

THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY.

VOL. III., No. 27.]

POONA—THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 1920.

[ANNUAL SUBSN. : Rs. 6

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	312
ARTICLES :—	
Bal Gangadhar Tilak.—I. ...	316
—II. By the Hon'ble Principal R. P. Paranjpye ...	317
SPECIAL ARTICLES:—	
The Khilafat and the Turkish Peace.—III. By C. F. Andrews ...	318
The Amritsar Debate. By W. A. Chambers ...	320
A LETTER FROM LONDON ...	321

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

THE first report of the Joint Select Committee on draft rules is to hand by the last mail. The Committee have made a change for the better in the rules for the conduct of business in the provincial and Indian legislatures. The report says :—

The Committee think it desirable that a Governor's intervention in the proceedings of his legislative council should be confined to cases in which control by the executive (which for these purposes the Governor must represent) is essential, having regard to the fact that the Government will not command a majority in any council or to cases in which the President will not be in a position to give the requisite ruling. In all other cases they think that the last word should lie with the President of the council. Following this principle they have substituted the word " President " for " Governor " in rules 3, 7 and 11.

That is to say, the President of the council, instead of the Governor, will nominate a panel of not more than four temporary chairmen to preside over the council in the absence of the President or the Deputy President. Again, the power of disallowing questions is now to be vested in the President and not in the Governor. This change makes the rule entirely satisfactory. It will be recalled that the only ground on which, according to the draft rules, a question or part of a question could be disallowed was that "it relates to a matter which is not primarily the concern of the local Government." It could not be disallowed on the ground that it could not be asked " without detriment to the public interest." The only objectionable feature in this rule was that the Governor, instead of the President, was to decide whether the question related to a matter within the province of the local Government. This feature is, however, removed by the change in the rule made by the Joint Committee, which is now rendered perfectly unexceptionable.

RULE 11 relates to motions for adjournment, which may now be made with the consent of the President of the council. There is, however, a serious reservation. The Committee add :—

But with regard to the last-mentioned rule (no. 11), they think it necessary to retain for the Governor the power proposed by the Government of India to disallow a motion for adjournment even though it may have received the consent of the President and of the council, if time permits of reference to the Governor before the adjournment takes place and if the Governor is of opinion that the proposed discussion cannot take place without detriment to the public interest. They have accordingly added a second paragraph to rule 22 (relating to the disallowance of resolutions) to secure this power.

The original restriction thus remains, though in a softened form. The Committee are alive to the drawback resulting from such a restriction, and have accordingly warned the Government to use the power with discretion. They observe :

The power to curtail public discussion in these newly constituted legislative bodies will obviously call for great discrimination in its use if it is not to prejudice their success, and to result, not in closing discussion, but in transferring it to less appropriate channels. But the Committee agree with the Government of India that the power is one which the Government must have at its command, and they feel no doubt that the Governor-General and the provincial Governors will use their discretion in the matter wisely.

Similar changes have also been made in the Indian legislature.

* * *

NO change is, however, made in Rule 22 which vests in the Governor and the Governor-General power to disallow any resolution or part of a resolution, on the ground, among others, that it cannot be moved without detriment to the public interest. The Committee evidently think that because the executive Government will not necessarily have a majority at their back as is the case in self-governing countries, unofficial members cannot be given the same latitude in regard to the moving of resolutions as is possible elsewhere. Allowing full force for this argument, we yet hold that the Government must trust to the good sense of the members to exercise this power with self-restraint. If the plea of detriment to the public interest is at all to be allowed, the Committee think, with reason, that the competent authority to decide the matter is the Governor, instead of the President. In regard to this matter, the Committee have paid no heed to the representations made by Indians. We wonder if the opinion of the Advisory Committee and the individual members thereof was made available to the Joint Com-

mittee. They nowhere refer to the Advisory Committee.

* * *

THE next most important thing to note in the Joint Committee's report is the removal of certain restrictions on candidature. The change made in this behalf in provincial councils is that persons registered as electors in special constituencies will be eligible as candidates for general constituencies, i. e. an elector, say, in a landholders' or commerce and industry constituency can stand for election by any non-Muhammadan or Muhammadan or European constituency, subject to the qualification that a candidate representing a particular community must himself belong to the community and also subject to the residential test. A similar change is made in the case of the Indian legislature. Another change of some consequence is that it renders "eligible for election by a general constituency in any province any person who is registered as an elector in any constituency in that province (whether general or special) prescribed for the provincial legislature." This is in accordance with the recommendation of the Southborough Franchise Committee that "candidature for the seats to which election is made by the members of the provincial legislative councils (the Committee had recommended indirect election to the central legislature) . . . should be extended to all persons who are qualified for election to the council of the province which they desire to represent." The draft rules would have closed candidature to some persons who were eligible for election to the local legislative council. The Committee think it unnecessary to maintain for either chamber of the central legislature any residential restriction other than residence within the province.

* * *

IN the case of Madras and Assam councils, the Joint Committee have adopted a welcome change. The draft rules provided for the nomination of five persons to represent the Panchamas and one to represent the inhabitants of backward tracts in Madras, and one to represent the labouring classes and another to represent the inhabitants of backward tracts in Assam. The change made by the Committee empowers the Governor to require the communities concerned to select their representatives from which he may make a choice. As the Committee remark, such a provision "may pave the way for election proper by educating backward communities in the advantages and responsibilities it involves." We cannot understand why it should be made applicable only to two provinces when, as a matter of fact, every other province, except the Punjab, has to provide by nomination for the representation of the depressed classes. The change made by the Joint Select Committee in the rule regulating the number of executive councillors is in the wrong direction. The draft rules fixed the number at two for all provinces

other than the three presidencies, in the case of which latter the number was not specified. The complaint of the Indian public was that in the case of the three presidencies a loophole was left by means of which a council would be composed either of four members (two Indian and two European) or of three members (one of whom would be an Indian with service qualifications)—neither of which arrangement would be justifiable in view of the addition of two or three ministers to the provincial executive. Instead of limiting the membership of the executive councils in the three presidencies also to two, the Joint Committee have left the strength in the other provinces unspecified!

