

# THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY.

VOL. IV, No. 22.]

POONA—THURSDAY, JUNE 30, 1921.

[ ANNUAL SUBSN. Rs. 6.

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	253
ARTICLE :—	
Bombay Development Scheme.—II.	255
Mr. Paranjpye's Policy	256
SPECIAL ARTICLES :—	
The Ethics of Violence. By H. C. E. Zacharias, Ph. D.	258
Burma Reforms. By D. V. Ambekar	260
Removal of Untouchability. By A Critic	261
Coolie Life in Assam. By Assam	262
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
Dyarchy in the Central Government. By E. L.	
Price, M. L. A.	263

### TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

IN spite of efforts to the contrary, the status of Indians in the self-governing Dominions of the British Empire is to form a subject of deliberation at the Imperial Cabinet now in session in London. The scandalous way in which they are treated in some parts of the Empire has aroused deep resentment in India and has accentuated racial feeling to an extent not known before. If the Dominion Premiers had succeeded in burking a discussion of this problem, it would have created a most unfortunate impression in India. The Hon'ble Mr. Sastri spoke nothing but truth when he declared, as has been reported by Reuter, that the treatment of the question by the Dominion Premiers "would be regarded in India as a test by which the whole position would be judged." India is as much a part of the Empire as the Dominions themselves, and if their subjects enjoy equal rights in India with any other class of His Majesty's subjects, it is difficult to see why any special disabilities should be inflicted on her sons who are settled in the Dominions. India's interest in the Cabinet mainly centres round the disposal of Mr. Sastri's resolution in favour of equal civic rights for Indians in the Dominions; and it is to be hoped that as a result of the exertions of India's representatives, the problem will be solved in a manner, alike honourable and satisfactory to all concerned.

WE are sure Mr. Montagu's intention to grant further increments to the higher services in India, which he took occasion to announce a few days ago in the House of Commons, will evoke strong protests from India. It was with great difficulty that on the eve of the introduction of the Reforms the country reconciled itself to the revision of their

salaries which was more or less looked upon as a price for the new political advance promised to her. The result was that these revisions swallowed a greater portion of the growth in provincial revenues, leaving the nation-building services like education and industries half-starved. The first budgets in the new era in most of the provinces were deficit budgets, which has already given rise to wide-spread disappointment in India. Even without the proposed revision, the popular ministers have an extremely difficult situation to face. The contemplated improvements in the emoluments of these services, if carried out, will indefinitely add to the difficulties of their position; and might even endanger the success of the constitutional experiment, upon which the future of India so much depends. Moreover it is unjust to overfeed the higher services at the cost of the lower ones which are greatly in need of relief. We feel we cannot too strongly plead for the abandonment of a scheme which will have such far-reaching consequences.

IT will be generally agreed that the case in which Mr. Hanmantrao Kaulgi of Bijapur was charged with contempt of court for appearing in the District Magistrate's Court with a Gandhi cap on his head to answer the charge of sedition has come to a satisfactory conclusion. He preferred an appeal to the Sessions Judge against the order of the City Magistrate, who, under the direction of the District Magistrate tried him for contempt of court. The Government chose to offer no defence, the result being that the order of the lower court was reversed and the accused acquitted. The decision of the Government to let the case go undefended indicates that they view the District Magistrate's action in objecting to the Gandhi cap with disapproval. Had it been otherwise, they would doubtless have taken all possible steps to contest the suit; and in the absence of the popular element in the inner councils of Government, it is doubtful if even this case would have been so satisfactorily settled. This only illustrates how the presence of ministers in Provincial Governments helps to prevent repression. For ministers, far from being absorbed in the Government, are everywhere leaving their impress on the administration.

ELSEWHERE we have dealt with Mr. Paranjpye's schemes for the extension of primary education; an important part of these schemes consists in add.

ing to the remuneration of the teachers who would, by using personal influence, prevent an early withdrawal of children from school. Such a withdrawal entails an almost absolute waste and must be prevented by all possible means. Mr. Paranjpye has outlined a scheme for the promotion of secondary education of the depressed classes, by establishing some 200 scholarships of the value of Rs. 10 to Rs. 15, so that no part of the burden on account of these students will fall on the parents. Again, a hostel of about 50 students of the depressed classes will be opened and maintained at Government expense. It will be realised that, for a beginning, this is a very important step. Mr. Paranjpye is also taking steps to adopt vernaculars as media of both instruction and examination for Matriculation. There are several other reforms which he has detailed in his speech as being contemplated by him.

\* \* \*

WE have said that the all-India Congress Working Committee's resolution regarding the use of law courts was a direct condemnation of Mr. N. C. Kelkar's conduct in a recent case here. Apparently Mr. Kelkar himself regards the resolution as being aimed at himself and denounces it in his paper in downright language. This Working Committee's resolution was passed, we are told, "in view of the misunderstanding in the interpretation and meaning of the Congress resolution regarding the lawyers and law courts." Mr. Kelkar declares that he has been compelled to fulminate his thunders in view of the misinterpretation of the Congress resolution contained in the Working Committee's resolution which purports to define it. He thinks that the Working Committee in this resolution carries the boycott of law courts to grotesquely impracticable lengths, and Congressmen need not profess to carry it out; they might construe the original Congress resolution in the way they think proper and act accordingly, never minding what construction the Working Committee puts upon it. This revolt from the authority of the all-India Committee on the part of one who is charged to direct the non-co-operation movement into right channels throughout the Deccan is significant. And it is particularly significant, when one remembers that Mr. Kelkar and his associates joined non-co-operation merely because the Congress supported it, although they themselves were against it. Mr. Kelkar evidently feels that the suppression of conscience has gone too far.

\* \* \*

MR. KELKAR reasons out his position in this way. Even the Working Committee admits the necessity of self-defence inasmuch as it allows of a full statement of facts to be made. If self-defence is permissible, it ought to be permissible to make the defence efficient, on the principle that what is worth doing is worth doing well. Then why not put in evidence and also employ counsel? It cannot be argued, says he, that to make a statement of one's position and leave the rest to the court does not enhance the prestige of the law-courts or en-

trench the bureaucracy firmly in its present stronghold, but if the same statement was made through witnesses or pleaders these dire results would follow. Mr. Kelkar stamps the whole resolution as illogical. It would be intelligible if the Congress were to ask its followers to disown the jurisdiction of the law courts, but their authority being allowed, and the need for some sort of defence being admitted, it is absurd to stop at a point where a non-co-operator's action would merely contravene the fundamental principle of the boycott of law courts and still leave the defence inefficient. To Mr. Kelkar the right course seems to be "not to recognise the authority of the British Government in political cases and suffer punishment, but in private civil and criminal proceedings against them they should vindicate their private rights and their innocence by efficient means." The Working Committee's resolution is objectionable both in recognising the jurisdiction of the courts in political cases and barring the door to self-defence in private cases.

