

H.F.M.
1924-1927

58B

1924^{To}1927

34 2002
187
Sept. 28. 1925.

PROPAGANDA ABROAD.

We reproduce elsewhere an effusion from an Englishwoman appearing in The Yorkshire Post as a sample of the unscrupulous agitation carried on in England in order to prejudice India. It is just when the question of further constitutional reforms engages the public mind that mendacious persons begin to chirp from various places so as to add to the general confusion. The particular specimen of this vicious tribe hails from Bihar where she says she has gained much experience of the working of the Montagu Chemsford Scheme. Oppression of the poor, corrupt judges above and bribery all round are according to her the results of the reforms. This poisonous striff passes for valuable experience of India in ignorant quarters in great Britain and a good deal of harm is done. It is true that perversion of truth and vile exaggeration defeat their own purpose of truth and vile exaggeration defeat their own purpose in the end but it is foolish to let this spread without taking any steps to exposit its true nature. India has yet to organise efficiently conducted bureau of political propaganda abroad.

- - - -

35-

2004

-6-

188

OCTOBER, 10, 1925.SOUTH AFRICA DAY.

Arrangements are being made, as will be seen from the notices published elsewhere, to observe the South Africa Day tomorrow in Madras by giving public expression to the deep feelings of indignation which have been aroused in the whole country by the barbarous attempts of the Union Government to render the life of the Indian Community intolerable. We hope that the nation's protest against the inequalities of the whites would be as united and serious as the circumstances required; But the Government have their duty to perform. Such an admittedly "Moderate" newspaper as The Bengalee says in its issue received to day:

What is really needed is firm retaliatory action upon South Africa by the Government of India. India would much rather lose financially or in business by such a step than sit with folded hands, while her sons for no faults of their own are being deprived of their rightful possessions. The Government should not waste anytime in following up the country's wishes. A lesson to South Africa even at India's own expense is better than weak kneed surrender.

We cannot afford at this hour of the day to be squamish or timid.

- - - -

36
47
189.
2006
October.12.1925.

LEADER.

The meetings held all over the country yesterday and the resolution of indignant protest against the proposed anti-Indian legislation in South Africa adopted should serve to open the eyes of the Indian Government and the Imperial Cabinet to the depth and unanimity of feeling on the question among Indians of all parties. The nation has spoken definitely with ^{one} ~~are~~ voice and the Government will be guilty of gross irresponsibility and breach of trust, if they fail to take the necessary steps to bring round the union Government or if they enter into any unholy compromise with the latter in a matter which admits of no compromise. Mahatma Gandhi in his message to the nation appearing elsewhere has given it as his experience of the Indian question in South Africa, that it is one of a series of breaches of promises and declarations which have been proved from official ~~Records~~ records. The responsibility for this has as much ~~xxx~~ upon the weak ~~mneed~~ policy of the Indian Government in ~~the~~ past as upon the unscrupulousness and disregard for the pledged word of the ~~Union~~ authorities.

- - - -

37

2008

-8-

190

October.14.1920.Indians in Malaya.

In a communication which we publish elsewhere a Malaya correspondent draws attention to the hopeless inadequacy of medical relief from the point of view of ^a quality as well as that of extent for the Indian labourers in the rubber estates of Malaya. The position judging from his account of the situation seems really deplorable and it is to be hoped that the Government of India would take the earliest opportunity of looking into this question with ^a greater earnestness than they have hitherto shown.

- - -

October.22.1925.INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

The Indian Community in South Africa do not appear to have been much impressed with the efforts that the Government of India have been making on their behalf. Indeed their feeling in regard to our Government would seem to be one of subdued despair if we may judge of that attitude in the light of comments of Indian opinion on the situation. "The ways of the Indian Government" our contemporary says, writing on "the fate of the Indian in the union", "seem to be very ~~mysterious~~ mysterious indeed. In reply to questions put to the *commission with the Indian question in South Africa the government* Government are reported to have said that they were still negotiating with the Union Government for a Round Table Conference." This answer of the Government of India, it is evident has bitterly disappointed South African Indians who surely do not stand to profit in any way by negotiations prolonged till the end of time. "The Indian Government" writes Indian opinion "are in negotiation with the union

Government now for at least a year if not more and not a word is known as to the result of the negotiations. While these negotiations are going on the position of Indians is growing from bad to worse. This fact has been declared over and over again by the Indian Community in South Africa. The much respected president of the South African Indian Congress has also strongly pressed for such a conference and yet the Indian Government who profess to be alive to the grave situation do not know the wishes of Indians in South Africa! Is this not a reply merely to evade the issue we wonder?" The fact is the South African Indians feel that they are a lot "remote, unfriended melancholy", our countrymen abroad realise only helplessness. The Indian Government they know is a subordinate branch of the Imperial Government and they say they would not be surprised if both the Governments could shoulder South African Indians. As for the people of India, "they are already suffering" observes Indian opinion "and our course in this country only adds to their suffering. They can only suffer for us and do no more. Their resolve in consequence is to make one more last appeal and if they fail then to quote Indian opinion again "our last resort is to suffer relying as Mahatma Gandhi says, upon our own strength and capacity for enduring hardships and in the innate justice of our cause". Helpless as we are we can unfortunately only look on in bewilderment and shame at our own impotence not a pleasant prospect to contemplate upon.

November.14.1925.

INDIANS IN NATAL.

The Government of India's communique on the Natal Townships Ordinance is by no means reassuring. The communique points out that two things have now been secured, of course due to the labours of the Government of India. One is that the proposed law is to be held in abeyance till next year obviously too small a mercy to make us go into raptures over it. The second is that the Government have "adequately safeguarded" the rights of these Indians who are at present on the voters' list. The second "concession" can only be considered as an insult to this Country. It is more in the nature of a bribe to the present generation of Natal Indians to betray its prosperity and must as such be rejected with scorn. The Townships ordinance or the Hweleth ordinance is a short piece of legislation. Its object is to enact that "no male person shall be placed on the Town Roll who is not entitled to be placed on the Parliamentary voters" Roll" The Indians in Natal do not enjoy parliamentary franchise and the Hweleth measures thus aims at them exclusively. To allow the present voters to continue to exercise their franchise can be no consolation to Indians. By everything, that is sacred, Indians are entitled to enjoy not only franchise but also as Mahatma Gandhi pointed out in his now famous better to general statements forming part of what is known as the statements Gandhi pact full civic rights. It will be no less than suicidal for the Indian community to accept the proffered concession foreshadowed in the Government of India communique for to accept it is to stray away from the road to full civic freedom and prefer and proceed along the sloping slope towards slavery. If the Indian Community resident in South Africa do not wish their children and children's children to become a community bait which we are afraid the Government will swallow.

November.17.1925. 193INDIANS IN KENYA.

The step motherly treatment accorded to Indians in Kenya is well brought out by the reply given by the acting Governor of the colony to a deputation of Indians that waited on him last month to plead for the grant of better educational facilities for Indian children. His Excellency is reported to have stated that ~~out of~~ of a loan of £125,000 sanctioned for education £80,000 had already been allocated to a European school and £120,00 to the school at Kabete and that the balance available was only £33,000 of which *already earmarked for the Arab school at Mombasa* the £10,000 was *deputation* tried to impress on His Excellency the obvious injustice of giving the lions share to the Europeans who were a minority in the colony and urged the need for granting at least a sum of £30,000 to the education of Indian children who far outnumbered the children of the Whites. This modest request was we are told by The Democrat of Nairobi rejected by the Acting Governor who further threatened them by saying that the Indian community by trying to obtain £30,000 might lose even the £20,000 that had the chance of being allotted to their needs. Comment is needless.

-- --

November.30.1925.

Indians

INDIANS IN EAST AFRICA.

We published on Saturday last a brief cable from our Mambassa correspondent to the effect that a calculated insult was offered to our countrymen in the East African city on the occasion of Queen Alexandra's Memorial service. It is all the more humiliating because Indians were subjected to it after being invited by those responsible for the conduct of the function. The episode is quite significant of the status occupied by our brethren in the colony and the treatment meted out to us in all matters affecting our sense of national self respect.

- - - -

December.8.1925.

TASK BEFORE ^{AW}COONPORE CONGRESS.

We learn from a message published elsewhere that Mr. Benarsidas Chaturvedi has given notice of his intention to move at the Coonpore congress a resolution urging the opening of a foreign department of the Congress to look after the interests of Indians abroad and organise educative propaganda. In view of the steadily growing demand for anxious attention in regard to the life and status of our countrymen overseas there is no doubt that the Congress will be well advised to take steps to systematically deal with the problems arising therefrom. The cause at present suffers not a little for want of timely attention and propaganda both here and abroad. Another resolution that Mr. Chaturvedi wishes to move is for the appointment of a committee to make preliminaries enquiries about the educational condition

42

195

20/8

-13-

of colonial Indians and report on the advisability or otherwise of sending a commission of enquiry to the places where Indians have settled in large numbers. It is to be hoped that the Cownpore Congress will find time to go fully into the question and do something tangible for the safeguarding of the interests of our nationals.

196

December. 9. 1925.THE PRESENT SITUATION.

It was a thought provoking speech which Mr. T.C. Goswami delivered last evening at the Desa Bandhu buildings on the present political situation in India. The first topic of important which he dealt with was the attitude of the Labour party towards this country. That party has always professed sympathy with Indian aspirations and we should be thankful for what it has done for us by ventilating our grievances. That however, we can not afford to rely solely upon is also true and Mr. Goswami's pointed references to recent incidents to show how labour has failed to satisfy Indian public feeling were telling and appropriate. The fact is that MacDonald Cabinets acquiescence in the Bengal ordinance and the reign of terror in that Province its profuse professions regarding Indian liberty. That the Labour Government was impotent to do anything for the advancement of the cause of Indian swaraj cannot possibly increase India's regard for that party for her experience of how pledges are kept has taught her that she should be chary of taking promises at their face value. Mr. Goswami's opinion is that even with regard to the commonwealth of India Bill. Labour's attitude was playing with it and it was being used as a pretext for delaying a settlement whatever that may be. Labour has only to go by the resolution of the Assembly and it can yet serve India by adhering to the Liverpool resolution and making Indian Swaraj a plank in its platform. It is rather doubtful whether this will be done, as no party in England, cares to risk its position with the electorate by placing Indian affairs in the forefront of its politics.

British Labour have achieved our objects

Labour's attitude was unsatisfactory, it was playing with it

64

197.

2022

Mr. Goswami points out that Labour is accusing the classes in India of being indifferent to the masses. That only shows we have a good reason to question its knowledge of Indian conditions, if not to suspect its bonafides. As the lecturer said the Government in India has woefully neglected its duty by the masses, high taxation, rack renting and the snails pace in education do not exactly show off their anxiety for the uplift of the poor. Mr. Goswami gave a telling instance of this indifference to their welfare. The late Desabhandu promised the Government that he would call off opposition if they provided the necessary expenditure, capital as well as recurring for the promotion of rural education and sanitation.

(continued on next page)

This offer is still being considered; why? It is because the authorities suspect that the development and awakening of the village would affect the position and reduce the power of the bureaucracy an identical motive which has prevented the Government an identical motive which has prevented the Government from restoring village autonomy has influenced the Madras Board of Revenue in its stout opposition to the revival of village panchayats. We do not desire to minimise the tremendous work which lies ahead in regard to the uplifts of the submerged and other classes not to place any obstacles in the way of the inquiry into the conditions of labour in India which the Labour party has directed to be conducted. But it must be remembered that even according to the League of Nations the progress made in India in the matter of giving legislative effect of the recommendations of the International Labour organisation has not been inferior to that made by many European countries. That the British Government is not keen on giving effect to its pledges in regard to self Government is proved by its narrow, unjust and suspicious military policy. In the circumstances Mr. Goswamy's plea for unity, for intrepid resistance to the inroads of the bureaucracy on our rights is one with which it is not possible for even people ordinarily indifferent to politics to disagree. Our salvation lies in presenting a united bold phalanx advance the programme or even modify it if you will but act as one man.

- - -

2026

December. 24. 1925.

INDIANS IN AFRICA.

"Hands off" is the insolent demand made by South Africa to India and this defiant spirit will only be encouraged by the studied coldness of Lord Reaching's reply to the representation petition as the Viceroy chose to call it of the Indian deputation. As a matter of fact, *Indians* in South Africa have been as Mr. Andrews has cabled astounded at the Viceroy's unsatisfactory pronouncement. Now that *General* ~~Statements~~ *Smith* has chosen another cable received to day confirms the report received a few days ago on this subject to withdraw his opposition to the Asiatic Bill its adopting by the Union Parliament is only a matter of time. The theory of Dominion right to complete freedom is nowhere else relied upon more insistently than in the *Union* which with audacious light heartedness, ignores certain well known limitations. "The Times of India" which has even *7* taken a just view of this problem defines their as follows:-

To begin with the Indians in South Africa cannot be regarded as alien interlopers for they went there under pledges and in 1914 had renewal of those pledges which give them good title to the rights of citizenship. Secondly the constitution of the union contains a provision that in case of legislation. "specially or differentially affecting Asiatics" the Governor General may refuse assert or reserve for the signification of the King's pleasure". This Indian problem does not belong only to the internal affairs of the union it overflows and has a profound imperial important which was recognised by the Imperial Government and by the union authorities when both put their signatures to the Union Constitution.

So far as we can see there is no disposition on the part of either the conservative Government now in office or the Hertzog cabinet to recognise the existence of these factors; on the other hand as Dr. Malan told the Indian deputation which waited upon him the observation of Mr. Thomas who was Colonial secretary under the Labour Government that the Indian question was an Imperial ^{one} ~~are~~ which could be decided only the representatives of great Britain, South Africa and India sitting together was resulted and denounced by the whites, what little doubt there was about South Africa's attitude towards the idea of a round table conference has been set at rest by the unequivocal statement of Dr. Malan that his Government had definitely decided not to consent to it. In these circumstances what should the British Government do? Our contemporary observes;

The Government and people of India have therefore a right to demand of the Imperial Government the strongest possible support of their reasonable claims and if in the last resort the union Government remain obdurate and the matter becomes our Imperial scandal, as in that case it would do the Imperial Government will not be able to escape responsibility.

It is scarcely likely that England would realise its responsibility may, interference of any kind will be deemed But of the question. The moment for considering as to what India should do in these circumstances will arrive sooner than the viceroy may think; the only factor which might possibly affect the course of events in South Africa is a courageous gesture on the part of the Government of India. So long as that is not forthcoming it is idle to anticipate any favourable turn of the tide.

January.2.1926.

201.

THE NATIONAL DEMAND.

Lord Sinha has been disowned by his fellow Liberals and Sir Abdur Rahim has been left far behind by his fellow religionists. The one had hugged the preamble to the Act of 1919 to his bosom and expressed his astonishment that his countrymen should dissect and repudiate it. But the Calcutta meeting of the All India Liberal Federation has thrown it on the Scrap heap and very nearly plumped for non-official amendment to the Muddiman resolution. The other had petulantly denied the capacity of Indians to swallow any large scale of self Government but the Muslim League has thrown that capacious doubt overboard and demanded an immediate revision of the constitution. We have been told on high authority that if India presented a scheme which had the support of the majority of the people, His Majesty's Government would take it into their consideration. The Congress, the Liberal Federation, the Muslim League the Indian Christian conference and the Non-Brahmin Congress represent all sections of Indians in the country and even a cantankerous critic cannot deny the claim that if all of them are agreed about the essentials of the national demand the authorities are in honour bound to examine with sympathy the question as to how far it is possible to satisfy Indian public opinion. Liberals have accepted the Assembly's resolution on the reforms and urged the appointment of a commission to report on the definite proposals mentioned in long resolution adopted by the Federation asking in the words of Mr. C.Y. Chintamani, that steps should be taken without delay to put the constitution on a permanent basis with provision for automatic progress in the future.

Mr. Jinnah described in identical terms the motion on the reforms passed by the Muslim League and Sir Ali Iman who moved it warned the authorities against delay which might endanger the position in India "as there was an idea of separation from the British Empire". The Christian conference has asked the Government to appoint a royal commission urging the immediate grant of provincial autonomy and the introduction of responsibility in the central Government the Non-Brahmin congress has similarly demanded the establishment of autonomous provinces, the Viceroy's executive Council being made responsible to the Legislative Assembly in certain matters. It is obvious, from this summary of the proceedings of the various political organisations that the demand of the Assembly has been more or less adopted by all of them. The action of the Congress therefore in considering the resolution of the Assembly as the minimum non-compliance with which by the Government should be followed by sterner action involving heavier sacrifices than before will thus appear to be authorities to withhold the reforms so universally put forward but it may also be said that there is little chance of the Government departing from its ostrich like policy by conceding what is due to the people of India. For it has ever been the policy of great Britain to make no move unless compelled to do so by force of circumstances; The congress shall have to meet the situation, when the Assembly's solution ^{continues} ~~continues~~ to be ignored with such fresh demonstrations and changes in strategy as have been set forth in the resolution at Cawnpore. At that time ~~those~~ ^{these} who are leading the movement are entitled to look for a just measure of sympathy, if not active help from these who chose to stand outside the congress for the reason that

3

7034
203

-21-

they are engaged in a cause which is dear to the whole country, They have also every right to expect that Congressmen would render every assistance possible laying aside small differences. It would be the weight of imprudence and political short sightedness of a culpable kind not to rush to the banner of the congress at a time when the bureaucracy contemptuously disregards the national demand and perseveres in its unrighteous policy of trampling upon the fundamental rights of the people.

- - - - -

2036
204
January.22.1926.INDIA'S DEFENCE.

India's defence, to the Indians is primarily a national problem, while to the Britisher it is essentially an imperial one. This difference in outlook and approach is very well brought out by the paper on the subject read by Mr. Edwin Howard before the Central Asian Society, a summary of which is contained in a Renter's cable published on another page. Both the Indian and the Englishman agree that all is not right with the defence of this country and that the question is vitally related to the issue of Swaraj. But while the one would make it a ground for expediting Indianisation and popular control of the Government the other only exploits it as a convenient pretext for postponing responsible Government strengthening the British elements in the Army and transferring its control to the Imperial Government. The latter is exactly what Mr. Howard wants to do. In the first place he ridicules India's aspirations for freedom as an idle dream so long as the country is not properly defended. The Indian nationalist has answered this taunt a thousand times by reiterating his demand for nationalising the Army and pointing out that it was not his fault if the country's defence was neglected by her ~~if the country's defence was neglected by her~~ present rulers who have trust in everyone but the children of the soil.

As regards the pact proposed by Mr. Howard between Delhi and Whitehall whereby India is to be assured the inviolability of her frontiers by British gums and soldiers paid and kept up by the British tax payer, in return for India's giving preference for British goods, we have only

5

205

2038

-25-

to say that such an agreement will strike at the root both of India's defence and trade. It will be as foolish and suicidal for Indians to rely indefinitely on British bayonets to protect their homes as it will be to give a ~~xxx~~ binding promise of perpetual preference which will fetter the future development of trade in the country. ~~The one will sap the manhood of the country.~~ The one will sap the manhood of the race as the other will ruin its commerce and the cumulative effect of the two will be to perpetuate the subordination, of India.

January 26 1926.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN TANGANYIKA.

Our fears, expressed on previous occasions regarding racial discrimination in Tanganyika are only confirmed by the opinions of the Indian Press in the colony. "The Tanganyika Opinion" of the 6th January utters a timely warning against the promotion of the scheme of European settlement in the territory whereby the highlands are to be alienated only for occupation by the Europeans, while the non-European races are to be confined to the lowlands. The paper rightly points out the evils which have resulted from such racial exclusiveness in other parts of Africa and appeals to the authorities to give up the scheme for the sake of peace, racial harmony and goodwill among the occupants of the mandated territory. It says:

It will be observed that a Europeans settlement has only done more harm in Kenya than good. In Tanganyika its harmfulness will be greater for the very simple reason that it is governed according to the terms of the mandate under which the use of the term "European settlement" would be entirely intolerable. In Kenya it has proved to be undesirable economically and politically and we firmly believe that these who are in favour of it are knowingly or unknowingly driving Tanganyika into a position similar to that which Kenya has assumed.

The paper adds that the economic development of the colony stands also to lose by the adoption of the scheme. It is to be hoped that the League of nations will see before it is too late that the views of racialism is not allowed ascendancy in the mandated territories under its charge.

January. 28. 1926.

TREATMENT OF POLITICAL DETENUES.

A considerable portion of the question time in the Assembly yesterday and the day before were taken up with the subject of the treatment in jails of political prisoners particularly the Bengal detenues. The Government spokesmen were neckled by several members and in one instance Sir Alexander Muddiman was made to admit that he as a human being should not like to live under the conditions of life such as ventilation etc allowed to these ~~rolling~~ rolling in the jails. There is no reason why a man merely because he happens to which the displeasure of the authorities should be deprived of the elementary necessities of ordinary human life and be exposed to the suffering and disease arising thereform. There should not be any the least trace of vindictiveness inhumanity or avoidable suffering in the treatment meted out by a civilised Government to political prisoners who have no moral stigma attached to them and are generally educated patriots and sometimes the flower of the nation's youth and manhhod. The answers given in the assembly clearly show how far below the civilised code falls the Government of India's standard of treatment of the politicals. While being treckled by the member yesterday we note Mr. Tamkinson, at one stage even refused to furnish the House with necessary information regarding the Bengal detenures. This provoked the intervention of the Bengal President who rightly observed that the Government should try to meet the wishes of the House ~~af~~ by collecting information wherever it could.

February.8.1926.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN PROBLEM.

6 Important developments are apparently taking place in South Africa one of these presumably is the attitude of colonial born Indians. The Association of the colonial born Indians in South Africa who constitute some 70% of the Indian population has passed a resolution so Renter tells us favouring Col.Creswell's solution of the South African Indian problem as outlined by him in his amendment to the Duncan Bill. Col.Creswell, it may be mentioned is the leader of the South African Labour party and is now a member of the Hertzog Cabinet based as it is on a coalition of labour and the Nationalists. The underlying principle of the Creswell solution was that the Asiatic problem whose whose root evil was the levelling down of the whites' standard of living should be tackled by compulsorily levelling up the standard of living of the Asiatics through the strict enforcement of municipal and health laws. If the South African Government vigorously enforced public health laws, "if they set up a standard of life not only among the Asiatics, but also among Europeans which would be compatible with European standards", if they made "their economic standard compatible with their standard of civilisation" if they had a larger and more prosperous wage earning community in this country" - we quote from a report of col.Creswell's speech on the occasion unfair competition". Col.Creswell's speech on the occasion it may be recalled was not as such speeches usually were, anti-Indian. He expressly wished to avoid giving offence to his Indian fellow subjects for he recognised that "they had a high civilisation when his ancestors were going about stained with the juices of berries". Col.Creswell also

moving his amendment they would be able to restrain Asiatics or Europeans from unfair competition

sympathised with the 17,000 Indians who had then be repatriated and who he understood, "were ^{to} living in great distress". "We had brought these peoples ~~here~~" Col. Creswell said "and we had brought these peoples ~~here~~" Col. Creswell said, and we were responsible for their position. We could not expect to remedy it at the expense of somebody else". It is perhaps these facts that have induced the colonial born Indians' Association to favour the ~~Creswell's~~ solution we should be exceedingly incautions however if in view of this Association's support for Col. Creswell, we accepted his solution without ^{very} careful examination. In the first place the proposal rests on the basis of our acceptance of certain local and municipal laws. Knowing how iniquitously municipal and health laws are enforced exclusively against the Indians, we cannot accept the solution without proper safeguards say by means of adequate representation of Indians we cannot accept the solution without proper safeguards, say by means of adequate representation of Indians on these bodies. In any case we cannot entertain this proposals without ascertaining South African Indian opinion. It must be mentioned in this connection that the colonial born Indians' Association is a body of recent origin. It has not been functioning well or ~~regularly~~ and both its efficiency and representative character this require to be examined. Nor in discussing an economic sol can ^we afford to forget that South Africa has of late dis too much race prejudice for ^{us} to be readily convinced th she would be satisfied with a purely economic solution. spite of these apprehensions, the mere fact that the ~~Whi~~ prepared to go behind the basic principle of the Asiatic Bill may however be taken to be a happy ^y ~~aff~~ery.

February.23.1926.

INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

While humiliation is the lot of Indians in South Africa we find that the situation in East Africa is steadily deteriorating. The Democrat of Nanobi in its issue of February 6 refers to the studied indifferences to Indian interests characterising the attitude of the Government in Kenya. As an instance it points to the facts that there was no one to whom the Indians could look with confidence in the conference of East African Governors that recently met at the Capital. The object of the Conference was evidently the consolidation of European interests in the colony and it is no wonder therefore that the Asiatic community was consistently ignored in its deliberations. Our contemporary points out that daily bulletions of the conference proceeding were being sent to the European press but none to the Indian section". It is therefore palapable" observes our contemporary "that the Governors of East Africa have made up their minds that Indians in East Africa have no political status of any kind. We are ~~xxxx~~ also told that the treatment meted out to Indian representatives in the Kenya council is cold and offensive being marked by the spirit of hanteur generally to be found in the conduct of antocratic tutors towards their pupils. Yet another instance of the studied insult heaped upon our brethern in the colony is provided by the fact that an entertainment to the Governors by the Associated chambers of commerce was given up because ~~for~~ few Indians were members of that body.

February.24.1926.

INDIANS IN FIJI.

The distressing story of the life of Indian labourers in Fiji emanated in an interview published elsewhere by the Indian emigrants who returned to Madras last evening ought to disillusionise these peoples who are made to believe, by interested persons that Fiji is a veritable El Dorado. The high prices prevailing there the low wages paid to Indian labourers the insanitary surroundings in which they are obliged to live and the want of proper medical relief these grievances convey a harrowing picture of the life of Indian labourers. Lack of facilities for the education of their children the condition under which they have to acquire lands and settle on them and the numerous impediments that stand in the way of their easy return to the mother country would doubtless make the Indian labourers here think twice before they go to Fiji. It is to be hoped that in the light of these facts emigration from India to Fiji will be discouraged.

March 8. 1926.

INDIANS IN EMPIRE.

12 212 2052

Indians are crying hoarse over over their exclusion from the pale of civilised citizenship in the Dominions and Colonies of the British Empire. In answer to this, as it were comes the circular issued by the Secretary of States for Home Affairs in Great Britain proposing to ^{take} ~~take~~ action against some of our countrymen in Scotland under the order governing the registration of ^{alien} ~~above~~ seamen. The Glasgow Indians Unions letter which we publish elsewhere along with the circular, clearly shows how the proposed action is ^a ~~a~~ humiliating culmination of the general policy of systematic exclusion of our nationals from all parts of the Empire. It is ^{to be} ~~were~~ hoped that the question will be raised in the Central Legislature at Delhi as to whether Indians are to be branded as condemned aliens in the very heart of the British Empire itself and denied the elementary rights of citizenship.

March 10. 1926.

INDIANS IN FIJI.

Earl Wintertou's reply to a question in the Commons regarding the education of Indians in Fiji can not be said well satisfactory. The position at present is deplorable so far as ^{fac} ~~fac~~ilities for the education of Indians are concerned. The number of schools in the colony available for Indians is small and of these available most are mission-^{ary} ~~ary~~ managed denominational institutions whose objective is at least as much conversion as that ^{of} ~~in~~ imparting education. It would appear as the Indians who recently arrived in Madras from Fiji told our representative that Indians do not wish to resort to these institutions lest their faith should be undermined. It is obligatory ^{on} ~~ane~~ the colony to appreciate this feeling and provide the necessary educational ^{fac} ~~fac~~ilities for the Community.

213 13 2054 (3)
of which the rest of Indians would be im-^{portant} if has exactly
willing staves. What the authors of the scheme ask us to do
is to sacrifice the right to full citizenship of over 200,000
Indians for the doubtful occasion of South Africa ^{retaining} new gasing
the right to exist of 100,000 souls in conditions over the future
possibilities of which we have absolutely no control. The new
suggestion, first ^{met} herfied it by the Viceroy and new more openly
carvassed by The Times, thus a dangerous death trap from which
we should. Keep our selves as scrupulously aloof as we possibly
can.

March. 24. 1926.

INDIANS IN CEYLON.