* * *

IT has become customary latterly to issue in the name of the president-elect of the Congress or the chairman of the Reception Committee an appeal to the Congress leaders who, since the emergence of a sharp division of opinion on the Reform Scheme, have persuaded themselves that the best interests of the country require their abstention from the Congress sittings rather than their participation in its deliberations. The *Tribune*, whose solicitude for a united Congress is well-known, now urges Lala Lajpat Rai to follow the well established custom and adjure all abstaining Congressmen to return to the Congress fold. The Lala, the paper adds, is peculiarly fitted to address such an appeal. He himself has ever stood for unity among public workers when separation seemed to many to be at once the easiest way out of the surrounding difficulties and a stage in the natural process of development of Indian politics; and he comes from a province which has ever set its face against the impending division of the national party into rival groups. No one will for a moment dispute the earnestness with which the suggestion is made, or the eminent qualifications of the president for the office of the mediator. He is among the few men who may well be regarded as the symbol of unity amidst a diversity of opinions, and this fact ought ordinarily to lend great weight to any appeal for unity that may come from him.

* * *

READILY as we acknowledge the very great advantages pointed out by *The Tribune*, which Lala Lajpat Rai possesses over his immediate predecessor in the Congress presidentship in this respect, he suffers from one serious handicap which did not operate in the case of Pandit Motilal Nehru. At the time the Amritsar Congress met, the prevalent feeling was that the Congress was a national organisation, that it represented not any particular class of opinion or a school of politics, but the nation as a whole. It was then the duty as well as the right of all who believed in the national character of the Congress to attend its sessions and claim a hearing for their views, however unpopular they may at the time happen to be. But the position has since undergone a radical change. Conference after conference has met under the Congress

auspices and has passed resolutions which can only be understood as an emphatic repudiation of the national character of the Congress. At least three provincial conferences and a larger number of district conferences have recommended the election to the various legislative bodies in the country of only such persons as are in complete agreement with one particular resolution of the Amritsar Congress. This perversion of the use of the moral prestige and resources of a national organisation to sectional ends has been welcomed with enthusiasm by the mass of delegates and has not been rebuked by those who, like Lala Lajpat Rai, Pandit Malaviya and Mr. Gandhi, are no doubt anxious to preserve intact the national character of the Congress. It was manifestly the duty of every leader, to whom any influence is given in Congress affairs, to have condemned the resolutions which had the effect of stamping upon the Congress a sectional character and of virtually expelling from the Congress all but those who belonged to the dominant party. We cannot help saying that these leaders failed in the timely discharge of this duty.

* * *

THE Liberals were entitled to look specially to Lala Lajpat Rai for a word of warning. When the Nationalists as a body were excluded from the Advisory Committee on Reform Rules in Delhi, the Lala promptly seized an opportunity to condemn the Government of India's partiality, and, what is more, he did not hesitate to warn the Liberal members of the Committee that any drawbacks in the rules would be ascribed to them. The justice of laying the blame for any objectionable rules at the door of those who used their best efforts to make them satisfactory may be questioned. The Liberals did not favour the exclusion of the Nationalists; they exerted all the influence at their command to make the Advisory Committee truly representative; they openly disapproved of its one-sided character; and they used their limited opportunities to the full for the improvement of the rules. And yet Lala Lajpat Rai saw fit to censure the Liberals as if the non-inclusion of the Nationalists was of their seeking. As, however, the censure was prompted more by his impatience at the exclusion of the Nationalists than by any supposed remissness on the part of the Liberals who were admitted into consultation, it really showed how anxious Lala Lajpat Rai was for united action. Contrast, however, the promptitude with which he reproved the Liberals for an exclusiveness for which they were certainly not responsible with the reluctance which he evidently feels in censuring the Nationalists who of set purpose degrade the national Congress and reduce it, to all intents and purposes, to a party machine. The All-India Congress Committee had occasion to meet since such a degradation in the status of the Congress took place, and no attempt was made to redeem the character of the national organisation.

* * *

IN default of such an attempt, either on the part of the nation's leaders individually or on the part of the Congress executive, to restore the Congress to its national character, what moral strength can an appeal for unity issued by the Congress president possess? Why is it that some of the leaders, whose loyalty to the principles of the Congress cannot be questioned and whose patriotism is unimpeachable, abstain from the Congress sessions? It is because they think that the Congress has already ceased to possess a national character, that it has become a party organization. The Nationalists could contend till last year that the Congress was a national body, whatever their individual sentiments might have been. But now, by their own act, they have in form made it sectional: the resolutions passed by them have lent complete justification to the reasons which deterred some of the Liberals from attending the Congress sittings. Why is the Congress president now to issue a piteous appeal to the abstaining Liberals? Is it to help the Nationalists register a decree of expulsion against themselves? Such an appeal, we must frankly confess, will be empty of all moral force. It would, of course, be the duty of those Liberals who are unwilling to surrender so easily the national character of the Congress to attend the Congress and assert their view in it, but it is idle in those who have made the Congress a party organization to appeal to the Liberals to rejoin the Congress in the name of national unity.

* * *

THE opposition which some persons set up between the acquisition of power and the safeguarding of civil liberty is, in the conditions of this country, nothing but forced and unreal. *The Standard* of Madras has a telling paragraph on this subject. It runs: "There is an academic controversy going on among prominent Indian politicians on the debating society proposition: Which is more needed for the country, freedom or power? As in the case of most of such questions, the best answer would be—both. By freedom is meant a declaration of the rights of Indians which would not be liable to infringement by any person or body of persons. But that is impossible. The body which makes the declaration of rights would have the right of abrogating them. If Parliament made the declaration of rights and if circumstances required, it would be quite ready to abrogate any or all of them. The American and French declarations of rights have not prevented the American and French Governments from making mishmash of them whenever necessary. A declaration of rights is of no value without proper institutions to guard them. A powerful local legislature, still more independent courts, would be necessary. Freedom and power go together, and they grow *pari passu*."

Notice to Contributors.

The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected Mss. or any other contributions sent to him.

BAL GANGADHAR TILAK.

I.