\* \* \*

NOW, this conclusion will be found to be only partially correct. For it is accompanied by a rider that people "ought not of their own accord to seek redress through these (British) courts." In an earlier portion in this article this proviso is proved to be unsound inasmuch as it is admitted that even non-co-operators must protect themselves against thieves and dacoits. So it must be permissible to proceed against such pests of society in a court of law, although you may have to do of your own motion. This reasoning may be carried one step further. Suppose your neighbour quietly takes your land; you must certainly be allowed to proceed against him as you ought to be allowed to proceed against a thief, for he has done thieving to your land. This really means that whenever a man has a grievance against another, resort to a law-court must not be forbidden, though in every case it would of course be better to avoid such resort as far as possible. Mr. Kelkar, in thus defending his own conduct and denouncing the Working Committee's resolution as an unreasonable and unwarrantable extension of the Congress resolution, really proves the boycott of law courts itself to be impossible and irrational. It is of course universally admitted that arbitration should be substituted for law courts wherever possible. This is true in all circumstances and has no particular reference to a scheme for withdrawing co-operation from Government. But beyond this, on Mr. Kelkar's own showing, the boycott of law courts is a chimerical idea.

\* \* \*

WE draw special attention to the article entitled "Coolie Life in Assam" which appears on pages 162-63. The reader will realise for himself how much tragedy is contained in that brief article, written by a man in very high position who knows the whole thing at first hand.

\* \* \*

**BOMBAY DEVELOPMENT SCHEME.—II.\***

" You will observe that we have tried to cater for four great needs. We have tried to cater on a big scale, but none too big a scale for the housing of the labouring classes. You will see that in Back Bay, if Bombay is to remain and extend as a great business centre, we have provided for what I call the housing of the wealthier classes, or rather I should say the business houses, for offices and all the other big buildings which are necessary in a great town. You will see that in schemes, some of which or all of which lie in the hands of the Improvement Trust, we are trying to provide ready made land suitable for the accommodation of the middle classes who need it, the lower paid middle classes particularly, whose need in housing is almost as much, if not more, than any other section of society in India to-day. You will have seen that we have spread out in our imagination and in our proposed action, towards those areas which are healthy areas and which seem, but for a few barriers that could easily be overcome, to be the natural suburban areas of this great city. We have taken in hand the question of Trombay. We have taken in hand the question of Salsette."—*Sir George Lloyd.*

WE propose to-day to examine some of the important schemes of the Bombay Development Department in the light of the above observations made by His Excellency the Governor of Bombay in his August speech. Out of the four great needs of Bombay, viz. industrial housing, business housing, middle class housing and suburban extension, we have already, in our previous article, dealt with the first, and in our opinion, the most important and most urgent of them and expressed our opinion that the schemes, in so far as they concern the labouring classes, would not at all satisfy the immediate requirements and that the problem of the industrial housing would remain unsolved as hitherto.

Next in importance from the standpoint of immediate necessity comes the housing question of the middle classes, especially the lower middle classes, "for whom," to quote the Development Department's report, "the provision of decent housing accommodation in the Bombay Island is becoming a matter almost of impossibility owing to the high cost of land." But with all this correct diagnosis of the situation, we are afraid the Development Department has utterly failed to apply the right remedy. A passage in His Excellency's speech, quoted above, leads us to believe that instead of building tenements for the middle classes Government propose to give them ready made land for housing, the schemes of which are in the hands of the Improvement Trust. These schemes are obviously the schemes of the Salsette and Trombay Development. But the progress so far made in the direction of developing these areas fills one almost with despair. "Practically the whole of Trombay Island, comprising twelve villages, was notified for acquisition by Government before the formation of the Department." The report has nothing to add beyond recording this fact. The Department itself has not so far done anything towards the development of this island. In Salsette, some 3,366 acres of agricultural land was notified in January last, which, with the western side of Trombay, is intended for

residential purposes. This is all that the Development Department has been able to do in the matter of providing "decent housing accommodation" for the middle classes. Nothing has been done beyond the acquisition and notification of land, nor is there any indication that the Department intends going beyond these two steps in the immediate future. The public is not informed as to the time by which suitable lands will be made available to the middle classes. The Department has not seen its way to give in the report the approximate number of tenements that can be built on the lands, set apart for the residential purposes of the middle classes. At this rate, we fear the Government would require decades to complete their schemes. Time, the greatest factor in the solution of the housing problem, has been ignored. We cannot too strongly condemn the halting manner in which and the slow pace at which the Government have thought fit to approach this thorny question. They seem to have made the housing question a side-issue in their programme and concentrated their attention on the reclamation schemes. We need make no apology when we re-emphasise here that it was the housing famine in Bombay which first prompted Sir George Lloyd to find out means with which to put an end to it and chalk out plans for building new houses. The Bombay Development Department is the fruit of His Excellency's thought and effort in this direction. But it is going about its business in a wrong way. We wonder how His Excellency has allowed it to do so. We feel certain that it is not yet too late. If Sir George Lloyd would take prompt action and revert to his original determination of removing the housing scarcity during the shortest possible time, the matter can still be set right. It is absolutely necessary in the interests of Bombay that the Development Department should concentrate all its energy and efforts on building tenements for the labouring classes and making suitable land available to the middle classes. Delay is not only dangerous, but suicidal. We would like to remind His Excellency of his own words uttered in August last. "Any one who realises," said he, "the inevitable results of any delay in a measure of this kind, now already too long delayed, must recognise clearly the responsibilities of breeding up an unhealthy, an unfit and squalid race of people. Unless we give them better air, better light, better cleanliness and better conditions, we shall not breed a race worthy of this great city."

Suburban extension is another urgent need of the congested Bombay. Without it, the growth of that great city is bound to be stopped. The Development Department has undertaken to develop the Salsette and Trombay islands to relieve the city of its present over-crowding and to provide accommodation for its future expansion. In Salsette, as many as sixteen schemes are proposed to be carried out, out of which only two have been so far completed. In Trombay, as we have just said, the Department has not gone beyond the acquisition and notification of land. Progress in this direction

\*The first article appeared in our issue of June 2.

has not been what it should be, though it is much better than that of the industrial and middle class housing schemes.