A special correspondent of The Englishman at Belhi is
responsible for the statement that the standing Emigration
Committee considered the views of the Ceylon Government on the
question of the mininum standard to age for Indian labourers
in Ceylon estates and that a satisfactory decision will be ar
at which will place the Indians and the estates on a much bet
fooling than at present. We do not know how far the corresp
optimisten is justified but we await with anxious interest
about the reported decision of the standing Committee.

April. 5. 1926.

"TIMES", ON INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

The Times survey of the present position of the
Community in South Africa which we extract elsewhere is
not for the suggestion it puts forward as a solution
problem but for the wish admissions it makes. It sh
first place, that the unprovoked assaults on the right
Indians in that country now grimly indulged in by the
have little or no justification an moral, social or
grounds, it being recognised that the Indian trader
poorer classes of the whites a cheap and hence benefi
ting or retail agency. In the second place it makes

214.

14

2086

(4)

that the question is not merely a Dominion, but is also an imperial problem - a problem, for that very ^{reason} ~~reason~~ in which this Majesty's Government have a grave responsibility to discharge. In the third place the survey brings into prominence ^{more} the fact that the whites ^{persecute} ~~persecute~~ the brown, not so much because they dread their competition - the Indian population is really negligible compared with the whites and non-Indian coloured but because the black may follow the example of the Indians and their woe would be tide the whites. It is this latter vague unreasoning and paralysing apprehension that, in the ^{light} ~~light~~ of The Times articles underlies the present ^{white} ~~white~~ policy towards the Indian Community, also theories they propound are plausible and perhaps true to a large extent. If that is so, what is the ~~to great~~ ^{logical} conclusion that follows? Not certainly that the Indian population should as far as possible be eliminated, beginning with the South African - domiciled Indian as distinguished from South African born Indians. How this distinction is mischievous ^{is} ~~is~~ and unreasonable we have already pointed out. A solution of the problem based on it can be only a delusion to the whites and snare to the Indian Community.

April. 8. 1926.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL PARTY.

It is worthy of note that Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, President of the Congress, takes a rather optimistic view of the political situation, created by the establishment of the Indian National Party. She is surprised that haphazard and heterogeneous, divergent and even antagonistic elements of the liberal forces have been mobilised for common action but she thinks that it is a tribute with the Congress that the essential features of its creed down to resistance to Executive authority have been accepted by the party. It is however extremely doubtful whether this coalition formed for a strategic purpose will last long.

15 2.5 2058

Already a section of the party is nervous at the language used by its organiser and is anxious not to be associated with the condemnation, expressed by him of Swarajists and the Congress. And as Lala Lajpat Rai has pointed out, it would be ^{miracle} ~~maralle~~ of they follow a definite policy in the Legislative Council and work as a team, trained and disciplined to follow a particular line of action. The central fact which comes out of the ^{Controversy} ~~Controversy~~ is that the dividing line ^{keep} ~~leap~~ the National Party and the Congress has now become very thin indeed and that is a feature which right be turned to advantage. Mrs. Naidu says:

The door of the Congress stands wide open for the return of these who have come ^{back} ~~back~~ to its threshold, and it is my earnest endeavour to create an atmosphere and an opportunity for ^{these} ~~these~~ within and those still without the Congress party ^{also} ~~also~~ reach a common understanding and write in a common effort for the liberation of India from the economic, social and political bondage. The ideals of the National Congress are ^{inviolable} ~~inviolable~~ but there is nothing immutable in policies and programmes and it is at this ^{movement} ~~movement~~ only a question of policies and not principles that ^{stands} ~~stands~~ ^{keep} ~~keep~~ them as the dividing line.

In such effort as Mrs. Naidu may make for bringing about United action ^{between} ~~between~~ Swarajists and ^{Responsible} ~~Responsible~~ Co-operationists on the ^{one} ~~one~~ hand and left the Congress and the National Party on the other. She has the support and good ^{wishes} ~~wishes~~ of every thinking Indian. When the battle for freedom has to be carried on there can be no room for two parties in the army which storms the fortress of vested interests in Union ^{above} ~~above~~ his strength.

April 22. 1926.

THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE.

The news given currency to by The Times of India that the Union Government of South Africa have at last agreed to the Government of India's proposals for a round table conference will be welcome in this country, though with one or two reservations. The reservations are easily set forth. In the first place such a conference could be of least ~~will~~ ^{be} benefit to us if it is

216

16

2060

(6)

to consider only isolated measures. The Asiatic Bills as we have shown ^{more} ~~merit~~ ^{one} ~~than~~ ~~are~~, is sent out symptom of a deep seated disease. The Colour Bar Bill, the Public Health Amendment Act, the Liquor Ordinance and so on are some other striking symptoms. To discuss measures like the Asiatic Bill above in these circumstances and secure their dropping is worse than useless, ^{hence} give such a solution is calculated to give a very misleading idea of the Indian view of the problem. If the scope of the conference is not wide enough to embrace every aspect of the Indian problem, it cannot result in a lasting and a satisfactory settlement. Above all if the Union Government has accepted the conference idea on any understanding as to the Government of India's willingness to speed up "Voluntary repatriation", then it may be confidently asserted that a conference on such conditions cannot be acceptable to this country.

May 8. 1926.

INDIANS IN KENYA.

Kenya has begun to give fresh trouble to the Indian community settled in that country. We note from a special cable to The Bombay Chronicle that "in spite of the emphatic decision of the Imperial Government abandoning segregation born the Europeans and Asiatics, the Kenya Government proposes the action of 21 residential plots in July next when Europeans only will be allowed to bid". It need hardly be said that this proposal is in glaring contravention of the non-segregation policy to which the Government are committed. Non-segregation, it may be recalled, was about the only point on which the white Paper of July 1923 made a concession to India. It is obvious that by seeking to ^{and} ~~action~~ favoured plots solely among Europeans what the Government want is to build up a European ^{and} ~~enclose~~ into which Indians might not ~~cirtude~~ ^{enter}. This way of getting round the policy solemnly laid down in the white paper may be ~~see~~ clear but it is clearly dishonest as well. To introduce

217.

17

2062

(7)

Segregation by the back door is as effective a blow against Indians as introducing ^{it} openly. We shall be surprised indeed if the Government of India acquire in ~~this~~ fresh onslaught an Indian rights. The Paddison Depantation, the Chronicle cable says, is on its way to Kenya. We hope it will valce note of the recent development and white up the Government of India into ^{it} taking prompt and effective action.

May 10. 1926.

INDIA'S PROPAGANDA ABROAD.

Dr. J.T. Sunderland of America has in his import and letter published elsewhere, urges the need for foreign propaganda regarding Indian affairs. The references in ~~in~~ December ^{it} ~~Veterances~~ he draws attention to, are an indication that the self imposed silence which the congress has been practising in recent ~~year~~ years on the subject is now considered a mistaken policy. The ~~Cownpose~~ Congress passed a resolution to revive publicity work. We hope that the early steps will be taken to organise a bureau for the purpose. The matter is of ~~same~~ urgency. Our audience is no longer Britain ~~above~~ as the Congress supposed at our time but is practically the entire world. To some extent, our own action but to a greater extent, the quick^{er} ~~cerning~~ of ^{world} ~~of~~ would intercome have ^{was} ~~awakened~~ the interest of many ^{interests} ~~countries~~ in India and they at present have to be satisfied with the news supplied indifferently by news agents, tourists and dilet ~~tantes~~ who have neither the knowledge nor the good will to supply true facts about India. Great Britain is already exploiting this increased interest to publish its versian of affairs. Indian, in other countries besides England, a recognitions of the value of publicity work and of the fact ~~that~~ Britain is sensitive to ~~world~~ ^{world} opinion. It would be ~~suicidal~~ ^{self-} suicidal for India not to counteract this objectionable propaganda at ~~a~~ at a time when foreign countries are in a mood to receive

218 18 2064

information about India. It is permissible to hope that Anglo-saxandom will ~~not~~ be the final arbiter, of India's destiny and ways may be open to us either officially through the League of Nations or unofficially through ^{the} international gatherings to bring to right some of the standing grievances of India and the larger question of her political gratus Propaganda need not mean advertisement of greivances in a ~~spirit~~ spirit of ill-will. It can be a netmal activity amounting to a well-conducted educative campaign in the international sphere personal propaganda has brought its triumphs as has been well demonstrated by the recent visit of Mr. C.F. Andres^N to South Africa and by the results of some deputations to England and elsewhere. Much more may be achieved by steady and patient work by a permanent organisation. It must be remembered that the understanding can count on no resources but these of the Indian ~~National Congress~~ ^{and} Acts its friends. India must have her own agency and methods to publish her case to the world.

May 19--1926.

INDIANS IN KENYA.

We referred last week to the news that the Kenya Government was contemplating to auction plots of ground to Europeans only. Another message published elsewhere to-day informs us of another proposal with a family weakness to the previous one. Round about the Members light house, plots of land will be offered for sale without restriction as regards caste, creed or colour. Indians ~~not reside in~~ might purchase plots and build houses thereon, but shared not reside in there. The proposal emanates from a Government committee and is, we fear, another sign that the policy of segregation has been blessed in ~~high~~ high quarters in spite of the white paper of 1923. If Kenya Europeans believe that Indians are weary of light, they are mistaken, for it is a matter of life and death to us and there can be no relaxation in resisting encroachment upon our rights. But a greater responsibility lies upon the ~~rights~~ British Government who decided the Kenya question, it ~~can~~ said, on the basis of pledges given to the colonists.

219. 19 2066

(9)

That loyalty to pledged word well, we hope, be proved also in regard to the promise of 1923 to do away with Segregation.

May 20 .1926.

LEADER.

In the course of a lecture delivered at Delhi on his way to Simla, Mr. C.F. Andrews stated that anti-Indian prejudice was so strong when he landed in South Africa that a section of the European Community clamoured for his deportation. That demand was met, however complied with, thanks to the good sense of the authorities and it did not raise much time for Mr. Andrews to enable the diehards to learn what he was for there can be no doubt about the tremendous effect produced by his interpretation of the mind and spirit of the East Kenya want an to add:

General telertzog of at last began to give way to his pleadings but unfortunately at that moment arrived a few Europeans from India and urges the South Africa good to proceed with the Measure, saying that the Indian outburst was mere agitation and that the people in the South did not care a jot for the Bill. General Hertzog and Dr. Malan were perturbed at this. "Whom shall I trust" asked General Hertzog. Mr. Andrews satisfied him that the Europeans from India did not know the real state of feeling in India and General Hertzog promised to do his best.

It will be interesting to know who these sementaus were who noted to the help of General Hertzog by ridiculoung Indian agitation. It would appear that they specially referred to the South of India, meaning the Madras Presidency, where the people "did not care a jot for the Bill". Do these Europeans belong to South Africa, we wonder, who returned after a tour in India? wherever they may be, they are guilty of deliberate misrepresentation. Madras responded readily to the call for help made by the South African deputation and there were strong protests from all parts of the Presidency against the humiliation and ill-treatment meted out to Indians in South Africa, many of whom were the descendants of people who had migrated from the South. The European mischief maker ought to be exposed, who ever they may be and we hope

220 20 2068
Mr. Andrews will throw more light on this episode.

June 16. 1926.

LEADER.

Earl Winterton was called upon to answer in the commons a number of questions an Indian affairs relating to the personal, ^{Constitutional} ~~causal~~ and other rights of the subject in India. That the answers ~~he~~ gave were not satisfactory goes ofcourse without saying. We publish them elsewhere. They serve to show that the Government have not even the shadow of a justification for the high-handed manner in which they have dealt with the liberty of the subject. Take, for instance, Earl Winterton's attitude in regard to the detention of Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose without trial. By his successful libel actions against certain newspaperers. Mr. Bose indirectly though it be, has cleared himself of the absurd charge levelled against him, namely that he was a revolutionary. Earl Winterton's attention was drawn to this fact and he was asked to explain why in the face of the High Courts findings in his favour, the Government continued to detain him. The only reply that Earl Winterton was able to give to this question was till ^{like} the wolf in Aesop's fable, to shift the charge against Mr. Bose and say that if he was not guilty of the charge which the papers laid against him, he was guilty of other charges! Earl Winterton went on to add that not only the Bengal Government but also the Government of India and ^{Secretary of State} ~~sofs~~, Lord Birkenhead himself had been convinced that Mr. Bose was guilty of the offences the Government charged him with. What matters it, then if the High Court had held the ^{cool} ~~Entrary~~ view? Ordinary people may be surprised at the audacious leotness with which the answer is made, but what is the remedy? Here in India a citizen may be ^{arrested} ~~arrested~~ and detained in jail for an indefinite period without any sat of judicial trial whatsoever at the sweet will and pleasure of the Executive. The citizen may only

221

21

2070

(11.)

enter ^{futile} protests and look helplessly on at the injustice. Nevertheless the ^{cracy} bureaucracy boasts that it has bestowed on the people of India the incalculable blessings of the rule of law. A few members of parliament know the seriousness of this abuse of power but they are powerless to effect any reform. At best they may draw attention to the exact state of things here by means of questions in ^{Parliament} ~~Parl~~ and this is what they are doing. The Labour Members' questions on Monday embraced not only facts relating to the detention of Mr. Bose but also the ^{constitutional} rights of the people such as the right to vote for and seats on the legislature and the right to hold offices under the crown on a basis of equality with His Majesty's subjects of European parentage. Earl Winterton's answers to these questions ^{it} will be found were no more satisfactory than those he gave in regard to the detention of Mr. S.C. Bose. He said the Government had chosen to fix certain proportions of European officers to Indian in the services which which proportions they were endeavouring to attain! On this ground it is noteworthy that the Government have placed a ban on Indians competing for certain services in London. The London door in regard to these services is closed to them which is a very serious thing and against which we daresay the Legislature here will protest when occasion offers.

July 14 .1926.

"RETURNED EMIGRANT."

That the lot of Indians who have returned from Fiji is very distressing is a fact to which we have had occasion to draw attention frequently in these columns. The Imperial citizenship Association in a communication to the Government of India which is summarised in our telegraphic Columns to-day urges that the Government should stop in and do something to afford relief to "the returned

emigrants." It is as the Association points out, the duty of the colonies which profited by their labour to support these unfortunate Indians, now stranded in the country, till they are able to resettle themselves in their districts and are absorbed into the population. The problem of the returned emigrant". Shows by the way how foolish it is for the Indian communities settled abroad to agree easily to repatriation or for the Government thoughtlessly to acquiesce in it without guarantee for its success.

July 15. 1926.

INDIANS IN CEYLON.

A correspondent, writing to The Morning Leader of Columbo brings to notice ^{one note} our mail hardship of the Indian labourers seeking repatriation from Ceylon. They have to proceed to Kandy to secure free railway warrants through the Indian Agent for their journey to India. This would seem to necessitate a stay of 5 or 6 days for the labourers at Kandy until the Indian Agent, completes his negotiations with the different authorities. In the case of the sick this stay becomes a special hardship ^{driving} driving them to beggary or some other means of earning their food. The matter has become serious enough to attract the attention of the local social service League. It ought certainly to be possible for the Indian Agent ^{will} to devise means of sending the labourers without delay. The Government of India should enquire into the matter and remedy the evil at an early day.

August 2. 1926.

INDIAN NATIONAL UNION.

The extent to which the ^{is} existing communal tension is exercising the minds of our foremost leaders can be gauged by the trip circular ^{important} letter sent out by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and Pandit Motilal Nehru published elsewhere and the

223 23 2074

influential support which the proposal put forward there has already had. It is suggested that a non-political, non-communal organisation called the Indian National Union should be started consisting of those that do not belong to ~~any~~ communal party and believe that communal ~~sheme~~ ^{between} is the negation of nationalism. Its object would be to prevent communal conflicts and bring about a through understanding both the different communities on a permanent basis. The principles in fact which the Union will be guided by ^{at} ~~our~~ precisely these which the Unity conference at Delhi had laid down, matters in dispute being decided by mutual agreement or by reference to arbitration on the basis of strict legal rights. The Union will try to give effect to the decisions of that conference and its Utility will ~~at~~ depend on the success it achieves in carrying ^{have} ~~to me~~ to the ignorant followers of the Hindu and Mahomedan Communities the importance, to the future of the country, of practising toleration and forbearance.

August 3. 1926.

"ACCEPT OUR VIEW OR YOU ARE LOST".

"Accept our view or you are ~~lost~~" appears to be the very defenite attitude adopted by the bureaucracy in India in regard to ~~measures~~ ^{nitally} affections the people. Irrigation and land revenue are subjects up-on which the Government seem to be into ^{no} mood to concilliate the ryots and they are determined to resist the attempts made to cloth the legislatures with real power in regard to these matters. The ^{late} ~~gate~~ of the Irrigation Bill in Madras is hanging in the balance and thanks to the want of discretion, if nothing more, of the local ^{Government} and the reactioning ^{any} views of the Government of India, it is not ~~likely~~ likely to be thoutht of for some time. The Tenancy Bill is running the risk of being throttled, a broad hint of the Law Member having prepared the public for it. The fact is that the Government feel that they can afford to ignore the wishes of the public. In the United Provinces Legislature

Council where the land revenue settlement bill is under discussion, Mr. O' DONNELL is reputed to have stated in clear and specific terms that the Government were in no mood to yield to non-official ^{pressure} ~~measure~~ on any of the vital issues. This had the immediate effect of frightening the landholders who from that moment have concerned to be discreet in thier opposition dropping all amendments to ~~the~~ which the Government would be opposed because they want the measure. Between the obscurity of the bureaucracy and the slavish mentality of landholders, the primary rights of the people are indanger of being ignored. Unless therefore the electorate choose courageous representatives who would stand by them all all costs, the legislatures would continue to be exploited by vested interests for their own lands.

Agust
August 4. 1926.

"RACIAL PARTIALITY IN THE INDIAN ARMY".

In the course of an interesting article on "Racial Partiality~~ing~~ in the Indian Army," published in the current number of The Modern Review Dr. J.N. GUPTA mentions some instance "to show that the Britishers are not only guilty of racial partiality but that they are wanting in kindness too in regard to Indian sepoys". It is stated that while British Soldiers were given "all earthly comforts" the Indian Soldiers were "handled together " in a few camps with much less comforts and much less staff to look after them, when they came back maimed and mutilated from the ^{front} ~~grants~~. Besides a higher rate of salary for the British than for the Indian soldiers, there is said to be a "Extremadous difference", in regard to the cost of clothing. Dr. Gupta observes;

All articles of luxury and comfort that one can conceive of ^{all} ~~our~~ freely supplied by the Government to the British soldiers namely at the cost of Poor Indian payers. An uneducated British rustie is supplied with a dress that costs 22 whereas Indian B.A's and M.A's who join

225 25 2678 (15)

that costs ^{1/2} 24 whereas Indian B.A.s and M.A.s who join the Indian Territorial Force and the Indian sepays of the Regular Forces are to get Rs.15 as Salary and Rs.20 for mufti clothing.

Why in the name of fairness we ask, showed there be such a wide ~~for~~ difference in the treatment noted out to the two classes of soldiers when the British statesmen are incessantly proclaiming their policy of treating all His Majesty's subjects, white and tanned as equals in every respect? Such unjustifiable and ~~granting~~ instances of partial treatment tend to obscure the value of Royal proclamations where Indian subjects are promised to be given equal treatment irrespective of colour caste or creed and create want of confidence among Indians in the sincerity of promises of British statesmen.

August 17. 1926.

BRITISH PUBLIC OPINION ABOUT INDIA.

Asked as to the state of British Public opinion about India, Lala Lajapat Rai told a press representative that while two years back feelings were entirely different he found now that no interest was taken in India and that there was supreme satisfaction at the things ask they have developed. The lost Dominion has been recovered and ~~our~~ ^{our} community is war~~ing~~ ^{ing} with another; what could be more comforting ~~is we~~ to the British die hard than this situation? The ~~pity~~ ^{it} of it is that knowing that much ground has been lost and that ~~dismity~~ ^{dis} means disruption, the leaders concerned are not yet ~~taking~~ ^{take} steps to close the breach and march awards to victory. It is ~~close~~ ^{close} the ~~breach-and~~ only when such national misfortunes mostly self inflicted, beset us that ~~that~~ the truth of the saying that nations by themselves are made is borne in upon us.

August 27. 1926.

(16)

INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

The lot of Indians in South Africa appears to be getting more and more miserable. The Maritzburg correspondent of The Natal Advertiser furnishes the information that 45 Indian labourers in the employ of the Railway, have left Maritzburg and their ~~and~~ places will be filled as far as possible with European youths. It appears from the report published in The Indian opinion dated 30th July last that during the past year, the policy of substituting ^{white} which youths for Indians has proceeded steadily with the result that only 25% of Indians ~~are~~ are left behind at Maritzburg. The ultimate object of transferring to Durban those Indians, who have not resigned and "concentrating at Durban Indian employees in Railway service" appears to be to give wide scope for the unemployed white youths to give obtain livelihood in other places. Such segregation is sure to work great hardship to Indians who are forced to leave places, where they had long settled and established business relationship. Again it is ^{repeated} that similar steps are ~~being~~ being taken with regard to Indians, working in the Railway dept at Lady Smith. The policy of "making room for white ^{workers} winners" and segregating Indians at Durban would, it is apprehended, eventually result in the Indians being obliged to ^{take} take advantage of the Government's repatriation scheme will the forth coming conference be able to put an end to this sort of most cruel persecution?

September 30. 1926.

LEADER.

The Government of India have now published for the information of the public an account of their negotiations with the Government of Ceylon regarding the conditions under which they would permit emigration to that colony. (of these conditions the prescription of a standard wage is apparently deemed by them to be the most ^{important} trip. A Simla telegram, which they have ^{based} leased the standard wage. We are not satisfied that they are comprehensive enough.

227 27 2082

We are not satisfied that they are comprehensive enough. It does not seem to be recognised by them that there is an important distinction between service at home and service abroad. A labourer working in his own country, although his wages may be comparatively less than those of another working abroad is in a peculiar sense a residuary legatee of the product of the industry in the country as a whole in which he or his children ought ~~directly~~ ^{directly} or indirectly hope to share. But that is not the case with our working in a foreign country without any rights of citizenship therein. There are other points too to be considered in connection with this question. Already as may have been gathered from what we published yesterday, the Ceylon planters are inclined to reside from their original agreement regarding allowance for non-working children. They have now passed a resolution claiming the option to give a free meal to non-working children of the labourer instead of the rice allowance which they had earlier undertaken to grant to the male worker. We do not wish to question their bonafides but their claim that they do this in the interests of the children of the labourers is based on a theory which on the face of it is unnatural. Moreover do they not know that many an Indian mother would rather starve herself to feed her child than take it daily to a free common kitchen. It must offend anybody's self-respect to accept such dolas. That is not receiving wages but alms and it is wages the Indian labourer in Ceylon is entitled to.

October 14. 1926.

LEADER.

The difficulties of persons returning from South Africa to the Madras Presidency under the "voluntary repatriation scheme" appear to be considerably greater than that they may seem to be to casual observers. The labour commissioner mentions in his report for 1925-26 to which we referred

226 28 2084
 yesterday, that 313 persons returned from South Africa during that year in 5 batches. The repatriates represented that the increasing difficulty in the matter of finding work was the main reason for their return to India. The ^{starve} ~~starve~~ of "voluntary" repatriation is exposed by the sad tale that Indians were being displaced "On shallow pretexts" by higher paid Europeans and even natives thus giving them no option but to return home with a feeling of disappointment ^a and despair. The Medical Inspector found that an hundred persons out of the total number were decrepits, of whom 16 were helpless destitutes. What compensation could these miserable people find in their Mother Country after they had spent the best portion of their life and energy in improving the conditions of a country from which they are driven out by force of unexpected circumstances, ^{under} ~~under~~ some substantial provision is made to enable them to spend the rest of their term free from the dread of starvation? Each repatriate, it is stated, is paid on arrival, a bonus of £10, subject to maximum of £50 for a family, in addition to the railway fares, but surely this ^{mockery} ~~no clear~~ of compensation is insultingly trifling. The hardships the repatriates are subject to, ^{lack} ~~on~~ their journeys owing to difficult accomodation in ships, ^{lack} ~~lack~~ of facilities for medical relief and scanty rations are serious. Ought such callousness be the reward for years of ^{exhausting} ~~exhausting~~ and devoted service?

229. 29 2086
November 1. 1926.

UNJUSTIFIED OPTIMISM.

It is a distressing fact that some of our public workers able, shrewd and experienced should after all that has happened, expect the British Government to do justice to India of their own accord. India has been often humiliated and betrayed and solemn promises made to the ear have been broken to the heart. That the people of India should, in spite of repeated disappointment, still be asked to have faith in pledges made to them by the authorities shows that those who give this advice have a benfiding nature who give optimism is entirely unwarranted. Sir Purushottamdas Thakendas, in the course of an interview, a report of which appears in our telegraphic columns stated.

The very fact that every ~~owing~~ of political parties in India is seeking to enter the legislatures both provincial and central is a satisfactory answer to Lord Birkenhead - an answer which I believe should meet with his our approval even. Ofcourse, if he tries our pailiences much too long and it is getting late already, it will be difficult to suppress genuene feelings of the Indian public against the present correspondent and some of the Magrant activities of the Government. There is necessity for earnest ~~will~~ and cooperation on both sides. Lord Birkenhead will recognse that it can not be all "give" on the part of India and all "take" on the part of the Government.

We would ask what greater ~~offer~~ effrontery is needed to move liberals and Independents than the speech of Lord Birkenhead at the meeting of Indian students' Hostel in London, an account of which appears elsewhere. In our place he states that India had been given not "an inconsiderable degree of democretic influence, and gespossibility," but lest he should be exposed by a reference to the actual scope of the Reforms, he corrects

himself by saying that India was in a state of "embryonic development", which correctly interprets the advance made by the constitution. It is ~~weth~~ worthy of note, as indicating the ~~anxiety~~ of the British Government to secure the good opinion of the nations of the world as regards the manner in which India is governed; that Lord Birkenhead refers to the need for convincing the world about the political progress made in India. That the British Government do not mean business is, of course, evident and it is further supported by Lord Birkenhead's statement that in a period "not too remote" they would implement the letter and **spirit** of their promises if only these returned in the coming general elections co-operated in working the reforms for what they were worth and that the secretary of state had not consulted the cabinet about the demand for accelerating the pace of the ~~Re~~forms. It is obvious from this contemptuous attitude towards the national demand that the Government feel that they can ignore it altogether. And yet Sir Purshottamdas thinks that our patience has not been tried for too long!

November 20. 1926.

THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE.

So drearily monotonous has been the tale of woe that has come to us from our brethren in South Africa during the past many years that even the slightest indications of a change for the better are enough to induce a considerable flutter of the heart. Hence we confess to feeling an amount of pleasure at the sympathetic ~~having~~ given to Mr. C.F. Andrews by the South African Labour Party which may not, after all be justified by the course of future events. At any rate the fact that the white Africa Policy does not require the eviction of Indians by fair means or foul and that Indians themselves may, with a little practical help and good will from the whites, become not merely harmless but

positively useful, even honourable members of South African Society indicates that the Round Table Conference will start in a fairly propitious atmosphere, though opposition such as Mr. Marwick's, which draws its sustenance from race prejudice will not be absent. Economic arguments which are not merely capricious and a cloak for race prejudice, deserve our earnest attention and if an arrangement can be devised, as the Labour Party seem to think it can, to prevent underselling or sweated labour by the institution of parallel trade unions, which ~~would~~ ^{would} not work as an excessive hardship to Indians, there is no reason why such an arrangement should not be fully explored by the conference. The great thing is for South Africans to recognise that they have a duty to the Indians settled in their midst. Mr. Knight one of the Councillors of the Durban Corporation has done a priceless service to both the races by telling the corporation straightly according to a special cable we publish elsewhere, that the indifference and neglect of the Council in the matter of housing Indians was in the Main responsible for the recent outbreak of plague and vigorously protesting against the uncharitable view that Indians should be compelled to repatriate themselves by wretched housing and niggardly pay. Such plain speaking must do a world of good.

November 22. 1926.

POLITICS.