THE death of Mr. Bal Gangadhar Tilak removes a great figure from Indian politics. For a quarter of a century and more, he had been the ideal of his followers and the dread of his opponents. Of Government he had been an unrelenting and consistent foe except during his stay in England, during which he scandalised young Indians by his studied moderation of tone. It is no wonder, seeing how he had to undergo State prosecutions more than once which left his fortune more than once in utter ruin. The wonder is, he rebuilt his fortunes with celerity and was ready to sacrifice them again. Clear-sighted and tenacious, he kept an eye on India's freedom and would not rest or let Government rest till it should be won. Concessions and reforms he would take, for they only added to the strength of the people, but he would not have them be too thankful or contented while the end was still far-off. Audacious in the beginning alike in aim and plan, he showed the true caution of the Mahratta in late life when he discountenanced the suicidal policy of rejecting the reforms or abandoning the constitutional position gained. By training, if not also by nature, he seemed more fitted to be in opposition than to hold the reins of Government. But the political manifesto which he drew up a few weeks ago proves that many measures for amelioration of the condition of the people lay near his heart, and there is no need to doubt what he would have advised his followers to do if they should come into power. Bold he was and willing to take risks, but he was wary withal and liked to test the ground of battle before he ventured on it. Left to himself, he would never break the law openly and invite its rigours like Mr. Gandhi. Neither is it possible to conceive that he would, like Mr. Gandhi, throw down the gage to Government and, all unarmed, take the vow of victory or death. His foremost intellectual quality was an alertness which bordered on restlessness. He must be wrestling with some difficulty or other. Even in confinement, his mind was occupied with problems of philosophic or antiquarian interest. Whether his speculations will stand the test of the scholar's scrutiny remains to be seen, but no one questions their quality of daring. There are those who lament his choice in life as a grievous error, for politics in the present conditions of India could not gain all that research lost. One has heard of English politicians of mark who, after an interview or two with Mr. Tilak, have given him a place among the greatest minds they have known. Disputants have testified that he was master of all the arts of controversy. Towards these he seldom showed tenderness, as he certainly expected none from them. He was trained in a hardy school. If he was not the founder, he was the most powerful exponent of virile journa-

lism in the vernacular. As he made Marathi an apt vehicle of his shrewdness and subtlety, so he gave polemics in the Deccan its strength as well as its weakness, its bold sweep, its undying aspiration, its elusiveness, its unrefined directness. Affable and kindly in private life and trusted in an amazing degree by his followers, he could move with perfect ease only in an orbit of his own and could not enter into any but temporary alliances with other leaders of political thought. He seemed to thrive on disputation. The hostilities he had with Ranade, Agarkar, Mehta and Gokhale ended only with their death. Each of these had the stuff in him of which greatness is made and proved his mettle against Mr. Tilak's relentless polemic. There is good reason to believe that Mr. Tilak knew the good points of his rivals and could appreciate them fully when he cared. Some one some day will draw comparison and contrast between Mr. Gokhale and Mr. Tilak. If it is done properly, it will be a valuable key to the politics of the Deccan during the last twenty or twenty-five years. Mr. Gokhale, who had a rare gift of seeing the true quality of his rivals, used to say that Mr. Tilak was born out of his time and that his genius would have found congenial scope a century or so ago. Like most generalisations, this would require qualifications before it could be made to fit in exactly with the facts. But there is no doubt that Mr. Tilak's forceful and combative personality had but small room for those qualities of sagacious counsel, cosmopolitan sympathy and persuasive eloquence that are the indispensable marks of a leader of men, suited to the eve of a democratic régime. It was the example of Mr. Tilak that first drew Mr. Gokhale to the service of the Deccan Education Society. But the spell did not last long. Differences of character and temperament first made, and then widened, a gulf between them. Towards the end of Mr. Ranade's life and more markedly after that event, they stood in the Deccan at the head of opposite schools of thought whom events often threw into active rivalry. Not in politics alone, but in the ethics of public life, in social reform, in educational ideals, in attitude towards Government and the British race generally, they were as wide apart as the poles. Each recognised, however, the burning patriotism of the other. Both loved the people and made sacrifices in their service. But how diverse their paths! The one passed through suspicion from Government and from people to the pinnacle of fame when he died, honoured and lamented by both. The other ended as he began, the enemy of Government and the victim of its wrath, but the idol of his countrymen. This is not the occasion to examine Mr. Tilak's principles, review his particular deeds or appraise his services as a whole. A critical study of these must disclose errors as well as merits, failure as well as achievement, occa-

sion for censure as well as for praise. But none can deny that he had great qualities or that he played a great part. To found vernacular journalism, to lose and recover his fortune more than once, to dare the wrath of a Government and go to jail with the crown of the martyr, to write original books, to dominate political activity for a generation in a large part of the country and leave a numerous and well-knit party behind—these constitute an indefeasible title to the honour and loving recollection of his countrymen.

II.

DURING the whole period of British rule in India there has been no man who occupied in the public mind exactly the same position that the late Mr. Tilak did during the last twenty-five years of his life. We say this even though we recall the names of Rammohan Roy, Dadabhai Naoroji, W. C. Bonnerji, Sir Syed Ahmed, Ranade, Mehta, or Gokhale, not to mention purely religious or social reformers like Dayanand, Keshub Chandra Sen, Vidyasagar or Agarkar. Some of these were greater, far greater men; others had a truer statesmanship and a surer conception of the problems before the country; some were more masterful in personal intercourse; others were far more eloquent; the intellectual calibre of some of them was certainly not inferior to that of Mr. Tilak. But in spite of all this, nobody—not even Dadabhai—touched the hearts of his followers and a very large section of the people in quite the same way as Mr. Tilak did. Such a phenomenon needs explanation.

Mr. Tilak's hold upon his country was to a very considerable extent promoted by the fact that he stood for the obvious line of policy in our country's politics. The common people are not able to consider deeply the pros and cons of any subject and are sure to like one who puts into a consistent form the ideas which are vaguely trying to find expression. A consistent and trenchant criticism of a foreign Government was just the way to rouse the people. The path of a reformer who seeks to criticise as well as to construct is very hard. The country is so situated that the work before the critic is lying ready to hand in vast quantities, while the opportunities for constructive work are comparatively few and in any case difficult. Mr. Tilak came at the psychological moment when the obvious advantages of British rule as compared with the old Indian rule had come to be regarded as habitual and a part of the very nature of things, and the disadvantages had begun to be acutely felt. He took full advantage of it, and the love of his admiring countrymen was his reward.

But a mere propaganda of criticism would not have led to the fervent idolatry that he commanded, had it not been accompanied by some fine personal qualities. Others have tried it, who did not possess these qualities and have not succeeded as Mr. Tilak did. Among these qualities a pure personal life is one of the most prominent. He

had none of the looseness of character often found among other patriots, his living was simple, he was always accessible, and he had a very engaging *bonhomie* of manners. Some of these personal traits were occasionally a handicap as he was sometimes too prone to follow the advice and suggestions of his *entourage* against his own better judgment. Then another very fine point in his character was his capacity for sacrifice. He started life in a spirit of sacrifice by founding, in collaboration with Agarkar and Chiplunkar, the New English School and the Fergusson College. The example of such a sacrifice of worldly prospects in a purely secular cause was at that time very rare. High English education was in his younger days the sure key to a fine official or professional career, and if he had so wished it, he could easily have ended as a High Court Judge or a Collector in the statutory service. The history of the severance of his connection with the Deccan Education Society is now well-known and need not be detailed in this place, but this first step was the starting point in the progress of an agitator's—we use the word in no bad sense—career. Then his undaunted courage in facing the various prosecutions which were believed by popular opinion to be specially directed against him personally, won him the admiration even of his enemies and opponents. His followers of course were rendered still more devoted by these events, and he attained a position almost unexampled in the recent history of our country.