To make suburban extension a success, the first essential is the provision of means of rapid transit. The present facilities afforded by the local services of the G. I. P. and B. B. & C. I. Railways are inadequate; but with the quadrupling and electrification of both the lines, the Development Department hopes that they will be able to carry per hour during the morning and evening rush periods 20,000 more passengers. At the same time it fears that the G. I. P. Railway will take at least five years to reach this maximum and the B. B. & C. I. not less than ten. The Department has therefore proposed to construct a fast electric tramway or light railway starting from the neighbourhood of Andheri and running through the Central Salsette area, across the G. I. P. Railway at Kurla, and along the west side of Trombay. We entertain very grave fears about the success of a fast electric tramway or light railway service. The fastness of such a service, and for that matter, any level transit provision, has proved in other countries to be too slow as compared with other transit provision, such as the over-head or underground railway service. If the experience gained by such big cities as London and New York is worth anything, we are strongly inclined to believe that level transit provision will be found in course of time to be quite inadequate to meet the growing requirements of a great industrial centre like Bombay. Sooner or later, Government will have to consider the question of over-head or underground railway service. It is therefore well if the department will consider this point along with its other schemes so that there may be no delay in formulating the necessary schemes and making financial provision for carrying them out in case such a service is found necessary.

Equally essential for the success of suburban extension is the provision of police protection, water supply and schools. People will not move to the suburbs if their lives and property are not assured against danger. Water supply is also an indispensable factor. Bombay has been going during the last few months through great hardships owing to the shortage of water and the various kinds of epidemics resulting therefrom. With such bitter experience behind them, the Development authorities will not, we hope, fail to make every effort to provide adequate supply of water to the suburban population. It is not necessary to dilate upon the importance of schools in the suburbs if every possible encouragement has got to be given to those moving to the suburbs. It is not possible for the parents to send their children to Bombay every day for their education. Nor is it desirable that children should have to travel such a long distance. It is the duty of Government to start schools in the localities where they want people to go and stay.

The reclamation schemes are being pushed on

with great vigour and speed. Sir, George Lloyd has made it quite clear in his speech that the ground gained in this way will be utilised for building houses for rich classes and for business purposes. We realise the need of making such a provision. But we are emphatically opposed to expediting the schemes of beautifying Bombay at the cost of her most urgent and pressing needs. The housing famine is the one crying need of the day. Every effort ought to be directed towards removing the congestion and making people breathe freer air. But the wonder is that the Development Department has allowed the housing schemes to proceed slowly while the least urgent schemes of reclamation are being expedited with usual rapidity and enthusiasm. The latter are not going to help the poor or the middle class men in any way. We therefore appeal to His Excellency to push on the various development schemes according to their urgency and not to allow his subordinates to do things according to their sweet will.

The newly constituted Ambarnath Taluka has been set apart for the industrial expansion of Bombay. All the new factories, mills and other industrial concerns that will spring up in Bombay hereafter will be located there. The water supply made by the Department is, in our opinion, satisfactory. Bombay is at present overcrowded with mills and factories. It is true that Government has stopped people from erecting new factories in the city; but they at times allow the old factories to extend their limits. We fear this facility afforded to the factory owners nullifies the restrictions placed upon the new factories. We therefore strongly urge that not only should the new factories not be allowed to be built in the city, but the old ones also should be forbidden from extending. We would further like to recommend to the Government of Bombay that they should appoint a committee to consider the possibility of removing the existing factories out of Bombay so that she will be free from a good deal of industrial congestion.

Finally, we are rather puzzled to see why this new Development is made a reserved subject and placed under an Executive Councillor. That it concerns Local Self-government in Bombay is as clear as anything. It should have been, therefore, made a transferred subject and placed under the control of a Minister. We still hope that the mistake will be corrected.

#### MR. PARANJPYE'S POLICY.

THE Hon'ble Mr. Paranjpye's speech at the Deccan Sabha last week is the first important pronouncement he has made on his educational policy, and as such it will attract, we believe, wide notice throughout India. Mr. Paranjpye, by reason of his exceptionally high attainments and his long record of devoted service in the cause of education, is everywhere regarded as the Fisher of Indian politics, and although responsible only for the education of the Bombay Presidency, he is naturally looked up to for guidance in other provinces as well. It will

field: and on this or a similar use of physical force the very existence of the whole human race depends. On the other hand, out of spite to plough up the standing crops of a personal enemy is obviously an unjust exercise of an otherwise beneficial employment. As regards the individual too, physical exercise has come to be recognised as not only beneficial, but essential to good health: yet, one can go in for so much exercise, as not to promote, but to injure one's health. Such exercise is not just to ourselves, and therefore it is rightly called violent.

From these illustrations it has already become clear that the exercise of physical force is just or unjust, according to the purpose for which it is employed: just, if e. g. to produce food, unjust if to vent one's spite; just, if to keep one's health unimpaired unjust if to pander to one's vanity as a record breaker. This fact comes out still more, if we consider the application of physical force to another human being.

Can the application of physical force to another ever be just? Obviously so, if the other asks for it. The extraction of a bad tooth requires much physical force; yet my dentist, applying that force to me, is acting justly. But what, if the tooth is not really diseased and the dentist fraudulently persuades me to have my tooth out, simply so that he may charge me? The dentist will still have my consent for the extraction and yet he would be acting unjustly. The justice or injustice of the application of physical force, then, does not only depend on the consent of the other party. It depends on the justice of the intentions of both parties.

But if it is the justice of the intention which alone counts, is consent at all necessary? It would not seem so. My child's tooth may be very bad and the only remedy may be its extraction; yet he may be so frightened by a dentist that the latter has to apply his physical force against the will of the child. For all that, he cannot be said to have done violence to the child; his exercise of physical power was rightly intended and therefore justly applied.

So we see that physical compulsion is not always wrong in itself, but that, to turn it into violence, there must enter the factor of an evil intention. Neither physical force in general, then, nor even compulsion in particular, can be called evil; it is the will behind the act which determines, whether we have to deal with a just exercise of physical force or with "violence."

But in that case would I be justified to use physical force to a perfect stranger, a grown up man whom I happen to see suffering from tooth-ache? May I justly use compulsion and drag him to a dentist to have his tooth extracted? My intention is of the best and purest: I pity the man's sufferings and wish to restore him to perfect health. He strongly objects, being convinced that his swollen cheek is due to a hornet's sting. My intention is right; so is his. Am I justified to use compulsion?