Politics would be a lifeless business if the unexpected did not sometimes happen. Even The Pioneer is occasionally on the side of the angels. We deal in another place with its tentative approval of the Swarajist's ^uthumping victory over communalism in this province. We wish to draw attention here to the persevering ^{ve}ingenuity with which like some good churchmen, it is ever on the look out to improve the occasion and draw therefore some edifying moral lesson. Our contemporary argues that the

232 32 2092

rejection of communalism logically implies that the demand for Indianisation is short sighted and injurious to India's interests and it expresses the hope that Indian politicians will soon come to recognise the truth of this brilliant discovery. To state its contention in its own words: "The spirit of communalism which demands the exaltation of the privileges of a certain community or the restriction of the rights of another is reflected in the uncompromising advocacy of Indianisation by striding up hostility to the British element in public services". But the Pioneer forgets that Indianisation far from being a question of getting some more jobs for Indians by the exclusion of Englishmen is vitally bound up with the preparation of the country for self Government. Hence it is that few Indians endorse the proposition which it holds axiomatic, that the continuance of the British element "is ~~likely~~ likely to be necessary and in justice to India, desirable for sometime to come," So long as the British element is maintained in fact, so long will there be specious arguments forth-coming for postponing India's emancipation. The demand for Indianisation is not prompted by communalism, it is the ^{innate} impulse to assertion of the elementary right of every free nation to have the conduct of its affairs entirely in the hands of its own sons.

December 11. 1926.

WORK AND WAGES IN FIJI.

We wish to draw attention to a communication which we publish elsewhere, regarding the grievances of the Indian community in Fiji. Indians ^{and} in the colony do not get a fair wage and they are obliged thanks to the ^{machinations} of a powerful ~~maep~~ monopolist organisation, either to go without any work or to work on wages which are absurdly low. Their position has become it appears exceedingly bad after the collapse of the strike of 1921. That strike

it may be recalled was broken by methods which were,
 to say the least questionable. Political colour was lent
 to what was clearly an economic dispute, the support of
 the colonial Government authorities were enlisted on the
 side of the sugar planters, the leaders of the broken.
 Indian community were deported, the organisation of
 Indians broken. This free use of both the political and
 the economic weapons had its effect. The community
 was humbled and crushed and it bowed its head to superior
 force which it could not with stand. It felt however
 that time would cure acerbities and that as months
 passed by its exiles to better treatment would be
 recognised. There are Indian planters, labourers who
 do a little cultivation or their over account who are
 ready to accept the 5th rate. It would seem that among
 the European planters themselves there are men who would
 gladly pay that rate to their Indian labourers. But
 the monopolist company would have to find a market of their
 own for their cane, and that the company would not purchase
 from them. Now such a threat proved effective. No wonder,
 for the company enjoys a monopoly and is so powerfully
 organised that no rival could stand its competition. There
 is this added circumstance that it has the support of
 the Government. Such at any rate, are the views which the
 Indian community in the colony holds. There is no doubt
 that the cost of living in the colony stands at a very high
 figure. The wages at present obtaining bear no relation
 to the cost of living. These are plain facts. Should
 not the colonial Government do something to right the
 injustice to which the Indians are subjected? It behoves
 the India Government to interfere to bring the matter to the notice of
 British Government without any delay.

would not let them do so. It issued a warning that
 such of the producers of cane as dared to fix a
 wages rate larger than that of the company

234 34 2096
December 27, 1925.

THE CONGRESS.

The Indian National Congress met yesterday at ^{GAUHATI} Gaurhati at one of its most important sessions to deliberate upon the work which should be accomplished in the coming year, to reply to the challenge of Lord Birkenhead. Mr. S. Sriniv Iyengar in his presidential address sets out lucidly the history of the struggle for freedom during the past 12 months. It is a convincing vindication of the policy which the congress has been pursuing. Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar shows ^{why have the centre of gravity both in the Central Government and in the provinces, alike in transferred and reserved departments when analysed closely is both in fact a} by a detailed examination of the ~~east~~ ^{central} Government and in the provinces, alike in transferred and reserved departments when analysed closely is both in fact a ^{the executive government in other words in the} ~~bureaucracy~~ ^{bureaucracy}. There is no escaping the conclusion Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar comes to, that "it would be a if we still sought to discover, in all this statutory hypocrisy the germs of self Government". Indeed what troubles the responsible citizen is the fact that he is unable to believe in the bonafides of the ^{bureaucracy} ~~bureaucracy~~. It has been demonstrated that the Reforms Act is a horrid mockery. The country has expressed its willingness to consider in an earnest and reasonable spirit the difficulties the authorities feel in acceding to our request and co-operate with them in ^{something other} ~~something~~ their path if only they made a gesture of genuine goodwill and friendship. But the power swelled ^{the} ~~bureaucracy~~ ^{bureaucracy} has contumaciously chosen to reject all these offers with scorn. What we ask is the duty of self respecting citizen in those circumstances. Whatever it is, it is not that of co-operating with the bureaucracy in a manner calculated to perpetuate our humiliation. Having learnt the lesson that there is no use in relying on the bureaucracy or on the British parliament for our salvation, we have no alternative other than that of relying on ourselves. Hence "the twin principles"

on which the Congress programme is based--"the principles of self reliance in all nation building work and of resistance to every antinational activity" which Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar pointed out,"must inspire all an efforts". His exposition of these principled of the Congress programme was able and penetrating. The Swarajists stand for council entry because it enables them to resist anti-national activity, they refuse to accept office because in their view, "by accepting office the Congress is bound to become an unconscious ally of the bureaucracy". The Responsivists would be hard put to it indeed to attack this line of reasoning. Be that as it may, one thing is clear: our salvation lies on ourselves alone. If as Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar says, we learn "to act as a single organisation, sanctions for the enforcement of national rights and demands will, of themselves, spring into existence." Hence the need for organised activity in every village and town in the country under the auspices of the congress. These organisations under proper leadership ought to be able to tackle local problems, help the legislators in formulating their programme in the councils and generally to revivify villages. In this work of rural reconstruction and national uplift under the auspices of the congress, all parties are interested and all parties might share without sacrificing one's convictions. It is to be hoped that those who at present stand out of the congress will realise their duty by the country and hearken to the fervent appeal for unity made in the address which is that of a great patriot and clear visioired statesman.

Handwritten: 11/10/1927

1st January 1927.

Handwritten: 236
2100

LEADER.

The proceedings of the Tabligh Conference at Delhi, a report of which appears where will be read with regret by all those who stand for Hindu-Muslim amity. The Conference consisting of some 1500 men solemnly resolved on making their purchases from Muslims only and on each member present securing at least 3 converts within 10 years. To seek to extend the benefits of one's religion to others by carrying conviction to the members of other religions is not to do anything wrong. In the case of the Delhi meeting, however, not only the method but the very objective is gravely wrong. The conversions are to be made to the end "to increase Muslim numerical strength" so that "when Swaraj was given to Indians, Muslims would be the virtual rulers". The conversions, moreover, are to be brought about by such methods as the economic coercion of the Hindus by denying the Hindu traders the custom of their Muslim Brethren. This policy has not ~~been~~ even the virtue of effectiveness; for the weapon suggested is like the boomerang calculated to harm its user as much as those against whom it is used. We hope responsible Muslim leaders will lose no time in dissociating themselves from a policy at once so dangerous and so fatuous as that adopted by the Delhi Tabligh Conference.

4th January 1927.

LEADER.

The position is that in India in most vital matters the decision of the Governors and of the G.G., that of the bureaucracy in practice, is made final under the Govt of India Act. No matter how stupid or outrageous the interpretation put upon the statute by these officials, no matter how vital its bearing

on the rights and liberties of the subject, their decisions are unappealable and should be submitted to. It is notorious that the other evil that the Law Chief Justice (of England) complains against, namely, legislation by executive rules, is rampant in this country. There are few constitutional rights enjoyed by Indians which the executive cannot trample down upon by the exercise of the rule-making power rested in the executive. So all-comprehensive is that power, both in quality and extent, that the Montagu Act has been progressively emasculated by the reactionary use of the rule-making power. As a matter of fact, by recourse to reprehensible methods of legislative procedure against which Lord Hewart warns Britain, whatever little powers the legislatures in India had are being curtailed. The Judiciary's powers are also being similarly encroached upon wherever the ^{executive} ~~beaurocracy~~ ^{beaurocracy} finds it impossible to do so. Is it any wonder that the country is up against the so-called reforms?

10th January, 1927.

LEADER.

It would appear that the Government of India desires that the Catholics of Madras should be represented in the Legislative Assembly and that for this purpose the name of a defeated candidate in the recent general elections is being considered for nomination. If this is so, we have no hesitation in saying that such a step would amount to a gross insult to the electorate and a violent departure from the sound conventions of the constitution. It would be an improper use of the power of nomination to allow a man to enter the Legislature

238

2104

--3--

by the backdoor when his constituency has refused him entrance by the front door. If a Madras Catholic is so poor the community is certainly not so poor in leaders that a representative other than the particular gentleman in question cannot be chosen. We had hoped that after the public condemnation with which a similar act perpetrated by the late Ministry was received, no fresh venture in that line was likely. We only hope that better counsels would prevail and that the blunder would be avoided.

21st January, 1927.

LEADER.

The public will come with satisfaction the news that the Legislative Assembly has carried by 64 against 46 the adjournment motion of Pandit Motilal Nehru ^{seconding} the granting of facilities to Mr. S.C. Mitra, an internee, who has been elected to the House, to attend the Assembly. The opposition by Government to this demand for elementary justice to an elected member of the central Legislature does not indicate any change of heart on the part of the authorities. We hope the Non-Official members will follow up their 1st step by similarly acting together on other questions.

22nd January, 1927.

LEADER.A TRIPLE WRONG.

The Legislative Assembly is to be congratulated on inaugurating an eventful era with the commencement of its renewed life, by vindicating in a striking manner its

self-respect, the privileges of its members and the inalienable rights of the electorate. The debate on Pandit Motilal's motion of censure was specially memorable because it was one of those rare occasions on which the veil of make-believe, lip sympathy and surface cordiality is lifted for a moment and the onlooker is vouchsafed a flimse of "nature red in tooth and claw" of the true motives that lurk behind smiling diplomacy. Even Sir Alexander Muddiman's sary-froid deserted him, and he had to blurt out that "India's Parliament" was a mock Assembly, a mere creature of the authentic mother of Parliaments, who could claim no privileges as of inherent right. Such devastating candour following close on the heels of the honeyed praise which he had lavished only the previous day on the new edifice of wisdom and justice which they were helping to rear in India was indescribably comic and showed him well worthy of the mantle of the immortal Will Wimble. It also made it easy for the non-official leaders to come down to brass tacks unhampered by complimentary frills and furbelows. It was child's play for them to dispose of the feeble non possumus which was all that Sir Alexander powerless for the nonce to weave his accustomed cob-web of sophistry, could oppose to their formidable array of arguments based on law, commonsense and the constitution.

To take the last 1st, Pandit Motilal and those who supported him took their stand on an absolutely unassailable position. The right of the electorate to the

240

2/08

--5--

free choice of the representatives, is limited only by the statutory disqualifications imposed by the rules under the Act. The case of detenus like Mr. Mitra does not come under the purview of these rules. The action of the Bengal Government in preventing him from taking his seat in the House infringes 3 different rights--the right of the individual member to take his seat, the right of the House to see that every one of its members is secured in the unhampered enjoyment of its privileges, and the right of the electorate to be represented by the man of his choice. The individual privilege could be forfeited only if the member concerned had been convicted of a criminal offence after a legal trial. Since not even the specific charges against him had been made known to Mr. Mitra, there was no legal bar to his taking his seat. If danger to life and property were apprehended from such a course it would have been the easiest thing for the Government to take the necessary precautions by putting him under close surveillance. As a matter of fact there was no such fear; as more than one member testified Lord Meston was willing to release Mr. Mitra if he gave an undertaking. In that case there was even less excuse for keeping him from the Assembly; for, as Pandit Motilal ~~R~~ pestinently pointed out, Mr. Mitra's willingness to take the oath of allegiance was as good a guarantee of good behaviour as any undertaking could be.

Great as was the injustice done to the individual member by the Government's action the affront to the House was even greater. Sir Alexander Muddiman relied on the

finding of a sub-committee of the committee on Reforms over which he had presided for his assertion that the House had no privilege in the matter. But Mr. Jinnah, who was a member of it promptly retorted that the matter was considered only so far as the terms of reference permitted ^{the} the committee to do so, and these were admittedly narrow. But the privileges of a legislative body are as much the off-spring of analogy and convention as of statute. Whenever it suits the Government to adopt Parliamentary practice in the Assembly its spokesmen are never tired of expatiating on the wisdom of building up a sound body of conventions. What is sauce for the gauder is surely sauce for the goose. When Charles I ordered the arrest of the 5 members, Parliament resisted it triumphantly and its bold stand has received the solemn approval of history and of all lovers of freedom. The Indian Assembly may ^{be} a creature of the Parliament, but if it is not allowed to ~~derive~~ derive its parent institution the body of democratic principles which the latter has evolved through long years of struggle, how can Parliament claim to have acted up to the spirit of the Declaration of August 1917 and implanted the seed of democracy in India? Even more than the privilege of the House it is the paramount authority of the sovereign that has been violated by the high-handed action of the Bengal ^{executive} ~~ex.~~ Mr. Mitra was summoned to attend the House and hear the King's message, by the ^{Viceroy} Viceroy in the name of H.M. But ~~he~~ he has been prevented from obeying the command of the kind by the administrative action of a subordinate ^{authority} ~~ex.~~ which is in subversion not

only of the constitution but of all sentiments of loyalty upon which Lord Irvin expatiated so much the other day.

Sir Alexander confessed himself the unconverted ^{bureaucrat} ~~XXXXXXXX~~ ~~that~~ that he is when he argued that the electorate had forfeited its right when it re-elected Mr. Mitra even after it was given a chance by the Bengal Government to elect another representative. The "Heaven-born" service has little use for history and less knowledge of it. But it is surely a limit for the member of the race which ^{Lord} ~~XXXX~~ Wilkes and Bradlaugh to put up this fatuous plea in all seriousness, and expect a sensible body of men to swallow it without murmur. Neither the massed forces of one of the most astute of British Sovereigns in the one case nor all the pomp and power of Parliament itself in the other could bank for ever the declared and determined will of the electorate; though both Wilkes and Bradlaugh had violated in an aggressive manner some of the most passionately cherished convictions and ideals of their countrymen.

Yesterday's debate provides one more proof of how irresponsible and unlimited power demoralises even the heirs of great traditions. The sheep-like subservience shown by the non-official Europeans to a Government which was deliberately depriving them of their rights and flouting their importance as members of a great institution whose panegyric they are never tired of singing was perhaps the saddest part of the whole business.

243

21/4

--8--

24th January, 1927.

LEADER.

Lord Irwin's ^{education} edn at the hands of his political mentors proceeds apace. His speech at the opening of the Legislative Assembly to-day is, if we may judge from the meagre summary furnished by the Associated Press, almost up to the usual specification of viceregal utterances of which veiled threats and potted wisdom are the warp and the woof. With admirable nonchalance he announced that, the British Government having decided to send reinforcements to China, the Indian Government "had agreed to co-operate in this purely defensive action by contributing a contingent including Indian troops". He remarked, in explanation of this generosity at the expense of India, that this country was nearest china. Few members of the Assembly were, we should think, in need of being reminded of this elementary geographical fact. It is indeed their vivid consciousness of this fact and its implications that has made Indian leaders protest time after time against Indian military policy being dictated by the War office. It does not seem to have occurred to Lord Irwin that the Indian people should have been consulted before his Government blibby undertook to co-operate with its British Master. No more poignant illustration is need of India's humiliating position in the Empire. For those who swallow a camel without turning a hair, there is no need to strain at a gnat. After the casual, matter of course reference to the movement of Indian troops one is not surprise^{ed}/at Lord Irwin's adoption of the Birkenhead formula, "No truce with agitation, and no advance without co-operation". Scarcely a month has passed since Lord Lytton~~made his~~ made his famous confession that dyarchy had failed, as because of the attitude of the Government as that of the popular leaders. This at least should have made Lord Irwin less cocksure of the Wisdom of his

solution, especially when he whole-heartedly endorsed the repressive policy of the Government of Bengal. To those who were beginning to think of Lord Irvin as a humane and broad-minded man, his callous reference to the unfortunate men who have been immured without trial for many months must come as a shock. So long as proof to the contrary is not offered, India must and will believe that these men are the victims of political prejudice, so that the question of releasing them is, pace Lord Irvin, inextricably bound up with the question of political reforms. The Viceroy speaks of the potential ~~in~~ menace to peace in liberating these men; but Lord Lytton considers them so harmless that he is willing to let them out the moment they sign a formal undertaking. Whom are we to believe? The great disadvantage of a Viceroy allowing himself to be tutored by bureaucracy is that he has to father its sins and occasionally and vicariously become the laughing-stock of the multitude. Pending receipt of the full text of the speech we defer further comment.

 26th January, 1927.

LEADER.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR CHINA.

The action of the Governor General in disallowing the motion for adjournment to discuss the question of despatching Indian troops to China on the ground that it could not be moved without detriment to public interests is an extremely regrettable one for many reasons. The fact that the discussion of foreign policy is taboed in the Assembly

245 2118

--10--

is bad enough, emphasising as it does the subordinate character of the Government of India. But the motion had been narrowed down so as to refer only to the desirability or otherwise of sending troops from India without consulting the Legislative ^{ure}. Sir Alexander Muddiman took refuge ~~1~~ under the plea that the discussion of the matter would involve reference to ^{the} foreign policy and that might lead to disastrous results. But the President while appreciating the point of view that that discussion would be prejudicial to the international situation, stated that he could not pay heed ~~1~~ to it so long as the motion was confined to the narrow issue. The ground on which the motion has been disallowed by Lord Irvin shows that though he realises that the discussion would be restricted to a ^{take place} for the vague reason that public interests would be prejudiced. In the dominion Parliaments such an arbitrary ruling is not possible and if any Premier should consider a public debate undesirable, he would demand a secret session. The Governor General of India ~~1~~ has thus lost a good opportunity to show that he is anxious to take the Assembly with him in important matters. So far as the substance of the complaint is concerned, it is obvious that the case for the Government is phenomenally weak. It will be remembered that a committee of the Assembly appointed to report on the Esher Committee's proposals recommended in March 1921 that "the Army in India should not as a rule ~~be~~ employed for service outside the external frontiers of India, except for purely defensive purposes, or with the previous consent of the Governor General in very grave emergencies, provided that this resolution does not preclude the employment on garrison duties overseas of Indian troops

246 2/20
--11--

at the expense of His Majesty's Government and with the consent of the Governemnt of India". This resolution was moved in the Assembly on the 28th March the same year and accepted by the Government without any demur.

The statement by the Government of Britain that the troops are being employed as a defensive measure makes it clear that the defence of India for which alone Indian troops could be sent is not involved. The action of the Government is therefore in direct contravention of their definite pledge, and that the Assembly which has thus been flouted, should be refused an appportunity, not to raise its protest, but merely to express its regret that it has not been consulted on the matter, proves its utter helplessness under the present constitution.

29th January, 1927.

LEADER.

The forecast of the terms of the provisional settlement of the South African Indian problem, which our Durban correspondent cables to-day, is so alarmistic that we cannot bring our selves to believe that the Indian Delegation could have been a party to such an agreement. One has only to look at the implications of the alleged terms to refuse to accept them as correct. If these terms be accepted, India would have conceded every claim that the bitterest of anti-Asiastics ever put forward. The agreement guarantees, for one thing, India's acquiescence in the white

Africa policy for ever and subject to no conditions whatsoever. For another, it undertakes to send out of Africa such a proportion of the existing Indian population, however large it be, as would suit the convenience of the Whites. Thirdly, the remaining Indians should be trained, partly at the expense of the Government of India so as to be made fit for their new status--whatever that be. Further^{by}, they are to enjoy no political privileges, if not for ever, at any rate till India attains the self-governing status of South Africa, till, ie to say India's independence is recognised by Britain. The latter provision shows that the framers of this clause are far-seeing; for they have the wisdom to realise that an independent India will not let South Africa keep the Indians in that country as helots even for a moment. These "magnanimous" provisions are deliberately calculated to reduce the ranks of Indians into a handful of "aliens" which at present they are not. The few Indians that may remain after repatriation are for a period to be kept in a purgatory as a sort of preparation for admission into white paradise at some indefinite time. For these concessions, which South Africa is prepared to make, we are to fetter our hands ^{regarding} ~~the~~ tariff duties on her wares and admit her merchandise, including liquors, on a free trade basis! Such are the features of the settlement according to the forecast of our correspondent.

In the face of the unequivocal satisfaction expressed by Mr. Sastri and of the continued optimism of Mr. Andrews we are unable to give credence to this forecast. The fact, however, that the South African Indians entertain grave apprehension about the terms of the agreement is a disturbing circumstance. It only emphasises the need for publishing the

248 2124
--13--

provisional agreement forthwith and allowing the country to express its opinion on it before the Government ratifies it. We trust the Assembly will take the earliest opportunity of raising a debate on the question.

4th February, 1927.

LEADER.

~~THE BENGAL~~

THE BENGAL DETENUS

The Government of India have again let slip an opportunity to put themselves right with the people of this country. Pandit Motilal Nehru moved yesterday in the Assembly, in a weighty speech, a resolution demanding the immediate release or their trial of all detenues under the old Regulations and the Bengal ~~Regulations~~ Criminal Amendment Act of 1925. He invited Lord Irwin to mark the 1st year of his Viceroyalty and the 1st session of the new Assembly by a real act of broad-minded statesmanship, and by a liberal gesture showing a real change of heart. This friendly advice, however, was not taken. The Home Member, who had told the Assembly, in his 1st speech, that the Government would consider the cases of detenues who made a declaration that they would not engage themselves in revolutionary activities, relaxed his attitude towards the end of the debate so far as to undertake to consider the release of particular detenues on medical grounds. This was quite properly deemed to be an unsatisfactory response by the ~~xxx~~ Assembly which therefore passed the resolution by 63 votes against 50.

Mr. Keane, the Official member from the U.P. who is Sir Alexander Muddiman's latest discovery of oratorical

249

2126

--14--

talent in the casern of provincial bureaucracy, would not have lightly jested with a nation's sorrows by referring to the resolution for the release of the detenus as an annual sporting fixture, if he had remembered the fable in Aesop in which the frogs called out to the boys who were shying stones at them:- "It may be ^{sport} ~~expat~~ to you, but it is death to us". But in his greater wisdom he went one better than those truant boys who never pretended that the stone throwing was done in the interests of the frogs themselves or blamed the latter for the unreasonable levity of their protest. From the slang of the race course to the facetiousness of the remark, "We are not going to surrender to young Bengal the right to determine the means for attaining self-government was a natural transition which again prepared the way for the consummate vulgarity of Mr. Keane's parting shot, that the revolutionaries were the "invisible rays"-- whatever they may mean--of the Swarajya Party. The Home Member could not, one suspects, have been very grateful to his henchman for this unblest piece of audacity; for it constitutes a thorough, if unconscious, admission of the truth of the Swarajist contention that the Ordinance was really a political weapon forged against them under the pretence of scotching revolution. The Home Member was more suave and diplomatic, but, if he only knew it, his rambling speech in defence of the Government's attitude gave the show away almost as completely. He confessed that revolution had not been scotched nor even clipped; ^{while} ~~whitai~~ the only

--15--

outward result of the Ordinance is as all know that some of the leading Swarajists have been rotting in jail for nearly two years now. "The Government had checked the outward manifestations of the movement to a very considerable extent, but the basic conditions remain unchanged". If as has been frequently asserted on behalf of the Government, the detenus represent the brain of the revolutionary movement how comes it that "the basic conditions remain unchanged", in spite of the fact that the brains have been safely put away under lock and key for well nigh two years? Must we then conclude that the brains have after all, eluded the lynx-eyed vigilance of the police and are still at large? It looks as though the Ordinance was invented not to root out revolution but to generate in the minds of the police the pleasant illusion of being extremely busy at the expense of the liberty and honour of innocent men. Mr. Goswami made public in the course of his speech, Lord Lyttons amazing admission that the men in custody had not actually committed any crime but were prevented from the commission of the crime by timely detention. That the detention of these people would act as a deterrent and prevent other crimes was an argument that did not Morley who wrote to Lord Minto:-

"You say, "we admit that being locked up they can have had no share in these new abominations; but their continued detention will frighten evil-doers generally". That's the Russian argument, by packing off train-loads of suspects to siberia will terrify the anarchists out of

251

2130

--16--

their wits and all will come out right. That policy did not work out brilliantly in Russia and did not save the life of the Trepoffs, nor did it save Russia from a Duma, the very thing that the Trepoffs and the rest of the "off's" deprecated and detested".

Lord Lytton and his advisors must have been gifted with the powers of divinity to read so accurately the evil designs in the hearts of these men, for they like Revelation scorn to offer any proof other than their own word for it. Who was the fool that said that the days of witch-doctors and trial by ordeal had gone never to return.

Let us examine for a moment the conditional offer to individual detenus made by Lord Lytton and repeated by Sir Alexander Muddiman. The latter said:-

" A declaration that a detenu on release would take no part in revolutionary activities would be an element to be taken into consideration by the Government, but this on the one hand would not amount to a confession that he had taken part in such activities in the past and on the other hand such a declaration could not and would not be accepted by the Government as a ground for release without examination of the whole circumstances of the case and .. past record of the detenu".

If, as the Home Member ingenuously protests, such a declaration would not amount to a confession of past crime, where is the point or justification in exacting it, unless the intention be to humiliate the man who makes it in the eyes of the country? Under the ordinary law of

the land no man is presumed guilty till he is proved to be guilty by a competent tribunal. If an undertaking of this sort is to be taken from men whose alleged guilt has not been proved in this manner, would it not be equally reasonable to demand on the philosophic assumption that every man is a potential rebel, such an undertaking, say, from the Home Member himself or from Colonel Crawford who was eloquent on the paramount claims to protection of Society and State? And what does the Home Member propose to do after registering such declarations, supposing he does get them? He undertakes to look carefully once again into the facts of the case and order the release if he is satisfied that it would be safe to do so. And so we come once again into the vicious circle: How is the public to know that the review has been carried out conscientiously and the decision arrived at justly? The mere fact that the Home Member is willing to review the cases once again on the giving of an undertaking shows that there is room for such review. If that be the case, is it not the duty of the Government to undertake revision, declaration or no declaration? Sir Alexander's shuffling evasions compel one to the conclusion that the conditional offer is nothing more than a lure to beguile the unwary. We are glad that the Assembly has not allowed itself to be deceived and has strongly condemned the Government's persistence in an unrighteous course by carrying Pandit Motilal's amendment by a large majority Government's blind perseverance in following is bound to create profound

dissatisfaction among those who believed that Lord Irwin had sufficient political courage in him to strike out a path of his own.

5th February, 1927.

Extraordinary alacrity has been shown by the Government in adopting the more retrograde recommendations of the Muddiman Committee. Nobody need be surprised that public opinion was not consulted about them or that the Legislatures affected have altogether been ignored. One of these charges has now made it necessary for a notice of 10 days to be given for a motion of censure of the Ministers and approximately ~~1~~ 1/3 of the total number of members have to support such a motion. Mr. A. Rangaswamy Iyengar, referring to the practical effect of the new rule, asked whether it was the intention of the framers that no motion of no confidence should be moved when once Ministers are appointed. The insistence on a large no supporting such a motion and the long ^{period required to support a whole motion} ample opportunities for manipulating opinion and bring undue pressure to bear on officials and non-officials. These impediments ^{which} would also seriously interfere with the responsibility which Ministers bear to the council. The Legislative Assembly and the Provincial councils, should insist that no rule affecting procedure should be made by the ^{present} Executive Government without their being given an opportunity to discuss the proposed changes. Otherwise work in the Legislatures would become a subject for ridicule, farcical and unreal, as it is already.

---19---

9th February, 1927.

Replying to a question put in the council of State yesterday the Government are reported to have stated that proposals regarding the separation of executive and judicial functions had been received from Madras, Bengal, The U.P. and Bihar and Orissa, and that they were being examined in the secretariat. This examination has been proceeding for nearly 10 years now without producing tangible results and the impression is gaining ground that Government are trifling with public opinion. It is extraordinary that they should take so long to arrive at a definite opinion on a subject which has been engaging public attention for many decades. If they are opposed to the reform which is being urged as much by non-officials, ^{by} as the Local Governments, the sooner they say so the better. The attitude of the Government of India towards this long-delayed reform bears eloquent testimony to their opposition to provincial autonomy of any kind. If the Local Governments which are in touch with the actual arm, advocate the step, it is not for the central Government to put obstacles in the way, as they have been doing.