In addition to these qualities of a high personal character and capacity for sacrifice, he had a very keen intellect which would have shone in any field. As it was, he was no mean Sanskrit scholar and has written some books on Indian antiquities which may live a long time. Scholars will discuss the correctness of his conclusions about the age of the Vedas, the home of the Aryan race or the true significance of the teaching of the Bhagwad-Gita; but it is remarkable that a man who lived so entirely in the rough and tumble of politics could find time for this work. This astonishing popularity in the political sphere was rather unfavourable to the formulation of a dispassionate judgment on his scholarship, and perhaps he himself developed in his later years an impatience of criticism, a pontifical attitude even on indifferent questions like the reform of the Indian Calendar.

Finally, he had a wonderful instinct for gauging the feeling of the public. He accurately mirrored public opinion, but his soul was hardly like that of the prophet who would castigate equally the authorities or the mob on their shortcomings. He often deliberately chose the less heroic path of following the mob even when in his heart of hearts he felt that it was not going right; he did not lay sufficient stress on any opinions of his own which, he thought, would be unpopular and would detract from his hold upon the public mind. Perhaps he lost sight of the fact that this hold is often made firmer when you are prepared to risk it for what you feel is right. But he made his choice deli-

berately, and one cannot now quarrel with it. Suffice it to say that he produced a good deal of animation in a body which was almost lifeless, he made the people think when they were content to accept things as they are, and he gave the country an example of sacrifice, pure life and devotion to the motherland. The pity is that the situation of our country is such that a man like Mr. Tilak had to spend his whole life in mere criticism and in doing what was very often mere destructive work; that his exceptional abilities could not be harnessed for doing the work of construction, in leading his country into the quieter paths of happiness and contentment; that a man of high personal private character and acute brains had to advocate, and often act upon, the truly Machiavellian doctrine that all was fair in politics and had to neglect other kinds of activities which are equally vital to national progress. History will form its own judgment about the place of Bal Gangadhar Tilak in the annals of India; but at a moment when his ashes are hardly cold, we can but say that in him there lived a GREAT MAN.

R. P. PARANJPYE.

THE KHILAFAT AND THE TURKISH PEACE.—III.

IN my second article, I tried to face the ultimate question, whether there is any possibility that the weaker nations of the world may receive justice at the hands of the strong. Is the East, from henceforth, always to be exploited for the profit of the West? Is Might and Might alone the arbiter? Is there no hope of justice? Is this the end?

No, this is not the end; there is still hope, even in this darkest hour of the world's history. The moral decline and fall of Europe have been so tremendous, the hypocrisy of Europe has been so deep, there is still hope of recovery and renewal.

Let me give, in this last article, some of the signs which appear to me, when I try honestly to face the facts, to offer encouragement and to keep my own mind from despair. I will draw two pictures only—one, from the older Universities of England, as they have been described to me recently by letter; the other, from the Labour movement in South Africa, as I have witnessed it with my own eyes.

With regard to Oxford, some time ago I had the very welcome news sent to me concerning the change which had taken place. The men, who were undergraduates in 1914, had come back, after passing through the long-drawn agony of the War, and they were determined that the world should not sink back again into chaos. There was rebellion in the air,—rebellion against the conventions and caste traditions of the past.

As an illustration of the new Oxford, my correspondent related to me at some length the story of a debate in the Oxford Union on "The Government of Ireland." The house was packed to the doors. At first some formal, ordinary, colourless,

speeches were delivered. Then after a while, an Irishman got up and uttered downright, open rebellion without a single qualifying word. He accused the Englishmen, who were present, of cowardice and cruelty, dishonesty and breach of faith. He declared, in unequivocal terms, for an independent Republic. If Ireland were not set free, he threatened an undying warfare. He appealed to the ultimate rights of man for liberty and justice; he denounced imperialism of every kind.

The scene was electrical. Instead of being shouted down, or ridiculed, or received with cold disdainful silence, he was cheered again and again. It was not merely his courage, which brought him this applause. It was the revolt of the generous hearts of young men, who had themselves been through the peril of modern battle, against all forms of tyranny and oppression.

A correspondent has written to me from Cambridge, that there also idealism is slowly recovering its lost ground. The spirit of question and revolt is abroad. It is true, he writes, that immediately after the war, human life went slack for a while; the popular cries of revenge and selfish greed were blatantly loud. But since then, loathing and disgust at the crimes of the Blockade and the slow starvation of central Europe have filled men's minds. An altogether healthier tone has come. The heart of the young is still sound.

No, the end is not yet! The light is breaking through. The young men, who fought in the War, have not ceased to see visions; and the old men are again dreaming their dreams of world set free.

I turn to my second picture. This time, the scene is in South Africa. There, the general election is at its height, with all that this means of excitement and absorption in fierce political strife. Racial passion is running high, and the temptation is almost irresistible to appeal to the lower instincts of men in order to catch the popular vote.

I was seated in a central committee room in Durban, along with some of the hardest-worked among the leaders of the South African Labour party. These men were tired to death with all the drudgery of the election. They had known very little sleep or rest for many days and nights. Yet they gave me a most patient hearing when I came to them and asked for their sympathy and support in the Indian cause. They had kept, in the very centre of their programme, the principle of 'equal pay for equal work' without any reservation in favour of their own race. One of them said to me the following words:—

Tell them, over there in India, Mr. Andrews, when you get back home,—tell them, that we shall do all we can not to act unfairly towards any race or creed. We want India to get Home Rule, just as much as we want Ireland and Egypt to get Home Rule; and when Labour comes into power, we shall be with you to a man. We are a young party out here in South Africa, and, as you know well, we have our colour prejudices very strong. I'm not going to say any more about what we're going to do, when we get into office; because it's no use at all to

make promises and then to break them. But I can tell you this, that we're working forward steadily for the principle of 'equal pay for equal work' and that means an end to the colour bar.

And you may be quite sure of one thing, Mr. Andrews, that we, working men, who had to fight against the capitalists every day of our lives, will never have any truck with "Empire" politics, if we can help it. We are convinced that imperialism and capitalism are the same thing. They always work hand in hand together, and it's no use fighting against the one without fighting against the other. So we are really on your side, though, from some of the things our members may have said, you may have been led to think the opposite. We are all dead against this "Empire expansion."