Without a doubt, all men would agree that I was not justified in doing so, but that I would be doing "violence" to the man.

True, his will and mine are both set upon the same good purpose, viz. his restoration to health. But there is a difference between us; and that difference is not a difference of wills, but of opinions. He thinks the purpose we both have in common can best be achieved in one way; I in another. The concord which should follow from each of us having the same purpose in view is destroyed, not substantially, but accidentally, through a difference of opinion.

Then what happens in such a case of divergent opinions? Whose opinion should prevail? It is clear that there must be a complete deadlock, unless there is an umpire to decide, whose opinion should prevail. Such an umpire may be called in at the instance of the two parties concerned: such a one might be an amused by-stander, who has watched my antics with the man with the swollen face; such a one might be the magistrate, before whom a guardian of the public peace may lead us. In the latter case, however, we see, that the consent of the two parties is not really necessary to the appointment of an umpire: there may be one already ready made. Ready made by whom? By the rest of Society. In other words, it is the community which gives "authority" to some one individual to decide on behalf of the whole community in case of differences of opinions. More than that, such authority has been delegated once for all to certain parties to a quarrel—to parents as against children, for instance. So we find, that to take my child by force to the dentist would not be "violence," but to take the stranger with the swollen face there would be "violence"—because in the one case I have, and in the other I have not, been given "authority" to do so.

But what happens in the case when the two antagonists for some reason or other will not or can not call in an umpire, to decide between the two opinions, which one is right? Two alternatives offer themselves—reasoning it out, i. e. persuasion; or fighting it out, i. e. force. The point now is, whether, since obviously persuasion in all cases must be lawful, force in all such cases must be unlawful?

The infliction of force can have two results, a positive one and a negative one. In the latter case, the opponent would be restrained from doing what he originally wished to do; in the other he would be impelled to do what he originally objected to doing. To revert to our illustration, the case of the stranger with the swollen face: negatively I could employ my force so as to render him senseless or incapable of resistance and thus, like an inanimate bundle, take him to the dentist; or else, positively, I could inflict such physical pain on him by my superior force, that I would intimidate him, i. e. make him fear an increase of his pain to such an extent that he had rather submit to my violence. "Violence" this clearly would be in the latter case; but

in what does the "injustice" of it essentially lie? Surely in the very fact that the man has become like an inanimate bundle or like an automaton; in the fact that he no longer acts on his own free will, but on that of another. In other words, the man ceases to act as a man, he has been robbed of that which makes his act to be human, as distinct from the reflex act of an animal or from the mechanical action of a piece of machinery. That is what is so revolting in the exercise of force: that it degrades, nay more, that its only purpose can be to degrade man and to reduce him to a sub-rational level.

Therefore, except in the case of people whose opinions are not fully human (such as of immature children or of mad people), there is no justice in applying force at all, and least so in order to decide the truth of two opposing opinions. At one time, to be sure, force was invoked to that effect, so that through an ordeal by battle truth might be established. The underlying idea of course is that, there being an omnipotent God of truth, that opinion must necessarily be the true one, whose holder prevails in a physical contest. But the *reductio ad absurdum* of that is that in that case pugilists' opinions must be accepted as true against the opinions of the wisest and the best, whose physique happens to be delicate. Mankind has therefore come to see that there is some faulty logic in that conclusion and that God evidently vindicates truth in a less direct and more complex way.

Hitherto we have spoken only of differences of opinions, not of wills (i. e. intentions), and we have seen that it is "violence" to apply force in that case, unless one is specially "authorized." What then about discord proper, i. e. when two people differ not merely in their opinion, as to how to achieve a common end, but differ as to the end itself? A burglar and I have not only a difference of opinion, as to who should possess the contents of my safe, we also have a difference of aims, of intentions, of wills. The burglar's intention is to advantage himself regardless of the good of others; my intention is, to frustrate its accomplishment. It needs no elaboration to establish the fact, that if the intention is not just, the employment of force to carry it out must likewise under all circumstances be unjust: the burglar is always using "violence," not just force.

But what about his victim? Clearly, to prevent the burglar from carrying out his evil purpose, is praiseworthy and to employ force to that end must likewise be held to be just. But what if I get angry and if my purpose is no longer the protection of my safe, but revenge on the ruffian who threatens my property? Preventing the burglar from burglarizing is to the man's real good; to injure him for the satisfaction of my own evil passion, is not to aim at the man's good at all. Hence, in such a case it is I who should be using violence, however extenuating the circumstances may be, seeing that I am acting under great "provocation."

But is intention alone sufficient to justify the use of force against one whose will is bent on

evil? Have I the right to give a burglar such a castigation as is likely to deter him from repeating his offence, provided my intention is not one of private revenge, but a pure desire for the man's reformation? That I am acting lawfully and justly in the case of my own child, whom I may be caning for a serious offence of his, is due to the fact that in this case, as we have seen already, I have been given specific "authority" so to do: but no authority has been delegated to me in the case of the burglar. I am not using "violence," as long as I confine myself to restrain the man's evil action, but to do more even for his own good, is to place myself in such a difficult position (seeing that I must be accuser, judge and executioner all in one): that Society has rightly decreed that no unauthorized individual may assume it.

But what, if there is no third party, to whom I may accuse the burglar? What, for instance, in the case of a raid made on behalf of one nation against another nation? What of war in general?

It is agreed by all, that only a "just" war is morally permissible; i. e. a war, engaged upon by people having a just end in view: e. g. the right of small nations, as was the case in the last great war. Both parties in fact may profess the same aim, differing only in their opinion, as to whether it is the rights of Alsace-Lorraine or of Ireland which require first attention. In that case, i. e. when called in to settle a difference of opinion, we have seen already that ethically force is always unjust and becomes violence.

But what, if the intention of a nation is manifestly bad—such as Germany's desire of annexing the Belgian mines and sea ports? On the strength of the principles we have tried to elicit above, it is clear that it would be only just for the Belgians in such a case to try and restrain the German invaders from carrying out their evil intentions. But does such "restraint" authorise the use of all the military technique of wholesale killing? Does the intention of the Belgian "sniper" or artilleryman remain just? Does he still desire the good of the German, whose life he is trying to take? Nobody could maintain it. However extenuating the circumstances may be, the cold fact surely remains that in a war the combatants on either side are not seeking the good of each other and that therefore their use of force cannot but be morally wrong.

(To be continued.)

