

THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA-CITY

VOL. IV, No. 47.]

POONA—THURSDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1921.

[ANNUAL SUBSN. RS. 6

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	553
ARTICLES:—	
The Crushing Military Burden	556
Washington.—I	558
SPECIAL ARTICLE:—	
Kolhapur Administration. By A. V. Patvardhan B. A.	560
REVIEWS	561
SELECTIONS:—	
Another Speech of Mr Joshi at Geneva	562
Dr. Slater's Speech on Hand-Spinning.	563

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

The Conference.

THANKS principally to the efforts of Mrs. Besant, there is a hope of the intolerable tension of the present situation being relieved immediately by a mutual arrangement between the Government and non-co-operation leaders. She suggested in the columns of the *Leader*, whose services in the cause of peace have been most valuable, that representatives of various parties should first meet in a conference to decide upon proposals to be made to Government and that they should then ask for an interview with the Viceroy. In accordance with this plan, Messrs. Kunzru and Jamnadas Dwarkadas saw Mahatma Gandhi in Ahmedabad, and presumably with his concurrence a deputation will wait upon Lord Reading to-day (Wednesday). In the meanwhile Lord Ronaldshay announced in the Bengal Legislative Council the Government's willingness to reconsider their policy if non-co-operators would agree to call off the *hartal* and thus remove the necessity for action on the part of the Government. The present trouble arose out of the measures which the non-co-operators on one side and the Government on the other felt it their duty to take, and no doubt peace will ensue if the *hartal* is abandoned. There is no reason why the non-co-operators should not give a pledge to cease from making an organised attempt to bring about a *hartal* since it leads to so much turmoil. If this is done, both the parties—the Government and the non-co-operators—will return to the *status quo*, each being free to follow their own policy. As to future action on the part of the Government, Lord Ronaldshay did not, and indeed could not, say anything; we too shall not venture to make a prophesy.

The Viceroy's Defence.

IN his reply to the Bengal Mahajana Sabha's address Lord Reading attempted an elaborate defence of the Government's new policy of "vindicating the law". Indeed he claimed that there was nothing new in that policy, that it was but a continuation of the policy of forbearance which was initiated by Lord Chelmsford, though under different conditions. If the law had not to be enforced before against non-co-operators, it was because they had given no occasion to do so, since they had then remained within the limits of the law. But now they had chosen to disobey the law of the land, and this change in their method necessarily required a change in the Government's attitude to non-co-operation. For no Government could allow a movement of civil disobedience to be conducted without interference on its part, and even when the Government of India held its hand it was understood that force would be used if it became necessary to do so. Nor could it be maintained that the laws which the non-co-operators had selected for non-compliance were in themselves immoral or iniquitous. For the repressive laws which were now set in motion had followed only upon an outbreak of violence; and such violence having taken place it was the Government's clear duty to take measures to prevent its recurrence. Thus some precautionary measures were necessitated by violence or intimidation on the part of the people, and if anyone took it upon himself to defy those measures to which the Government was driven by popular excesses, it was but right that the ordinary law of the land should take its due course on such an offender and impose penalties upon him. But, in these circumstances, no-one could convict the Government of an intention forcibly to put down the movement of non-co-operation, so long as it would remain peaceful. That had been the policy of Government before, and continued to be the policy of Government now.

* * *

Spectious Pleadings.

SUCH is the defence put forward by the Viceroy, and if repression followed in every case only upon the outbreak of violence or upon the imminence of such an outbreak and ceased the moment the immediate danger was removed, then there would indeed be a complete justification for a resort to some repressive measures or other, though there would naturally be a question as to what measures would be suitable. But is it true that repression has always

followed in the wake of violence? The Viceroy himself refers in his speech only to the conditions obtaining in Calcutta. It is generally agreed that in that place some amount of physical violence and a good deal of intimidation did take place, and consequently there the Government may be said to have been under the necessity of making its authority felt. How far the Government should have gone in exercising its authority from the viewpoint of expediency is another matter to which we shall return presently, but no one can reasonably complain if Government interferes wherever violence occurs or wherever there is a likelihood of its occurring. One may well ask Lord Reading as to what had happened in Lahore *e. g.*, to necessitate the application of the Seditious Meetings Act, and practically to force the leaders of non-co-operation in the Punjab to offer resistance to the Government's orders, even against the wishes of Mahatma Gandhi or the general instructions of the Working Committee of the Congress? Even from the narrow legal point of view it is doubtful if the Seditious Meetings Act could apply to the business meetings of bodies like the Provincial Congress Committees; but from the larger considerations which a statesman has to keep in view it is sheer madness to force civil disobedience upon people who were themselves hesitating to start it and would have been languishing for an occasion to do so even supposing they were really burning to take it up. With what reluctance Lala Lajpat Rai commenced civil resistance is now well known, and if after it is once launched, the people of the Punjab think it a point of honour to come forward in their hundreds to support their leader and, with him, take up the gage thrown down by the Government, and if as a consequence the gaols of Lahore fill with such civil resisters, will Lord Reading still maintain that force was used by Government only as a last alternative? The truth is that Government left the non-co-operators no alternative.

* * *

AGAIN, what was the situation in the United Provinces which necessitated Government interference?

Repetition is not
Substantiation.

If there was coercion on a large scale anywhere, the Government could have adduced facts in proof of it in replying to Mr. Kunzru's motion for adjournment. But instead the Governor disallowed the motion and merely asserted that the steps taken by Government were absolutely necessary. Sir Harcourt Butler has since explained at greater length the situation as he found it which, in his opinion, rendered resort to repression perfectly justifiable, but the fact that the Government was unwilling to make such a statement in the Council and submit it to the criticism of the people's representatives can only lead one to infer that the accuracy of all the incidents mentioned in the speech cannot be vouched for. The case of Madras is still worse. There also a motion for adjournment similar to Mr. Kunzru's in the United Provinces was disallowed by the Governor,

who then appeared in the Council to offer an explanation. The explanation was simply this: "When we extended the (Criminal Law Amendment) Act, we did so purely as a precautionary measure and that it is our profound hope that we may have no reason to make use of it. But we have seen certain action being taken by certain people and combinations of people in other parts of India which has been a direct challenge on their part to the constitution of the Government, and I am sure that I shall receive the full approval of every member of this Council when I say that it is our bounden duty to take every precautionary measure to prevent any revolutionary agitation of this character." It means quite plainly that nothing very serious has happened in the Madras Presidency, but in view of what has happened elsewhere Government thinks it expedient to arm itself with extraordinary powers, hoping at the same time that no occasion will arise to put them in force. If violence is not apprehended in consequence of anything which has happened in Madras, how can the extension of the Samiti Act to the whole of the province be defended, merely because it is applied and enforced elsewhere? It can only imply that because the Government of India has generally decided upon a policy of repression, it must be in evidence in Madras also. The rod must at least be brandished if not actually used. We thought it was the statesman's function to keep the rod as much from the people's eyes as possible even if it had to be used occasionally. Lord Willingdon bore handsome testimony to the unwillingness of members of council to embarrass the Government. One can only say that the readiness of the councillors to help the Government was ill rewarded by the Government in foisting upon the whole province a repressive policy not demanded by the local situation, and in foisting it even without giving a chance to the council to discuss the question.

