area, of which 4,500,000 dunams are cultivable, the Jews do not hold more than 1,250,000 dunams." There will be 225,000 Arabs in the Jewish State and only 1,250 in the Arab State. The Commission itself admits that there is no surplus of land in the Arab State, to be given to the Arabs who are to be repatriated from the Jewish State, and as in the last resort transfer of population is to be compulsory, it will be difficult to carry this recommendation into effect, which, however, is necessary in order to have a clean out. In spite of these defects, very serious defects all of them, Mr. Crossley, one of the three members in the House of Commons who took a pro-Arab view of the matter, made an earnest appeal to the Arabs, as a very trusted friend of theirs, to accept partition. "I would ask the Arabs," he said, "to realise that if they give up a part of their national aspirations under this scheme, so do the Jews give up a part of theirs. If the Jews under this scheme gain a Jewish independent State, so do they gain an Arab indepen-

dent State." He himself objects to the scheme of handing over a purely Arab population in the north to the Jewish State, but he thinks that in order to avoid friction in the future it would be better to hand over the population to the Lebanon and Syria. Sir Arnold Wilson, another pro-Arab member, does not think that compulsory transfer of population is either necessary or advisable. He said in eloquent words:

From all this welter of misery and tragedy I believe something better will arise, but for the next 20 years we have to look forward to an accentuation and development of nationalism; once we can give that its fullest scope we shall see the rise of good-will. In Bagdad 20 years ago no Arab would consort with a Turk, no Turk would hesitate to shoot an Arab at sight. The relations between Persians, Turks and Arabs were bitter. Boundary Commissioners had to be heavily escorted to prevent bloodshed. The Arabs of Iraq are now independent, and we have a tripartite non-aggression agreement between Turkey, Persia and Iraq, which is working and may in the future be an important factor. There is no reason why the same thing should not happen in Syria, for Syria, not Palestine, is the modern prototype of the living ohid brought to Solomon. Alexandretta, Labanon, Latakia, Northern Syria and Damascus, all are separate States. I believe that we shall one day find them all working together as harmoniously as Persia, Iraq and Turkey. Let us look to the good future of man with some faith in it, and some ability to look at the problems of the day without letting our senses blind and bewilder us. . . . If we let these people stand on their own feet in their own respective areas, peace, I am sure, will come soon, and perhaps sooner than many of us expect it.

It is to be hoped, however, that under the pressure of the partition scheme Jews and Arabs will come together and hammer out a scheme acceptable to both.

### THE FLOODS IN ORISSA.

CONSEQUENT on the serious flood damages reported at Cuttack, I along with a group of Congress volunteers started from Cuttack by boat on 8th August and passed nearly 50 miles along the river Kathjodi and its various tributaries. As we passed, we met rows of villages on both sides of the river. After passing a distance of 15 miles we branched off from the main stream and entered paddy fields which had the appearance of a lake in miniature. The breaches in the embankments were many and we saw the flood water rushing towards the villages in various directions. Apprehending the floods, some of the river-side villagers had already left their houses and had stationed themselves on the embankments of the river. Even then their miseries were not over. Apart from the total destruction of their *Biyali* and *Mandia* crops which they would have reaped after a fortnight or so, the villagers have been completely isolated as a result of the floods. We passed certain villages where there was neither salt nor oil to be had and the people had to go completely without them. Because there were no heavy downpours of rain along with the onrush of flood water, houses have not collapsed to the extent they did during the floods of 1933. But this statement does not hold good with regard to the houses of the poorer folk, generally the Harijans. They had as a rule miserable little huts in close vicinity of the river banks. Therefore all their dwellings have been washed away by the floods.

Apart from this great calamity, which leaves them, old and young alike, to the blasts of the furious rainy nights, both the Harijans and day-labourers are

passing days without any food. These people earn their daily bread by working on the fields. But as all the fields are now immersed in water, they have no employment in any sense of the term whatsoever. It must be clearly understood that in the villages we visited, there is none so affluent as can afford to manage his household without help from outside for a month or so. As the villages have been cut away from one another, these people are left entirely to their own resources. Consequently, they give whatever little they have to their children and most of the adult population live on either one meal a day or go without food. As we entered a village, apparently less affected by the floods, we saw most of the villagers in a famished condition. On questioning them, we found out that they were living on one meal a day from July 25th when the floods first isolated them from the neighbouring villages. In our investigations at this stage, we are unable to ascertain the exact area affected by the floods. But this much can be said with some certainty that the entire Puri District excepting the Kharda Sub-Division and some villages in the Sadar Thana and more than half the District of Cuttack have been affected by these floods.