H. C. E. ZACHARIAS.

### BURMA REFORMS.

THE House of Lords has agreed to the second reading of the Government of Burma Bill, the opposition of such well-known friends of democratic institutions in India as Lord Sydenham notwithstanding. This is due as much to the earnest plea for prompt action made out by the Standing Joint Committee on Indian Affairs in their report on the Bill as to the presence of Lord Chelmsford in England. As Lord Lytton acknowledged in the

not be amiss therefore if we attempt a close, if critical, review of the educational policy laid down by him. Before doing so, however, it is but fair to state that the enunciation of the policy which we find in his recent speech does not pretend to be complete; it must not be assumed from what he has stated to be his immediate aim that nothing more is to be expected during his régime. For our part we expect from Mr. Paranjpye at least this, that he will take a long view of the work that lies before his department and lay the foundations of a policy which, pursued during, say the next ten or twelve years, will land us in universal elementary education. It may be admitted at once that this is a stupendous task demanding a mint of money, but it must be faced, whatever sacrifice it may entail even as England one-pointedly devoted all her national resources to the winning of war, never minding the cost. The framing of such a comprehensive policy requires much thought and care and we feel sure that there will be no disposition in any quarter to blame Mr. Paranjpye for not producing a cut and dried programme of educational expansion just yet. He has contented himself in his last week's speech with stating the problems with which he is immediately concerned as they appear to him, and the statement he made on that occasion must be understood in that light. But we will repeat, if only for the sake of emphasising it, that, to serve as a guide for the next few years, the educational policy must be conceived on bolder lines.

The first step which the Bombay Government have taken in the matter of greater extension of education is the increase of grants-in-aid from one-half to two-thirds of the educational expenditure incurred by municipalities, provided the Government are satisfied that the municipalities in question stand in need of this larger subvention out of provincial funds. Mr. Paranjpye has now declared that the Government will interpret this proviso in a liberal spirit, and we believe every municipality which is in earnest about the diffusion of education, may count on an increased grant. We must say it is a long step forward, supposing it is sound policy to depend upon local bodies for accelerating the pace of educational progress. If with this is combined the system of double shifts, which first originated in Poona during the memorable controversy about the primary education of girls last year, it should be possible for many municipalities to introduce compulsory education in their areas. It will be remembered that in this controversy it was common ground between both the parties that, with a two-thirds grant from Government, the Municipality of Poona could apply compulsion to the education of the children of both the sexes even without economising by introducing the shifts system. The finances of the Poona Municipality are, if anything, in a more straitened condition than those of the average municipality in this Presidency, and if even the confirmed opponents of girls' education could not find any excuse to defer universal compulsory education on receipt of

a two-thirds grant out of the provincial treasury, one is entitled to cherish the hope that most municipalities will put the Compulsory Education Act in effect.

An earnest attempt must be made by all who have educational progress at heart to induce the municipalities to avail themselves of the enhanced scale of grant-in-aid to introduce compulsory education, but although there is no good reason why such attempts should not succeed, we are not without doubt that, even when placed in possession of a larger share of the total cost of education, several municipalities, particularly in the present temper of the public, will fail to take advantage of this concession. We would, therefore, suggest that Government should not altogether leave it to local bodies to introduce compulsion at their will. Where the municipalities are clearly in default, the Government can and ought to require them to take the necessary steps for the introduction of compulsion, if necessary in stages. In the article on the Madras Elementary Education Bill (now passed into law) that appeared in this paper some time ago, the writer very pertinently pointed out that the measure, while following the English Education Act of 1870 in adopting local option for the purpose of introducing compulsion, had deviated from it in one essential particular, inasmuch as it omitted to make it obligatory on the local bodies to provide sufficient accommodation for all the children of the school-going age residing in their areas. This criticism applies equally to the other provincial Elementary Education Acts, for they are all of a permissive nature. We wonder if such permissive compulsion has succeeded anywhere. The English Act required each local authority to increase the rates to the extent that might be necessary and to provide as many school places as there might be children in that district. This obligation to provide adequate accommodation was enforced on all local bodies; what was left to their option was the application of compulsion to the attendance of children. We cannot see why Governments in India should not apply compulsion in the matter of providing necessary school accommodation. This was regarded as a necessary preliminary to the success of local option in England; to our mind it will be found necessary to the complete success of local option in India also. Indeed, in this country, unembarrassed with ideas of individual liberty current in England at the time, the compulsory provision of schools will practically mean the application of compulsion to attendance as well. Let the Government find out, on a careful survey of the financial position of municipalities, what amount of pecuniary assistance is necessary in order to enable them to introduce compulsory education in their areas. When that much assistance is rendered, an obligatory duty may be cast on those bodies to provide accommodation for all the children in the locality. This pecuniary assistance may be varied within certain limits to suit the varying conditions, but unless the Government takes the initiative in

some such direction, we are not very sanguine of any considerable progress being achieved.

As to the introduction of compulsion in rural areas, Mr Paranjpye seems to be overwhelmed by administrative difficulties. Without minimising these difficulties in any way, we think that they will not be very serious. A people used to State regimentation for generations past is not likely to make much trouble if education is compulsorily imparted to their children. It would be a different matter if the contention of the Government is that in villages there is still some field for the diffusion of education on a voluntary basis. If it were found that schools are only awaiting erection to be filled up, then there would be no need for compulsion in those areas for some time to come. In such villages at any rate a policy of opening more schools must be vigorously pursued, and the public are anxious to know how much money the Government are prepared to spend on education on rural areas, whether on a voluntary or compulsory basis. For our part we shall require a lot of convincing if it is sought to be made out that, even if the necessary funds be available, compulsion is not at present practicable because of administrative difficulties, as one hears it maintained sometimes. Even so, there may be some villages which will have such largely attended schools as to make it advisable to use compulsion for the purpose of requiring the attendance of all the children of the school-going age in that area. There is not even an enabling Act which is applicable to rural areas in the Bombay Presidency. But Mr. Paranjpye sees a difficulty here. He says there is no machinery available in villages for the enforcement of compulsion, even if provision were made in law for it. The Bombay Government contemplates constituting punchayats in certain selected villages, and when these are set going, then it will be time to consider if they can be entrusted with a compulsory Education Act. We are not convinced that the constitution of punchayats is necessary to the introduction of compulsory education in villages. In the Punjab, the Central Provinces, Bihar and Orissa and Madras, the Elementary Education Act applies to rural as well as municipal areas; it cannot be contended that in all these provinces every village is endowed with a punchayat or that the application of the Act is confined only to such villages as can boast of punchayats. Indeed, in the Madras presidency, although there are union punchayats in certain villages or groups of villages, the local authorities empowered to administer the Act in villages are only taluk boards. These latter can certainly function through local attendance committees. It is therefore quite unnecessary to adjourn compulsion in education to a day when punchayats are in working order. It will take two years for the formation of punchayats, and even then they will be formed on a very limited scale. To us it appears to be quite unjustifiable to wait so long, if in other respects it is possible to push ahead. We have not considered here the financial difficulties that may beset our path; but finances

forthcoming, we cannot think of anything that need seriously hamper our progress or cause much delay.