Lawyer or
Statesman?

* * *

LORD READING in his Calcutta speech disclaimed any desire on the part of Government to be vindictive in its dealings with non-co-operators. He remarked:

"I can assure you that it causes me great regret to see citizens of reputation and respectability defy law for political reasons with the consequence that they are prosecuted and placed in prison. But the leaders and their followers take this course deliberately for the purpose of being arrested. They are courting arrest. It is their definite and avowed policy. Indeed the boast has been made that they place the Government in a dilemma, for either the Government has either to abandon its policy or else it would continue arresting and prosecuting, and it is said that in either case the Government is in an unhappy position... The arrests in most instances are forced upon the Government. The Government does not seek them. No Government would wish to make arrests of this character, but the avowed policy is to compel the authorities to arrest and when the arrests have taken place to arouse sympathy for the persons arrested. Then demonstrations are made to force the Government to make more arrests."

We can well believe that Lord Reading's Govern-

ment did not willingly launch out on a policy of repression; but it is not clear that even if such a policy was justified in the beginning, the Government has not been able to keep it in check. The discretion allowed by it to the provincial Governments has been scandalously abused in certain cases. If it is the avowed policy of non-co-operators to court arrests and indeed to force Government to make arrests, is it not the clear duty of Government who wishes to counter this policy not to make arrests? If, e. g., the orders prohibiting demonstrations in Calcutta were violated by people whose participation in the demonstrations Government knows will not lead to disorder, will it not be wise on the part of Government, as a mere matter of expediency, not to take notice of these violations and not to give these people what they are hankering after—arrests? But the Government would seem to be proceeding on the assumption as if it were a law of nature which knows no variation—that punishment must follow upon the commission of an offence. If it be argued that the Government can on no account interfere with the processes of law, one may ask why Government did not prosecute the several hundreds of people who repeated the resolutions for which the Ali brothers were put on their trial and sentenced to imprisonment? It can only be explained on the ground that all that is lawful is not necessarily expedient and that Government must have an eye, now and all the time, to something higher than mere law—statesmanship. Why, then, is that rule not observed now?

Picketing Prohibited.

WE had hoped that in the Bombay Presidency at least there would be no repression. For one thing the Prince had visited this province, and for another—and a much more powerful reason—we had thought that Sir George Lloyd would resist the cry raised elsewhere for “a firm policy.” But orders have been issued prohibiting the picketing of liquor-shops in Poona. Now we must confess that picketing has had its ugly features here, that some amount of physical violence and unlawful intimidation has taken place, but most of it occurred, not in front of the liquor shops but elsewhere, which the present prohibition order will not help Government in preventing. Secondly, there has happened no violence recently. There was no occasion therefore for the order. The only reason for it seems to be that the Government of Bombay thought that it must give some practical evidence of its readiness to carry out the general policy of repression decided upon by a higher authority. One hesitates to make this allegation with reference to a Government which has shown admirable self-restraint so far on all occasions, which occurred recently, for the use of force. But it becomes difficult otherwise to explain this uncalled for order. The Government might have tried to enlist the co-operation of the people in preventing such coercion as was being practised upon the

would-be drinkers. We hope that in view of the change in policy which appears to be contemplated by the Government of India, the Bombay Government will cause this order to be revoked.

Malabar Relief.

ON account of the thousand distracting influences which draw away people's attention in a whirl of seething emotions, poor Malabar has indeed been isolated. . . . It is very painful to see how far still the country is from realising the real situation in Malabar.” So writes Mr. Devadhar in his fifth report of relief operations. The number of refugees has now gone up from 22,600 to 26,000 and of camps from 17 to 21. The daily expenditure is about Rs. 4,000. It is a satisfaction to find that Mr. N. V. Sarma is touring in Gujerat and Mr. Hardatta Sharma (of the Servants of India Society) in the Punjab, collecting money for the relief fund, and their experience is encouraging. The fund has now reached Rs. 90,000 against the sum of 10 lakhs needed—less than one eleventh. The work of reconstruction is still in the stage of discussion, and when that begins, which we hope will begin soon, very large funds will be needed. “The vast population who have lost their all and stand helpless and naked, turned out into the streets as it were, will have to be started afresh.” For this purpose Mr. Devadhar has again gone to Malabar to make plans for the future and to discuss them with those who are on the spot—official and non-official. Remittances may be made to Mr. Devadhar at the Servants of India Society, Bombay.

Flogging of Labourers.

IT would appear incredible to most of our readers that the flogging of labourers should be allowed by law in any part of the British Empire at this time of the day, but such is indeed the fact. In the labour laws of British North Borneo not only is the imposition of criminal penalties provided for insignificant breaches of hiring agreements, but the flogging of recalcitrant labourers is laid down as a penalty for various offences. The only consolation is that the planting interest itself wishes to put an end to this survival from the age of serfdom. The *Planter* of Kuala Lumpur considers the existence of such a law on the statute book as a *scandalum magnatum*. It is immaterial, says this organ of the planters' community, whether the law is enforced or not.

“The fact that the B. N. B. labour laws provide that a labourer for trivial breaches of contract—petty labour offences—may be sentenced to flogging, makes available for employers of labour a most dangerous weapon which they are at liberty to invoke if they choose. It is wicked and immoral that such should be the fact. Corporal punishment may produce salutary effects in preventing the recurrence of wrong-doing in that type of offender who is, apparently, deterred from a repetition of his crimes only by the fear of physical pain. It is still a punishment in the United Kingdom for male misdemeanants under certain Acts such as the Offences of the Person Act and the Criminal Law Amendment Act; but obviously corporal punishment should be reserved for certain grave offences and should never be inflicted upon refractory estate labourers resident in territories forming part of the British Empire.”

THE CRUSHING MILITARY BURDEN.