10th February, 1927.

It is not perhaps to be wondered at that there is no reference at all to India in H.M.'s speech from the throne opening Parliament. The present Government do not mind what India's ^{feelings} ~~feelings~~ are and India thanks to the differences which for the moment divide her political parties presents to them no "problem" which, say, china or the vociferous

anti-Labour die-hands among their own followers do. They have also the support of "experts" like Lord Reading who, though wearing other labels than that of the Conservative Party, whole-heartedly back up a policy little removed from junkerism. Lord Reading, as may be seen from a cable published with where, still but echoes what Lord Birkenhead has been saying. The ex-Viceroy would have India pass the examinations stipulated by Whitehall, get over the "efficiency bar" and do sundry other impossible or humiliating tasks set for her before aspiring for any substantial advance in political power. Lord Reading's reference to the existence of Indian States as an obstacle makes one doubt if he is at all serious about further advance; for, that problem may remain with us for ever if the implications of his suggestion are to be respected.

11th February, 1927.

SPECIAL LAWS FOR BACKWARD TRACTS

The debate in the Assembly on the resolution demanding the withdrawal of special laws from Chota Nagpur division and the districts of Anjuli and Sambalpur and Santal Parganas has brought out the inherent weakness of the case for the Government in maintaining "backward" tracts in all their pristine "glory". The motion was adopted by 50 against 40 votes demonstrating the strength of feeling among the representatives of the people about the need for placing the inhabitants of these places on a footing of equality with those in ordinary districts so far as the administration of civil and criminal law is concerned. We cannot undertake

to say whether the angle of vision of the authorities will change as a result of this emphatic declaration of public opinion. Even during the few days in which the new Assembly has been in session the Government have sustained successive defeats which, under a system in which the executive is responsible to the legislature, would have precipitated a general election. But the Government of India appear not to be ruffled by these repeated votes of censure; they seem to flourish under them. This inverted system of Government by defeat is demoralising in the extreme.

The defence put up by the Government of the present practice is in effect a strong condemnation of their policy in regard to these backward districts. The Home Member told the Assembly in all seriousness that these would be unrest among santhals if the ordinary law was introduced. Apart from the crudity of this reasoning, it is a sad commentary on British rule that there should be any class of people in this country to-day who preferred to live in darkness. He admitted that all the restrictions were not necessary but suggested that it was the local Government that should decide what modifications were required. But the fact is that a resolution adopted by the local Legislature on the subject has so far remained a dead letter. The Home Member was somewhat conciliatory, but his understudies gave free and undignified expression to official views. Mr. Donovan detailed the ancient prejudice of the bureaucracy towards Indian lawyers and stated that the real reason for the demand made in the

--22--

resolution was that pleaders from outside may have greater scope for their activities. He went further and pleaded for more special laws for the Santhals. ~~if~~ It is a curious kind of tribute paid to the honesty and bravery of these people to require them to shut out of the outside world for eternity. The gibe against the men of the law is indulged in by those who do not wish executive highhandedness, tyranny and violent departure from the rule of law to be exposed. The fact is that the special laws applied for the benefit of these tracts, while they may perhaps afford scope for the administrative capacity of a few civilians, repress the people concerned, inuse them to half-civilized conditions and deprive them of all incentive to live a fuller life. Those who are acquainted with the way in which agency ^{is} administered know the evils attendant on the application of special laws and the abuses which abound in the system. If, as was stated yesterday, there is any apprehension that land would pass out of the hands of the real owners, if it is feared that pleaders would take away the little left by money lenders, it is quite open to the Government to take suitable measures to prevent exploitation. The reluctance to do so and the determination to fall back on the remedy of erecting a wall round them preventing their coming into contact with civilisation cannot but redound to the discredit of the Government.

14th February, 1927.

THE PROBLEM OF INDIAN STATES.

Rulers of Indian States are taking counsel among themselves more frequently than hitherto as regards matters of common interest. A message from Patiala says, for instance, that an informal conference of some Princes is being held these to-day to consider the future of the states and other subjects. The desire to safeguard their status is only natural and if the way in which this is done does not conflict with the larger interests of the country the object is quite legitimate. This movement for the consolidation of their power and prestige is due to the apprehension that the Government of India have recently been interfering with the administration of Indian States, in a manner which is indicative of a change of policy and to the fear that their position may be prejudicially affected by such proposals for constitutional reform as may be made by the forthcoming statutory communication. So far as the suspected change in the angle of vision of the Government is concerned, assurances have been forthcoming from the present Viceroy that such a view is entirely without foundation. Apparently Indian Princes find it difficult to reconcile this verbal ~~repudiation~~ repudiation with the definite acts of interference which have occurred such as in the cases of Nobha, Indore and Hyderabad. As is now well known the last meeting of the council of Indian Princes discussed this question seriously and the references

--24--

to the subject in the speeches of Princes of States which Lord Irwin has been visiting recently point to the necessity felt by them for some kind of assurance from the Government that greater care would be taken in their dealings with them. Public opinion in British India is quite clear that Indian Princes cannot be allowed to tyrannise over their subjects and that there should be devised some suitable method of bringing succour to states which are habitually misgoverned. In view of the treaty rights enjoyed by these states and the constitutional relation subsisting between them and the Government of India, any direct intervention by the latter is extremely undesirable and would be keenly resented both in the States and in British India. This does not at all mean that erring Rulers should be allowed to continue their detestable sway; only, there should be brought into existence a tribunal which could command the confidence of Indian Princes and their subjects which could be entrusted with the task of recommending remedial measures.

The obligation, on the other hand, rests with the Rulers to take on hand, with a view to tackle it seriously, the question of improving their methods of administration that the advance made by them may fit in with the constitutional progress achieved in British India. This is necessary both in order to strengthen their own position and to demonstrate that they are ardent patriots who envisage a glorious political future for their country. They are not unaware of the fact that the existence of states is being put forward as one of the impediments in the path of quick political progress as pseudo friends as well as open enemies of Indian freedom. It is the obvious duty therefore of the Rulers

to so conduct themselves in their relations with their subjects as to allow no scope for those who want to exploit that fact in order to obstruct or delay the attainment of Swaraj. Indian States cannot be allowed to be the back-waters of a self-governing India which most of them are at the present day. They ought to remember that their responsibilities to their subjects, their duty to their mother-country, demand the conversion of the system of absolutism into one in which the people's voice is supreme, as rapidly as circumstances would allow. Broad-minded statesmanship quite as much as their own interests require that Indian Princes should, instead of merely seeking to isolate themselves in obscure and dubious safety, make their Government rest on the solid rock of people's contentment, which is possible only when they bring about full responsible Government.

16th February, 1927.

It has always been recognised on all hands that the dignity and independence of the judiciary should be jealously maintained in the interests of justice, and the Government of India have been given credit for loyally adhering to this view, in their dealings with the higher judiciary. The subordinate magistracy have not enjoyed the same immunity being generally under the influence of the police, and this is one of the chief grounds on which the separation of executive and judicial functions has ~~xxxxx~~ always been urged. It is therefore with something of a shock that one comes upon a

261.

--26--

police officer virtuously criticising the judiciary for their "excessive lenience" to murderers, and the surprise is intensified when the Government improve the occasion by underlining all that the Officer says.

It is not for the Governor General nor for that matter for the Government to say whether the Judges have exercised their direction rightly or not. When a man is appointed Judge the Government have presumably satisfied themselves as to his character, capacity and sense of responsibility and they should leave him to do his work according to his lights without interference.

2nd March, 1927.

It was a truly amazing story that was revealed by Mr. Harisarovottama Rao's question in the Madras Legislative Council yesterday regarding a shooting "accident" in the Bolampatti valley reserved forests; if anything was more amazing it was the Law Member's ~~p~~ unpreparedness or unwillingness to answer the simplest supplementary questions arising out of it. It would appear that in August 1925 Mr. Charles Mahory went shooting in the reserved forest in question and it appears he hit and killed a man in the darkness. One would have thought that there was sufficient justification in this for the police to take cognisance of the matter for the Government to prosecute the officer. But, in their superior wisdom, they considered "the legal aspect of the question" and arrived at the conclusion that it was "a mere accident". So they gave some compensations to the relations of

26 ✓
--27--

the deceased and inflicted condign punishment on ~~Mr. Mohony~~ Mr. Mohony by prohibiting him from shooting in any reserved forest for 2 years, the ends of justice thus met to their own satisfaction, they dropped the matter. Now, a prohibition of this kind may be a terrible thing for a keen sportman such as Mr. Mohony appears to be. But to the uninitiated many in whom the instinct of the chase is not so highly developed, the Government's handling of this matter must appear utterly inadequate. If the shooting was a "mere accident" why should it not have been left to the duly constituted tribunals so to pronounce it after a proper trial? And why should the Government have maintained such secrecy in the matter that it was left to a private member to draw public attention to it by an indirect question in the Legislative Council? Seeing that the member was unable to furnish without notice on even the most important features of the incident the public will not rest satisfied with his statement that the Government had carefully and impartially investigated it at the time of the occurrence. They owe it to themselves, to the Officer in question and to the public to order immediately a regular and open enquiry into the matter

2nd March, 1927.

We are quite unable to see why provincial legislative councils should be prevented from adopting resolutions demanding the immediate conferment of Swaraj upon India. They represent the electorate which, however small it may be, has been considered by the Government to be fit to speak

for millions. And it stands to reason that expressions of opinion by I elected members on wide national issues should be welcomed by the authorities because they give acue to the state of the mind of the public. We are told that the Governor of Bombay has disallowed a resolution on the ground that it referred to a matter which was not primarily the concern of the Local Government, demanding the establishment of full responsible provincial Government. It is absurd to contend that the matter does not concern Bombay; it affects it deeply. The Governor cannot hope to stem the tide of Swaraj by preventing the legislature from discussing the subject, but it is regrettable that he and his brother Governors do not see that by failing to interpret the rules in a liberal manner so as to establish sound precedents, they are contributing to the unpopularity of the very reforms, of which they boast, in season and out of season.

3rd March, 1927.

One point in Sir Basil Blackett's speech to which we think attention should be drawn is his reference to the beneficial services for which the Government of India are responsible. The Finance member in this connection dealt solely with education in areas specially administered by the Government of India. A casual reader of the speech is apt to think that the Government of India's responsibility in regard to services classed "beneficial" does not extend further than services in the provinces directly administered by them. There is at present no clear understanding as to

the duty of the Government of India in regard to beneficial activities in other areas or in respect of particular branches of nation-building activities. In other countries, federal or central authorities undertake upon themselves responsibilities of a varied kind in regard to education, agriculture, industries and so on. They maintain research laboratories and information bureaus, give expert advice and in various other ways participate in the burden of keeping the countries activities abreast of the times. Of late the Government of India have shown a tendency alternately to secure entire control over these activities and to disown all responsibilities for them. The position at present is exceedingly anomalous. One wishes something will ere long be done to get their responsibilities in these matters more clearly defined.

8th March, 1927.

We invite attention to ~~Mr~~ Earl Winterton's replies to questions on Indian affairs in Parliament, published where if the Indian Navy Bill is passed by Parliament there would be little use in the Legislative Assembly discussing it afterwards in connection with the consequential legislation that might be brought up before it. There are many unsatisfactory features about this Bill, notably those clauses which empower the Governor General to utilise the Navy for other purposes than the defence of India in emergencies and leave it to Parliament

265

2158

--30--

to decide whether India shall bear the expenses in such cases. The Legislative Assembly should protest in time against being statutorily branded with this stigma of inferiority. India has little use for a Navy which her central Legislature cannot control absolutely. We hope non-official members will initiate a discussion on this matter at an early date. To another question--whether the Skeen Committee's Report, which is ready, would be referred to the Imperial Defence Committee before publication--Lord Winterton gave a non-committal reply. But we cannot overlook the possibility of such reference ~~xxxx~~ in which case sections of the report and recommendations based thereon which were not palatable to the war gods at Whitehall might never see the light of day at all. This fear is not merely fanciful when one remembers the fate of the Esner committee's report. The Skeen committee was appointed to go into the question of military training for the benefit of India and at her expense, and any attempt to burk its findings, whatever they might be, would be deeply resented in this country.

10th March, 1927.

THE ASSEMBLY AND REFORMS

In moving the cut from the allowances of the Executive Council yesterday in the Assembly, Mr. Jayakar said:- "We do not feel there is any reality in this House-- -- The last point has been reached. If the Government do not yield now we shall have to think of going back and turn to

--31--

some other methods of rocing the Government to yield to the popular feeling". Mr. Jayakar is the chief of the responsivists, the leader who broke away from the main wing of the Congress because he would have no lot or part with obstruction and devoutly believed that the Reforms could be worked for what they were worth. His disillusionment which he admitted in proposing the motion for the virtual rejection of the demand for the Executive Council of the Government of India, has not come a moment too early, since the supercilious intransigence of the Government about which many of the speakers compained, has been plainly nursed on the unfortunate interreceptive feuds in the country bet the various parties and communities. The communal issue has in fact become so obstreperous that it could not be kept out of this discussion in the Assembly on the question of constitutional reforms. As it turned out this digression was fortunate rather than otherwise, since it gave an opportunity for a full and frank statement of views of the Hindus and Muslims towards the question of further reforms and their mutual desire for friendly co-operation in this cause. If it only the non-Swarajist parties would recognise the significance of Mr. Jayakar's admission and the communal leaders settle their outstanding differences in the spirit in which Messrs. Md Yakub and Lajpat Rai approached them, we need not despair of national unity and the Government would have to sing to another tune.

As regards the present attitude of the Government towards the question of constitutional advance, neither the excessive friendliness of Sir Basil Blackett nor the airy

267

2/62

--32--

persiflage of the Home Member leaves us much indoubt. The former appealed for faith, hope and love but forgot that every action of the Government of which he was a member was a negation of these virtues. A grimly ironic commentary on the Finance Member's appeal was furnished by Sir Alexander Muddiman's naive admission that "the changes made in the Act by Parliament did constitute restrictions on the power of the assembly, but those restrictions were in the opinion of Parliament very necessary". As a matter of fact Parliament knows and cares as much about it as the man in the moon. The Civil Service, which governs India, found the Assembly a thorn in its side and asked for these restrictions and duly got them; Parliament never cared to ascertain what might be the wishes of the people of India apart from those ~~in~~ of the Government. That being the mentality of Parliament in regard to Indian affairs, the position taken up by the Home Member as to the proper function of the ^{commission} statutory ~~communication~~, though entirely correct according to the letter of the Government of India Act, is, with due deference to him be it said, solemn pretence. He said that it would never to ~~it~~ lay down in advance the policy to ~~the~~ be followed and it must be left to the ^{commission} ~~communication~~ to recommend ~~that~~ that policy should be. But the Government have repeatedly ~~expressed~~ ^{expressed} their faith in the preamble and have made it ~~mistakeably~~ ^{mistakeably} clear that they do not intend to hand over the reins to the people in the near future. When their views are so well-known, it would be a miracle if a ^{commission} ~~communication~~ appointed in full consultation with them did not echo those sentiments dutifully after a formal examination of the ground traversed. Apart from this, India does not all grant the

268

2144

--33--

premises that any outside body could take it upon himself to judge her political progress. Even such a meticulous constitutionalist as Mr. Ratnaswami was constrained to point out in the course of a singularly bold and trenchant speech, that "the commission was not to see how far the people were ~~xx~~ at present fit for a larger measure of self-Government, but to devise ways and means for fitting them, and training them to attain fully responsible Government as early as possible".

But the Government do not look at the question in this way at all, because they cannot contemplate with equanimity the prospect of abdication even in the remote future. They have wielded and are ~~wixx~~ wielding unlimited power, and they know the power is sweet and they are not prepared to part with it. And so we find Sir Alexander Muddiman mocking at the helplessness of the Assembly and telling it that if it wanted to persuade the Government it could not do this by fighting them. The least that the Assembly could do in the face of this taunt was to carry Mr. Jayakar's motion. In the light of this overbearing and contemptuous attitude, only one interpretation is possible of the Home Member's pompous declaration". " All are agreed that some change in the constitution is desirable; but the question is when and how it could be made". The Government do not mean to advance a single pace if they can help it and in this they are sure of the fervent support of the non-official Europeans, who, if Col. Crawford can be taken as fairly representing them, treat the electorate and the Assembly with contempt, and while verbally favouring progress, are in practice

269

2166

--34--

violently~~xx~~ opposed to it. In these circumstances, if we are to wait for national unity, national sanctions and a national civil service to precede political advancement as Mr. Ratnaswami counsels, and go on believing that the Government will help us to achieve these things we shall have to wait till eternity. Our achievement lies in our hands, and we must seek it only through united action.

17th March, 1927.

SEPARATE ELECTORATES

" we kill the thing we love"----the words of the tragic poet must have occurred to many when Sir Sankaran Nair moved his characteristic resolution on separate electorates in the council of State yesterday. Sir Sankaran Nair was never a mealy-mouthed politician and he had always the strong man's partiality for emphatic statement. But, if he had reflected for a moment, he would have seen that exaggeration, ironic or otherwise,--- always a double edged thing in politics---was never more unreasonable than now when communal feelings are very sore and an amused and adroit opponenet, the bueaucracy, is ever on the alert to pounce upon any the least evidence of ~~communal~~ communal antagonism as opportune excuse for faulting the people's wishes. It was not so very long ago that Sir Sankaran stood forth in the council of State as the champion of Madras advocating the immediate grant of autonomy to this province, on the ground that all the conditions precedent

to the extension of the Reforms in this wise were present here. And yet we find him now suggesting that there should be no further political advance for any part of India, so long as both communities are not prepared to abjure separate electorates. This inconsistency is hardly less striking than is the other inconsistency, slyly alluded to by Sir Alexander Muddiman, bet his present righteous indignation against the exclusiveness of separate electorates and the unctious with which he pleaded for reservation of seats for the majority community in Madras before the Joint Parliamentary Committee.

The truth of the matter is, of course, that Sir Sankaran has allowed his experience of communal excess to cloud his judgment. He is firmly convinced that separate electorates are opposed to the spirit of the Reforms and cannot but retard the harmonious and rapid development anticipated for them; and perhaps judging other people's attitude from his own, he seems to have concluded that, faced with the alternative of more reforms or perpetuation of separate electorates, most sensible men would plump unhesitatingly for the former. But the issue is by no means so simple as that, nor are the alternatives so clear. For one thing, separate electorates are not the only obstacle in the way of further reforms; the chief difficulty is the unwillingness of the Government to go forward, but the unfortunate manner in which Sir Sankaran raised the issue made it possible for the Home Member to evade the question of the Government's responsibility and to treat the inevitable differences of opinion among the popular leaders that disclosed themselves in the course of the debate as sufficient justification for the "sit tight" policy

271

2170

--36--

of the Government. To ask the Government to act as compulsory arbitrator in such a matter is to court disaster. As Mr. Ramadas pointed out in his statesmanlike speech outlining the attitude of the congress towards this vexed question, "the matter is essentially one for negotiation and settlement bet^{ween} the 2 communities". This has been recognised in the National Demand, which asked Government to convene a representative conference for the working out of a constitution for India and Inter Alia, devising effective safeguards for minorities. The Congress itself is in favour of it elctorates, but it recognises that many well-meaning and responsible Hindus and Muslims aloke, while looking upon separate electorates as necessary evils, would treat them "as temporary expedients to tide over the difficulties of the present situation which is hoped to be a passing phase". The whole question is being carefully considered by the Working Committee, which is expected shortly to present its record to the A.I.C.C. We trust that the latter body will, on receipt of the report, be in a position to respond to the invitation of the Council of the All-India Muslim League and the result of the joint deliberation will be a permanent solution acceptable to both communities. However this may be, it is obvious that Sir Sankaran's resolution was not the right way of setting about the business, as was amply proved by the support that Mr. Sunrawandy's reaction-ary amendment received.

In the circumstances Sir Sankaran was well advised in withdrawing it; it would have been much better if he had not moved it at all.

272

2172

--37--

19th March, 1927.

REVISION OF REFORMS.

It is one of the anomalies of the British Administration in India that men who are by nature profoundly antipathetic to the system it has perfected are often compelled to act as its apologists and the result is a painful divergence between profession and practice. Lord Lytton who has been associated with more unpopular and reactionary measures than almost any other Governor who has come out to India within the past decade, is by temperament and training singularly ill-fitted to play a complacent part in the bureaucratic scheme. Not very long ago he candidly confessed that the Reforms were a failure and the Government were as much to blame for it as the people. Speaking at a conference yesterday, he recognised the great progress of local self-Government in Bengal and acknowledged that the people of Bengal displayed in this sphere in an eminent measure their capacity for self-Government. Such an admission would naturally beget the question:-- Why, then, should not the constitutional advance for which they have, along with other Indians, been agitating, be granted without delay? But Lord Lytton is so placed that he cannot openly acknowledge the justice of such a question. So he is reduced to the plea that the masses of rural India are not really interested in the forms of Government but only in its functions. "What they really took into account was whether they were getting education, sanitation, improved communication and better conditions of life in general in the village". Whatever might have been the truth of this matter half a century ago, it must be obvious that Lord Lytton's contention no longer holds good. The political awakening in the country is not confined to parti-

cular ~~ex~~ classes or sections, but has taken the masses also in its stride. Moreover the functions of the Government ~~ex~~ are not so readily separated from its form as Lord Lytton would have us believe. If after a 150 years of British rule India is still immersed in ignorance and illiteracy, unfitted to defend herself against possible aggression and far poorer than she was, that is largely due to the foreign domination and the presence of an alien spirit in the administration, though that administration has striven according to its lights, to fulfil the functions of Government to the satisfaction of the governed.

-----If any proof were required it would be furnished by the entire history of constitutional agitation since 1919. Whether it was full-fledged Swaraj that the people demanded or the smallest improvements in dyarchy, the reply has always been the same, though the excuses have varied. Mr. Das in the Fardipore address was prepared to offer co-operation if only the Ministers were given some real power. More than 2 years have passed since then and Mr. Satyamurthi asked for the identical thing yesterday in the Madras Legislative Council. He suggested the transfer of all subjects to the Ministry and greater scope and freedom of action for them.

There is ample support for this position in the Muddiman reports, but the utmost the local Government would undertake was to bring the views of the council to the attention of the powers that be when the revision of Reforms came under consideration, as they hoped, at an early date. Mr. Satyamurthi's taken motion was carried by a large majority but the attitude of the Government is significant in spite of the Revenue Member's pompous profession of sympathy for popular aspirations. Lord Birkenhead's meaning is pretty clear, though wrapped up in fine phrases--the Government

274

2176

--39--

are not going to advance till they are compelled to do so. It is for us to provide the element of compulsion by closing up the ranks ~~of~~ and making a massed attack on the citadel of the bureaucracy.

26th March, 1927.

The truth of our remark yesterday that the demoralisation among the non-official parties in the Legislative Assembly has, in the current session, appreciably prejudiced public interests, has been further borne out by the division which took place on the Home Member's motion regarding the payment out of Indian revenues of an annual amount of £2000 to each of 2 new members of the Judicial committee of the Privy Council. The motion was carried by a majority of one vote, showing that party organisation had failed miserably in respect of an emphatic opinion. During the debate yesterday no new arguments were brought forward on behalf of the Government ~~of~~ and their success is therefore due solely to the absence of some non-official members from their post of duty. It was made clear during the debate in the House of Commons on this subject, that the British Government were expecting that the present Assembly would be more friendly to this motion than the previous one and thanks to defective leadership this hope has been fulfilled. Some members expressed their apprehension that as the two new places are intended for persons with recent judicial experience in India, the Government would appoint third rate men who, during their ~~career~~ ~~career~~ career in this country, had imbibed their own prejudices, and that such a fear is not entirely baseless is

--40--

proved by the sharp criticisms which were evoked recently in Bengal by the appointment of a retired judge to the Judicial committee.)

29th March, 1927.

MR. YAKUB ON JOINT ELECTORATES

Mr. Jinnah's Invitation to Representative Muslims.

New Delhi, March 28th....

Maulana Mohamed Yakub, a leading-Muslim member of the Assembly has clarified the air by a statement which he made to the Associated Press on the subject of Joint Electorates. He says the misapprehension of some Mussalmans about the tentative scheme of constitutional changes adopted by an informal meeting of some prominent Mussalmans held at Delhi is quite premature. In the 1st place the scheme is only a tentative and preliminary basis of coming to a settlement. Mussalmans who adopted this scheme have made it quite clear that the scheme will not be binding until it is ratified by representative Muslim organisations in India. For this purpose Mr. Jinnah has addressed all representative Muslim organisations to nominate their representatives to attend a meeting of Muslims which he intends to invite it Bombay shortly in order to discuss the matter. In the 2nd place the scheme does not mean the total extinction of separate electorates because, if Hindus in the provinces in which according to the scheme they will be in a minority desire to have a separate electorate for their community. Mussalmans in the provinces in which they are in a minority will reciprocally be also entitled to separate electorates in those

--41--

Provinces. The scheme is intended only to find out whether Hindus are willing to place themselves under a Muslim majority even in a small part of the country when they want ~~become~~, Mussalmans to place themselves under a Hindu majority in a large portion of the country. I earnestly appeal to my co-religionists not to be overalarmed and not to be too hasty in giving the fullest expression to their views before they have heard the promoters on the scheme.

1st April, 1927.

LORD BIRKENHEAD'S SPEECH.

-----The unworkability of dyarchy has been frankly admitted by such competent critics as Lord Lytton; Lord Birkenhead himself is not, after more than 2 years of judicial scrutiny, yet able to make up his mind whether it has been a success or not; the unanimous weight of Indian opinion has declared itself repeatedly against it; and yet the secretary of State is not prepared to budge an inch from it so long as the Swarajists do not repent of their contumacy, put on sack-cloth and ashes and attempt the Sisypheus task of rolling the dyarchic boulder up the hill of progress. Was greater wilfulness ever displayed? Could a more wanton insult be offered to the intelligence of a whole nation? But we must remember even effrontery such as Lord Birkenhead's thrives only on congenial soil. That soil the present chaos in India supplies in abundance. On the prospects of Hindu-Muslim unity Lord Birkenhead was

politely incredulous; the efforts of the recent Delhi Conference in that direction be damned with faint praise; the quiet persistence with which he magnified trivial incidents gave the lie direct to his unctious protestations that there was nothing which he more ardently desired than the restoration of amicable relations between the 2 communities. In a word, he believes that India's weakness is England's opportunity.

And now, granting that all his impossible conditions are fulfilled, what shall India hope to gain from the early appointment of the commission? Lord Birkenhead can no more change his outlook than the leopard his spots. Who else would have thought of interjecting the remark that it lies in the power of Parliament to alter the law and to extend the incubation period beyond 10 years? But we have even more startling proofs of the reactionary groove in which, in spite of his fine phrases, his mind is all the time working.

We have been repeatedly told that the function of the commission, when it comes, will be strictly judicial, and that it would be a gross violation of the spirit of the Reforms to prejudge the issues in any manner. We have also been told that India's inability to defend herself is the great obstacle to self-government in the near future. One would therefore naturally think that it would be left to the commission to decide this question solely from the point of view of India's interests and India's limitations. But here comes Lord Birkenhead affirming most unequivocally that "all these questions whether they relate to interchange of reinforcements or to the spread of military training in India or to Indianisation

of the Indian Army, can only be handled with the necessary degree of success if they be brought under a comprehensive survey by the authority competent to examine them from the broadest Imperial view point."

And he proposes to invite the Imperial Defence Committee to sit in judgment over these matters. From what we know of the antecedents of that committee it does not require much foresight to say that if it is to be the arbiter of our military destinies we shall have to wait for Swaraj till the Greek kalends. If this is not prejudging one of the biggest issues the statutory commission will have to face we do not know what the term means. After this stupendous somersault we are not surprised at the comparatively mild paradox that his lordship advances, that the Indian Army is not maintained for Imperial adventures. Consistent and logical argument was never Lord Birkenhead's strong point. If, according to his own admission, British Military expenditure has only increased 50% since 1914, whereas India's bill has gone by cent per cent during the same period, what is the inference? If India is asked to maintain a standing army on a war-basis at all times, should not Australia and Canada be asked to do likewise? But enough of this. Where every assertion is a wilful perversion or a mischievous taunt it is waste of time to discuss them seriously. What the country has to take note of is the intransigent temper of our rulers. It is only national unity and a rock-like determination to achieve freedom that can prevail against it.