But the whole question is one of finance; as to how much additional funds the Government is prepared to make available for the spread of education. It is calculated that universal primary education will require an annual outlay of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  crores and the point for consideration is over how long a period this expenditure is proposed to be spread by Government. Provided the necessary funds are raised, it becomes comparatively a minor matter how it is spent; whether part of it is devoted to extending education on a voluntary basis, and if so, what proportion it bears to the amount spent on compulsory education. What the people are anxious about is that the greatest possible progress in education should be made compatible with the ability of the people to bear additional taxation; and our hope in this connexion is that the Minister will take courage in both his hands and propose bold schemes for the expansion of education although they should entail large addition to the present burdens and consequently much popular odium. We believe that the Council and the leaders of public opinion will give him their cordial support. It will, we think, be a very good idea to appoint a Committee of the Legislative Council, with perhaps one or two added members from outside, for the purpose of investigating the whole problem of education. The Committee should be specially charged with the task of recommending to what pitch and in what form additional taxation may be levied. If the Committee is sufficiently representative, it will afford the Minister some clue of the preparedness of the people to make sacrifices. If there is a disposition on the part either of the Committee or of the people outside to shirk the burden which they must bear for the sake of education, it is the duty of the Minister to do propaganda work, for we are sure it is only necessary to beat up public opinion a little in order to obtain popular support for fresh taxation. If Mr. Paranjpye will only try to enlist the sympathy of the public, we are sure that the whole Presidency will rally round him.

#### THE ETHICS OF VIOLENCE.

IN these days when the problem of Non-Violence can but be deemed by all thoughtful students of Indian affairs to be of all pressing problems the most fundamental, it may perhaps be of some advantage to think out its implications and underlying principles in order to clear away the many misconceptions, half-truths and fallacies which beset its path and to make room for that clear thinking in which alone I can see hope for clear and right action.

In law, "Violence" means any unlawful exercise of physical force. If the physical force can be used unjustly, it follows that there must be occasions when physical force can be used justly. In other words, force is not wrong in itself. Physical force is employed, and justly so, to plough a



course of the debate, the ex-Viceroy "had been able at the meetings of the Joint Select Committee to express the views of the Indian Government." It is clear that he considerably influenced the ultimate decision of the Committee in favour of dyarchy for Burma. Its exclusion from the itinerary of the Secretary of State and the Viceroy in 1918 had been adversely criticised and Sir Reginald Cradock's scheme of reforms had created the impression that the problem of Burma would not be tackled in the only right manner possible under the circumstances. Lord Chelmsford is thus proving himself more serviceable to India, which, of course, includes Burma, in his unofficial than in his official life as Viceroy. Our only regret is that the present agreement between Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford on the question of Burma Reforms was not found possible at an earlier stage. In that case the Secretary of State could have, in virtue of the powers vested in him by the Government of India Act, 1919, created Burma a Governor's province without recourse to the dilatory method of parliamentary procedure, and Burma would have been enabled to come into her own even simultaneously with India.

As to the suitability of dyarchy to conditions in Burma, opinion in the Committee was somewhat divided. Some of the members were favourably disposed to the Government of India's plan which was more or less cast in the mould of the Morley-Minto scheme. The disadvantages of granting to Burma a scheme of reforms which merely allowed the legislature the right of criticism over a wide field unaccompanied by any sense of responsibility are obvious, and the experience of India in the matter which is by no means reassuring must have impressed them with the very limited nature of the scope for advance in the same direction, when the time came for a forward jump. Nor could they fail to take account of the impression that might have been created by the Committee's decision in favour of the Government of India's scheme, as it would have meant a negation of Mr. Montagu's promise of December last. It is a matter for satisfaction therefore that the Committee recommended with one voice the scheme of dyarchy embodied in the Bill. The vague idea entertained in some quarters for Burma's separation from India was made by some noble lords the ground for delay in passing the measure in question. We are glad that better counsels prevailed. They failed to recognise, as the Committee recognised, that such a step, whenever it would become a matter of practical politics, would not be hampered by the limited provincial autonomy contemplated by the Bill. The question is thus a complicated one and all the issues involved in the idea of separation must be properly explored before any solution is finally come to.

It need hardly be made clear that the scheme outlined in the Bill will necessitate the collection of detailed information as to qualifications for franchise, composition of the council, the method of election, the classification of subjects into "reserv-

ed" and "transferred" and similar matters by personal investigation and a Committee will shortly visit Burma to this end. In order that the experiment of dyarchy may be started under favourable conditions, it is necessary that the franchise should be as wide as local conditions will allow and there should be direct election even in case of rural areas. The Burma Government have now modified their original proposals to the extent of withdrawing their partiality for indirect elections; and it is to be hoped that the fullest effect will be given to the wishes of the people in this regard. The Committee would also do well to bear in mind the fact that the Burmans have been insisting upon a 70 p. c., instead of a 60 p. c. elected element in the Council, its maximum suggested strength being 100. It would also be desirable to transfer the complete control of education to natives of the soil, as in the case of Indian provinces. The educational policy of the local Government has aroused very considerable opposition in the province, so much so that that itself has been regarded as justifying a resort to non-co-operation with the Government. Everything should be done in the new order of things to allow the Burmese Education Minister an unrestricted field for his constructive ability. Female education having made greater strides in Burma and women being in the enjoyment of a greater measure of liberty in the social life of the country than in India, the problem of female franchise presents less difficulties in Burma. In fact it would be more correct to say that it presents no difficulties of a serious nature. The wishes of the people as expressed through their accredited representatives in the council have been in favour of such a step, for we find that so far back as 12th February, 1921, it adopted the following resolution unanimously:—"This council considers that franchise should be extended to women from the outset, in view of their advanced position in Burma." It is to be earnestly hoped that this sex disqualification will find no place in Burma's first electoral rules.