IN reply to a question put in the Legislative Assembly last February, the Finance Member, Mr. Hailey, said that out of the total public expenditure in India, including that of the provinces, 33½ per cent. is for public defence, 11¾ p. c. for sinking fund and interest charges on the national debt, 4% for education, and ¾% for sanitation. The total public expenditure in this case includes the whole expenditure on commercial undertakings like posts and telegraphs and all expenditure debitable to railways, except the working expenses. If we leave the provinces out of account, as now they are financially independent of the Central Government under the new constitution, and confine ourselves to the total expenditure of the Central Government alone, the proportion of military to the total public expenditure works out to a still higher figure, viz. 52%, being 66.31 crores (gross) out of the total budgeted amount of 127.60 crores. We would prefer to base our calculations on the total expenditure of the country—including provincial—as the military services are for the benefit of all Governments, Central and Provincial. Even then the Army claims as much as full one-third of the total, leaving two-thirds to be divided between the hundred and one other services, central and provincial, nation-building and revenue-producing. The crushing military burden is, moreover, becoming more crushing year by year, as will be shown below, and our Reformed Councils have no power to reduce that expenditure by a single pie. It was only as a matter of grace that the Viceroy allowed general discussion and criticism on military matters last March, when the budget for the current year was presented.

One of the causes of the heavy military expenditure in this country is the exorbitant costliness of the British officer and soldier, due to their excessive pay and to their being trained in England instead of in this country. The soldier is on short-term service in this country and his average term is calculated at only five years and four months. Besides, being much too highly paid on an average, Rs. 1210 per annum (fancy paying a white soldier Rs. 100 a month against Rs. 15 to a brown sepoy!), he is well clothed, housed, fed, supplied with electric lights and fans, and provided with deferred pay or gratuity at the end of his term. The expenses of recruiting and training him in England are paid by this poor country. A share of the cost of providing military schools and colleges in England is also borne by us. "All changes and improvements in the pay and organization of the British Army," of which every Tommy serving in India is a component part, "necessarily react on Indian finances." Before the war, the soldier used to be paid, on first joining, one shilling a day, or Rs. 22-8-0 a month. Now he is paid not less than four times that amount, because his pay has to be the same as that of the soldier in the United Kingdom, whose salary again depends upon that of the industrial

worker in England, from whose ranks he is generally drawn. His pay was raised twice even before the war, in 1902 and again in 1904, thereby adding to our military burden by one crore and five lakhs annually. The increment in the soldier's pay since the war has cost this poor country no less than six crores and five lakhs annually, notwithstanding the fact that the total number has been reduced by 6,000. Thanks for this small mercy. This system of getting the European soldiers on loan from the army of a rich country like England is costing us immensely, much more than we can bear, and it is now time that we should look round and see if it would not be more economical and feasible—assuming that a European army is necessary—to have a local European army, locally recruited and trained, and serving for a period of, say, twenty-five years, like civil servants. Such an army "was proposed (in 1858) by Lord Canning the Governor-General and by others because they considered that it would be more fully at the disposal of the Government of India, and more economical; and that officers and men would identify themselves with the country and its inhabitants providing a source from which officers could be drawn for various civil employments." But this was not to be. Is it not worth consideration now when India's back is breaking under the all too heavy load of a foreign, costly army? Until this load is lightened in some way or other, our nation-building departments like education, sanitation and medical relief will ever be starved. Unless the present personnel of the British branch of the army—officers and men—be substituted, at least partly, by less costly and equally effective sons of the soil, or in other words unless the Army is much more Indianised than at present, there does not seem to be any hope of finding money for the development of the country in all directions.

The established and normal strength of the British part of the army in 1914-15 was, artillery, cavalry and infantry all told, about 2700 officers and 75,000 men. The Indian branch of the Army, artillery, cavalry, infantry and sappers and miners, consisted of 2800 British officers and 1,60,000 Indian officers and men. Besides these there are 21,000 officers and men of the Imperial Service Troops, maintained by the several Indian States at their expense and at the disposal of Government whenever wanted. During the war, this strength was considerably increased; and the additional force is now mostly demobilized, though we find the sum of one crore of rupees provided for the demobilization in the current year's military estimates. Now the question we have to consider is whether such a large standing army—with a total strength of over 2,61,000—is necessary for the purpose of internal security and for external defence. In 1885 when the Russian bogey* appeared on our

* That it was a mere bogey is fully borne out by what Sir Guy Fleetwood Wilson has written in his memoirs. "Again I was impressed," says he, "by the absurdity of the Russian

frontier, our army was increased by 10,000 British and 20,000 Indian troops, costing us an additional three crores of rupees. The Government seems to have conveniently forgotten this, and not a whisper is heard of discharging these 30,000 men, though there is not the least fear of a Russian invasion and a favourable treaty has been concluded with Afghanistan. It is very convenient to forget this, as the Indian Army can, at a moment's notice, be shipped to China, South Africa, Egypt, France, Germany or any part of the world, where British interests may be prejudicially affected. The Indian Army is really neither wholly Indian, nor used exclusively for Indian requirements. The Esher Committee has not cared to fix the specific purposes for which the Army in India may be used in view of the greater responsibilities assumed by the British Empire in consequence of the treaties of peace recently concluded. Yet they clearly and expressly say on p. 32 of their report:

"The centre of gravity of possible military operations has shifted from West to East. In the future we must contemplate the possibility of our armies operating in the middle East based *partially on India and partially on home.*" (Italics are ours.)

In the past the Indian army has been freely utilized for extra-Indian purposes. In the future it is intended to be used for purposes in which India has not the remotest chance of a direct benefit. And to that end a large standing army is maintained for being drawn upon at any time, much larger than the local necessities of this country warrant. Is it not but fair and equitable that the British Government should be asked to pay a portion of the expenses? Or, in the alternative, to reduce the strength, especially of the British part of it? Even a rich country like England does not spend at this day more than 20% of its total expenditure on defence (army, navy and air force), Canada not more than 11%, South Africa 8%, Argentine Republic 16%, Portugal 20%, Norway 11%, while poor India pays fully 33%, and that too in peace time. Sir Godfrey Fell says that Japan spent 53'4% of her total expenditure in 1920 on the army. But Japan is aggressive and has to govern other countries. India has no intention of exploiting her neighbours. The cost of wars, like those we had recently with Afghanistan and in Waziristan, is in addition to the normal 58 crores. In 1918-19 the total military bill—ordinary and extraordinary—amounted to 64 crores; in 1919-20 to over 83 crores and in 1920-21 to 71 crores; what guarantee is there that it will not exceed the budgeted figure of 62 crores during the current year? India can no longer bear this burden and must refuse to be exploited in this manner any longer.