I had imagined, all the while, that the Labour party in South Africa was standing merely for race privilege and race ascendancy. But I found that, even out in South Africa, a great change had taken place. And if this could be said of labour in South Africa, how much more could it be stated of Labour in England!

No, the end is not yet! Idealism has not perished in the West! In spite of all the terrible degradation which has come over Europe, the heart of the young, the heart of the poor, the heart of the labourer, is still sound.

Here, then, are two rising forces of revolt. Here are two on-rushing streams of new life. On the one side is the intellectual revolt of the young in the universities; on the other side is the practical revolt of the working men in the great workshops of the world.

When those young Oxford undergraduates,—aristocratically English by birth and tradition,—cheered the Irish speaker, who preached stark republicanism and naked rebellion, a blow was struck for the intellectual freedom of the new age of mankind.

When the dock labourers at Tilbery refused to handle the ammunition which was being sent out secretly by the British Government to Poland in order to create fresh carnage in central Europe, a second blow was struck for the practical freedom of the new age of mankind.

These forces of rebellion and revolt are all young. They are of the future, and for the future. They are not of the dead past. They are united in deadly hostility against all secret diplomacies, all "protectorates" and "mandates," all outworn creeds of "Empire."

These are the facts of the new world, which must be taken into account by the leaders of the Khilafat movement. It is to this tribunal of the future that our faces in India must be turned, and our efforts directed. "Let the dead past bury its dead." The old world is passing away. In spite of all the present signs to the contrary, the tide of humanity is rising. We, who are now living, may see that tide come to the full before we die. The immortal lines of Arthur Clough are once more being fulfilled:—

Say not the struggle naught availeth,
The labour and the wounds are vain,
The enemy faints not, nor falleth,
And as kings have been they remain.

If hopes were dupes, fears may be liars,
It may be, in you smoke concealed,
Your comrades chase even now the fiends,
And, but for you, possess the field.

For while the tired waves, vainly breaking,
Seem here no painful inch to gain,
Far back, through creeks and inlets making,
Comes silent, flooding in, the main.

If the Khilafat movement is to win the respect of this new Europe; if it is to gain the enthusiastic support of these younger men of the future who have not been hardened by the lust of power; if it is to make good its claim for justice, then its programme must in no way conflict with the most exacting demands of intellectual truth and political freedom. There must be nothing which has even the semblance of imperialism, whether religious or racial.

When I turn to the actual documents published by the Khilafat Committee and Delegation, I find this reliance on intellectual truth alone obscured by the insistence on religious dogmas, and this assertion of political freedom weakened by the insistence on Turkish imperialism. The subjection of non-Muslim and non-Turkish races to Turkish sovereignty is put forward as an irreducible minimum, which must not be departed from by a hair's breadth. A religious imperialism is advocated, which might become no less tyrannical than the predatory imperialisms of Europe.

What the Khilafat claim would mean, in practice, may be easily realised as follows. It would mean, if carried out, the forcible suppression of the independence in Armenia, in Lebanon, in Syria, in Arabia. It would mean that, whether these countries desire it or not, they are to be forced back under Turkish sovereignty.

To my mind, such a demand is unthinkable. It is also intolerable.

If the explanation is given, that "autonomous government within the Turkish Empire" is very nearly the same as independence, my answer could be that this is mere verbal quibbling. It is the old diplomatic juggling with words. The camouflage is too obvious. It will deceive nobody. Independence is independence; "autonomous government within the Ottoman Empire consistent with the dignity of Turkish sovereignty" (to quote from one of the Khilafat documents) is *not* independence, but something quite different.

There is one further consideration of serious importance. To insist on this subjection of Arabs, Syrians, Armenians to Turkey *on the ground of the fulfilment of religious texts and dogmas*, is to leave cold the modern mind. Experience has shown that humanity itself has frequently been injured in the name of religion. The freedom of the future age is not to be bound in this manner by the shackles of religious dogmas. Mankind will seek more and more the freedom of unfettered intellectual advance, the freedom of fearless enlightenment and emancipation, the freedom of a boundless search for truth.

In this atmosphere of freedom, all the irrational accretions of religion, all authoritative scriptures and obscurantist dogmas, will have to be brought to the test of the intellect, the science, and the conscience of mankind. Already, in the west, the dogmas of Christianity have been compelled to pass through this fiery ordeal, and many of these so-called Christian doctrines have been ultimately destroyed. The dogmas of Islam will have to be tested in the same furnace. That which is temporal in Islam will have to be abandoned: that which is eternal will alone remain. It has yet to be seen, how far the dogmas of the "Khilafat" and the "Jazirat-ul-Arab" can withstand that fiery trial, and how far they must be modified to meet the spirit of the times.

C. F. ANDREWS.

THE AMRITSAR DEBATE.

ONE hundred and twenty-nine members of the House of Commons have endorsed the action, at Amritsar, of General Dyer. And in so doing they have placed themselves on the side of those who would rule India by terror. This is disturbing, and it fills with amazement those who would approach the settlement of Indian affairs by an appeal to the good-will of the Indian people. Yet, when studied quietly it is not so ominous as it at first would seem. Undoubtedly, these one hundred and twenty-nine Commoners do represent a school of thought—a cult of the swashbuckler which makes not only Indian questions difficult, but all questions which arise in politics. That cult ruined Germany, it has caused untold woe to Ireland and, had it had its way, it would have lost South Africa to the British Empire. Fortunately, it does not always have its way, and this time it was defeated—defeated by the almost universal feeling, in England, that Prussianism should form no part of British rule. English feeling has been shocked by the Punjab atrocities, and the debate in the House was a reflection of that emotion. It is true that the cry, "Dyer stopped another mutiny," and the stories of numerous outrages by the mob influenced opinion, but, at length, it was seen that the shooting into an unarmed crowd, the whipping of men, and the infamous crawling order were things that no decent man could condone. Even Sir Edward Carson, a fit spokesman of a Dyer cult, did not defend these; he relied on the platitude, "Trust the man on the spot". Mr. Montagu's speech was provocative, and properly so. He knew—none better—what was in the minds of his opponents. They were waiting, and have been waiting, to destroy him because he had given the reforms to India. Many had insulted him by offensively calling attention to the fact that he is a Jew. Most of them bitterly resented that a Radical should administer India. All these influences were operating, and Mr. Montagu was alive to the mental condition of his foes—they were more than political opponents. Hence he spoke frankly, and