In these flooded areas—

1. There has been a total destruction of the *Biyali* (early) crop with very little chance of the winter crop ever being harvested.

2. The day-labourers of these villages who form the bulk of the population are without food and shelter and if no relief is forthcoming, they will die an early death.

3. Though the comparatively richer folk of the villages have their houses mostly undamaged they are suffering from starvation because they have been completely isolated. Again their prospects of a good harvest have been completely shattered by the ravages of the floods.

This is the situation just at present. But after the floods are over, both the rich and the poor alike will have to face the entire absence of food-stuffs and serious unemployment. Their crops for the whole year have been destroyed by the floods. So the most important problem is not the distribution of relief doles, very important though that may be at present, but the devising of means which will enable the village folk to get along for the whole of the year. Again, partly due to water-logging in all the villages and partly due to starvation and semi-starvation, serious epidemics are likely to break out, which should be carefully guarded against by the Orissa Government. Doctors should be sent on tour from village to village to keep the villages free from the ravages of epidemics.

Considerations of space do not permit a detailed description of the condition of the cattle. When human beings live in the open, the question of the cattle being sheltered does not arise. All fields being in water, the cattle have nothing to graze on. If immediate relief for them be not forthcoming, they will die in hundreds and thousands. We also received reports of 60 buffaloes being swept away by the floods from the village Nalakanā.

The situation which faces the Orissa Government to-day is in every sense of the term a bewildering one. How can the baby province with its meagre resources cope with a situation so vast and serious? We appeal to the generosity of all patriotic Indians to come to Orissa's rescue at this critical juncture. The poor afflicted Oriyas are after all their brethren and as such they have a claim on the generosity of their more fortunate countrymen. We hope, there-

fore, that in her distress Orissa will not be left severely alone. The whole of India ought to rush to its help and alleviate its distress as far as practicable.

Camp  
Kakatpur, }  
12th Aug. }

SHYAM SUNDAR MISRA,  
Member, Servants of India  
Society.

## SHORT NOTICE.

### AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ANNUAL.

Ed. by HARLEAN JAMES. (American Planning and Civic Association, Washington.) 1935. 21cm. \$3.00.

THIS publication contains a record of civic advance including the proceedings of the conference on city, regional, state and national planning held at Cincinnati, Ohio, in May 1935 and addresses selected from the conference on state parks held at Skyland, Va., in June 1935.

The object of this publication is to get the public to interest itself in the questions pertaining to the use of rural and urban land, water and natural resources and to ensure its support to national, regional, state and local planning for the best use of such natural resources. It further aims at advancing the higher ideals of civic life and beauty by safeguarding and developing natural wonders and scenic possessions in America and obtaining national and other parks and recreational facilities for the maximum good of the people.

The book deals with a great variety of questions such as (i) federal lands including national parks, museums, protection of wild life, (ii) rural land problems such as development, land settlement, population distribution, agricultural planning, soil erosion, etc., (iii) housing and town planning for rural and urban areas, (iv) highways and roadsides, (v) co-operative activities and various other matters. As the subjects are varied, articles have been written, somewhat profusely, on each item by persons having knowledge and experience of that particular subject. Emphasis is laid on the necessity of co-ordinating and harmonizing the national, regional, state and local activities with a view to obtain the maximum good to the public as a whole.

This book is written in a simple and non-technical style and is therefore readable by even laymen. Those connected with the administrations of municipalities and district local boards will find the book interesting and instructive. The book contains thirty-eight illustrations.

P. G. DANL.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

- STUDIES IN APPLIED ECONOMICS, Vol. I. By BENOY KUMAR SARKAR. (Chuckervertty Chatterjee & Co., Calcutta.) 1932. 22cm. 308p. Rs. 6.
- THE CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM OF INDIA. By NARESH CHANDRA ROY. (University of Calcutta.) 1937. 22cm. 380p. Rs. 2-8.
- BENARES HINDU UNIVERSITY, 1905-1935. Ed. By V. A. SUNDARAM. (The Author, Benares Hindu University, Benares.) 1936. 24cm. 632p.
- GENERAL WAGE CENSUS. Prepared by the Labour Office, Bombay. 1937. 24cm. 265p. As. 12.
- THE KHARIAS. By SARAT CHANDRA ROY and RAMESH CHANDRA ROY. (Man in India Office, Ranchi.) 1937. 23cm. 530p. Rs. 11.