The Finance Member laid on the table of the Assembly last March a memorandum on the growth of military expenditure since 1913-14, from

invasion scare. Personally I much doubt if the Russians ever meant to work into India. They probably meant to keep us occupied while they did as they pleased in Central Asia and Persia."

which the following figures are taken, in the hope that they will be found informative:

FIGURES OF NET MILITARY EXPENDITURE.

Details.	1913-14 Rs. in lakhs	1921-22 Rs. in lakhs	Increase p. c.
1. Salaries			
Officers, British ...	107	178	66
Officers, Indian ...	195	164	-16
Soldiers, British ...	346	950	146
Soldiers, Indian ...	334	348	4
[Mark the difference between the increments of British and Indian forces.]			
Followers, &c. ...	25	33	32
Reservists ...	15	39	160
Administrative staffs	59	158	167
[The superior staff got 167% increment in eight years.]			
Account staffs ...	27	77	185
Supply corps, Animal transport, Arsenal, Clothing and Cantonment staff	113	210	95
Medical staff ...	57	177	210
Chaplains, educational and technical staff	17	54	218
Military Works staff	32	81	153
R. I. Marine staff ...	19	30	58
Furlough & voyage pay	52	105	102
Miscellaneous ...	7	9	2
Total	14,05	26,13	
2. Provisions, lighting and fuel for troops and followers	168	334	99
3. Clothing and kit ...	88	254	189
4. Ordnance and miscellaneous stores	114	285	150
5. Marine stores ...	11	26	136
6. Medical and Vet. stores	16	20	25
7. Purchase of animals	21	19	-10
8. Feed of animals ...	121	207	71
9. Movement of troops and stores	109	288	164
10. Auxiliary Force ...	29	45	55
11. Territorial Force ...		5	—
[Here is a grand beginning of a citizen army with 5 lakhs of rupees!]			
12. Misc. allowances & other charges	106	154	45
13. Military works, i. e. accommodation, roads, defences, &c.	93	341	266
[New barracks for men, bungalows for officers and hospitals are intended to be built.]			
14. Mechanical transport	0	174	—
15. Royal Air Force ...	0	124	—
16. Surplus strength under Demobilization	0	100	—
17. Recommendations of Esher Committee	0	128	—
[These four new items swallow a small sum of 5¼ crores!]			

18. Payment to British War Office (for British forces in India)	92	204	122
19. Rewards for services	1	12	—
20. Pensions, Compassionate allowances & gratuities	246	563	129
21. Special services ...	32	2	—
22. Conversion of Silladar into non-Silladar Cavalry	0	42	—
23. Occupation of Waziristan	0	305	—
[This is the tail of the war with Waziris and is the cost of occupation.]			
Total	26,52	62,43	
Deduct receipts	41	23	
Net expenditure	26,11	62,20	138%

We will conclude this article by an extract from a speech of the Rt. Hon. Srinivasa Sastri delivered at Calcutta in the Liberal Federation on the last day of the year 1919 pertaining to this subject: "Of the many parts of this big administrative machinery which you call the government of a country, the most conservative part, with the most old-world ideas, is the military department. Their prejudices and their worn-out policies they hug till they know not what they are doing. Then they wake up all of a sudden. I know nothing military that moves quickly, except the Indian military budget, which year by year mounts up, until within 20 years it has more than doubled itself and heaven knows whether in the next three years it is not going to treble or quadruple itself. Except in the matter, therefore, of encroaching upon the poor resources of the Indian tax-payer, the military department is very slow indeed, and particularly slow in taking a big advance in its policy. Military policy is always secret, never allowed to be known to the people. Now the policy must change entirely. It must take the more generous line that Mr. Montagu and others have imparted to the other side of the administration. Not till then shall our responsible government be as full, as many-sided and as fruitful as it should be to this great country."

WASHINGTON.—I.

A COUPLE of months ago President Harding made his first—and long expected—pronouncement on the Negro problem in the United States. The speech was delivered at Birmingham (Alabama) and urged that, whilst there should be neither political nor economic differentiation, there must be mutual recognition of the absolute and permanent divergence in things social and racial. If that is not the caste system, one does not know what is: neither inter-dining nor inter-marrying for ever and ever, between white and black, whatever their respective cultural standard. Such an appalling principle to see laid down by the spokesman of the Republican, *i. e.* the supposedly Negrophile, party, makes one

gasp. However, one asks oneself, can President Harding have been so indiscreet, to put it no higher, as to have allowed himself to betray such race prejudice, even if it happened to share it? However dared he publicly to stigmatize more than a crore of American citizens as of an inferior species? No doubt all Christian Churches in the States, all fair-minded people throughout the country did rise in protest against so monstrous a denial of the very first words of their "Declaration of Independence," that *magna charta* of the Republic, wherein—of course—all men are declared to be equal? Did they? Alas, the only protest has come against the *revolutionary* idea of President Harding that Negroes should be allowed to aspire even to economic and political equality! One indignant senator condemns the assertion of such a principle (of economic and political equality) as "impracticable, unjust, and destructive of the best ideals of America" and as "a blow to the white civilisation of this country that will take years to combat"! Heaven preserve us, then, from "the best ideals of America." And Heaven be thanked too, that if we had to be castigated for our own sins of caste and have experienced the English whip, at least we have escaped the American scorpions: nothing so bad, but it might have been even worse.

It is really extraordinary how backward a country this America is, how antiquated for all its newness. And not only in its race prejudices. The other day we gave examples of its pre-historic mentality regarding economics. It always seems to lag behind, this much advertised "go-ahead" country. It was last to enter the War, it is last to make an even formal peace. It was only on Nov. 14th that the United States and Germany came to be at peace once more. And the war fever and the Anti-German frenzy still rages unabated over there, when in old Europe people are thinking of how best to get back to the old days of friendship. The Eleventh of November business of course still tries everywhere to keep alive the "patriotic" spirit, without which even the most competent Secretaries of War can make no decent-sized war. "The Unknown Warrior" is still *le dernier mot* in political canonisation, the elaborate propaganda-staged effort, designed to lull the heart-aches of ten thousand times ten thousand whom "patriotism" robbed of their nearest and dearest. In America—as a prelude to the Washington Conference (what an omen!)—they have just buried their Unknown Warrior to the accompaniment of much gold braid and fine oratory. In England they did all that last year, or was it even the year before last? Of course, this year every effort was made to keep up the brave show, even in England. But there the attentive observer could detect a hollow sound; he could hear the urgent questionings which well up in all hearts and which refuse to be stilled by pageantry and fine words: the question, What, after all, did we gain for all our sacrifices?