D. V. AMBEKAR.

#### REMOVAL OF UNTOUCHABILITY.

MR. GANDHI has now explained that when he invited the co-operation of the Liberals, he did not invite them to join in the picketing campaign, but only to try to abolish drink in their own way. Let me clear away one misconception. The Liberals as a body are not opposed to picketing; they readily admit the utility of that method under certain conditions; but they think that, with the transfer of the abkari department to the control of popular ministers who are well aware of the public feeling in the matter, picketing is not necessary. It will at best produce a temporary effect, and when it is open to the Liberals to devise means for a permanent suppression of the drink traffic, they must not be held to blame if they do not feel much enthusiasm about the picketing movement that is now going on, though it is wrong to say that they are hostile to

it. Mr. Gandhi now invites the Liberals to prohibit the sale and manufacture of drink by legislative action. I must say that I read this statement with a sense of relief, for I had thought that Mr. Gandhi intended to practise non-co-operation not only with the Government, but also with those who would deign to take part in the Government. If Mr. Gandhi welcomes legislative action in this matter it follows that he must likewise facilitate the taking of measures calculated to lead to prohibition. He will admit that prohibition, extremely desirable as it is, will create a serious deficit in the provincial revenues which has to be made up. He feels that there is much room for economy in the present scale of expenditure; in this view all will agree. He feels that there is no room for further taxation; with this view few will sympathise; his own collection of a crore merely for the purpose of setting some *charckhas* going disproves his statement. But whatever truth there may be in either view, Mr. Gandhi will recognise that economy to the extent that is desired cannot be effected at once, that it will necessarily have to be spread over a series of years. He will also realise that if it is an evil to be made to pay more taxes than one can bear, it is a greater evil to have the drink curse in our midst. So, whatever his opinion of the expensiveness of the present administration and the resourcelessness of the people may be, he ought to support the present Minister in the proposals he may bring forward for additional taxation with a view to the immediate abolition of drink. Mr. Gandhi may later on cause the administrative machinery to be so readjusted that the additional taxation, to be levied now, will be unnecessary and that even the present pitch of taxation may be lowered. Thus, without committing himself to the soundness of the existing arrangements, he may, for the sake of abolishing the drink evil, himself support, and advise his non-co-operationist followers to support, the taxation proposals that may be found necessary by the present councils. That anyone should go into the council and take any legislative action must seem to Mr. Gandhi reprehensible, but to him far more reprehensible is the drink traffic; and in order to put an end to it he does not mind asking the Liberals to go forward in what he doubtless regards as their evil ways and to stop the curse of drunkenness. In a similar way, he can, and in my opinion he ought to, put aside for the moment his views about the present financial arrangements of Government and lend his active support to schemes of taxation, although if he had the control of the whole machinery such schemes would perhaps be unnecessary. It is only in this way that there can be any useful co-operation between the Liberals and the non-co-operators. If Mr. Gandhi does not agree to this, the Liberals may or may not succeed; but there cannot be the co-operation between them which Mr. Gandhi desires.

And I wish to invite the co-operation of the non-co-operationists in the work of abolishing the untouchability of the depressed classes. This item

at one time occupied the first place in Mr. Gandhi's campaign of non-co-operation, and although the Liberals cannot comprehend how this purely social matter can at all be related to a scheme for withdrawing co-operation from Government, I feel certain that on that point, detached from other items of non-co-operation, Mr. Gandhi will have the active support of all the Liberals. Let the non-co-operators and Liberals join hands with regard to this single item and lead it to success. If it is true that *swaraj* cannot be attained till the higher classes cease to treat the depressed classes as worse than brutes, the non-co-operators must really devote an appreciable part of their energy to the movement for putting a stop to the "touch-me-not" spirit of the higher classes. The non-co-operationists hope to establish complete *swaraj* by the end of this year at the latest, and yet their labours in the cause of the removal of untouchability, which they declare to be a necessary pre-requisite of *swaraj*, are practically nil. If the non-co-operationists do not disdain the help of the Liberals, it is possible for both to work for some such plan as the following. The untouchableness of the depressed classes must go immediately. Everyone must undertake not to regard the touch of the depressed classes as pollution. But the anti-untouchability campaign must aim higher; those who engage in it must try to popularise interdining with members of the depressed classes, and those who declare themselves to be in favour of the elevation of the social status of the depressed classes should be asked to give an undertaking in writing to make no difficulty about interdining. These things can be done immediately, but there are other things which, though they may not be feasible at the present moment on a very wide scale, must still be placed before the country as items to be practised within a short time; they are, *e. g.* the throwing open the public wells and cisterns and temples to members of the depressed classes. The Hindu religion is the most cosmopolitan in the world, and it should not be impossible to throw down, after a brief propaganda in its favour, the barriers of caste within the precincts of the Hindu temple under the very nose of the god. Some day may be fixed, on which prominent members of the higher castes may march the so-called untouchables into the temples in procession. Such a demonstration will have a great moral effect, and perhaps some *hartals* may be observed as a sign of repentance for the sins committed by Hindus for generations past. Thus can the gateway to *swaraj* be really opened by the non-co-operators and Liberals working conjointly.

A CRITIC.

#### COOLIE LIFE IN ASSAM.

THE economic and political aspects of the coolie question in Bengal have obscured the moral aspect. What is the moral atmosphere of a tea garden in Assam? Comparison with mill or coal districts is misleading. Conditions in a tea garden, away