his frankness excited to incoherence a group in the House. These worshippers of a Jewish statesman, Benjamin Disraeli, have a convenient memory! It is to be presumed that these men would resent that they should be likened to the Continental Jew-baiter, but their mentality is little, if anything, above that level. It is a duty to point out to those who applaud the vote of Mr. Montagu's enemies that the period of unrestrained oppression in the British Empire has passed. All, but a few, are ashamed of what is happening in Ireland, and those, who count, are striving to solve that dreadful problem in a peaceful manner, although the murderous activities of ill-conditioned men thwart their every effort. But a few years ago, coercion would have automatically come into play; to-day wild men alone think of coercion as the remedy. What is true of the attitude towards Ireland is equally true as regards India. An absence from England shows to the returned exile, in a vivid manner, the great change in European opinion; the European is weary of violence. He shudders at the disasters which the use of force has brought, and he wants no more. This fact must ever be kept in evidence, and although there always will be those who see no solution but brutality, their capability for great mischief is crippled. The vote of the one hundred and twenty-nine may therefore be dismissed as a wicked attack on a man hated because he had dared to inscribe on a pedestal a maxim of government, which in future will guide the British administrator. This was venomously resented by those who would have it different, but the measure of their venom was the measure of their defeat. Mr. Bonar Law, as was to be expected of a humane gentleman, spoke of the indignation he felt when he first heard of the massacre, and how he had waited for General Dyer's explanation. The explanation was before him, and he condemned in no uncertain manner the action of that soldier. Mr. Asquith spoke of the incident as unprecedented in British annals; he evidently had forgotten the Peterloo massacre of 1819, when at Manchester, a crowd of citizens had been ridden down by cavalry because they had asked for Parliamentary reform in such a way as to frighten a timid magistrate. Peterloo and Amritsar pass into the history of Democracy. The Labour party endeavoured to carry the discussion further than the Government wished, but it was felt that the civil authorities had put upon General Dyer a task beyond his power. It was also felt that they had forsaken him. The House of Commons apparently was actuated by that thought, and the resolution adopted by its members closes the matter. Of this India may be certain—there will be no more Punjab atrocities. However, it must not be taken that rebellion and murder are to be supinely treated. The rebel and the murderer, in whatever part of the British Commonwealth they appear, will be sternly punished, but the unarmed and innocent citizen may go on his way unafraid, none daring to prevent him making his grievance

known. The punishment of General Dyer is severe: not so severe as perhaps his conduct deserves, but he is a broken man. He has been condemned by the Army Council, a condemnation he did not presumably expect; by a Cabinet of statesmen drawn from all parties; by the House of Commons, and by almost every newspaper in England. It would be human if Indians showed a disinclination to allow the matter to drop, for they have been hurt grievously in soul and body; but would it be wise to continue the controversy? Indians have now a power greater than militarism, and if that power is used rationally, they are masters in their own home.

W. A. CHAMBERS.

London, July 10.

A LETTER FROM LONDON.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

LONDON, JULY 15.

DYER'S CASE IN THE COMMONS.

THE great Dyer debate has come and gone. It has been something in the nature of self-revelation. For the first time, the Secretary of State's salary came upon the British Estimates to be voted on. One would have thought that the occasion would have been sought for a full dress debate upon Indian policy in general, in view of the brief period allowed for such discussion. But it was not to be. For the first time, in Indian affairs, the Government of the day had sent round a three-line whip to their supporters, instructing them to be at their posts for a critical division that might come at any time. One would have thought that the seriousness of the occasion would have impressed itself upon the supporters of a Government responsible last year for the passage of the Reform Act. But in spite of the sharp reminder of Mr. Whiteley, the Chairman of Committees, this, too, was not to be. For the first time in the history of events in India—it is an old complaint that even when the Secretary of State made an important speech on the ancient motion that the House do now go into Committee on the Indian Estimates, Members rapidly disappeared into the purlieus of the House leaving the Minister to address a begarly array of empty benches—there was a full House, except during the dinner-hour, right up to within an hour of midnight. What for? To discuss Indian policy? To heal the open wounds of India? To allay passions and give ground for hope and reconstruction? Not a bit of it. Rarely—it is generally agreed—has the House been seen to worse advantage. Parliament was certainly not itself. It became the arena of sordid squabbles, strong and angry passions, vehement denunciation, public and personal insult, evil insinuations and racial hostility. Though there have during the present Parliament been many discontents with the Ministry and with individual Ministers, for the first time, on Thursday last, a great wave of passion and hatred against one Minister drove a very considerable portion of the Government's supporters into the division lobby against them. Had any

stranger, unacquainted with Britain's responsibilities towards India, been incited to express an opinion on the situation, the very last thing that would have occurred to him, following upon this foolish display of temper by the House, would have been that it was aware of any such responsibilities. He would certainly never have supposed that barely six months ago Parliament had, by deliberate enactment, set India on the first steps of the road towards full self-government within the Empire. What he would have remarked was an extraordinary veneration, on the one hand, for a military mumbo-jumbo called Dyer, and, on the other, a vicious and virulent attack upon the Secretary of State for India, because he refused to worship at the idol's shrine—and for other reasons. "What many of us are asking," wrote Mr. T. J. Bennett, M. P., to *The Times* next day, "is whether an atmosphere charged with personal antipathy—not free, as I am well warranted in saying, from the racial prejudice which worked mischief in France during the anti-Dreyfus controversy—was favourable to the consideration of the weighty matters that were in the Committee's charge last night." *The Times* special observer of the proceedings of Parliament, a remarkably acute critic, advanced as a chief reason for the provocative effect of Mr. Montagu's opening speech upon the minds of a very large section of the House, that he, being an Oriental in psychology, had committed the error of misunderstanding the psychology of the House by appealing to it upon the basis of reasoning from the general to the particular, instead of from the particular to the general. It is difficult to believe that this was an argument intended to be taken seriously, for Mr. Montagu certainly had a majority of the House (all endowed with a western psychology) with him in the result. And we may remember that Disraeli was at least as Oriental as Mr. Montagu.

PREJUDICE AGAINST MR. MONTAGU.

But Mr. Bennett and the critic both laid their finger upon the vital spot nevertheless. Mr. Montagu is an Oriental. He is a Jew. And these crimes cannot be forgiven him by a small band in this country whose organ is the *Morning Post* and whose mouth-piece seems to be Mr. Rupert Gwynne. I emphasise the smallness of the group, for I am certain that the majority of those who voted against the Government the other night were animated by very different motives. But anti-Semitism is clearly abroad in some circles, "Germans and Jews" is a phrase often to be found in the mouths of certain ultra-Britishers of the true blue-blooded type. Religious prejudice and racial antipathy is more widely spread in this country than the superficial on-looker would suppose. The recent attacks upon the Chief Justice, Sir Alfred Mond, Sir Herbert Samuel, Sir Stuart M. Samuel, and Mr. Montagu, to mention but a few of the most prominent British Jews, indicate clearly what lies at the back of the minds of those who speak and write glibly of international finance.