The proof of such an assertion? We are content to produce a single witness, though a remark-

able one: the Rev. G. A. Studdert-Kennedy. And who is he? A very remarkable man, who during the war became a remarkable Military Chaplain. As "Woodbine Willie" he was not only the Johnnie turned on to distribute material "comforts" of *Woodbine* cigarettes, etc. amongst his men, to keep them amused and their morale up: all this he did with remarkable success; but what was far more remarkable was the complete understanding of and deep sympathy with the common soldier, which gave him an exceptional place in their affection and an exceptional opportunity for spiritual leadership on his part. Of course he was conspicuous for his bravery and for his patriotism: nobody could have been less "defeatist" than he. After the war was over, he began to fascinate packed churches by his unconventional, un-"parsonic" sermons and even a wider public by his very remarkable, very shrewd and very beautiful books. This is the man who this last Eleventh November at the most notable Armistice Service in London addressed a vast concourse by admitting that

"he has appealed to the troops during the war and encouraged them to fight on the ground that they were fighting for freedom and honour. He knew now it was nothing of the kind.

There was no freedom and there was no end to war. We had lied as a nation and besmirched our honour. We had broken our promises and gone back on our word in half a score of cases. There was no peace, and we seemed to be further from peace in many ways than ever before, and he felt it was due from him as an act of penitence to make this open confession to God, because he did not rise high enough and become brave enough at that time.

What he should have known and what they all should have known was that there was no freedom to be won by the sword, no honour to be vindicated by it, and no peace to be got out of it.

In an appeal to those who might have lost dear ones he asked for forgiveness for their enemies, for they knew not what they did. They were mad, he said: he himself was mad; they were all mad."

(We quote from the *Challenge* of November 18th.) Mr. Kennedy is a brave man; he has won many decorations during the War: but never, we believe, did he do a braver thing than when he stood up at the Central Hall, Westminster, and dared to say what "patriotism" so feverishly tried to keep unsaid. Comparisons are odious; but how many years do you think will it be, before American mentality reaches the level of thought, so admirably expressed by this Englishman on behalf of the common people of England to-day?

Mr. Kennedy of course is only a symbol, a mouthpiece, of war-disillusioned England. Much in the same strain, "C. E. M." in the *Manchester Guardian* of the same date has an arresting essay on "The Nuisance of Cause and Effect," in the course of which he bitingly exclaims:

"It makes a fine, stirring slogan, does "Down with causation!" And no other form of strong waters is better at making you raise it than are the early days of a war. If, with unseemly sobriety, anyone hints, at so cordial a time, that the dead hand of cause may still have a grip in it, he can be easily seen to have no drop of true blood in his veins; base are the slaves who think we may

have to reap as we sowed, or lie on our beds as we made them; let them just look at the choice grapes about to be borne by the fine healthy thistles that we have so long been planting and watering."

With "C. E. M." more and more of the leading nations of the world come to see, that the War was nothing but the harvest of all the policy of grab and violence and the system of competition, sown in the pre-war period, and not by "the enemy" alone. They very rapidly, however reluctantly, are coming to see further that in the "Peace" of to-day we but reap what we sowed at Versailles three years ago. What the detested Bolsheviks proclaimed on coming into power four years ago as the only possible principle of peace—"No Indemnities; No Annexations"—; what at the time was laughed out of court as preposterous and wicked: that to-day is seen to have been only too true. The indemnities are inevitably dragging the whole world into bankruptcy; the annexations are nursing racial hatreds and laying the foundation for "next wars." Even Alsace, which was in a sense merely a dis-annexation, as the opponents to a plebi cite at the time of Versailles so cleverly put it, is found to be up in arms against that "Motherland" about which one had heard so much fine rhetoric. *Le Progrès Civique* of Nov. 19th sums up the actual position by saying that politically all Alsatian Deputies are in the opposition; administratively, the huge increase in redtapism and gendarmerie (!) has made the whole population disaffected; whilst morally, the threatened secularisation of schools by the provincial government is calling for the most acrid religious hostility. "The Armistice of Nov. 11th, 1918, has given us back our two Provinces; but that is where we are to-day, alas. after three years: yesterday, indescribable enthusiasm, to-day shouts of hatred and separatism!"

If Alsatian opinion to-day is becoming solid for severance from France and for erection into a separate neutral little country like Luxemburg; if such a result is possible with people who were as staunch Frenchmen 50 years ago as Normands, Bretons and Provençals are to-day: what must be the feeling of the unmixedly German (whether mentally, culturally or racially) South Tyrol handed over to Italy; of Posnanian and Silesian Germans threatened by Polish barbarism; of Hungarians Rumanized, Turks Hellinized, Albanians and Bulgarians Serbified? And all, because there has been that "decisive" victory, which was going to abolish war forever! Shall we learn in this generation that victory never results in peace, but only in more war: or shall our children's children also have to be immolated to Moloch, before the Churches will teach mankind to pray, not for victory, but for stalemate? Thus of course, and thus only, does permanent peace come: when people fighting against each other recognize, that by fighting nothing can be settled; that, winning or losing, they all lose; that some settlement must be arrived at, and that it cannot come by force. The recent Anglo-Irish Peace is of the latter order; the Car-

sons of course shriek that this Peace is an English admission of having been beaten by the Irish "murder gangs": no doubt Irish extremists say much the same about acknowledging Ireland beaten into submission by the Black-and-Tans. The fact is, there has been no defeat; but neither, thank God, has there been victory. That is why lasting peace is possible. England and Ireland to-day do not "disarm" in the sense of a "Conference for the Reduction of Armaments": they disarm as little, as Wessex and Northumbria, Assisi and Perugia, have disarmed against each other; they simply have come to the conclusion that arms are not the method of settling anything. "Vo Arms"—not "Fewer Arms," à la Washington. But that is another story; to be continued in our next.

KOLHAPUR ADMINISTRATION.

II.