1st April, 1927.

INDIANISATION OF THE ARMY.

The committee appointed in 1925 under the presidency of Lt. General Sir Andrew S³keen to consider the problem of how suitable candidates for the King's Commission can be recruited and trained, has at last submitted its report, a telegraphic summary of which appears elsewhere in our columns. The committee was appointed primarily to investigate the possibility of establishing an Indian institution on the lines of sandhurst. The Committee's recommendations have at 1st sight a plausible air of liberality, which however is falsified on a close examination of the details thereof. Yet it is amazing that even these halting recommendations have not found favour with the Government of India. No other explanation is possible to the deliberately chilling communique with which the Government of India have seen fit to preface their issue of the report. The Secretary of state ~~xxx~~ for India, indeed, was disastrously explicit in his virtual repudiation of the Committee and all its work, made in the course of his Indian speech in the House of Lords-- a speech which lends credibility to the report quoted by our Simla correspondent of a high army official whose commentary on the report was:-- "Oh, it is not an army order, it is only a report and the fact that S³keen has signed it does not make it more than what every report is. It puts up an ideal which need not necessarily be taken to be capable of practical achievement". The above quotation is an admirable summary of Lord Birkenhead's reference in the House of Lords to the S³keen committee's report, whose recommendations he was in considerable pains to discount in advance. As a matter of fact however the proposals really contain nothing which could give reasonable cause of satisfaction to the people of India. In effect the report recommends a

progressive scheme of Indianisation, whereby in 1952 half the total number of the King's Commissioned Officers in the Indian army will be Indians and it is astonishing that no suggestion is made as to what is to happen after that date. As a means towards that objective it is proposed that the number of Indian students admitted to Sandhurst (at present ten) shall be doubled and thereafter increased progressively by four every year until a military college on the lines of Sandhurst is established in India in 1933, after which Indians seeking King's Commissions will be able to obtain their training in this country though "in order to maintain the imperial connection in military matters" twenty vacancies at Sandhurst will continue to be reserved for Indians, while reciprocally the Indian Sandhurst will open its doors to British candidates who desire to avail themselves thereof. "In order to ensure the best efficiency", the commission recommends that successful cadets from the Indian Sandhurst shall be attached to a British infantry cavalry unit in the United Kingdom for a year ---a suggestion which is intended to create spirit of good fellowship between British and Indian officers, and prevent the setting up and perpetuation of any sort of racial distinction in the army. For the same reason, to remove racial Barriers, the committee recommends the doing away with the General unit scheme, condemned alike by Indians and Europeans, and explicitly rejected by the committee on the ground that it conflicts with "the system of co-operation between Indians and British in every other sphere of administration". The decision to postpone even the 50% Indianisation of the Indian Army to so remote a date as 1952 is exceedingly illiberal and naturally has not met with the approval of the Indian members of the Committee,

281

2190

--46--

who naturally wish the period shortened. Equally, the committee refuses to commit itself to any further subsequent advance in Indianisation beyond the remote 50% which is hardly encouraged. The attitude of the Government of India to even this timid approach towards the Indianisation of the army is significant. The Government of India as also the Secretary of State display indecent eagerness to dissociate themselves from the recommendations of the committee. Lord Birkenhead indeed was apparently so distrubed by the report that he seriously thought of burking it, until possibly he could devise some method of discounting its undue liberality. The Government of India in ~~obedie~~ obedience to the wishes of the India Office are sufficiently explicit in their communique they lay it down, as did the Secretary of state in the House of Lords, that, in effect, Indian Army policy is a matter that concerns primarily not India, but the Imperial Government and the committee of Imperial Defence to whom apparently it is to be submitted. By the time both these bodies have discussed the committee's proposals and whittled down the already exiguous concessions contemplated therein there will probably be very little left either to benefit India or to disturb the equanimity of military die-hards like Sir George Mac Munn to whom the Indianisation of the Indian Army is anathema. No, the Indian Army will never be Indianised until it is finally understood that it, like all other domestic affairs, is a matter of purely Indian concern, and entirely outside the province of Imperialism.

23th April, 1927.

How far the Government of India have been able to keep up to their public declarations regarding Indianisation is shown by the fact, adverted to in the message from our simla correspondent published elsewhere, that one Mr. Crosthwaite has been appointed to act as member of the Railway Board in the place of Mr. Sheridan going on leave. Mr. Crosthwaite is not a servant of the state Railways, so that the excuse hitherto put forward that the appointment of an outside Indian would be unjust to those in service cannot avail the Government this time. It was only in the last week of February that the Assembly virtunally rejected the demand for the Railway Board grant by 59 votes against 52 as a protest against, among other things, the failure to appointment an Indian to that Board. That so soon after this demonstration the authorities should defy the Assembly proves their growing irresponsiveness to public opinion.

29th April, 1927.

DEFENCE OF INDIA.

The recent statement of Lord Birkenhead on the Sskeen committee's report that the army policy in India is not at all an Indian question but one which chiefly affects imperial interests and therefore must be decided in consultation with the Imperial Defence Committee by the British Cabinet which ought, once for all, to set people here ~~thinking~~. It shatters the hopes raised by the previous declarations of the Government of India that the army in India was intended only for the defence of India. It shows further that they were mere eye-washes made after the war when any other attitude would

have evoked in the country widespread dissatisfaction and disgust. Time cools enthusiasm and provides excuses for retraction and that is why we find the Secretary of State repudiating the policy which the Government in India had solemnly promised the Indian Legislature to point out. Indignation against this retrograde attitude was expressed only the other day by Mr. Jinnah, a member of the Keen committee, who now finds that the report has all but been scrapped and Sir P.S. Sivaswami Iyer in an article which he has contributed to the current number of The Indian Review, apprehends that "judging from the utterances of Lord Birkenhead and the Communique of the Government of India, the odds are against the acceptance of the Recommendations of the Committee". He thinks that these proposals are cautious and modest and that they do not go as far as the resolution of the Assembly or the wishes of some members of the committee demanded.

-----the Britisher says India cannot be fit for self-government until she has her own army, but at the same time every little attempt to develop her defence resources is sympathetically thwarted and she is further told that she can only be given control over her own army when she attains Dominionhood. There is therefore no point in fixing our attention on one aspect of the problem to the exclusion of the other. Great Britain would not willingly allow India to develop her army until she obtains political freedom and in the meanwhile there is every necessity for her to compel the authorities to carry out Indianisation as quickly and as widely as possible.

30th April, 1927.

REFORM IN INDIAN STATES.

We publish elsewhere a remarkable memorandum, hitherto unpublished, prepared by the late Dewan Bahadur S. Srinivasa Raghava Iyengar, one of the most distinguished Indian Administrators and for some time Dewan of Baorda. At a time like the present when the subject of reform in Indian States is attracting so much public attention both in the States and in British India, we dare say this illuminating study on the subject by one who could speak with authority will be read alike with interest and profit. The document it is necessary to bear in mind was drawn up some 30 years ago. The Indian National Congress had then but just emerged into public notice and had only begun to put forward demands on behalf of the country which, though exceedingly modest, were yet met with but indifference and ridicule by the bureaucracy. The call for a full-fledged democratic constitution had not yet then been made. The leaders were then content with melioristic measures, such as the expansion of the councils, the increased representation for non-officials, the throwing open of high offices to Indians and so on. In not demanding responsible Government for the States in his memorandum, therefore, Mr. Srinivasa Raghava Iyengar but reflected contemporary public opinion.

The fact, however, that Mr. Srinivasa Raghava Iyengar did not ask for what no one thought of at the time does not minimise the merit of his memorandum. On the contrary, it displays such grasp of the essential needs of an Indian State that one

can confidently assert that no reform whatsoever would be worthwhile which does not take account of the principles he has enunciated. ~~It~~ ^X may perhaps be as well that we examine his draft constitution a little in detail. "The happiness of the people, as the foundation of the strength, durability and happiness of the ruling dynasty shall be," runs one of the fundamental clauses of the draft constitution prepared by him, "the paramount object of the Government of the country". Starting with this principle which was to him axiomatic, Mr. Srinivasa Raghava Iyengar enunciates provisions which, he shows, are corollaries to the above mentioned principle. First comes the abolition of personal rule and then follow the concomitants of such a reform---the enforcement of some sort of ministerial responsibility, the enthronement of the rule of law, ^{the} ~~of~~ provision for a competent, responsible and impartial law-making body, the prohibition of the exercise by the prince of suspending and dispensing powers, the administration of justice in accordance with the process of law, the safeguarding of public revenues against encroachment by the princes and so on. It is a sad fact that as yet few of the Indian states enjoy the benefit of wholesome provisions like these without which no citizen can feel his person or his property secure. Mr. Srinivasa Raghava Iyengar in his memorandum makes the British political agent, so to say, the guardian of the constitution of the State in which he is stationed. This provision cannot of course apply to modern conditions. The protector of the constitution in a federation according to modern conceptions should be, not the Central authority, much less one of its subordinate agents, but a federal court. But that is a matter of detail only

286

2204

remotely connected with the subject which the distinguished writer of it had in view. The insistence on the enforcement by the States of the elementary rights of the subject---the right of freedom of person, of property, of speech of association, and so on--^{first} is the 1st and the most essential step in the reform of Indian States. It is this vital fact, beside which all else is secondary and consequential, that the late Mr. Srinivasa Raghava Iyengar has clearly brought out and established.

The days have however passed by when the subjects of Indian States will be content with the guarantee of personal rights only. They are now demanding with justice and with increasing effect, that the other set of their rights as citizens, namely, constitutional rights should be as well recognised as their civil rights. This is a problem which bristles with difficulty, for, in this are involved the rights ~~of more than one party.~~ of more than one party. There are, first, the subjects; there are then, their rulers, the Government of India as the suzerain authority over the states constitutes a 3rd party; and then there are the people of India whose interests also are involved. How exactly the rights of all these parties, in some respects felt to be conflicting, are to be reconciled in a question that deserves attention. Mr. C. Vijayaraghavachariar, the veteran Indian Patriot, whose views we published in our columns on Wednesday surveys the problem in a masterly manner and boldly suggests that while most of the 562 states might be absorbed in British Indian provinces, being separate "states", in name only, the prominent ones such as Hyderabad and Mysore might be constituent provinces of a ~~the~~ federated India, enjoying the same rights

287

2266

--54--

and privileges and discharging the same responsibilities as the British Indian Provincial governments at present do. In his view there is no escaping the democratisation and federalisation of the States. His line of thought is interesting and his reasoning logical. It must be admitted, too, that the trend of political forces to-day is towards that direction.

The move towards responsible government in the Indian states, whether the princes will it or no, is every day gaining increasing momentum; and the citizens of the states are taking an increasing interest in the actions of the central Government subjecting them to scrutiny and criticism from the angle of vision of the provincial state of a federation. It is ~~times~~ time in the circumstances that the leaders bestowed earnest attention on this great problem.

3rd May, 1927.

PROBLEM OF INDIAN STATES.

The movement among Princes of Indian States to get their status and rights guaranteed in advance of the statutory commission is a mischievous and retrograde one in so far as the object is to stem the progress of reform in India. The spirit of "After me, the deluge", animating some of them, prompting them to take steps to counteract the forces of democracy, is one which is as deplorable as it is detrimental to the lasting interests of the country. Their desire, as our Simla correspondent says, to have a committee or commission set up immediately in order to define in an authoritative manner their position vis a vis such reformed constitution for British India as may be set up, in so far as it is the result of an apprehension

that their interests are likely to be seriously prejudiced by the widening of the bounds of freedom, is scarcely calculated to exhibit their patriotism in a favourable light. As Indians, it ought to be their sacred duty to welcome every indication on the part of the people of India, whether in their areas or outside, of their yearning for living a fuller life and by precept and example show how that end could be convassed successfully. Instead of thus doing what they can to promote the cause of the country, many of them appear to be at present engaged in discovering methods to make their own autocratic position impregnable. But what is deplorable is that they are further said to be engaged in checkmating the movement of freedom in British India by depicting the probable consequences of swaraj in as dark a hue as possible, with the intention of scaring the British Government into stiffening its attitude towards the popular cause. It is beyond the power of any human agency, however strong it may be, to keep down a nation for ever and our ~~regret~~ regret is not because the powers-that-be may be influenced by the reactionary section of the Indian ~~xx~~ aristocracy, but that the latter are denying themselves the legitimate pride and ineffable joy which would be theirs if they contribute to help forward the national movement. It is obvious that any inquiry into the future status of Indian States and their relations with the Indian Legislature and executive should follow, not proceede, the settlement of the constitutional question, for it would be obsurd to contend that the interests of two-thirds of India should be made to depend on or be influenced by those of a third of India. It is premature now to consider their position; for it is not known what the future Indian cons~~titution~~titution would be like. As "Federalist" points out in the interesting article published elsewhere, there

are questions of internal reforms, external status and economic and financial relations which have necessarily to be carefully considered, but no committee can envisage these problems in the absence of any knowledge of the fundamental basis and incidents of the future political structure of India. Indian states cannot escape the surging tide of nationalism; subjects in any of them moved by such progress, as is taking place in the adjoining provinces, are demanding reforms which rulers would find it increasingly difficult to withhold. It is in the nature of things impossible for the states to remain the antechambers of reaction which most of them are at present, and the abiding interests of themselves, their subjects and their country require that they should enlarge the powers and privileges of their people so that in time they may become constitutional heads of governments working in co-operation with each other for the common good of India. No commission can prevent the natural developments which we have indicated and no formal document to which the Princes and British India are parties can bind posterity in the way in which it is sought to bind it.

5th May, 1927.

Lahore is the unhappy scene of the latest outburst of mob violence originating in some obscure personal feud or local faction but rapidly taking on a communal tinge and spreading far beyond the ambit of the initial disturbance. The origin of the trouble so far as it can be ascertained seems to have been the assaulting of a sikh woman by a Muslim which furnished the excuse for a quarrel between the wilder members of the two communities. The police intervened and it looked as if the commotion had subsided, but it suddenly

--57--

began again on a much larger scale and rapidly degenerated into a general melee. "Muhammadans mercilessly assaulted the Hindus and the Sikhs severely dealt with Muhammadans wherever they could get hold of them". How the Hindus happened to be in it is a little puzzling at first, but not really so difficult to understand. They were probably vicariously expiating the sins of the Sikhs. Be this as it may, there is something Gibbertain about the whole thing which would make it altogether laughable if it were not for the tragedy with which the atmosphere is surcharged. By all accounts it looks as if the horrors of Calcutta might be re-enacted at Lahore if the authorities are not vigilant. Why, after the incidents of the previous night, no adequate preparations were in train to anticipate and check the disturbances of Wednesday evening will, we dare say, form the subject of an official enquiry as early as possible.

6th May, 1927.

THE LAHORE RIOTS.

-----Three features of the trouble, which the communique brings out, are such as calculated to disturb the general public. One of them is that the outbreak partakes of the nature of the external expression of long nourished and pent up communal hatreds. Else the attacks on the Hindus by the Muslims for the real or supposed sins of the Sikhs is inexplicable. The undoubted acts of sacrilege, incendiarism and aimless assaults by one party on their opponents with whatever weapon that came in handy are facts which are

--58--

deplorable and do no credit to the leaders of the communities. Another noteworthy feature of the disturbances is that all the 3 communities have fared equally badly in the affrays. This shows that all the communities are alike inclined to take the law in their own hands, perhaps, as some may suggest, on the theory that violence can be cured only by violence. It looks as though the Sikhs and the Hindus wish to show that they are no cowards as some suppose. If this is the fact the discerning citizen should deplore this development; for, great nations are built on due respect for law on the part of their citizens. The 3rd feature of the situation is that as in Calcutta assaults and acts of incendianism are committed, not by bands of people, but by individuals or small bodies on individuals or small bodies. These are the more dangerous because they require large forces to tackle distributed throughout the town at intervals of a few yards and watching and functioning constantly. The incidents are deplorable because they are acts done, not in a moment of Bit but deliberately and almost fiendishly. The situation is fraught with further danger, for the happenings at Lahore are having a disturbing effect on other centres --on Amritsar, on Delhi and so on. In view of these facts and of the mischievous ~~it~~ possibilities latent in the situation, we think it is the duty of the leaders of the 3 communities--Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs --be times to sound a note of warning to their followers and to make them desist from the mad course which some of them are at present pursuing.

10th May, 1927.

THE KEROSENE WORKERS' STRIKE.

The collision between the workers and the authorities of the Burma Oil Company today, which resulted in the resort to firearms is a grave warning to all concerned that the present position should not be allowed to continue any larger. Firing on an unarmed crowd is a heavy responsibility for anyone to shoulder. We dare say no time will therefore be lost in ordering a searching enquiry into the circumstances in which firearms were used and whether if at all and how far the firing was justified. The points all dispute between the men and the company do not seem to be incapable of easy adjustment. The men doubtless complain of many grievances, which was the immediate cause of the strike, is the suspension or dismissal of 114 men by the company on the ground of retrenchment. The other is rather trivial, namely, the thoughtless deprivation by the company of 4 benches the use of which the workers had hitherto been permitted. We note the company is not unwilling to meet the men on both these points, that is, on a condition. The condition is that the workers should contract to guarantee a certain amount of output in a given time. Perhaps in the light of the latter condition, the workers see in the dismissals, not the fortuitous circumstance of the men becoming surplus hands for lack of business, but deliberate victimisation on the part of the employers. They feel, rightly or wrongly, that their comrades were "sacked" because they were prominently connected with the Union activities. The employers, on the

297

2218

---60---

other hand, would appear to suspect an equally deliberate enforcement of a policy of ca'nny on the part of the workers, for, they say that if the stipulated output is guaranteed, they are prepared to grant the demands that the men make. It ought, we think to be easy in the circumstances which of the parties labours under an imaginary grievance and who exactly is mistaken. If there was a machinery to enquire into the dispute, things might not have taken so serious a turn. Now at least we trust the enquiry promised on behalf of the Labour Commissioner will soon be held, for, we feel that if the workers could be persuaded that there would be a just and impartial enquiry, in which the dice will not be loaded against them, we do not think they will refuse to return to work. We suggest to those concerned, therefore, to come to an amicable understanding over the proposed enquiry.

13th May, 1927.

THE STRIKE ENQUIRY.

The full details of the shooting incident on Tuesday are not yet available; but the evidence tendered at the magisterial enquiry enables one to gather the main facts leading up to the use of firearms. As usual, the strikers had gathered at the tope near the installation, but with no other particular objective in their view than that of discussing their grievances. Some trouble appears to have arisen. When the lorries containing petrol for distribution in the city left the installation and passed by the place where the strikers had gathered. At this point some of the men seem to have obstructed the passage of the lorries by drawing up across the road a felled palmyra tree. The road was

cleared of the obstruction by the police, but the strikers again replaced it on the road so as not to allow the lorries to proceed. The police continued their efforts at persuading the men to give up obstructive ~~tactics~~ tactics. One Police Sub-Inspector however considered the position too much for the police to handle and asked the assistance of the men of the Company in protecting the stranded lorries. The company authorities there upon rushed their men to the scene and launched an attack on the strikers who had gathered around the lorries. Stone-throwing which it is alleged had been indulged in by the strikers was equally freely resorted to as a ~~retaliatory~~ retaliatory measure. Finding themselves outnumbered the Company's men became panicky and began to use their firearms and shot at the crowd and being perhaps "in an excited mood" did not know what the bullets really did, though almost every one of those who used firearms says that he did not hit the men. As it has turned out, however, that the men have been by bullets and wounded, it is evident that their bullets proved dangerously effective. The evidence available so far prima facie establishes two facts; first, that the calling in of the company's men to help the police was a mistake. The time had not come for the police to have abdicated their functions in favour of the Company's men. Secondly, all available evidence points to the fact that the use of firearms was absolutely uncalled for. Mr. Black's anxious call to his men to stop shooting the moment he heard the sound of a shot shows that in his view there was no need for opening fire. There is also the evidence of Sergeant Goodwin who was positive that there was no need to use fire-arms at the time. The resort to firearms was therefore a result either of recklessness or of foolish panic. The Police were on the spot: Sergeant

Goodwin says he himself had firearms; and if there was any need for using them, the police ought to have been trusted to do their duty.

The shooting on an unarmed crowd has had reactions which those responsible for it little anticipated. It has served to spread indignation among the ranks of the workers. It has exasperated the men especially as they suspect that what passes for an enquiry is all a process of preparing the whitewash. The first thing necessary to restore confidence and re-establish peace, is therefore to fix the responsibility for the shooting and bring the offenders to book. A state of things in which it is possible for people to fire at an unarmed crowd, under the very nose of high-placed officials of the police force, without those responsible for it being tried by a judicial tribunal in open court is intolerable. The Law Member who is now in the City ought to be able to gauge the strength of public feeling on the subject. We hope the Government will, without delay, order an open judicial enquiry into the whole affair.

17th May, 1927.

The strike of the workmen of the Oil Companies in the City has happily been brought to an end to-day and all parties who have contributed to this amicable settlement of what might have developed into an ugly menace to the public peace and the starting point of a disastrous industrial life on a large scale, deserve to be congratulated on their earnest efforts in this behalf. It will be seen that, on the 2 important points of difference between the employers and the workmen, the former have recognised though somewhat belatedly, the

wisdom of giving way to the workmen's chief demands, so that the benches will be restored to the tinkers, and the dismissed men will be reinstated. As regards the other points at issue, the employers' notice seems to be studiously vague, especially in offering temporary employment to the tinkers who had been reduced as coolies. It is however to be hoped that the understanding upon which the men have returned to work will be interpreted in a liberal spirit by the employers on whom a special responsibility rests in the matter.

18th May, 1927.

CONGRESS AND A CONSTITUTION

FOR INDIA.

As may be gathered from a report of the proceedings published elsewhere the resolutions passed by the A.I.C.C. at its yesterday's meeting were more or less non-controversial. The most important of them related to the framing of a future constitution for India. This resolution directs the working committee to frame for submission to the Congress for approval, a Swaraj constitution for India in consultation with the elected members of the legislature. The resolution really negatives the so-called convention idea. The congress proposal is by no means the worse for it. Under the Bombay resolution, the congress retains in its own hands both the initiative and the final voice in the framing of a Constitution. Certain general principles calculated to provide the corner-stones for the Constitution are implied in the very resolution. It provides in the first place, that

--64--

the constitution should be a Swaraj one and nothing less. It should secure autonomy for India. In the second place there should be as an integral part of it a declaration of rights guaranteeing to the subjects such elementary rights as freedom of conscience, religious liberty, the right to personal freedom in its various aspects, and so on. This provision, it will be seen, is but a corollary of the resolution passed by the committee the day before. The resolution on inter-communal harmony prescribed that fundamental laws guaranteeing certain rights should form part of the constitution, including laws providing for the extension of the rule of law to Sind and the Frontier Province. The proposed declaration of rights is only a means of giving legal effect to the earlier resolution meant to secure communal harmony. The resolution on the constitution imposes an obligation on the working committee to work in a co-operation with those parties in the country which are not composed of congressmen and with the members of the legislatures. This is the happy reciprocation of the sentiments of other parties and a provision meant to show to Lord Birkenhead that it is not at all a great thing for all parties in India to agree on a constitution. A constitution drawn up in the manner provided will show that it has behind it the weight not only of numbers; but also of every shade of opinion, and of the experience the legislators at large. If such a constitution does not extort respect, the world will know that the fact can be due only to the cussedness of the authorities. -----

The other resolutions passed by the committee fall into 2 categories. One set of them refers to the organisation and support of Labour. The uplift of Labour has for the past some years figured so often on the congress programme that Mr. Vallabhai Patel's motion cannot be said to be a new-comer.

The interests of the ~~The~~ masses, of workers, rural and urban, are really those ~~the~~ of the congress and it is no surprise that attention should frequently be paid to them in all their phases. This is a welcome development though one wishes that the frivolous talk of the kind indulged in over the motion on the B.O.C. strike had been avoided. The resolution of the British Trade Union Bill was little more than an expression of sympathy with and fraternal greetings to a section of Britishers who have been friendly to our aspirations. The other set of resolutions related to China and to subject nations. The A.I.C.C., following public opinion in the country, condemned the despatch of Indian Troops to China without consulting India; and as a token of its sympathy with that Asiatic nation, it expressed its appreciation of the proposal ~~x~~ to send an ambulance mission to that country. The Committee also condemned, by its resolution, regarding the League of oppressed Nations, all varieties of exploitative, parasitic imperialism which preyed upon weaker nations.

The resolutions which the committee have so far passed are mostly non-controversial. The really difficult portion of the committee's work remains to be done. The differences which divide the parties inside the congress itself have yet to be reconciled and unless perfect understanding and harmony are restored among them, no substantial work ^{will} be possible.

259.
2230
--66--
24th May, 1927.

The shooting incident in the City in connection with the kerosene Workers' strike formed the subject of a few questions in the Commons yesterday. Earl Winterton, in reply to the questions, mentioned that no body concerned had been authorised to open fire and discreetly expressed inability to make any more statement because the whole incident might form the subject of judicial proceedings. Earl Winterton concluded that the Government of India were awaiting the report of the magisterial enquiry. Whether the magisterial report is ready or whether indeed the enquiry has at all been completed are questions to which we in the city have not been able to secure an authoritative answer.

27th May, 1927.

INDIAN STATES AND REFORM

The recent Conference of Indian Princes at Simla is not an isolated episode in the ~~unpleasant~~ ^{conventional} routine of Ma--bap government, as those familiar with the picturesque annual sessions of the Indian chamber of Princes might imagine. Not only did some Princes, who had till then stayed away from the chamber, take part in person or by deputy in the proceedings of the conference, but the meeting itself has started many currents of activity which are calculated to have far-reaching consequences. We have already discussed in these columns the resolution passed at the conference asking the Paramount Power to define the position of the states vis a vis any scheme of reform that it might decide to introduce in British India. We have pointed out that this is putting the cart before the horse. At the same time it is just possible that the more far-seeing among the Princes recognise that any

attempt to stem the tide of Indian Nationalism would be as futile ludicrous as the immortal Mrs. Partington's challenge; in that case they might consider it more politic to let it be known that so long as outside intervention was not permitted in their affairs, they were not interested in what happened in British India. If the British Parliament contemplated a real transfer of its responsibility to its Indian counterpart, this would be the best time from the point of view of the Indian Princes to get their virtual independence acknowledged. They could plead treaty rights against being handed over to the new Indian democracy; if the British Parliament acknowledging the force of this argument, were to decide to retain its control over "Indian" India, this control could not be much more nominal than hitherto, so that the main object of the princes would be gained. Some such process of reasoning seems to have culminated in the feeling which the Princes' conference has put forth. If this inference be correct, there attaches a new significance to the statement, published in certain Anglo-Indian contemporaries, to the effect that movements for overhauling the internal administration have been set on foot by rulers of various states, and that attention will be first devoted to the establishment of permanent civil service cadres and the securing of real independence for the judiciary. The initiation of these long-neglected reforms, would be obviously intended to impress the paramount power with the sincerity of the ruler's benevolent designs for their subjects and thus prepossesses the former in favour of the latter's claim to be treated as virtually independent rulers.

Now, the inauguration of permanent civil service cadres is an excellent thing especially when it is intended, as it is averred, to replace the old order of personal rule

Government will not have the hardihood to justify the arrangement on the ground that no qualified Indian is available. It is still not too late for the Government to avoid the mischief of setting up a pernicious precedent and appointment of a non-official Indian to the Executive council. We must also take this opportunity of emphasising that the leader of the Indian delegation should at least this year be an "Indian of suitable rank and qualifications", in the words of Sir Pheroze Setna's resolution in the council of State in 1924. Mr. S.R.Das speaking on that resolution promised to ~~xxx~~ announce shortly the Government's decision on the subject, and held out the hope that the demand put forth by Indian opinion would be considered sympathetically. But the only tangible result was that last year a retired European Civilian, Sir William Vincent, was appointed in flagrant opposition to the implied undertaking. We can only hope that a similar cynical disregard for popular opinion will not be shown this year.

THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL:-

QUESTION OF ACTING VACANCY.

The following editorial note appeared in "The Hindu" in August last year to which a reference is made in our editorial columns to-day:-

"The appointment of Mr. A.K.Campbell to the temporary vacancy created by the absence on deputation of the Hon.Sir C.P.Ramaswamy Iyer will cause regret but hardly any surprise. There is nothing to cavil at as to Mr. Campbell's qualifi-

fications for the post, but it has by now become a well-established practice that, conformably to the recommendation of the Joint Select Committee, the number of the Europeans and the Indians in the Executive council should be equal. Any departure, for however short a period and whatever the reasons of administrative convenience that may be advanced, from that accepted convention cannot but be regarded as a reactionary step and resented as such. It is not an argument that can for a moment hold water that the arrangement is for a period of 2 months only. A false step is none the less false because there is a time-limit to its duration. And once granting the venality of a retrograde action because of its temporary character why should not the same excuse prevail when ^{future} ~~like~~ vacancies arise for gradually lengthening periods. The real test of the palliative position taken up in justification of this insidious method of consolidating the dominance of the Steel Frame lies in the answer to the question:- "Had a similar vacancy arisen in the European half of the council and an Indian been appointed, would these arguments then carry the same appeal"? We rather think not. We are aware that there is also another reason which has had its influence with the Government. That is the difficulty of making a suitable choice among the Indian aspirants to the post. We do not mean of course that suitable men are not available. There are enough men of experience among Indian Officials and non-officials while it is also rumoured that the Ministry was not unwilling to deputize one of its members to fill the temporary vacancy. The difficulty obviously lay in selecting a candidate who would satisfy all parties--a thing that is impossible in the present circumstance. But the

existence of a difficulty is no excuse for running away from it and the Government's habit of easy short-cuts which is the result extend the influence of the bureaucracy is a dangerous one against which all right-minded men must vigorously protest.

2nd June, 1927.

ENQUIRY INTO TRADE DISPUTES.

Our special correspondent at Ootacamund telegraphed yesterday that there was now before the Government of Madras a proposal to establish arbitration or conciliation boards to enquire into and report on labour disputes that arise from time to time in the presidency. The proposal is one which we think ought to commend itself to the Government. That such a body, if it exists, will be frequently referred to seems certain. The number of occasions on which Labour and capital are coming to conflict is steadily increasing. Taking the case of Madras City alone, we know that within the past one month there have been at least four regular strikes and as many cases of acute disagreement between the employers and the employed. In one at least of these cases, the point at issue between the ~~employers and~~ ~~the employed~~ management and the men were, at the end of nearly 3 weeks and after a good deal of injury to person and property had been done, found too trivial to be a justifiable cause for the strike and the lock-out which resulted from the dispute. In another case, where also a strike has been declared, it would appear--at any rate such is the version of the men--that the management refused point-blank to give the men even a hearing to their grievance. In almost all

304

2244

these cases, one outstanding grievance, ~~In~~ which the men alleged was that their leaders were being deliberately dismissed for the simple reason--whatever the ostensible excuse--that they were organising the men into trade unions and thereby seeking to disturb the "placid pathetic contentment" of these men. Whether and how far this charge of "victimisation" against the employers is true, we have no means of knowing. But a cursory study of the history of the recent strikes, and cases of labour unrest in the country would show that if only the men could be convinced that all cases, necessitated by the exigencies really of business depression and that the men were sent out solely because the industry could not otherwise have worked without loss, then the epidemic of strikes which was such a marked feature last month in the city might not have broken out.

If, as Labour alleges, the dismissals constituted really an act of victimisation of Labour by ~~capital~~ ^{capital}, then, we have no hesitation in saying that they are the result of deplorable short-sightedness on the part of the employers. The tide of the trade union movement in India, it is true they learnt, cannot any longer be stemmed by ill-considered acts undertaken with a view to placate false notions of prestige and discipline. The growth of trade unionism in India is inevitable. The Indian legislature has passed an act recognising properly formed trade unions and safeguarding their legitimate rights. The Indian Trade Union Act came into force yesterday. It is a fact which cannot be ignored. In the circumstances, what the wise employer--as for the matter of that, the wise employee as well--ought to do is

to encourage the growth of responsible trade Unionism on sound lines. Under the Act, Labour gets many things it wanted. The corporate existence of its unions----- provided they are registered under the Act-- is recognised; their right to collective bargaining is fully established, including the right to strikes and certain valuable immunities from actions civil and criminal have been conferred on them. Nor have their claims to enlist the help of outsiders or engage themselves in political action been denied; the right to undertake activities to provide for "friendly purposes", such as mutual insurance, education, unemployment benefits, etc.; is recognised. So long as Labour leaders show themselves keenly alive to the potentialities of these provisions for the good of labour at large and refrain from seeking to exploit the unions for sinister or extraenous purposes, we do not see why they should not command the sympathy of the employers as well. At present workers do not appear to realise that a trade Union has other and more important functions to discharge than those of a strike committee pure and simple. If the Unions have not been successful in the past, it is due as much to the fact that they were mere strike committees as to other causes. Now that a trade union law is in operation, it is to be hoped that the tendency among workers, first, to declare a strike as soon as a union is formed and then make frantic appeals for help to a public whose support had not been sought and enlisted before the declaration of the strike, will altogether disappear.

Much of the discontent and unrest among the employees are, on careful enquiry, found to be due to misunderstanding, the result, on the one hand, of the lack of responsible

leadership among the men and of the existence of short-tempered and imperious agents of the employers on the other. The efforts of both Labour and capital to enlist the sympathy of the public, so noticeable of late, constitute, in our opinion, a very healthy development. They show that neither Labour nor Capital aspires for anything more than justice. In these circumstances, if a machinery is available, so constituted as to enjoy the confidence of both the men and the management, we should think its enquiry and report will have considerable influence as a pacifying force. Both the employer and the employed will think twice before they seek to ignore the findings of a body which is recognised by the public at large as an impartial one. It need not necessarily be an arbitral body unless both the bodies accept it as such. To begin with, a conciliation board might be enough. We hope the Government will lose no time in expressing their views on the question and in establishing a machinery the absence of which has in the past occasioned, besides the economic vastage entailed by stoppage of work, considerable loss of property and a little insecurity as regards the safety of persons among the employers and the employed.

307 2250
June 4th, 1927.

THE INDIA DEBATE.

The same contempt for public opinion appears in an even more exaggerated form in Earl Winterton's observations on the question of political prisoners. He contended that these men were in jail "because they were guilty up to the hilt of participating in the operations, which nobody except a few lunatics could condone". And he trotted out the stale argument that the regular trial of these men by ordinary courts would endanger the lives of witnesses. But, in the same breath, he went on to admit that "revolutionary crime in Bengal was confined to a small area and had almost disappeared from the rest of India." If conspiracy has thus been reduced to manageable proportions, where is the danger to the lives of the Government's truth-telling witnesses? And why should the ordinary processes of the law be suspended any longer? Are we to conclude that the Government's real intention is not to put down conspiracy, but to vindictively pursue with punishment these unfortunates who have suffered terrible things already? If revolutionary crime is, as Lord Winterton averred, an epidemic in Bengal which obeys certain laws of periodicity much like cholera and small-pox, what earthly good could the exercise of any number of arbitrary powers do? But the Government safe in the citadel of unreason, defy logic and humanity, alike. Their spokesman confounds conciliation with weakness and proudly declares that the law is no respecter of persons. The law is however not exalted but dragged in the mire when it is used as it has been used in the case of ~~sabhaschaman~~ Subhas Chandra Bose

and hundreds of others like him.

Eral Winterton's observations ~~on~~ ~~the~~ on the political situation were even less satisfactory than the rest of his speech. He seemed to take it for granted that the only question on the tapis was the appointment of a statutory commission ----- It was impossible he said to announce the date of appointment or the condition governing the acceleration of date--as if it mattered much now--or the names of the personnel, though every consideration would be given to the suggestions made in Parliament on this last point. But he made no reference whatever--and none else seems to have noted the omission or attempted to get it rectified--to the one thing that really matters. What are to be the terms of reference of the proposed commission? If it is to be nothing more than the statutory body mentioned in section 86 of the Government of India Act, India has no use for it; and she is not prepared to acknowledge the validity of the Preamble to the Act, If, on the other hand, it is to help India to frame her own future constitution it is Indian opinion that must first be consulted as to the date of its appointment, its personnel and its terms of reference.

6th June, 1927.

When Earl Winterton gave the House of Commons his version of the truth about the Bengal detenus he apparently forgot that there was at least one man out of jail who would be ready to pounce upon his smug sophistries and expose them for what they are. Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose has lost no time in pointing out that there has not been even the least pretence of giving the detenus anything like a fair chance of establishing their innocence. In his own case all that was attempted by way of informing him of the charges or the nature of the evidence against him was a casual statement by a police officer that the Government had documentary evidence that he was "a member of a conspiracy for importing arms, manufacturing explosives and murdering police officers". This kind of wild hitting can be easily indulged in by anybody who is in a privileged position; its value, as proof of the detenu's guilt is nothing, or less than nothing. As Mr. Bose pertinently points out, if there were really such a determined conspiracy about even the lynx-eyed vigilance of the Bengal Police could not have prevented a whole host of murders and other acts of violence, whereas the actual number of these unhappy affairs in Bengal of recent years can be counted on the fingers of one's hands. The bogey of revolutionary violence is largely the creation of a timorous police which fancies a man behind every bush and an autocratic executive which brooks ~~number~~ ^{no} opposition even of the mildest and most constitutional variety. This bogey will vanish the moment the Government have the sense to let the broad light of day stream upon it.

10th June, 1927.

A notice signed by the Chief Presidency Magistrate was served last evening on Mr. M. Singaravelu Chetti calling upon him to show cause why security proceedings should not be taken against him for alleged incitement of labourers to violence. Upon the specific allegations we shall not say anything as they will be duly inquired into by the courts, but we think that the Government, under whose orders the present action has been taken, have been extremely illadvised in initiating the proceedings. The Indian Trade Union Act has just come into operation and the Government themselves are stated to be considering the question of bringing a machinery into existence, for the settlement of disputes between employers and labour. In Madras and in Trichinopoly, labour has been somewhat restive during the last few weeks, but the proper method of settling such disputes as arise is by encouraging the parties to agree to submit the questions at issue to conciliation boards and refrain from doing anything which is likely to embitter the feelings of the workers or make them feel, rightly or wrongly, that they are being attacked indirectly. There are no indications that as a result of propaganda, the situation has developed any ugly aspects threatening the peace and tranquillity of the City. We publish elsewhere a statement issued by labour leaders questioning the policy of the Government in respect of their action against Mr. Singaravelu Chetti. It is a grave and unwise step which Government are taking for which we see little justification.

June 14th, 1927.

COMMISSION ON REFORMS.

-----so long as the object of the commission is ~~the~~ to inquire into the working of the Government of India Act in the terms of the ~~the~~ ^{the} preamble to that enactment, it cannot satisfy the public or the requirements of the situation. The need of the hour is a definite and unequivocal promise to allow the people of India to determine for themselves the form of Government they desire, and the adoption of measures to implement that undertaking. So far as the former is concerned, there cannot be any reasonable doubt as to the fundamental features, as they have been defined in the National Demand, and the Congress will soon be called upon, at the instance of the executive, to approve of a scheme of Swaraj, filling up the ^e details of the outlines indicated in that Demand. We have frankly no hope that the Government are actuated by any desire to proceed about this business in the direction desired by India, and we doubt that if even the ^l mildest politicians of the moderate school are convinced that any good can come out of farcical enquiries instituted so as to canvass support for a particular position. Any attention directed to it might only mean travelling over the ground traversed by the Muddiman Committee. The country ought, therefore, to concentrate its energies on the task of consolidating public opinion and so strengthen it as to make it effective for achieving national ends.

312
2260
17th June, 1927.

SATYAGRAHA IN MADURA

Disobedience of Arms Act

Procession Through Streets.

Madura, June 17th....

Satyagraha through disobedience of the Arms Act was begun yesterday evening here by Mr. Ganapathi Aiyah holding a sword about 2 feet long for which he had taken no license. He ~~xxx~~ led a huge procession through streets, singing national songs, the procession terminating before the National Girls' school.

Mr. Somayajulu and Mr. Ganapathi Aiyah addressed a gathering at the junction of the West and North Chitral Streets, and appealed for public support. Mr. Ganapathi Aiyah was garlanded. Nothing untoward has happened. Bhajana parties are arranged to go round streets both in morning and evening. Great enthusiasm prevails.

The Tamil Nadu volunteers are confident of success of the Madura Satyagraha movement. Further developments are awaited with anxious interest by the public.

18th June, 1927.

THE "DEBATE" ON INDIA.

The so-called debate on India in the House of Commons of which Reuter has cabled a summary was a tame affair which only afforded another opportunity to Earl Winterton to make one of those jejune, bland performances for which Lord Birkenhead's understudy has become famous. His parrot-like repetition of his chief's sentiments and observations naturally makes no impression on the House and so mechanical has become his part in the India Office that he has been ceased to be careful in the statements which he makes to the public. No exposure could have been more thorough than of the impression which he sought to produce that the victims of the Bengal reign of terror have had some kind of judicial trial. Earl Winterton has of course subsequently expressed regret that anything that he said should have created that impression, but if he is sincere in what he said recently that neither he nor the Government of India were anxious to exercise extra-judicial powers a day longer than was necessary, he should not lose a moment in ordering the release of those 150 persons who are still denied their liberty. His remarks on the subject of the Royal Commission were scarcely calculated to clear the mist surrounding that subject. He admitted that the Government of India were collecting materials for use by the commission and referred to the fact that the personal had to be submitted to Parliament. From his observation that "the question of the precise date of the assembling of the commission was becoming one in which matters of practical convenience bulked almost as largely as questions of policy", it

~~It~~ would almost appear that the Government had no real objection to its appointment almost immediately if that course would not be inconvenient. But whatever interest the question may excite among politicians in Great Britain it will have no influence on the overwhelming majority of Indians because they know that neither its composition nor its terms of reference are likely to be satisfactory.

Earl Winterton however thought it his duty to defend the Government of India in their relation to the Legislative Assembly in a few observations the amazing inaccuracy of which is obvious. He said that the debates there had influenced the course of Government more strongly than was contemplated when the Act was passed. We cannot narrate once again the story of the irresponsible attitude assumed by the Government towards the decisions of the Legislative Assembly, whether in regard to legislation, voting of grants or resolutions; suffice it to say that the certification of the enhanced salt duty the restoration of many refused grants and the throwing of the resolutions on the army on the scrap heap, must go to prove the falsity of Earl Winterton's claim. That the members of the Assembly are powerless is absolutely true, how could the Under-Secretary dispute this point when he knows that the Executive is not responsible to the Assembly? We shall not enter into the reasons, which, in Earl Winterton's opinion, have been responsible for the changed outlook in India which he believes has occurred. But he is making a sad mistake if he thinks that one of the factors is the belief among the people of India that their energies should be conserved for the next stage when the Statutory Commission appeared on the scene. When that brilliant constellation appears he will find that it leaves India cold.

22nd June, 1927.

"POWERS" OF THE INDIAN LEGISLATURES.

Earl Winterton took the House of Commons into his confidence on Monday last and told the members what a world of harm some of them were doing by repeating the cry that Indian legislatures had no power and no initiative. In his opinion, it has been discovered that the members of these bodies had greater powers than it was thought they would have when the Government of India Act was placed on the statute book, and he would be surprised if the Statutory Commission, when it instituted an enquiry into the matter, arrived at any other conclusion. We shall not dogmatise as to how the members of the commission will take the kindly tip provided for them by the Under-Secretary of State, but it is obvious to the Indian public that he has been freely drawing on his imagination in order to exaggerate the value of the councils for his own purposes. It is quite easy to demonstrate the fact that the legislature possesses no greater influence now than they had before the reforms were introduced, in almost all departments of ^{Governmental} ~~govt~~ activity, but we shall take the subject of Indian services alone in order to disprove the claim of Lord Winterton. Several councils have asked for the abolition of the boards of Revenue on the ground that they were only the 5th wheel in the coach and were therefore superfluous, apart from the fact that they were the ante-chambers of reaction opposing every desirable reform and placing obstacles in the way of healthy innovations. But the bureaucracy has consistently opposed the step on various

ostensible grounds, the real reason being the apprehension that if the popular voice was allowed to prevail there would have to be a reduction in the number of higher appointments open to the Civil Service. The question of the abolition of the post of ~~divisional~~^s divisional commissioners has like wise been frequently debated in the councils of the provinces which still continue to employ those costly media for the transmission of correspondence between the district Officers and the Government. But the authorities under the influence of the powerful bureaucracy have so far refused to adopt the proposal, though the reform has had the advantage of being supported by committees appointed by the Government themselves. We have had bitter complaints made in the councils about the irresponsible attitude of the Government towards this demand, but the protests have been absolutely in vain and the commissioners are flourishing. If Earl Winterton desires further evidence as to the uniformly contemptuous way in which the Government treat the legislatures of the land, he would find it in the treatment accorded to their resolutions and motions of protest regarding the public services question in general. The story of how the proportionate persons scheme was initiated and carried out is familiar to all. Mr. Montagu consented to the repatriation of those conscientious objectors who had ~~no~~ scruples in serving the changed government. It is unnecessary to dwell on the ridiculously exaggerated value of the reforms which made Mr. Montagu agree to give this compensation, but the point is that this generous scheme was, under the influence of the powerful civil service, repeatedly altered and modified so as to benefit the deserters in every possible way. Again, it is a matter of common knowledge how the Assembly's refusal to grant the money required for the

Assembly's refusal to grant the money required for the Lee Commission was unceremoniously swept ~~ad-~~ aside by the Government and now, liberally the pay and pensions of the members of the higher services have been improved in spite of the vehement opposition by the Assembly and the public. In fact, the services have, by the manner in which they have succeeded in their agitation, demonstrated the importance of the legislatures and their inability to guard the public exchequer from being raided behind their back. So unhampered indeed have been the Government that, under the influence of the India Office, they have reconsidered their decision in regard to British members of the services recruited in India and are on the eve of admitting them to the benefits recommended by the Lee commission to those recruited in England.

22nd June, 1927.

The personnel of the delegation from India to the September session of the Assembly of the League of Nations has been announced. It will be found that, as hitherto, it will be led by a European, not by an Indian, in spite of the fact that after strenuous attempts on the part of the Central Legislature to make the Government realise the necessity for an Indian to lead the deputation, they gave an undertaking that they would their best to satisfy public opinion. It is humiliation that the Indian delegation to an annual assemblage of the representatives of various countries of the world gathered to discuss momentous questions,

13th July, 1927.

And still they come. We are obviously never to see the end of concessions to the foreign element in the Services camouflaged under some pretext or other. The Lee recommendations were originally confined to the All-India Services, but later many of their benefits were extended in a most unwarranted and autocratic way to many provincial service officers of non-Asiatic domicile. And now their zealous friends in the House of Commons are moving heaven and earth to get these Officers the privilege of retiring on proportionate pensions, which is now enjoyed only by those in the higher services. The way in which this flagrant suggestion, which was put forward by Mr. Wardlaw Milne, was met by Earl Winterton speaking on behalf of the Government was characteristically disingenuous. While displaying a stern front as became the guardian of the Indian Tax-payer's interests, the Under-Secretary posed as equally anxious to do the just thing. He artlessly answered that Lord Birkenhead had directed, "the Government of India to notify local Governments that he would be prepared to consider on the merits, as cases outside the rules, applications for permission to retire permanently from the officers of Local Governments, who were appointed either by the Secretary of State in Council or by a subordinate authority, but in the Local Governments opinion deserving of special consideration".

We cannot conceive that Lord Birkenhead is so unsophisticated as not to know that this involved phraseology will be most assuredly interpreted as a general

invitation to all and sundry to apply forthwith for this additional boon; as for the Local Governments, they will never be so churlish, for would not a declaration that a particular officer was not "deserving of special consideration" amount to a reflection on their own prestige and discrimination as employers? Thus Lord Birkenhead or his ingenious Lieutenant in the Commons has coined a formula--blessed word--I intended simultaneously to line the pockets of royal servants and turn away the wrath of disgruntled Indian politicians; only those politicians and the public which they represent are not such simpletons as to miss its significance.

14th July, 1927.

STATUS OF INDIAN PRINCES.

The deputation despatched to England on behalf of the chamber of Princes has finished its work and started on its return journey with flying colours and a fanfare of trumpets announcing its success all along the line. The object of the deputation was two-fold -- to get the opinion of eminent counsel on the constitutional position of the Princes and to initiate steady and effective propaganda in England on behalf of the Princes' claim to virtual independence in the conduct of the internal affairs of their states. If the Reuter message on the subject which appears elsewhere is a fair sample of their efforts in the latter direction, Messrs Huskar and Rushbrook Williams may feel pardonably proud of their skill. "Public interest in the question of Indian Princes has been aroused, and stimulated," we are told; what

exactly this means will appear when we consider that it is exceedingly probable that such opportunist effusions as Lord Sydenham's article which we discussed the other day, owe their inspiration to the activities of the deputation. In the face of this very natural inference Reuter's unctuous testimony to the "utmost sobriety and discretion" of the propaganda started by the deputation sounds comically absurd. But the possibility of an unholy alliance between the Anglo-Indian die-hards who are vowed to oppose India's demands to the utmost and the Indian Princes many of whom are bent upon their keeping autocracy unimpaired, is sufficiently disquieting. The congenital aptitude for misrepresentation of the one fortified by the powerful influence of the other may do endless mischief if steps are not taken sufficiently early to counteract its evil effects.

The fact that one of the Chief purposes of the deputation has been to secure the opinion of leading counsel on the constitutional position of the Princes indicates that the latter rely primarily upon what they conceive to be their legal rights in the negotiations with the Government of India which they have in train. It is useless to attempt to assess these rights till the opinions that have been collected and the evidence on which they are based are made public. But, what we are concerned to point out here is that the purely legal aspect of the question is the least important of all its aspects for all practical purposes; no judicial tribunal can take cognisance of questions affecting the constitutional relations of the Princes and the Paramount Power.

Any change in these relations must, therefore, be the outcome of mutual adjustment based on an exhaustive discussion of all the political and moral issues involved. In other words, the high contracting parties to such an agreement must be not merely the British Government and the Princes but also the people of India and the subjects of Indian States. The one accepted fact that dominates this discussion is, an Indian correspondent writing in The Daily Herald points out, the right that has always been claimed and exercised by the British Government of intervention in case of "intolerable misgbat". This right, he says, the British Government cannot now abdicate, and when the British Parliament transfers its responsibility for the Government of India to duly accredited representatives of the Indian people, it will also automatically transfer to them the right of intervention and control over Indian states; for so long as the system of administration in the Indian States continues to be personal and autocratic the necessity for outside control will remain as a safeguard against misrule. It is perhaps natural that Indian Princes should be anxious about their position in a self-governing India, but if they have vision and are patriotic and far-seeing they should take into consideration their own position vis-a-vis their subjects with the gradual spread of democratic fervour, their place in a self-governing India and the reforms, constitutional and administrative, which they have from now to introduce in their states so as not to lag behind the movement for freedom in British India.

15th July, 1927

One of the declared objects of the permissive resolution regarding Congress entry adopted by the Non-Brahmin Confederation at Goimbar~~g~~ore is the attainment of political freedom under the aegis of the Congress. It is incumbent on those who seek to bring about this striking charge in the mentality of the party to act in accordance with this policy so as to render the easy and rapid achievement of concerted political action possible. We cannot therefore too ~~xxx~~ strongly deprecate the grossly violent and unseemly language indulged in by a certain class of speakers at public meetings. An organised campaign of vilification of a whole community such as appears to have been inaugurated, to judge by the meeting held last evening at the Gokhale Hall, is far from calculated to bring about co~~x~~ordination of activities which is necessary in the struggle for political freedom. "Why should it lie in the mouths of those whom it would not suit to give us further reforms to urge that there are waiting factions in Indian political associations," said a speaker last evening. This is a belated but none the less welcome discovery, but its efficacy will be in danger of being lost if it is accompanied by the incessant chanting of the hymn of hate.

19th July 1927.

Our special correspondent at Simla suggests that reading between the lines of Mr. Craik's speech in the Punjab Legislative Council one will find that the Government of India will embark upon legislation calculated to curtail the liberty of the Press. The occasion for the proposed legislation is Mr. Justice Dalip Singh's decision in the Rangila Rasul case that it is possible to libel prophets and saints whom thousands revere without being guilty of prompting class hatred under Section. 152-A of the I.P.C. It is of course necessary that provisions should exist in our criminal law to penalise those who utter slander against the founders of religions and their prophets and saints. But in making such provisions, there is need to exercise great caution in the method and in the wording of the enactment meant to attain that end. We have far too much experience of the working of press laws to refuse to sympathise with those members of the Punjab Council who felt it difficult to be drawn by Mr. Craik into an unguarded support of rebusious proposals for controlling the press.

1st August, 1927.

INDIAN PRINCES AND REFORMS.

When attempts are being made to induce rulers of Indian States to dissociate themselves from the national movement and range themselves on the side of reactionary forces it should afford the public great relief to have definite and solemn statements from the more progressive and enlightened princes avowing their concern for constitutional progress in India. Speaking at a luncheon the other day in the House of Commons the Jamsaheb of Nawanagar is reported to have declared that Indian rulers were in no way out of sympathy with Indian aspirations for further constitutional reform. The Maharaja of Mysore referred to this subject in his speech at the banquet to the Viceroy on Friday last in Mysore. His Highness after complimenting Lord Irwin on the fact that he has shown his willingness to grapple with the question of the place of the Indian states in the constitutional of the future, expressed the hope that "a way may be found in which it will be open to us to play an honourable part as partners with British provinces in whatever form of federal government may be decided upon". This clearly shows that, far from wishing to discourage political advance in British India, Indian Princes of the type of the Maharaja of Mysore and the Jamsaheb expect a far-reaching move in the near future, their only anxiety being that in such a federated system of government as may be decided upon, Indian states should have a part to play, proportionate to their interests and honourable to themselves. That is a claim which merits every consideration and the position would be clear and

more satisfactory if the generality of the rulers of Indian states were inspired by the same high and enlightened views. Their insistence on the passing of the Indian Princes Protection Act did not conduce to the establishment of better relations between them and the public in British India. The attitude of irresponsiveness adopted by many of them to the demands of their subjects for associating the people more closely with the administration has also tended to increase the prejudice existing in India against the rulers of these states. Unfortunately there are short-sighted Princes among them who do not realise the fact that their own security and happiness depend only upon the contentment of their own subjects and the satisfaction of their political aspirations. The conditions for the introduction of generous reforms are favourable in Indian States. Dr. Rushbrook Williams, in trying to account in his article on "India and the Future of the Indian States" in the current Asiatic Review for the comparative absence of communal outbursts in them, attributes this gratifying circumstance to "the identification of interest between the ruler and the ruled", He says:-

"Why are religious disturbances so rare in the States? Most Princes are very tolerant--but so are the British. The difference, perhaps, lies in this, that in an Indian State, Hindus and Muslims are first of all subjects of a Prince, accustomed to respect his Government ~~to~~ and to live in amity under his rule. Only secondarily are they conscious of communal differ

In British India the exact reverse is often the case". The identity of interest is a feature which rulers like the Maharaja of Mysore are taking praiseworthy efforts to establish on a firm foundation by gradually effecting a devolution of power to the people. But they are an exception and there is need even for them to quicken the pace. The deputation of Dr^g. Rushbrook Williams and Col. Haksar to England on their behalf has by no means tended to clear u-p matters, and the chancellor of the chamber of Princes would be well advised to issue a statement explaining the object of the deputation and setting out their attitude towards the question of Swaraj for India.

August 2nd, 1927.