ANIMOSITY TOWARDS MR. MONTAGU EXPLAINED.

But if there is such a thing as a specifically Oriental psychology, then it would certainly seem that an Oriental is more likely to possess a sympathetic understanding of Oriental peoples and their hopes and aspirations than a non-Oriental. Meanwhile, it may be of interest to Mr. Montagu's opponents and critics in India that by their extravagant attacks upon him they merely play into the hands of the most reactionary, the most prejudiced, the most anti-Indian, and the most anti-British section of the British people. What is the true explanation of the remarkably widespread animosity in the House towards Mr. Montagu during and after his speech? There was nothing in it to which any person animated by ordinary liberal conceptions could reasonably have taken exception. Its liberal sentiments were pronounced and emphasised. I think it is very likely that it was not so much Mr. Montagu's matter as his manner that aroused a great deal of the opposition. He is not, in the true sense of the term, a House of Commons man. He was certainly not over-tactful in his antitheses last Tuesday, but judging from the deep feeling with which every sentence was charged, he evidently did not think that this was an occasion for the tactful handling of a delicate situation. But in addition one must remember that Parliament does not regard Dyer in the same light as Indians are bound to do. The curious legend has obtained widespread currency that he is an officer, deprived of the guidance of the civil authority, who was faced with a murderous mob which might have overwhelmed his small force that was responsible for the protection of European children and women; that the country around was in a state of turbulence and the city of Amritsar charged with violent emotion that might again spend itself at any moment; that he had to make up his mind what to do in a grave emergency; and that even if he made a mistake, it was one that might, in view of the circumstances and of his military record, be condoned. There were quite a number of members who could not bring themselves to believe that a British officer of standing could do what Dyer admittedly did, without good cause. There are, in the present Parliament, a large number of ex-service members, who, besides a natural loyalty towards a brother-in-arms, emphasise that, in moments of military emergency, the only proper judge of what the situation needs is the man on the spot and his discretion ought not to be influenced by the thought of what others might think, who were not present and could not visualise the position in which he found himself.

JUSTIFICATION FOR MR. MONTAGU'S EMOTION.

Mr. Montagu's emotion was understandable. He has been under considerable mental strain for a very long time. After the stress of getting through his Bill last year and having to fight for juster treatment of Turkey at a time when he should have been resting under medical advice,

he was eventually compelled to cease work for an unexpectedly prolonged period. Since his return to office, he has laboured under the difficulty of having to push forward and secure support for the Reforms in detail in the face of the great feeling that has been engendered by all the revelations in connection with the Punjab disorders and of the Khilafat agitation, which is now developing into a political campaign of non-co-operation. During the last few weeks, *India* and the *Morning Post* have joined in a hymn of hate against him, the former in the true spirit of political peevishness and ineptitude, the latter because it has never been able to forgive Mr. Montagu for being himself. There are undoubtedly classes in this country which will fight to the last ditch in the cause of imperialism, militarism and general political and social reaction. Their numbers are relatively few, but they are influential and they have everything to lose. They talk of honour, but jeopardise their own because they disregard everyone else's. They are lost to all sense of wider responsibility. Dyer, the militarist and the imperialist, means more to them than the Empire that he has served so badly. Imperial prestige weighed more with them than the constitutional traditions upon which the Empire has hitherto been based. They hate reform and they therefore hate the principal spokesman of the reforms, whom they persisted in regarding as their author and their sole sponsor, though, as Mr. Bonar Law, who wound up the Debate, reminded them, the policy upon which those reforms were based was a Cabinet policy and the Cabinet bears full responsibility for them at every stage. But then these people are not followers of Mr. Bonar Law. Their special divinity is Sir Edward Carson, an irresponsible firebrand, whose mission appears to be to destroy the very Empire, pride in which he easily professes, and that was why, when the Ulster Unionist Leader got up to reply to Mr. Montagu, his followers cheered him to the echo, though the substance of his remarks had very little in it. It was simply a forensic effort and nothing more.

SPEECHES OF MESSRS. CHURCHILL AND ASQUITH.

Perhaps the best speech of the day was that of Mr. Churchill. He was not very emotional, he was succinct and business-like, and he was able very largely to overcome the atmosphere of hostility and passion that had been generated by the speeches of his predecessors. He had no difficulty in showing that the treatment that had been meted out to General Dyer was no more severe than that accorded to large numbers of general officers during the War and since, and who had no ground for grievance on account thereof, having regard to the King's regulations, and he also showed that, taking into consideration the long period that had elapsed since the original occurrences and the approval that had been given to Genl. Dyer by high officers, civil and military, up to the time of his evidence before the Hunter Committee the Army Council had erred on the side of leniency in imposing upon him the

least penalty which was within its power to do. For himself, he would have been prepared to subject General Dyer to even more serious punishment. He flatly refused to believe that General Dyer saved India. Unarmed as India is and armed as the Government of India is with all modern weapons of precision, India should not have been lost to the Empire, even on the basis of force alone. But the basis of the British relations with India had never stood on physical force alone, and it would be fatal to the British Empire if the British people were to try to base themselves only upon it. Mr. Churchill quoted with approval Mr. Montagu's claim that the British way of doing things had always meant and implied close and effectual co-operation with the people of a country to whom the Empire owed so much. We could not afford in India to have the same loss of co-operation and good-will, a disastrous breakdown in which in Egypt had so recently taken place. Mr. Asquith's contribution to the discussion was brief but pointed. He condemned, with great severity, the civil authorities for gross neglect of their duty in abdicating their function and giving a *carte blanche* to the military.

THE TWO AMENDMENTS.