IN the previous article I endeavoured to set out the results of the educational policy of the Kolhapur Durbar since the Maharaja's installation and to compare them with the results in the adjoining British districts in the same period. I selected education first, because nothing is calculated to help forward the advancement of the masses so much as the diffusion of elementary education. Applying this test, we found that the Kolhapur State not only does not look after the interests of the backward classes more jealously than the British Government but is wholly neglectful of them, to the point, it is strongly suspected, of even applying the money ostensibly taken for being spent on primary education to other purposes. Next to primary education, the abkari department bears most intimately on the welfare of the masses, and it would be interesting to examine the Maharaja's abkari policy with a view to seeing if in the Kolhapur State intemperance is checked more severely than, say, in the Satara district. In doing so, it is best to fix one's eyes upon the total consumption of alcoholic spirits instead of on the revenue it brought into the treasury, for an addition to the abkari revenue is not inconsistent with diminishing consumption if higher rates are charged. The quantity of consumption however must be a true index of the abkari policy as it works out in actual practice. Let us take a period of twenty years and see whether there has been an increase or decrease in consumption in this interval in the Kolhapur State. In 1898-99 the total consumption of country spirit in terms of 25° U. P. gallons was 23,077; it rose in 1918-19 (the latest year for which figures are available to me) to 85,144—an increase of 269%. In the British district of Satara the consumption in 1899-1900 was 18,141 gallons of strength 25° U. P.; in 1920-21 it became 20,594 proof gallons—an increase of 51%. To take only the last ten years, consumption increased in the Kolhapur State from 46,895 to 85,144 gallons, while in Satara it decreased from 37,585 to 20,594 gallons; i.e. drinking increased in Kolhapur 81%, while it decreased in Satara 45%. Lest it should be contended that

the figures for Satara are exceptionally favourable, making the parallel unfair to Kolhapur, I am willing to take a wider area for comparison. Consumption in the four Deccan districts (Sholapur, Satara, Poona and Ahmednagar) was reduced during the last ten years from 2,34,925 to 2,27,268 gallons and in the whole of the Presidency proper from 26,15,526 to 26,14,789. Thus, the past ten years have seen a reduction, however small, in the total consumption in British India, whether in the Deccan or in the Presidency, while in the Kolhapur State there has been an actual increase of 81%. What a contrast this—

51% increase in Satara against	269% increase in Kolhapur,
45% decrease " " "	81% increase " "
3% decrease in Deccan " "	81% increase " "

It does not show that the Kolhapur Durbar is taking more precautions than the British Government to save its subjects from the curse of drunkenness; it proves rather that it takes practically no precautions to that end. Nay, more. The State exposes the subjects of British India and other Indian States to sore temptations by planting liquor shops just on the edge of its territory. All along the Varana valley, just off the British boundary, are to be found liquor shops which, though in the jurisdiction of the State, pander principally to the cravings of British Indian residents. Everyone will agree that this is a thoroughly immoral arrangement, for it is nothing else than exploiting the vice of others to enrich oneself.

The figures given above tell us how, as a result of the excise policy pursued by the Maharaja, consumption is mounting up in the Kolhapur State, far, far in excess of the rise (recently there is some slight diminution) that is taking place in the British territory. But the reader will ask: was there so little drunkenness in Kolhapur at the start that the Maharaja thinks his State can afford to have a larger proportionate increase every year than British districts, so that, with all the rapid increase of late, Kolhapur is not worse off now than Satara in point of consumption? I must answer this question as follows:—Kolhapur was never quite so backward in the matter of drinking, as this question assumes. For, if in 1899-1900 Satara, with a population of 12,25,989, had liquor consumption of 18,141 gallons of 25° U. P. strength, Kolhapur, with a population of 7,05,201, had consumption of 21,392 gallons of equal strength; that is, while the rate of consumption per head of population was 0·7 drams in Satara, it was 1·4 drams (both of strength 25° U. P.) in Kolhapur: just double! There being already twice as much drinking in Kolhapur at this time, it is increasing every year at a much higher rate for some twenty years, with the result that the latest available figures show that now the average rate of consumption per head of population is 1 dram (London proof) in Satara, while it is 4·9 drams* in Kolhapur. I have not been able to

* In the administration report for 1918-19 this figure is given as 4·09, but it is obviously a mistake.—A. V. P.

find out whether these drams are in terms of proof or of 25° U. P. Even supposing that the latter is the case, the average rate of consumption is 3·7 proof drams in the Kolhapur State, or nearly four times as much as in the Satara district.

Thus our study of the excise policy of the Kolhapur Durbar for the last twenty years leads us to the following conclusions :—

(1) That, in this period, the rate of increase of liquor consumption in Kolhapur was upwards of five times the rate in Satara ;

(2) That in the latter half of this period consumption *increased* in Kolhapur twice as much as it *decreased* in Satara ;

(3) That at the present time the average rate of consumption in Kolhapur is a little under four times what it is in Satara ;

These are the results to which His Highness the Maharaja's policy has led. It is well-known that His Highness wishes to appear before the world in the role of a champion of the masses, incurring the wrath of the advanced classes merely because of his championship of the masses. The reader can judge for himself if the few facts adduced above in regard to the growth of drunkenness in the Kolhapur State sustain this rôle.

III.

I will conclude this article by just touching upon another aspect of the Maharaja's administration. It concerns what are called the Sheri lands, or the personal holdings of the Maharaja. When His Highness assumed the reins of power in 1894 his holding extended to 6,060 acres. It went on increasing slightly every year until it grew to 7,260 acres in 1904-5; but the following year it swelled suddenly to 16,675 acres. One wonders how the Maharaja's private estate could increase by nearly 1½ times in one year. Perhaps you expect to come upon some explanatory note in the administration report? Then you are entirely mistaken. The report has no more to say about this huge increase than it would have if the increase was, say, 1 or 2 acres. Once more there are gradual additions, but in 1908-9 the area again increases by a spurt from 20,429 to 26,167 acres. Only now you are vouchsafed an explanation—and it is not the Maharaja's fault if the explanation fails to satisfy you. "The increase was due chiefly to certain forest lands being brought under cultivation and included under this head during the year under notice." The question rises to one's lips: If the forests brought under cultivation belonged to the State, why were they added to the Maharaja's personal holdings? Or does the Maharaja regard all State property as his own and leaves it to the State only so long as it is not sufficiently productive? It is difficult otherwise to account for the rise in sheri lands from 6 to 27 thousand acres during the present administration.

The problem which is now being tackled in all advanced countries is how to deal with an "Acquisitive Society": Kolhapur, it would seem, has not

even yet emerged out of the anti-diluvian age of an "Acquisitive Autocracy"!

A. V. PATVAEDHAN,
Secretary, Daxini Sansthan Hitavardhak Sabha.

REVIEWS.

India at the Present Time. By CANON A. W. DAVIES, S. P. C. K. London, 1921. pp. 166 x 9. 6d.