The year's session of the Tinnevely District Conference, the concluding proceedings of which we publish elsewhere was on all accounts a successful one. The address of Mr. Satyamurthi, the President, was a clear exposition of the stand point of Congressmen in regard to the welfare of the different communities. The Congress recognises that the nation cannot progress if each one of the communities of which it is composed does not progress steadily and well; and Congressmen, no matter what their caste or creed is, are prepared to do everything in power to uplift the backward and the depressed in all possible ways. This task of upliftment is best done, Mr. Satyamurthi holds along with other Congressmen on a basis of communal concord and co-operation

327 2298

--no--

and may be spoilt by a policy of isolation and conflict. That is why congressmen every where have welcomed the decision of the Justice Party to join the Congressmen---a policy which, it is significant, the Tinnelvely Conference has heartily approved by passing a resolution welcoming the Justicites into Congress fold. Mr. Satyamurthi's anxiety to see the nation present a united front every patriot would share. That anxiety has led him as many will think, to put forward some new proposals. Except illustrating the fact that under the Gauhati policy congressmen are at times placed in embarassing situations, Mr. Satyamurthi's new scheme does not seem to help us much. It is significant that the Tinnelvely Conference preferred to pursue a course different from the one suggested by the President. About the resolutions passed by the Conference, we have not much to say. Most of them were of the usual kind meant to carry out the Congress programme. There is one, however, the wisdom of which, to our mind, seems open to doubt. Following the lead of Chingleput, the Conference seeks to place a bar on members of "Communal political organisations"--a course our objections to which we have already set forth. So long, at any rate, as the Muslim League prefers to continue to be "communal-political", such a suggestion seems impracticable and unwise.

328 1300
--181--
10th August, 1927.

THE COMMISSION AND COMMUNAL DISHARMONY.

The leading article in The Times on the Indian Reforms Commission, of which Reuter to-day cables a summary, will be read with quarrel with considerable suspicion in this country. Nobody will quarrel with our contemporary in its enunciation of what it regards as fundamental facts in the situation. The Times singles out two for special mention, the place of the Indian States in the future Indian constitution and the problem of the minorities. So far as the 1st point is concerned, it is recognised by The Times itself that the "problem of the future relations of the Ruling Princes with the Government of India is less urgent^{first} than the 2nd one. ^{second} Indeed there are signs to show that Indian politicians and their relations on the basis of modern principles will be of mutual advantage. The pronouncements of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore and the Jamsaheb of Nawanagar show which way enlightened opinion among the Princes tends; while, as Pandit Motilal Nehru made it clear in his speech at Bangalore on Monday, Indian politicians are no less anxious to work for a settlement which will be acceptable to the rulers and the-subjects in Indian States. One may in the circumstances feel confident that the spirit of give and take among these is strong enough to reduce the issue to one capable of easy solution. The communal problem, just at present, looks more serious. We do not in any way wish to minimise its gravity. We know it has become the despair of a few patriots. A Delhi message, published yesterday, shows, things are so bad to day, in this respect that they have moved Mr. V.J. Patel, by no means a pessimist, to observe that his hopes, born of a

399.

2302

--932--

survey of the attitude of England, of favourable treatment for India, have been shattered by the gloomy outlook of the communal situation in India. Bad as it is, we do not think it is desperate or irremediable. Communal ~~distemper~~ ^{dis}temper in India is not a disease unfamiliar to us. We know too much of its etiology and successful treatment to feel unduly despondent over it. As The Times points out, though to draw conclusions of its own, time will prove to be the best and most efficacious solvent of communal antagonisms. Experience has ~~xx~~ again and again shown that this malady not seldom distils its own cure. To take a recent example. Upset by the Rangila Rasul judgment, the Muslims of a certain area in the Frontier persecuted their Hindu brethren for a time, but soon found economic considerations too ~~a~~ ^{very} strong to enable them to pursue that unjust and cruel policy. They therefore proclaimed that the Hindus might remain on conditions stipulated, we take it, more to save their face than to be ~~en~~forced. Similarly in the very Punjab where the inter-communal friction is at its worst, a Peace Sabha has been set up to restore communal harmony. The communities have, it is obvious, to live together. For, despite the remark of The Times that India has always been a paradise of minorities, ie, that minorities have been ever held sway, the people have progressed far enough to realise the need to assert their rights and, ~~as~~ long, to wring our respect for ordered, democratic rule. To seek ~~to~~ ^{therefore} to perpetuate the existing system of government by raising up the bogey of Muslim or Hindu domination, as The Times is a futile effort.

15th August, 1927.

Our special correspondent at Simla throws some light to-day on the way in which the selection committee appointed to recruit candidates for the Indian Medical Service has worked in practice. It would appear, in the 1st place, that candidates who possessed only Indian degrees were on that ground summarily rejected. If this be the case, it is surely an unwarranted libel on the Indian Universities as well as an insult offered to Indian Medical Graduates, especially as they were not told beforehand that the non-possession of a British degree would be a disqualification. It is further apprehended that the selection Committee's hands were fettered by certain instructions from Whitehall which were tantamount to making a farce of Indianisation. We have at present no means of knowing as to how far these charges are well-founded, but as it is notorious that whitehall has not taken kindly to the Indianisation of the Indian Medical Service, one will not be surprised if the allegations prove true. The country will await with interest the Government's replies to the questions in the Assembly of which, we daresay, non-official members will give notice to the Government, if they have not already done so.

18th August 1927.

THE STATUTORY COMMISSION

Amidst the huge crop of conjectures and canards to which the public is entertained on the forth-coming statutory commission, there is great risk, we are afraid of the Indian public missing the reality of the danger that seems to be developing in the attitude of the Government of India and its personnel to-day. The sincerity and simplicity that characterised Lord Irwin's early utterances was qualified by the distinctly unpromising and disappointing stand he took in January last before the Assembly when he definitely reiterated, after all that had happened, the claim of the British Parliament to decide the future political fate of India and the necessity of satisfying that Parliamentary Providence by a policy of calculated to demonstrate the people's fitness for the next step. The subsequent developments that have taken place in the bureaucratic and Anglo-Indian worlds and the stir that has been created among Indian States indicated attempts to prepare an atmosphere of reaction at the present juncture in which the unfortunate communal conflicts and the differences among the political parties in the country have been fairly availed of. Perhaps, as a result of the counsels tendered to him by bureaucratic satraps or colleagues or as the product of the conservative traditions in which he has lived and laboured, there seems to be very little doubt to-day that Lord Irwin is by no means among the group of British politicians who would accelerate the pace in India or would qualify the imperial hold on India by a policy of trust and co-operation on equal

terms. It has to be recollected that the prospective announcement of the Royal Commission earlier than 1929 is due neither to a desire to respond to the demands of the Moderates nor to a disposition to meet the demands of the nationalists some little way. It is apparently due, in the 1st place, to the exigencies of British politics and to the desire of the present Government not to leave it to their successors to alter the Indian constitution in ways that may affect vested interests of the British with which they are more closely identified. In the next place, the advancement of the date of the Commission may be due to the political and administrative exigencies in India. The term of the present legislatures will expire in 1929, the year in which the Statutory Commission is bound to be set up, and a general election cannot be taking place at the time with the certainty of an alteration of the personnel and the framework of the existing constitution. The administrative convenience and necessity of settling the revised constitution in time for the next elections was the cause of the departmental activities started more than a year ago for preparing the materials for the statutory inquiry. In the circumstances, the national demand and the national agitation for framing putting into operation the Swaraj constitution have received only such recognition as is unavoidable. So far as we can infer, the correspondence and the communications that are undoubtedly going on with the Secretary of State in regard to the Statutory Commission must have had a purely official orientation backed up by the politics of the official class in India. It is indeed deplorable to find that the Indian members of the Viceroy's Executive Council have shown no marked efforts to place before the Viceroy the Indian point of view. This was the primary policy for

which the Morley and the Montford schemes designed the reforms of the Executive Councils by the appointment of Indians Quá of Indians and preferably of representative non-official Indians, to give the head of the Government, to use Lord Morley's expressive phrase, the Indian angle of vision. What exactly they may have done is no doubt a matter for conjecture but that they have failed to impress the Indian angle of vision regarding the Statutory Commission seems indeed evident. Taking all that has appeared in the press, in England and India, it is fairly clear that between the Government of India and the Secretary of State 3 proposals are being discussed as to the personnel of the Commission. The first is that of a purely Parliamentary commission, without any Indian in it and with only some Europeans with Parliamentary experiences of the type desired by the Secretary of State, the Viceroy and their official advisers. The 2nd is that of such a commission with a number of so-called assessors in India. This had been universally condemned and the Secretary of State has perhaps realised the futility of the whole thing though apparently the Government of India may have hoped to tickle and bring round a large number of Indian politicians of their own brand by putting them in a large list of assessors. The 3rd is the appointment of a commission possessing a mere modicum of representation of Indian Liberal and Nationalist schools and of special interest by no means in sympathy with nationalism. It is remarkable that the idea of consulting Indian opinion through recognised leaders

in the country on these momentous questions is not in evidence anywhere in official circles. The appeal for co-operation of the Viceroy is evidently wholly one-sided and no wonder it has produced little effect. The Madras Congress has no doubt to give the right answer to the Governments final decisions ~~x~~ if they are announced, as is expected, before the end of the year. It is time the Congress leaders found out the full implications of what is developing and achieved that unity in the national demand, as is so feelingly advocated in Dr. Ansari's message to his countrymen published elsewhere, and the means of enforcing that demand on which alone the success of all national efforts depends in no small degree.

August 23rd, 1927.

THE NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION IN MADRAS COUNCIL:-

A motion expressing want of confidence in the present Ministry was moved to-day in the Madras Legislative Council on behalf of the Swarajya Party. An occasion for such a motion has now arisen; for the Justicites having solemnly resolved on refusing to accept office till provincial autonomy is granted in the place of dyarchy, the Sw^arajists may reasonable count upon effective support from the council for a motion of no-confidence in the Ministry. The Congress party in the council did not till now bring forward such a motion

because they felt that there being no majority behind them, any motion they might bring would prove either ineffective or harmful inasmuch as, if they succeeded, they would only have helped a communal party to regain office. Now this reason, as we have said, no longer holds good. It has therefore become obligatory on the part of Congressmen to put into operation the 1st clause in the Gauhati Congress mandate in regard to the council programme. That clause lays down that "in particular congressmen in the legislatures shall---- oppose the formation of a Ministry by other parties until in the opinion of the Congress or the All India Congress Committee, a satisfactory response is made by the Government to the National Demand". No response has been forthcoming from the Government in regard to the National demand so that the Congress Party has no other alternative than that of overthrowing the Ministry. The efforts of the Swrajists should be real and earnest in this matter. It will be disingenuous to seek to get round it by moving the motion by allowing it to become ineffectual by any negligence on their part. If any Congressmen feels that the Gauhati mandate is wrong, the ~~Gauhati~~ remedy is not to set it at naught but to get it altered by the Congress. We ourselves think that the policy ²announced at Gauhati is defective in more particulars than one and have repeatedly criticised it as unsatisfactory. But no Congressman in the Council so long as he sits there as a Congressman, owing his seat to the Congressmen ticket, may violate the mandate of that body.

236 2316
August 24th, 1927.

It is well that leading Congressmen have expressed their views regarding the attempt made by a number of young men to break the statue of Col. Neill on the Mount Road. They rightly hold that instead of wasting their time and energy in trying to cause damage to the statue in question, they should turn their attention to ~~the necessity of removing the statue because of the~~ constructive work for the Congress. It is the duty of leaders of public opinion to persuade the young men to desist from all violent methods. It is obvious however, that the object of the attempt is to draw public attention to the necessity of removing the statue because of the feelings of indignation and disgust aroused in the public mind by the acts of Col. Neill. The public cannot but sympathise with their motive. But the method pursued to achieve that purpose is objectionable and it is as far removed from Satyagraha as violence is from non-violence. We would very much desire that the activities of these young men should be directed to popularise the Congress and spread its gospel far and wide. In this connection we must deprecate the tendency on the part of the trying magistrate to inflict unnecessarily severe sentences on the young men concerned. Far from proving to be a deterrent this harsh punishment is likely to have the contrary effect.

August 25th, 1927.

THE NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION.

The No-Confidence Motion has been defeated and the Chief Minister has told all the world that "he and his colleagues would do all to deserve the confidence of the country". The intention is laudable; but he is sadly mistaken in thinking that yesterday's vote represents the opinion of the country. A bare glance at the ~~analysis~~ analysis of the voting will sufficiently explain what we mean. The nominal majority of the Ministry is seen to be really a hopeless minority; for of the 67 members who voted for them, 11 were officials, 23 nominated members and only 23 elected members (including the 3 ministers themselves and 6 European non-officials) as against the 56 who voted against them. Could there be greater humiliation than this for a Ministry which professes to be imbued with the democratic spirit of the Reforms? Is not their dependence on the official vote tantamount to a gross repudiation of the 1st principle of Reforms, that they should hold office only so long they enjoy the confidence of the representatives of the people? Their reliance on the nominated and the European votes is equally objectionable since these men generally regard themselves as the men of the bureaucracy rather than as the representatives of the people or even of sections of them. One of the nominated men said that all of them were constitutionalists--statement which was also endorsed by the Europeans on their own behalf. This, if it reveals anything, only their peculiar notions as to the nature and

238 2320

--111--

of constitutionalism. The Europeans, for instance, are against prohibition and they know that the Ex-~~ercise~~ Minister has declared that to be the goal of his policy; the chief Minister when questioned on this subject maintained a discreet silence and yet the Europeans preferred to vote for the Ministry, ignoring the wise rule against buying a pig in a poke, simply because, in their view, the Ministry is working the constitution. But could there be anything more opposed to the spirit of the constitution than that any section of ~~MEMBER~~ members should support a Ministry with which they are not in agreement on major questions?

Yesterday's voting clearly proves that the Ministry depends for its precarious existence on the sweet will of the officials. The so-called Independent Party is no party at all in the regular sense. The Independents are in office, but the electorate had no more to do with this than with the periodic revolutions in the restless republics of South America. The general elections threw them up as isolated entities, like pebbles on the beach. They were troubled neither by the burden of loyalty to a Party, nor by the moral bond of election pledges. But the bureaucracy for reasons of their own ~~skilled~~ graciously on them and this was the signal for the motely crowd--all the masherless men, all the born Ministerialists and all the nondescripts who seek election to the Council for reasons not very clear to themselves--to ~~flock to~~ flock to their standard. Thus the Independents became by the break of circumstances independent among themselves

and objectly dependent on a number of others--the Reserved Half and their official contingent, the nominated auxiliaries, the non-official Europeans, the aristocratic zamindars and so on. A Ministry drawing support from such elements can make no claim to responsibility, for the Legislative council has unmistakeably repudiated it. Dyarchy, to which it has sworn fealty, finds less support than even in the eyes of the country, as may be judged not only from the Coimbatore decisions, but also from the fact that even the Justicites got much greater support from the elected part of the council, (they secured a majority of one), when the non-confidence motion was brought against them in November 1923. It behoves the Ministers, therefore, to ponder well the implications of yesterday's voting and do the only right and possible thing--resign.

By their doing so, position will not become worse than before so far as progress towards responsible Government is concerned. On the other hand, both they and the country stand to gain by it. They would be accounted and acclaimed as honourable men for they would be only acting up to their public declarations. The Honorable Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliar is reported to have said in the course of a speech at Rajamundry in February last:-

"The measure of his party's success in carrying out its programme would, to a large extent, depend on the measure of support it had in the council. Speaking for himself he would say "Jai seetharam" and go about his business the moment he felt he was not wanted by them. So far as he could see, it appeared to him that any 20 people could carry on the Government with the aid of the Ministerialists the official bloc and a few stray

people who could be impressed into service on particular occasions under any system of party government. But Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliar did not believe in such a kind of carrying on of the Government".

By handing in their resignations the Ministers would be dealing another knock-out blow to the pernicious idea that dyarchy is a half-way house to responsible government and thus doing a distinct service to the country.

August 26th, 1927

The no-confidence motion in the Bengal Legislative Council has met with a better fate than befall the like motion in Madras. The voting was 63 against 57 in the case of the Hindu Minister and 66 against 62 in that of his Muslim Colleague. Both Mr. Chakravartty and Mr. Gauznavi have, it is understood tendered their resignations and we may probably look for further developments in the light of Sir Stanley Jackson's opening speech the other day:- "I shall accept the decision of the council and it will not be possible for my Ministers to retain their offices. It might be necessary to prorogue the house in order to enable me to fill their place". This foreshadows an attempt to form another Ministry which may receive support from the Muslim and other members of the Council who are still for working dyarchy. It is, however, another question whether the attempt will succeed; past experience shows that the composition of the Council is not favourable to the formation of a stable Ministry, apart

from the difficulties introduced by the personal equation which have always been greater in Bengal than elsewhere. The speeches on the non-confidence motion show that personal feelings have played some part in dislodging the two ministers. But these personal feelings themselves derive their strength largely from a consideration which is strictly constitutional. Thus it was asserted by speaker after speaker that the Ministers should resign because they did not command the confidence of a majority of the elected strength of the Council, and had been so long kept in office only by the official and nominated votes, that they had not shown a sense of responsibility to the council and had failed, in their anxiety to be in the good graces of the Reserved Half, to support the people's demands and voice forth their grievances in regard to such matters as the kulkatti shooting. It was on precisely the same grounds that the Madras Ministry was overthrown. The only difference between the situation in Madras and that in Bengal is that, whereas here the Ministers have evaded the formal (but not moral) defeat with the aid of the bureaucracy, even that all-powerful coterie has not been able to save its ally in Bengal. But the popular verdict is in both cases the same. The Bengal Ministers have quietly accepted it. Will our Independents do likewise?

September 5th, 1927.

CLOSER UNION OR FEDERATION.

In recent discussions on the future constitution of India a good deal of stress has been laid by competent people on the need for a strong central government and a word of caution has been uttered that, in the zeal for what has been called provincial autonomy, the overwhelming necessity, especially in the case of a country which is yet to exercise full or nearly full self-governing powers, for "one people working out one destiny". There may perhaps not be any considerable difficulty in India to so adjust the powers and functions of the central and provincial authorities as to secure national efficiency and provincial initiative and pride. This is especially so because the demand has scarcely been made by any considerable section of political thinkers for a system like the one they have in Australia, where, unlike as in Canada and South Africa, the State Governments owing to historical causes, gave the Federal Parliament only specific, defined powers, preserving to themselves those residuary powers not expressly transferred-----The question then is as to the changes which have to be made in the constitutional so as to facilitate the carrying out of one national policy. As, according to that constitution, no change in the system can be made without the approval of a majority of the people in a majority of the States. -----

343

2330

September 12th, 1927.

The anti-untouchability campaign is steadily gaining ground in the country; and we are glad to note that no one perhaps realises the urgent need for ridding the country of the evil better than Hindu leaders themselves. The movement gains strength by such Conferences as the Simla Untouchability Conference, a telegraphic account of which appears in our columns to-day. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, certainly no heterodox Hindu, recognises the necessity to treat the depressed classes as brethren in fact as well as in his public speeches. The evils of the custom from every point of view, political, social and humanitarian, are serious and some of these were referred to by the speakers at the conference. They are too obvious to need proof. The only obstacle on the path of reform is, not lack of conviction on the part of the leaders as to the vicious nature of the system, but uninstructed superstition in the villages. This obstacle is being steadily got over, thanks to the work of the Congress and other organisations. Indeed, one may feel confident that as long as village reconstruction work progresses, the custom would disappear.

2332
244
September 15th, 1927.

The non-officials scored another victory in the Assembly yesterday by carrying, in the face of Government opposition, Mr. M.K. Acharjya's adjournment motion regarding the labour troubles at Kharagpur Railway workshops. Sir George Rainy attempted a defence of the action of the authorities in throwing out surplus hands on the ground of justifiable retrenchment, but his speech scarcely tackled the real point in non-official criticisms. Nobody ever suggests that Railway Workshops should be turned into so many workhouses or charitable instructions. What was wanted was that the men should not be victimised under the plea of retrenchment to pay off old scores against them. If, as was alleged by more than one member, orders for articles which might have been manufactured in the workshops were placed with firms abroad so that the men might be told that there was no work for them to do and sent out, then, surely, the action of the authorities was little less than callous. Far from curtailing opportunities for employment, the Government in these days of unemployment should be keen on opening out fresh avenues of work for the people. Will they now at least retrace their unwise steps and adopt a more considerate policy towards Labour?

245 234
September 19th, 1927.

The case for the immediate removal of the Neill statue from its prominent position in Mount Road and its consignment to merciful oblivion was put with unanswerable force by the speakers at yesterday's public meeting, a report of which will be found elsewhere. The hectoring pose of the figure is an offensive to the eye as the memory of the man it seeks to commemorate is odious to every patriotic Indian conscious of the greatness of his country and the cruel wrongs she has suffered at the hands of such persons. No Government blessed with an iota of imagination would have perpetrated the initial blunder of allowing the erection of a statue ~~of~~ to such a man in a country which must feel unutterably humiliated by his collourness. And no Government which professes to care for public opinion can continue to ignore the protests of outraged national feeling. The Government, if they are wise, will accede to the public demand without more ~~loss~~.

September 20th, 1927.

THE SIMLA SESSION.

The presence in Simla of a large number of Indian leaders belonging to various political persuasions was availed of in order to hold a unity Conference, but agreement has not yet been arrived at even in

246

2336

regard to minor issues and sub-committees are still evolving formulae acceptable to both the Hindu and Mohamedan communities. The continued failure to compose the communal differences. is having a disastrous effect on the country and leaders do not perhaps realise sufficiently that on them lies the greater portion of the responsibility for the outbreaks of fanaticism. When the Viceroy's offer to convene a conference was virtually rejected by public opinion, it was in the belief that those concerned would earnestly strive to get rid of the communal canker and bring about concord. It is a matter for profound regret that no satisfactory settlement has been arrived at and the way in which the Assembly has dealt with the Bill relating to scurrilous attacks on founders of religious affords a clue to the mentality of the members belonging to the two communities which is far from conducive to the conduct of negotiations on the basis of reason and commonsense. This measure, even as modified by the Select committee, covered a very wide field, but yesterday it has been rendered more objectionable still by reason of the fact that the offence has been made non-bailable. The voting shows that representatives of Indian public opinion have either been carried away by unhealthy prejudice or allowed themselves to be ~~inf~~ indifferent to the seriousness of the issues raised by the new law. This attitude has been exploited by the Government and some non-official European members who have combined to extend a concession to bigotry.

September 22nd, 1927.

Ahmedabad must be congratulated on the important step it has taken to deal with communal matters. Both the communities have now resolved to refer disputes to an arbitration of four Hindus and four Mohamedans, and the existing customs and rights of both being made to educate the people about the merits of the new arrangement and their duty to appeal to the board the moment a trouble arises. The leaders should, until the masses are thoroughly imbued with the spirit of mutual respect and toleration, keep a vigilant watch on the march of events. Once the habit of reference to the board is acquired, there need be no apprehension of the rank and file taking the law into their own hands.

October 4th, 1927

The Government of India's annual exodus to the Simla Hills is as hoary an ^{institution} ~~institution~~ as the Madras Government's move to Ooty in the hot weather and as little defensible. The question of curtailing or doing away with it altogether is a hardy annual but thanks to the powerlessness of the Legislature this wasteful practice which shields the ears of the Government from the buzz of public opinion for 6 months in the year has been allowed to go on unchecked. The enormous outlay of capital on New Delhi is one more powerful argument against the simla exodus. But, according to the Simla correspondent of a local contemporary, Sir ~~xxxx~~ Basil Blackett's strenuous attempt to make his colleagues take this view has failed, and the question has been comfortably shelved for another year. It is rather late in the day for the Government of India to take refuge in the plea that New Delhi is not healthy in the Summer months. They ought to have thought of it before

the summer months. They ought to have thought of it before removing the capital from Calcutta and sinking many millions in residential quarters and palatial office buildings.

October 15th, 1927.

The Anglo-Indian die-hards are assiduously racking their brains for reasons why there should be no Indian on the Statutory Commission. Mr. Chartres, the President of the European Association, who has just returned from England, thinks that it is essential to produce a unanimous report since the members of the House of Commons "did not know the details of Indian conditions". The inclusion of Indians, will not, in his opinion, be conducive to the drawing up of a unanimous report, hence Indians should be kept out. The contention is, on the face of it, absurd. There have been other Royal Commissions before now, the Lee Commission, for instance, which included Indians and nevertheless produced a unanimous report. It is not as though that Mr. Chartres thought that every Indian must be a dissident. His reference to the objects of the Anglo-Indian League which was recently ushered into existence in England plainly shows that he believes there are Indians who could be relied upon to readily take their cue from European friends and colleagues. If, nevertheless, he is against Indian representation, it is because he knows there is no chance for the appointment of such jo hukun to the Commission getting the slightest support in the country. That is presumably what he had in mind when he spoke of the difficulty of selecting persons who would commend

the confidence of all political parties. "Ditcher" carries this argument to its logical conclusion by facetiously suggesting in the current number of Capital, that the Commission should be an international body selected by Geneva and presided over by Lord Ronaldshay. This might perhaps serve as an unconscious caricature of the wishes of those worthy people who think that the sole function of the Commission should be to deliver judgment in vacuo. If the commission is not merely to pronounce whether the present constitution has been a success or not but also to lay down what in its view ought to be the main principles of advance, it should be obvious that it must not only have an Indian element in it but a predominantly Indian personnel representative of all political parties that really matter. Its report may or may not be unanimous but if there is an unmistakable cleavage of opinion nothing will be gained by glossing it over and producing a dummy report which would convince nobody by its being made to order unanimity.

October 17th, 1927.

Mr. Satchidananda Sinha on Dyarchy.

Even since he retired from the Finance Membership of the Government of Bihar and Orissa, Mr Satchidananda, who has had better opportunities than most Indians of judging dyarchy from the inside, has been carrying on a consistent campaign against it because he is perfectly satisfied that it can lead nowhere nor ever help to fulfil the promise underlying the Declaration of August 1917.----- He points out that dyarchy means an artificial division of subjects which is opposed to the very nature of Government which is one indivisible. Joint ministerial responsibility is of the very essence of Parliament

Parliamentary Government, but though the Government of India Act does contemplate it, in no province has it been sought to be enforced, since it is obviously more convenient for the Governor to deal with individual Ministers if his aim is to bend them to his will. He takes care to appoint safe rather than capable men and the status lower than that of the Executive Councillors, which they enjoy in the cabinet, their being in charge of less important departments and their entire dependence on the Council in matters of finance--all these go to emphasise their inferiority and dependence and make them more anxious to please the Governor rather than the Council to which they are nominally responsible. At the same time the personnel of the Executive Council Mr. Sinha points out, is even less satisfactory than it was in the pre-Reform days, since the European members who seem to be appointed on the principle they should form a sort of make-weight against the democratic bias introduced by the Reforms, are generally crusted reactionaries, either subservient place-hunters or harmless figure-heads. Mr. Sinha gives a pointed instance of these unsatisfactory appointments. "In reply to interpellations it was not long ago elicited in a Legislative Council that while the Indian Executive Councillor in that province was pompously dubbed as the 'Home Member' and was naturally believed to be in charge, as such, of the Political and the Appointment Departments, the main work of the Appointment Department---that of appointing, posting and transferring the officers-- was entrusted by the

Governor not to him--the Home Member--but to his civilian Col-league". The Governor, the driver of ~~mixx~~ this in-Congruous team, exercises autocratic powers far in excess of any he ever enjoyed before the Reforms; and yet by an absurd convention he has been declared sacrosanct / and immune from criticism. His Government is in the unenviable position of having to conduct all important legislative and administrative business through a Legislative Council about 25% of the sanctioned strength of which are his nominees, the result is that "the Governor-in-Council is naturally driven to resort to methods for securing votes from non-official members which are not unoften open to grave objection, and which ~~are common mixx~~ have generally a highly demoralising effect both on the Government on the reserve side, as also on the non-officials who are its habitual supporters". That, if there were nothing else against it, would be sufficient to condemn dyarchy in the eyes of all honestmen. Provincial autonomy, as Mr Sinha points out, is the only solution that will meet all the difficulties that dyarchy has brought in its wake.

October, 24th, 1927.

THE UNITY CONFERENCE.