Whereas Sir Edward Carson's motion to reduce the Secretary of State's salary by £100 was made with a view to discredit the Government for having done too much in the way of censure and punishment. Mr. Spoor, in moving, on behalf of the Labour party, a similar amendment, did so in order to express the party's view that the Government had not gone nearly far enough. He not only demanded the trial of General Dyer, but the impeachment, of Sir Michael O'Dwyer, the recall of the Viceroy, the trial of all those officers against whom allegations had been made, and the immediate repeal of all that repressive and coercive legislation which, more than anything else, had contributed to the present unhappy state of affairs in India. And it was along these lines that eventually the divisions took place. General Sir Aylmer Hunter-Weston pleaded for moderation in the discussion. The military Members, of course, spoke and voted mostly as Military men. Sir William Joynson-Hicks made a most dangerous speech in support of General Dyer. Indeed, it is difficult to know whose speech was the worst of the three, his, that of Mr. Palmer, Mr. Bottomley's right-hand man, or Mr. Rupert Gwynne's. On the whole, I give the palm to the latter for sheer provocativeness, just as Mr. Bennett and Colonel Wedgwood, on opposite sides of the House, deserve the utmost praise for their fine speeches on behalf of the people and the liberties of India. Mr. Gwynne spoke as a British reactionary and an anti-Asiatic of the worst type. Mr. Bennett spoke as one who knew his India and loved it, and Colonel Wedgwood as an English gentleman who did not wish to feel ashamed of his country. Mr. Gwynne seemed to take a malicious joy in inventing the legend that Mr. Montagu was in league

with the worst extremists in India in an attempt to wreck the British Empire and that one of these was Mr. Gandhi, who was personally and immediately responsible for the vile and inflammatory placards that had been set up in different parts of the Punjab at the time of the disturbances. He summed up the matter in a very few words. If Mr. Montagu were Mr. Gandhi's friend, he had no right to be Secretary of State for India. Mr. Clynes made it clear that if the amendments were pressed to a division, the Labour party would vote against the Government on Mr. Spoor's motion, but with it against that for which Sir Edward Carson and Sir William Joynson-Hicks were responsible. The air was so charged with electricity at this moment that Mr. Bonar Law had great difficulty in controlling the House. He made a firm, but temperate speech, which required very careful examination, but he made it perfectly clear that the Government fully supported Mr. Montagu and were not to be moved in regard to General Dyer. As a result, the Labour amendment was overwhelmingly defeated and the reactionary one was defeated by a majority of 101, amidst confused cries from partisans of either side. Even if the Independent Liberals and the Labour Members had not voted with the Government, this amendment would have still been defeated, but by a narrow majority. As it was, one felt that the Government had been faced with the most serious division in its Parliamentary existence, and that its position was considerably shaken by the revolt of the Tory Members of the Coalition, whilst the position of Mr. Montagu, in particular, was undoubtedly weakened.

DEBATE IN THE LORDS.

To-day there was to be a Dyer Debate in the House of Lords, but, owing to the absence at Spa of Lord Curzon, who wants to take part in it, it has been postponed until Monday and Tuesday of next week. It is quite likely that the Government will suffer defeat. Lord Finlay will move the attack.

INDIANS IN EAST AFRICA.

I find that I have no space left to discuss the debate raised on Lord Islington's question in regard to the position of Indians in East Africa, which was taken yesterday. I hope to do so in my next letter.

The Madras Co-operative Leather Goods Factory, Ltd.,

STARTED & MANAGED
BY

THE SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY

Will make all kinds of Boots, Shoes, Sandals, Belts, Bedstraps, Handbags, Hold-alls, etc., to your complete satisfaction.

It is a workmen's Society. Workmanship Excellent. Rates Moderate.

THE SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY,

ROYAPETTAH—MADRAS.

INCREASE YOUR CROPS

By Manuring With

FISH MANURE

AND

FISH GUANO

the cheapest and best forms of organic manures.
Fuller particulars and quotations can be obtained

From—

INDIAN FERTILISERS Ltd.,

TRICHUR

(Malbar Coast.)

AWARDED A FIRST CLASS CERTIFICATE BY THE SOUTH INDIA AYURVEDIC CONFERENCE AND EXHIBITION,
SIDDHA KALPA MAKARADHWAJA

THE WONDERFUL DISCOVERY IN THE MEDICAL WORLD.

FOR ALL "ACUTE" AND "CHRONIC" DISEASE.

Prepared Scientifically by Ayurveda Ratna Pandit N. V. Srirama Charlu, Ph. D. Sc. and Ayurveda
Valdya N. Narasimhacharia, Retired Sub-Registrar.

This unparalleled and Ancient medicine is prepared in exact accordance with Aurvedic and Western Modern Principles, carefully tested and Standardised by expert analysis and found to be an unrivalled Elixir for the general prolongation of life, and particularly a guaranteed remedy for Nervous Debility, Skin Eruptions, Eczema, Vertigo, Loss of Nerve Power, Vigour, Memory and Appetite, Depression of Spirits, constant Mental Misgivings, want of spirit and energy. Melancholia, Rheumatism, Gout, Paralysis, Insanity, Hysteria, Dropsy, Diabetes, Piles, Asthma, Consumption, Dyspepsia, all Uterine complaints, and all sorts of Urethral Discharges, Acute or Chronic, of all kinds and all men and women's ailments, etc. This is the only safe and reliable remedy for all diseases resulting from youthful indiscretions and loss of Vitality. It imparts New life and Energy, by increasing and purifying the blood. It contains such valuable ingredients as Sidha, Makradhwaja, Mukta Suvarna, Loha and vegetable drugs. This can be taken also as a tonic by every one of either sex, without any restriction of Diet Season or Climate.

Complete Directions are sent with the Phial of 60 pills (for a complete cure) Price Rs. 10 (Ten) only. V. P. Extra.

Apply to :—**THE MADRAS AYURVEDIC PHARMACY,**
POST BOX No. 151 MADRAS. "Telegraphic Address"—"KALPAM", MADRAS.

HEALTH IS WEALTH!

If you have lost your health

"SWARNA RATHNAKARAM"

Is the only sovereign remedy of the day.

It is a Wonderful Blood Tonic and the only Genuine Cure for Leprosy Diabetes Consumption, Asthma, Paralysis, Piles, all women's ailments all Karma Rogas and other incurable diseases. Gold and Iron, Pearl and Coral are the main ingredients. Prepared by the Veteran Pandit C. T. Arumugam Pillai Ayurvedic Doctor, and son Ayurveda Baskara C. T. Subramania Pandithar Author of Jeevarakshamiratham and other Ayurvedic Sastras.

Don't rely on Advertisements. Try once and thank God. **20 doses Rs. 10-8-0.**

We further notify to the public that under Theria Sidhar's methods, we treat the worst cases of eye diseases such as cataract, Gonorrhoeal Opthoma and the like without any operation and pain to the patient. Cure guaranteed. Excellent unsolicited testimonials received are open to inspection by the public. Wonderful cures have been effected of late.

BASKARA & SONS,
16 Vythianatha Mudhli Street,
G. T. MADRAS.

Telegraphic Address, :— "Bhaskara" MADRAS.