from public opinion and inaccessible to the ordinary visitor, are entirely different from conditions in mill or coal districts. The latter are near big towns or on the railway. Life in a tea garden is shut out from the public view. There live the *sahibs* in their bungalows and the coolies in their lines. The coolies are recruited from various parts of India. In a coolie line are to be found Madrasis, Santhals, Ooriyas, Mundas, Oraons, Assamese, Chams from Behar and United Provinces and the C. P., low-caste Bengalis, and hillmen,—a motley crew in different stages of physical and moral development. Many of these are born in the garden and almost all are completely out of touch with their villages. They have no place to go to, no aspiration in life, no hope of material or moral improvement, no standard, no ideal. The ray of religion does not penetrate the coolie lines; education is unknown; instinct governs their conduct of life, chastened by the rules and regulations of the garden. They are slaves of the planters, body, mind and soul. It is a low animal existence, an agency to create dividends for the Company. As regards the planters, they are out to make money. In their compulsory exile, the only amusement they indulge in is physical; intellectual amusement is not appreciated. Sports and games, riding, shooting, drinking and swearing are the order of the day. Such as are not votaries of physical energy have little to relieve the dull monotony of existence. In their day-to-day life there is no refinement or culture. Physical pleasure and animal gratification are indulged in without restraint. Absence of white women is more than made up by drawing upon the young womanhood in the coolie lines. It is a traditional right, which no coolie can resist on pain of severe chastisement. The degradation of the coolies is so complete that in most cases they cannot conceive of any right in them to thwart the desire of the *sahibs*. Are they not the slaves of the *sahibs*, and are not their wives, sisters and daughters the ultimate property of the *sahibs*? A kind *sahib* pays for his indulgence in the shape of a few rupees; a bad *sahib* does not pay. When the *sahib* wants a woman from the lines, she must be supplied by her father, brother or husband. A young coolie woman going of one evening to the bungalow in the company of the *sahib's* bearer or *chauki-tar* is nothing strange, it involves no disgrace. It is a sort of tax which may be levied on any coolie's hut. Some *sahibs* stick to one girl; others like change. In the Khoreal shooting case in the Calcutta High Court, it came out in the course of the evidence and as a matter of normal conditions, that the manager of the garden, Mr. Grant, kept Nasib Ali's sister as his mistress. Nasib Ali was the assistant manager's bearer. Mr. Grant gave evidence in the case; he did not deny the fact. There it is. What is wrong, why make a fuss about it? Mr. Grant has the reputation in Assam of being a pious Scotsman.

As against this picture, there are well ordered gardens where planters live with their wives and children. Life is healthy and the atmosphere sweet

and pure. The Rev. Mr. Andrews is going to see for himself the coolie in the garden. Will he enquire into the moral aspect?

ASSAM.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### DYARCHY IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA

SIR,—With regard to Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar's article in your issue of 16th instant, members of the Assembly will generally, I am sure, be very glad to see a member of Mr. Ayyar's attainments and personal distinction taking a broader view of State affairs and his relation thereto than he seemed to take when discussing the codification of Hindu Law. But I suggest to Mr. Ayyar the Constitution is so new, that the powers of the Assembly are not yet exerted or even asserted, and that till the powers already granted to the Assembly have been exerted and asserted and so tested, it would be absurd to go to Parliament with a request for amendment of the existing Constitution. Reading together the Constitution as it exists and His Majesty's instructions to his Governor-General and Viceroy thereon, I can but think there are wide developments to be made under the existing law before change by law is necessary or advisable. And personally I am dead against dyarchy in the Central Government till the Assembly has, so to speak, "found itself." Till the Assembly has itself formed a policy and founded a party thereon, it cannot influence the course of government whatever the Constitution; but a policy and party being formed, it can wholly influence the course of government, without any change of Constitution. I hope Mr. Ayyar is not induced to make his suggestions by a wish to placate non-co-operators. The spending of effort to try to reconcile the irreconcilable, to placate the implacable, to move to useful service those whose hearts are wholly given to

"All centuries but this one,"

like Mr. Gandhi, or to

"Countries other than their own,"

like the Ali brothers, is to plough the sands.—Yours, etc.,

E. L. PRICE.

Karachi, June 20.

## TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

OUR criticism of the Ali brothers' apology is based, Mr. Gandhi says in *Young India*, on a misunderstanding. Our standpoint is so radically different from that of non-co-operators that it is quite possible that we have been betrayed into a misunderstanding of the position of the Ali brothers. But it is superfluous for us to give the assurance that there is no wilful misunderstanding or misinterpretation in what we have written. On the contrary, we will take leave to say that we did our level best to understand it from the point of view of non-co-operators and to sympathise with it, but we have evidently failed grievously in it. We must make it clear that we have no fault to find with the apology itself, but we cannot appreciate the efforts made afterwards to explain it away. We are not surprised at our failure to understand the apology and the sequel to it, seeing that "one of the greatest of non-co-operators" who is believed to hail from Allahabad and the editor of the *Janmabhumi*, than whom we cannot conceive of any two truer and more ardent non-co-operators (after Mr. Gandhi of course), have also similarly failed. All the same we feel sincere regret if unwittingly we have done any injustice either to Mr. Gandhi or to the Ali brothers.

## GOOD SEEDS.

We have the best seeds in India,—both vegetable and flower—suitable to our climate. Sow the right kind of seeds at the right time and save disappointment.



Large descriptive catalogue with numerous illustrations free on application. Mention this paper when writing.

PESTONJEE P. POCHA & SONS,  
SEED MERCHANTS, POONA,  
Bombay Presidency,  
INDIA.

## TRADE UNION LEGISLATION

OR

### Notes on the Trade Disputes Act.

A reprint is being taken of the four articles that were contributed to the SERVANT OF INDIA by "A Labour Advocate."

To those who wish to study the subject, this little compilation, which puts together materials rather inaccessible to the ordinary reader would be found highly useful.

*Register orders immediately.*

FOR terms of Advertisement, please apply to the Manager, SERVANT OF INDIA, Kibe Wada, Budhwar Peth, POONA CITY.

## READY FOR SALE.

A reprint of the articles

ON

## Medical Services in India.

BY

AN I. M. S. OFFICER,

Price As. 8 Postage extra.

In convenient form. Only a limited number of copies available for sale.

Please order your requirements at once from:—

THE ARYABHUSHAN PRESS,  
POONA CITY.

## Dr. BAILUR'S MEDICINES.

HIVA-JWAR.  
Ague pills.  
Price As. 8.  
Per bottle.



BALAGRAHA  
CHURNA  
Epileptic powder.  
Price Re. 1.  
Per bottle.

As for our catalogue for other medicines & Particulars.

Liberal commission for Merchants.

Dr. H. M. BAILUR,

Dispensary, BELGAUM.

## CUT ME OUT

and mail me, with your name and address, to  
Good Luck Co., Benares City.

I will bring you, per V. P. P., one **COSY SILK SUIT** length for Rs. 12 only. These pieces are economical, hard wear and handsome ever made.

Test them any way you please—Why not give it a trial?

Name.....  
Address.....

## Currency Reform in India

BY

Prof. V. G. KALE.

Price Re. One.

Copies may be had from booksellers or:—

The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City

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. Sole proprietor and Senior physician of the Madras Ayurvedic Pharmacy.

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 Siddha, 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 one Phial of 60 pills (for a complete cure) Price Rs. 10 (Ten) only. V. P. Extra

Apply to:—AYURVEDA RATNA PANDIT N. V. SRIRAMA CHARLU, Ph. D. Sc.

The Madras Ayurvedic Pharmacy,

"Telegraphic Address"—"KALPAM," MADRAS.

POST BOX No. 151, MADRAS