The adjourned meeting of the Unity Conference will be held in Calcutta on Thursday next. The need for a settlement was never so great, what with the recurrence of dastardly outrages and the unceasing hymn of hope preached by fanatics, but the question is whether the prospect of an amicable settlement is rosy. Lala Lajpat Rai has sounded a note of discord which is not calculated to advance the cause which we have all at heart. In the 1st place he has objected to the choice of Calcutta as the venue of the conference, as Delhi or Lahore, where the trouble is greatest, was in his view the more suitable place. Now that final arrangements have been made it is obviously undesirable to make this an issue over which a controversy should rage. But Lala Lajpat Rai objects to any conference being held at a time when, owing to the feelings and passions roused by the recent murderous attacks on Hindus, the atmosphere is too disturbed to permit of a calm and dispassionate consideration of the various points involved in the problem. One would think that it is precisely because there is overwhelming necessity to take urgent measures in order to bring about concord, the time for action is now, the leaders and followers are pained and humiliated and yearn for peace, and not when an atmosphere of public apathy prevails. Now, one may ask, is this atmosphere to be created except by a heart to heart talk between persons meeting with the fixed determination of arriving at a satisfactory conclusion. There is no doubt that the events which are happening are apt to depress the stoutest

hearts and alarm the most optimistic minds, but the situation is one which requires an immediate remedy, as otherwise, in the absence of a counter-movement led by persons of influence and power, matters would still further drift towards chaos. If we think therefore that there is no alternative to the conference, it is certainly not because we are satisfied with the results of the conference at Simla or with the attitude of the leaders of the two communities. The reports and counter-reports published soon after the Simla sitting, have created widespread apprehension in the public mind regarding the ability of those who gathered at the meeting to take a cool, dispassionate and statesmanlike view of the questions at issue. If they were imbued with the true nationalistic spirit and animated by a spirit of give and take, the points in dispute could have been settled. But unfortunately nothing has been achieved. In the words of Dr. Ansari, President-elect of the Congress, whose appeal we publish elsewhere, leaders "should not be deterred by murders and assaults by the individuals of one community against the other. On the other hand, these misguided actions of a few fanatics should urge them on to expedite the work of unity." He asks his Mohomedan brethren to give up the habit of taking the law into their own hands and suggests that criminal prosecutions should not be spared if there was need for such action. The Calcutta conference, if it is to yield fruitful results, must satisfy two conditions. In the first place, it must be a conference of such representatives of the

communities as would be able to carry the masses with them and persuade their followers to act according to the decisions arrived at by the conference. In the 2nd place, it must bring into being an organisation which will continuously function to carry out the resolutions of the representatives. Incessant propaganda and working of inter-communal organisations for promoting peace have a value which has as yet not been adequately appreciated.

November 5th, 1927.

SEPARATION OF EXECUTIVE AND JUDICIAL FUNCTIONS.

The U.P. Legislative Council has adopted again unanimously a resolution asking the Government to take steps to bring about without any further delay the complete separation of ^{the} judicial from executive functions. The authorities have been scarcely fair to the Indian public in the matter of this ~~xxx~~ ancient grievance. Eminent jurists, successful administrators, weighty commissions and influential committees have at various times urged the introduction of this reform, the papers in regard to which occupy many shelves in the Secretariat of the Local and Central Government and of the India Office. It is hardly necessary to refer to this doleful story again except to say that the Government of India many years ago went so far as to direct a scheme to be drawn up. But they slept over it afterwards and for some mysterious reasons have since been putting off the demand of the representatives of the people. A resolution was issued soon after the

Reformed Assembly met for the first time informing Local Governments that if they decided to submit proposals they would be considered by the Government of India and if any legislation was required, it was stated that they would be prepared to give effect to it. Four Local Governments, the United Provinces, Bihar and Orissa, Bengal and Madras submitted their recommendations relying upon their assurance from the Government of India, and the last communication on the subject from a Local Government was nearly 3 years ago. Asked on the 30th August last the reasons for the delay in sanctioning the proposals, Mr. J. C. Crerar states in the Assembly that the question was one of great complexity and difficulty and that the Government of India were about to address the Secretary of State on the subject. If there are difficulties they are there to be overcome and we do not suppose that the Government of India would be willing to concede that they are entirely bereft of statesmanship or lack in resourcefulness by relying on the intricacy of the subject for the unconscionable delay in dealing with it. The fact therefore appears to be that there is very great reluctance on the part of the powers-that-be to bring about the separation of the functions, not certainly on the ground of additional cost because it has proved that much extra expenditure is not necessary but because there are apprehensions felt that the prestige of the civilian and therefore of the Government would suffer, that "law and order" cannot be so easily administered as it is at present if the acts of the executive are to be subject to review by courts of law at every stage and that efficiency would suffer if the district magistrate were to be deprived of the judicial powers he now possesses.

It is not clear why any reference to the Secretary of State is not necessary, especially after the unequivocal promise of the Central Government that Local Government have only to send up schemes for being approved. The inference therefore is that, if the Government of India have not gone back on their views, it is the Secretary of State who has directed "the subordinate branch of the British Government" that no innovations should be introduced except with his previous approval. The serious miscarriages of justice, gross abuse of authority, insecurity to person and executive high-handedness which the present system of making the prosecutor the judge has given rise to, are familiar to the public, but the "reformed" Legislatures have been quite helpless in the matter and, for a wonder, even the Government of India are apparently finding obstacles in their path. It is high time that the country was taken into their confidence by the authorities as to the real causes of the lamentable delay in giving effect to such an elementary principle of Government as the separation of the functions.

November 9th, 1927.

A MONUMENTAL FARCE.

India has had to suffer many indignities at the hands of Britain but it was reserved to Mr Baldwin's Government to strike upon the most irritating and malignant of them all. An all-British commission made up of amiable mediocrities is the response that Britain has seen fit to make to India's unparalleled sacrifices in the service of the Empire, her undaunted efforts at attaining a position of equality in the eyes of nations and her unconquerable hopes for the future. And yet she will throw up her hands in despair and pretend to commiserate India on her short-sighted following when the latter answers, as she must, insult with contempt and injury with inflexible determination to carve her own future, regardless of Britain's frowns or favours. No one can read the laboured, unconvincing and half-hearted statement issued by Lord Irwin in defence of his masters' decision to send out an all-British commission to judge of India's fitness for further reforms without feeling infinite compassion for him and realising with all the terrible grimness of finality that it is folly ~~following~~ to look for our political salvation outside our own determined and united efforts or to expect the vested interests that hold India in their grip to rise to the heights of self-eliminating altruism and help this country to realise its honourable ambitions. The mental processes by which according to the Viceroy, H.M.'s Government arrived at their decision are as revealing as the decision itself. It has taken them nearly 3 years to realise that "the uncertainty of what

constitutional changes might be imminent may have served to sharpen "communal antagonism. But when this patent fact was being repeatedly impressed upon their attention by the nation's leaders they wilfully shut their eyes to it and refused to do anything.

Even more significant is Lord Irwin's declaration regarding the nature and object of the commission and its task. It takes for granted that Parliament must, in any circumstances, be the final arbiter" of India's destiny, and that Indians far from claiming a predominant voice in the shaping of their own future, should be grateful to H.M.'s present Government for their graciously deigning to take account of their aspirations. Lord Irwin says, "For myself I cannot doubt that the quickest and surest path of those who desire India's progress is by the persuasion of Parliament". In other words, the Preamble is to be regarded as immutable for all time like the Laws of the Medes and the Persians. And yet, we have it on his own assurance that the Government of India Act (much less the Preamble thereto) "never professed to incorporate irrevocable decisions." India has never agreed and will never agree that the British Parliament should be the arbiter of her destiny. And for a good reason. Let us glance for a moment at Parliament's qualifications for the task and also how it proposes to discharge it. Parliament is to decide the fate of 300 million people, but it requires to be assisted by a commission which would not only "be unbiassed and competent to present an accurate picture of facts to Parliament" but also "willing to take

whatever action a study of these facts may indicate to be appropriate". In other words, the commission while nominally acting as the eyes and ears of Parliament, will in sober fact be the real judge and arbiter. For a Parliament, whose ignorance of India is abysmal, whose constitutional scruples have been set at rest and vanity flattered by the appointment of a committee of its own members and which has shown itself servilely subservient to the present Tory Government will deem its task done when it has crossed the t's and dotted the i's in the Commissions report and consign India with a sigh of relief to the limbo of oblivion. How far is this Commission which will be entrusted with one of the most onerous tasks of the 20th century, fitted to discharge its duties? A casual glance at the list of names will suffice to show that the most malignant ingenuity could not have thought of a worse set of persons. But for the chairman, the commission is composed entirely of 3rd ratemen who have absolutely no knowledge of India and who, if they had been the free choice of Parliament would have blashed for all time its reputation for discrimination, while its compulsory acquiescence in their selection must scout its pretensions to be regarded as India's judge in the eyes of all thinking men. And the Commissions claim to freedom from bias is as debatable as its competence. Sir John Simon, great lawyer and constitutional expert, though he is, far from having any sympathy for the victims of imperialism, is an orthodox successor of

360

2364

Mr. Asquith in this respect. Four of the members are conservative so that the others, even if they were minded to dissent from the views of these representatives of Toryism, would find themselves in a minority. It is not for nothing that the proprietor of the most influential of Conservative newspapers, a paper which has been consistently hostile to Indian aspirations, should be on the commission; from this brilliant stroke Mr. Baldwin's Government undoubtedly anticipate that British opinion would be carefully prepared to accord a favourable reception to the Commission's findings and quietly bamboozled into the belief that the commission was received with delirious enthusiasm in India. As for the two Labourites who have been pitch-forked into the Commission to give it a representative complexion, men of their modest position in public life could hardly be expected to swim against the tide.

~~Moreover~~ Having thus secured in advance impartiality and a high standard in the commission, the Government graciously recognise, in the words of the Viceroy, that "Indian opinion has a clear title to ask that, in the elaboration of a new instrument of Government, their solution of the problem or their judgment on other solutions which may be proposed should be made an integral factor in the examination of the question and be given due weight". But the precise value of this admission may be judged from the fact that in, Lord Irwin's view, the opinion of British official members is entitled to exactly as much weight as those of Indian leaders. This dictum, taken in conjunction with the proposal to ask the Central Legislature to set up a select committee from its

elected and nominated non-officials to make representations to the commission, points to an implication of which the Viceroy was evidently not aware--that the Government are so fully convinced of the identity of outlook of the Commission and of British officials in India that they consider representation of the latter before the commission a superfluity. If this precaution be deemed insufficient there is, of course, the safety value alluded to mysteriously by the Viceroy when he said that "the task of taking evidence on the more purely administrative questions should be undertaken by some other authority which would be in the closest touch with the commission". This latter body will in all probability be composed exclusively of members of the steel-frame, in which case, what time a select committee of the Legislature would be presenting petitions and making representations with bated breath and whispering humbleness, the bureaucracy, strong in the consciousness that the Commission was its sworn friend, would engage gaily in the task of doctoring corroborative evidence to entrench itself more firmly than ever in its position of top-dog in unfortunate India..

The Statutory Commission on Indian Reforms is an insult to India. It stands for the betrayal of the most solemn pledges, the repudiation of the fundamental principles of Britain's own constitutional practice, the cynical disregard of those eternal moral scruples, which should regulate the conduct of states no less than of individuals. "Co-operation and more co-operation" has been the constant refrain of Britain all these eight years and at last here we have in concrete form her idea of the kind of co-operation she expects from us--the co-operation of the slave in chains with the overseer who superintends

his agony whip in hand and not the co-operation that exalts equals and draws the ties of friendship tighter. Let India give the only possible reply to this arrogant gesture of the British Cabinet. They count upon our mutual differences, our personal and communal jealousies and the much-tried faith of our Moderates in Britain, to keep us apart and make us fall an easy prey to their scheming and make ourselves the laughing-stock of the world? Shall it be said of us that we sold our birthright for a mess of pottage and merited the curse of unborn generations? To these questions the Indian National Congress has only one reply to give --it will have nothing to do with the commission. It is for other parties to consider whether they will range themselves with the Congress which is determined to liberate India or with those who are fully resolved to keep us in bondage. Let them not be misled by the specious plea that the Indian Legislature has been given its rightful place in our rulers' counsels by this device of a select committee. Apart from the fact that such a committee will in no way be representative of India, it will have no more rights than any other body or any individual, however insignificant, since it will have no power to influence the recommendations of the commission in the slightest respect. As will be seen from a special cable published elsewhere, our Labour friends in Parliament roundly condemn the exclusion of Indians from the commission, but by long experience we know that the Labour party is a broken reed for us to learn upon; otherwise, would it have allowed two of its members to accept places on the commission? Once again let it be remembered that our

salvation lies in our own hands. In the name of the glorious India of the future which every loyal son sees with the mind's eye, we implore all Indians, irrespective of caste, creed, community or party, to rally to the cause of the congress which is the cause of the country.

November 21st, 1927.

THE MINIMUM DEMAND

X X X X X

Indian leaders, Moderates as well as Extremists, far from "mistaking asseveration for strength and formulae for state-craft", know their mind very well and are bent upon getting what they want, so they have begun the work of organising the boycott quietly and undemonstratively. They do not regard it as question of kicking against the pricks but as one of vindicating national self-respect. Time will show whether they have mistaken "asseveration for strength and formulae for state-craft", but meanwhile there is no excuse for British Statesman refusing to understand what it is that we want. Pandit Motilal Nehru has clearly stated it in these words: "Any proposal short of some suitable form of full responsible government will not satisfy the congress". That this is also the demand of every progressive party in the country outside the congress has been made evident by the manifestoes and statements issued by the leaders of these parties and the proceedings of the all-party meeting held in Bombay of which an account appears elsewhere Pandit Motilal has made it clear that the question of personnel is altogether a secondary consideration

that and that the main object ^{is} to the commission is that it enshrines the spirit of the Preamble to the Government of India Act which responsible Indians have repudiated with one voice. Hence it is that the attempts at compromise made by the British Labour Party woefully miss the mark while they are also, as Pandit Motilal has pointed out, incompatible with its previous demands on behalf of India at its party conferences. In the circumstances the Congress could not but ask the Labour Party to withdraw its members from the Commission and desist from all efforts at weak compromise. The commission as at present constituted can do no good to India and need not engage in the farce of an elaborate enquiry on the spot in order to be able to produce a report of sorts. Such a report would not carry us anywhere. But if Britain means business, there is nothing to prevent her from adopting the modus vivendi suggested by Pandit Motilal on behalf of the Congress Party:-

" We believe that the only honest course was to declare what the Government proposed to do and then appoint a commission to draft a scheme giving effect to that declaration by settling details about the protection of minorities, the relations of Indian States and such-xxxxxxlike matters". Mr. Nehru continued that "on such a commission there would naturally be room for representatives of various interests and if the declaration proved acceptable to India all parties would be willing to co-operate

until something in the nature of what I have indicated is done".

In other words, what India wants is a radical change of heart in Britain and an announcement of policy indicative of this change and not a purposeless roving inquiry. In all previous instances in which Britain genuinely desired to confer substantial self-government--in the case of the white Dominions, in the case of Egypt and even in the latest case of East Africa --this is the method that she has followed. Why should she not adopt it in India? If she does not, she will be only estranging India still further and, as Pandit Nehru warned her statesmen, encouraging the forces that work for cutting the pointer.

November 22, 1927.

Practically every political party in the country with the exception of the Justice Party has officially formulated its policy in regard to the Statutory Commission and the preponderating weight of opinion has declared itself for a complete boycott. In the circumstances, it is high time that the Justice Party also brought itself into line with the other parties. We note that a meeting of the party executive is to be held on the 30th instant to discuss and settle this question. A great responsibility devolves on the leaders of the party to guide it aright to the only decision consistent with national self-respect. The auguries are undoubtedly propitious, for we observe that already prominent members of the party like Dewan Bahadur Muniswami Naidu and Dewan Bahadur Kumaraswami Reddiar have declared themselves unequivocally in favour of boycott. There is good reason for thinking that the rank and file of the party is as zealously for boycott as those of other parties and they will be considerably heartened-up by the outspoken advice of these leaders.

heartened up by the outspoken advice of these leaders.

November, 23rd 1927.

Yet another inquiry is about to be started in India. Lord Irwin announced in the course of a speech at Rajkot that the Secretary of State has decided to send out an expert committee (1) to report upon the relationship with the Paramount power and the States with particular reference to the rights and obligations arising from treaties, engagements, sanads and usages, (2) to inquire into the financial and economic relations between British India and Indian States and (3) to make recommendations that may be considered desirable or necessary for their more satisfactory adjustment. Indian Princes have been demanding such an investigation and it is owing to their persistence that the present one has been taken. The matter however is not so simple. The relationship between the Government and the States cannot be considered and decided without reference to public opinion in India and independent of the larger problem of the adjustment would affect the future constitution. Again, financial and economic questions affecting India and the States deeply affect the finances of the country and the impropriety of deciding about them behind the back of the elected representatives of the people is obvious. It must also be remembered that the subjects of Indian states are deeply interested in the solution of these problems. They have every right to see that their

desire to secure increasing political rights in the states is not jeopardised by the new conditions which may be brought about as the result of the present inquiry.

November, 25th, 1927.

LORD BIRKENHEAD SPEAKS

x

x

x

x

x

Neither the blind obstinacy of the Tory Government nor the stiff-necked self-confidence of Lord Birkenhead will come as a surprise to India. But we must confess that the unblushing pusillanimity exhibited by the British Labour Party has come with something of a shock even to those who never pinned much faith in the professions of British politicians, whether in or out of office. Lord Birkenhead's speech shows that Mr. MacDonald and his colleagues were from the beginning would the conspiracy against India. The official statement issued by the Parliamentary Labour Party in explanation of its decision not to oppose the commission or withdraw its members therefrom is a masterpiece of diplomatic duplicity and disingenuous evasion. The Party's mild regret at the government's failure to secure the co-operation of Indians does not prevent it from co-operating with the Government in sending out a Commission which is an emphatic repudiation of the principle of self-determination which has been repeatedly affirmed by British

Labour on behalf of India at its party conferences. It makes a painfully futile show of independence by putting forth certain suggestions, knowing all along that even these suggestions which do not in any way improve the commission from the Indian point of view have not the least chance of acceptance at the hands of the Government. It recommends, for instance, that the commission should consult the Indian Committee on equal terms, hold its joint sittings with it for taking evidence, then again consult with it before framing the report, and that the reports of both the bodies should be presented to the Joint committee of both House of Parliament. It is, obviously, content to ignore India's contention that the method of selecting the Indian Committee, which the Government have already outlined, is most unsatisfactory and will not make it representative of Indian opinion, that the provision for joint meeting and consultation--even if the Government should agree to it, which is not likely in our judgement from Lord Birkenhead's speech--would not make it possible for the Indian Committee to get at and unmask the secret propaganda in the shape of official evidence with which the bureaucratic hierarchy would take care to feed the all-British Commission and, what is a much more important consideration than all else, that the showy privilege of submitting a separate report to the Joint Parliamentary committee would, in fact, mean nothing, since Lord Birkenhead has expressly stated that the Committee's proposals would be "published, analysed and accepted or rejected", in other words, dealt with in precisely the same way as the proposals that might be submitted by any other

public body or individual. The Labour Party's statement describes the suggestions outlined in it as "stipulations". One would expect a self-respecting Party to plainly stipulate that it would withdraw its co-operation if its stipulations were not complied with. But no, Mr. MacDonald and his friends would far rather swallow their own words than have it said of them by the Tory Government that they were lacking in a sense of responsibility. So, Mr. MacDonald, assisted no doubt by his brief sojourn among the Chancelleries of Europe, has discovered a formula--blessed word!--with the result that the Labour Party discreetly winds up its statement with the high-sounding though meaningless words that it "has every confidence that its representatives on the commission will act in the spirit of this stipulation". As for asking them to resign if its modest demands are complied with, well, how could it be so childish, especially after the magnificent compliment paid to Mr. MacDonald by the Secretary of State?

The debate in the Lords, hap, in one respect, been productive of unimixed good. It has cleared the air. It must now be plain to the most hopelessly inflated co-operator that there can be no co-operation with England on a footing of equality and self-respect, that the Tory Government regards India's aspiration for self-government as an ~~idiotic~~ idle dream and is determined to flaunt the Preamble in her face with the asphatic gesture of insolent might, that the British Labour Party, by incontinently throwing overboard all its fine principles and promises the moment it was put to the test, has conclusively justified the charge, "Scratch a Labourite and you will find a jingo Imperialist". We hope, in the

circumstances, that the last has been heard of our domestic differences, that our people will realise that the country's salvation lies in their repudiating with one voice Britain's claim to keep us in tutelage for all time.

November 26th 1927.

THE UNWANTED COMMISSION.

X X X X X

And so we come to this that the British Parliament has appointed a commission ^{or} which is responsible to it alone. The task entrusted to that body is not to assist India to draw up a constitution which would confer self-governing Dominions----in spite of the fact that those Dominions were and still are as dependent on the British Army and Navy as India is), but to examine ~~the~~ ^{the} fitness with a view to deciding whether small dribblets of concessions shall be given her or the shadowy reforms she now enjoys shall be taken away. This commission has thus been set up in defiance of Indian opinion, and in spite of the elaborate paraphernalia of safeguards paraded by Lord Birkenhead, is bound to ignore all-Indian opinion wherever it does not square with its own views or which it may consider unpalatable to Parliament. What can Indian opinion, therefore, do but ignore it in its turn? We should gain nothing by wooing it; on the other hand we should be only making the chances of united action among ourselves more difficult.

It is obvious that we cannot stand still after rejecting this commission. We must go forward to assert

December 20th, 1927.

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

INDIAN STATES AND THEIR SUBJECTS.

----- And in the vast majority of states the personal rule of the Prince is /causing, where it is not oppressive, a good deal of dissatisfaction and unrest because of the denial to them of an effective voice in the control over the affairs of the State. If the rulers would only reflect calmly on the question, they would realise the humiliation and the indignity involved in the subjects approaching the British Government for the redress of their grievances. And they must further know that they cannot afford to put off a just and satisfactory solution of the constitutional question in view of the extraordinarily complex situation which would be ~~xxxxx~~ brought about by unsatisfied ambitions. As for the policy of aloofness, it is no longer practicable, even if it were desirable, for either British India or either the States to pursue it. As Mr. Ramachandra Rao pointed out the exact position of the States in an all-India polity should have been defined long ago; but it cannot be satisfactorily settled unless both the people of British India and the subjects of the states are given an effective voice in arriving at a decision.

December 26th, 1927.

THE CONGRESS ADDRESSES.

-----The whole of India is united to-day on the simple basis that the right of self-determination is inalienable and the Simon Commission should be let severely along because its appointment, which is the culmination of the consistently hostile attitude manifest in the whittling down of the reforms, the ruthless persecution of political workers, and the subordination of the country's welfare to the alien vested interests, is a clear declaration on the part of Britain that she is not prepared to admit that this fundamental right is India's. Britain holds the Preamble inviolable, but India repudiates it; for, as Dr. Ansari said:-

"No sane or self-respecting Indian can ever admit the claim of Great Britain to be the sole judge of the measure and time of India's political advance".

Britain has no longer any excuse for misunderstanding what India wants. Dr. Ansari has put it in a nut-shell:

"Indians do not claim anything more or less than that they shall occupy the same position and enjoy the same rights in their country as free people do in their own. If this can be achieved within the Empire, they have no desire to break away from it; but if the Imperial connection stands in the way of our reaching the goal we should not hesitate to sever that connection. Our motto, in the words of Mahatma Gandhi, should be 'Within the Empire if possible, without if necessary'".

373

2398

There is general agreement as to the goal to be reached; the only other question to be considered is what is the best method of achieving it. ~~But~~ Dr. Ansari suggests that, side by side with taking all measures that would make the boycott of the Commission absolutely effective, a draft constitution for a self-governing India should be prepared by the Congress in consultation with all other parties and interests concerned at a National convention to be summoned for the purpose. Such a constitution would serve two all--important purposes; it would impart intensive political education to the masses and give a name and a shape to the "immortal longings" in their struggling for utterance; ~~it~~ and it would give to minorities that assurance regarding their rights and status in a free India which is their due and which will induce them to throw themselves wholeheartedly into the struggle for freedom without doubts or reservations. Once this basic difficulty is removed there should be no difficulty in ejecting from the body politic the communal poison which has sapped it of its vitality and brought it to the deplorable condition of a house divided against itself. As Dr. Ansari, who commands the confidence of both the great communities, in a preeminent degree, convincingly points out the solution propounded by the A.I.C.C. of the political and religious differences that now loom so large upon the warped vision of the communalists, is the most ~~and~~ sober practical and statesmanlike that can be devised under present conditions and any community which refuses to give it a fair trial will be incurring a very serious responsibility. Happily, signs are not wanting that the country as a whole is tired of these domestic squabbles.

and that communal leaders themselves are coming more and more to recognise that the welfare of their own communities will be best promoted by their working in harmony with the aspirations of the nation as a whole. It is to be hoped that Dr. Ansvari's fervent appeal to the minorities to act patriotically and in the true democratic spirit at this hour of crisis, will evoke a noble response.

December 27th, 1927.

It is well that the action of a handful of ~~Munx~~ Mohomedan Leaders in the Punjab in causing a split in the All-India Muslim League is being strongly resented in the country. Moulvi Monomed Yakub, Deputy President of the Assembly, and a few others, have issued a statement condemning the tactics of Main Sir Monomed Shabi, pointing out the consequences of holding 2 meetings of the League. They also incidentally say that the question of boycott of the statutory commission should not be discussed at either meeting and that it should be considered at an extraordinary session of the Muslim League at Delhi in February next. This attitude of hesitancy and the call for postponement do not show that the signatories appreciate the gravity of the situation and the necessity for the country to be united on issue of the Simon Commission. The split is obviously the result of differences among Mohomedan leaders on this important question, and therefore there is no point in asking the League to avoid this subject. Feeling runs very high; in view, moreover, of the importance and urgency of taking up the challenge

375 2402

thrown by Lord Birkenhead, the Calcutta session cannot afford to let the matter drop. Mr. Jinnah's clarion call reinforced by the singularly weighty and wise pronouncement of Dr. Ansari yesterday at the Congress, can be responded to appropriately only by determined opposition to the commission on the part of all parties in the country. Let the Lahore rump do what it likes; the world knows ~~xx~~ what value should be attached to it.

December 23th, 1927.

INDIAN STATES SUBJECTS CONFERENCE.

The resolution passed at the Indian States subjects Conference, which we published elsewhere, gives us an idea not only of the aims and ideals of the people of Indian States, but also of the methods which they propose to pursue. They show that our fellow-countrymen in the states are animated by the same high ideals which the Indian National Congress cherishes and that it is their endeavour to get their states and organisations closely affiliated to ours. The Conference rightly directed attention first on the demand for the rule of law, for, that is the foundation on which alike progress and freedom rest. The separation of the revenues of the state from those of the sovereign as such, which is another of the demands of the conference, is an essential preliminary reform to healthy progress. No prince has the right to treat state revenues as part and parcel of his privy purse which he might put to whatever use he pleases.

376 2404

Every enlightened ruler ought to be contented with a civil list strictly in keeping with his legitimate needs and dignity on the one hand and the total resources of the State on the other. It is true that the Indian Princes gave up the idea that the State is their private property. That the more progressive at any rate of the rulers have begun to realise the wisdom of accepting a well-defined civil list is one of the pleasing signs of the times. The resolution of the Conference demanding responsible Government to be introduced if necessary by definite and well-defined stages, is a well-conceived one with which no progressive thinker may quarrel. So is the decision of the Conference on the Expert Enquiry regarding the treaty rights and privileges of Indian rulers. The Conference condemned this body for the same reason for which the Congress resolved to boycott the Simon Commission. The terms of reference to the Butler Committee are extremely one-sided. They do not take account of the rights and privileges of the subjects which, according to the traditional law of the land, are in many cases correlative to those of the princes. What with the anarchy of the princes and of the Paramount Power, the subjects of the States have to fall back upon support elsewhere and it is natural that they should approach the Indian National Congress to lend them a helping hand. We dare say the Congress will do all in its power to assist the subjects of the states to realise their goal. In the ultimate analysis that goal is the goal of the Congress--a united India of which the States are parts organically related to the whole and functioning as a single, well-knit unit. Geography has set a common

goal for both history and common culture have ratified it. As regards the methods of attaining that goal, the conference suggested ^{joint} action on the part of the Congress and of the subjects of the States and resolved to establish a standing committee to collect funds and do propaganda work regarding the aims of the Conference. This decision is wise, for success not a little depends on continuous and sustained activity.

5087A/RH
172
2013

RI/RH

22/3/16 Jan 121