This slender little pamphlet represents a paper by the well-known Principal of St. John's College, Agra, read before the Central Board of Missions at London some six months ago. We may say at once that we have never read anything more weighty in so small a compass. After an extremely shrewd survey of the political situation, and having stated that "Europe for centuries has looked upon the East as a fair field for adventures, commercial, political, and even religious," Canon Davies tackles the two problems selected by him for the earnest consideration of the Central Missionary Board of the Anglican Church: the "educational work among the middle and professional classes; secondly, the evangelistic work in the villages, the so-called mass movement work." His verdict on these two questions—and nobody can dispute the author's competence to deal with them—may be summed up by saying that, whilst the classes affected by the mass movements desire Christianity, but cannot afford it, the professional classes who could afford it do not desire it. Never have we seen the truth in missionary matters stated so nakedly. Canon Davies has managed to formulate the dilemma of the missionaries in a manner which is bound to become classic. "Is Christianity essentially an expensive religion? he asks. "The poorest villagers of India can afford to be Mohammedans, they can afford to be Hindus, or at any rate Animists, they cannot afford to be Christians. Does it not look as though we have somehow so bound up the religion of Christ with the forms and spirit and standards of the West that the caste man will not accept it, the poor out-caste cannot afford it?" As for the present condition of the Indian Church he contrasts most unfavourably the reforms promulgated by the Government with the illiberal and distrustful attitude of most Missions. "Where the State has given with one hand, can we not give with two?" he indignantly queries, and he goes on pathetically: "We aim at planting the Catholic Church in India. It is there, but it is stifled and broken. I believe that there are undreamed of possibilities of fruitfulness and growth in the Indian Church. *But it has lost heart and lost faith in us.*"

It is interesting to see what such a clear-sighted writer has to say on the Conscience Clause in schools. "In the United Provinces there seems to be no room for doubt that we shall within 12 months be presented with the alternative of granting a conscience clause or forfeiting our Government grants, and that in most cases the forfeiting of grants would involve the closing of our institutions. In my judgment the granting of a conscience clause would probably prove that some of our institutions are not worth maintaining, but I firmly believe that in many, if not in most cases it will not so materially restrict opportunities for Christian teaching and influence as to justify us in withdrawing altogether from the field of higher education."

As the Canon says, for the Christian religion both Hindus and Mohammedans have a great respect and for ourselves we wholeheartedly associate ourselves with that respect. As regards the professional missionaries of that religion in India, all we can say is that it would seem to us quite certain that their position in Indian eyes would be a very different one, if they all were persons of as keen an intellectual insight, and free of preconceived notions as is this courageous O. M. S. Principal from Agra.

Nicolas Lenin: His Life and Work. By G. V. KRISHNA RAO. Revised Ed. 1921. Ganesh and Co., Madras. 8 As.84 pp. 5 x 7½. THIS is a slight brochure which professes to give a great deal more than it actually does. The "Life" is scrappy and confused, and in 21 pages devoted to it betrays complete lack of familiarity with the history it pretends to give. The 21 pages are divided into seven (!) chapters, whilst chapters 8 and 9 (18 pages) consist of a transcription of a few passages from Goode's and Ransome's articles in the *Manchester Guardian* and Lansbury's in the *Daily Herald*. "Lenin's Writings" is the heading of chapter 10 (4 pages)-a little padding to introduce two appendices, containing Lenin's "Thesis on Bourgeois Democracy and Proletarian Dictatorship" (an antiquated manifesto of his to the 3rd International) and an article of his which appeared in the *New York Herald* (30 pages.) The last chapter (3 pages) on "Lenin and Gandhi" can hardly be taken more seriously. Rhetoric, after all, is really no substitute for knowledge.

Z.

NATIONAL SELF-REALISATION.

National Self-Realisation By S. E. STOKES. (S. Ganesan, Publisher, Triplicane, Madras.) Price not mentioned.

MR. STOKES is an American settled in India for a long time and has made it his home by the strongest of human ties, namely of marriage. He has married, we are told by Mr. C. F. Andrews in the introduction, a Rajput lady, has six children by her and the whole family lives in Kotgarh on the Himalayas in Indian style. He deserves the thanks of the Indian public for exposing the iniquities of the Begar system on the Himalayas. Mr. Stokes is a constant writer to the Indian journals on the subjects of political, social, educational and religious importance and his writings are always marked with careful thought and diligent scholarship. It is a good thing that these writings have now been brought together in a book form. Mr. Stokes says that he is a student of philosophy and naturally, therefore, the ordinary readers would be disappointed if they expect him to echo their own pet ideas to the end. If he is a great admirer and lover of Indian customs and traditions, he is equally so of the western, and he deprecates the common airy manner in which writers, Indians and European, after a superficial observation often generalise in an unfavourable manner on the customs and traditions of one another which leads only to mutual misunderstanding, contempt and recrimination. Mr. Stokes is a Gandhian non-co-operator, but then in a philosophical sense. He foresees clearly all the dangers attendant on the success and failure of this movement (some of which have unfortunately come true) and suggests therefore that the better way is to make use of the Reformed Councils and make them really effective by the starting of Vigilance Committees from the village upwards co-ordinating their work and helping, and compelling, the Councils by the force of well-informed and therefore responsible public opinion to do what the country really demands. This is very sound advice and in this Mr. Stokes utters no impracticable platitude. He has actually tried this plan with regard to the abolishing of the *begar* system and the attendant malpractices in the Himalayan administration and, he says, "we have only been working for about a year in any sustained manner, and even in that time a considerable amount has been accomplished."

V. V.

SELECTIONS.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE.

ANOTHER SPEECH OF MR. JOSHI.

THE following is the text of the speech made by Mr. N. M. Joshi during the debate on the Reform of the Constitution of the Governing Body in the International Labour Conference at Geneva:—

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen. I generally approve of the report which the Commission of Selection has

placed before you this morning, but there are a few points in which I differ from the proposals of the Commission as they were placed before you.

The question of the representation on the Governing Body, of the extra-European countries, is a very important one, not only from the point of the interests of the non-European countries, but from the point of the interests of the Conference itself. We want this Conference to be really international; we want it to be joined by all the countries of the world; we want that this Conference should not only benefit the Governments, employers, and organised workers, but we want it to benefit the large masses of unorganised workers of the world, especially of the Asiatic countries. If we agree with this view, you will easily see how important this question is.

At present, the number of countries which have joined this Organisation from the extra-European world is a little more than those from the European world, but their attendance is somewhat smaller, on account of some difficulties, and on account of the fact that they have not yet seen the importance of this Organisation. But, Sir, this state of things will not last long.

I am quite sure that within a short time the extra-European countries will see the importance of joining this Organisation, and it is only then that this Organisation will be truly international. Speaking from the point of view of a worker, and addressing my comrades of the Workers' Group, I say this that we workers know that if our working conditions are to be improved rapidly, or even at all, they can be improved only by an international effort. National efforts made for a long time have failed to give the workers what they wanted, and all the workers in the world have now realised that their conditions can only be satisfactorily improved by international action. We, therefore, must take care in this Conference to make this Organisation truly international and to bring all the workers of the world to take interest in this Conference; and one of the means of making them take interest in it is to make them feel that they have proper representation on this body. It is from that point of view I appeal to my comrades in the Workers' Group to see that the workers of the extra-European countries be properly represented on the Governing Body. Some people seem to think that representation on this organisation should be governed by the number of organisations of the workers in their respective countries. I differ from that point of view. This organisation is not merely constituted for the organised workers; it is intended even more for the benefit of the unorganised workers.

Coming to the Report of the Commission, I should like to say a few words as to their recommendations. In the first place, the Commission recommends that the Governing Body should consider the desirability of certain changes in the Peace Treaty. I do not agree with this view. I do not think that any change in the Peace Treaty is necessary. The number of extra-European countries is much larger than the number of European countries and when all these extra-European countries join this Organisation and are represented at the annual Conferences, I am quite sure they will be able to secure adequate representation for themselves on the Governing Body. I do not feel, therefore, that there is any necessity for making a change in the Peace Treaty. From the point of view of the extra-European countries, there is, in my opinion, a danger in fixing, by a change in the Peace Treaty, the proportion of representation on the Governing Body to be allotted to European and extra-European countries. If the proportion is fixed to-day, it will be much smaller than the extra-European countries deserve, and being fixed in such a manner, it will be difficult to get it changed after a few years when the extra-European countries are better represented in the Conferences. I feel, therefore, that from the point of view of the extra-European countries, the fixing of a certain proportion of representation between the extra-European countries and the European countries will not in the long run prove to be in the interests of the extra-European countries.

Then, Sir, there is another proposal, namely, with regard to substitutes. I was on the Sub-Commission which discussed the matter, and my impression is that, in connection with these proposals, there was a certain Recommendation made that, out of the six substitutes given to the employers and the six given to the workers, there should be some proportion of substitutes fixed for extra-European countries. Unfortunately, I do not find any reference to that in that Report at all. I hope the Rapporteur will give some explanation of this.

I differ from the view of the Commission as to the giving to those countries which are already represented on the Governing Body power to appoint substitutes from their own country. That proposal means giving to those countries which are already represented on the Governing Body two members on the Governing Body instead of one, and I do not think there is any necessity for it.

Then there is the question of the proportion of seats on the Governing Body reserved for the three groups. In the case of the Government group, the Report recommends that one-third of the seats should be allotted to extra-European countries, but in the case of the workers' and employers' groups the Report recommends that only one-sixth of the total number of seats should be so reserved. I fail to understand why this difference has been made by the Commission of Selection. If the extra-European Governments deserve a representation of one-third, I do not see why the workers and employers should not have the same representation. The only explanation, to my mind, of this difference is that the Governments have two votes each so the workers' and employers' one, and the Commission of Selection thought that if they could satisfy the Members of the Government group of the extra-European countries, there would be no need to trouble about the representatives of the employers' and workers' groups. There is no other explanation, to my mind, of this difference. It may be said that the workers' and employers' groups of non-European countries are not satisfactorily represented here. That may be true, but what is the best way of inducing them to come here? To my mind, it is to let them feel that they are treated very generously here.

There is another point. If the number of extra-European countries who have sent employers' and workers' Delegates is very small, I would nevertheless ask the Conference to remember the number of workers they represent. The Indian workers' Delegate and the Chinese workers' Delegate (were he here) would represent 500 million wage-earners, while the whole of the European workers' representatives would not represent that number.

I feel that there is not much force in the argument used that in this Conference to-day the numbers of workers' Delegates from extra-European countries is not very large. I am sure that, if the workers from the extra-European countries feel that they are generously treated here, the number of their representatives will increase year by year. I hope that this Conference will take a very generous view of the demand made by the workers and employers of the extra-European countries, and that the proportion which has been fixed by the Commission of Selection for their representation will be changed in their favour.

As regards the exact proportion we would like fixed, my friend Mr. Crawford, from South Africa, will move an amendment which I hope the Conference will accept.

HAND-SPINNING AND HAND-WEAVING.

DR. GILBERT SLATER'S SPEECH IN THE MADRAS COUNCIL.
THE following is the full text of Dr. Gilbert Slater's speech on the resolution in the Madras Legislative Council for the encouragement of hand-spinning:—

Mr. President, I am inclined to think that if the existing political constitution had been in existence ten years ago and if the question of hand-spinning and hand-weaving had been discussed then, the Minister for Development would have said that it was impossible for either hand-weaving or spinning to compete with machinery and that therefore attempts to

develop handicraft textile industries would not be successful. But to-day that attitude has changed, and now the conventional and orthodox opinion is that there is no reason to despair of hand-weaving but that hand-spinning is a perfectly hopeless matter. I should like the House to consider how it is that the change of attitude to which I refer has taken place with regard to hand-weaving. I think we may attribute this to the work of Sir Alfred Chatterton who refused to despair of the handloom. And as a consequence he introduced or stimulated the introduction of the earliest invention in the whole series of English textile inventions by which hand industry has been superseded by machine industry, viz., the fly-shuttle which was originally invented by Kay in 1733. That invention of nearly two hundred years ago was introduced into India about the beginning of the twentieth century; and I believe many a hand-loom weaver finds that on certain sorts of work he can make a living by the fly-shuttle loom when he could not by the old loom.

Now, I would like to suggest to the Minister for Development that he should consider whether on some similar lines investigation cannot be carried out with regard to hand-spinning. The first invention in spinning machinery was Hargreaves' spinning jenny invented in 1759. In its original form a boy turning a handle supplied the power for about a score of spindles. India has on the one hand the primitive charka and also the wonderful spinning machinery in such factories as the Buckingham and Carnatic Mills. Is it not possible therefore that India can also find room for some intermediate type of spinning apparatus, more suitable to the special conditions of Indian life than the power factory which develops great industrial towns? I think it is impossible to visit the great textile city of Bombay without feeling that factory industry in India is subject to very great drawbacks. Recently in the Bombay Legislative Council it was stated that 90 per cent. of the population living in the mill area in Bombay are suffering from venereal disease. The quarterly health returns from Bombay show deaths sometimes twice and sometimes three times, or more than three times, as many as the births. On the other hand we have a great agricultural population in India which in normal seasons has no work to do during several months of the year, and when rains fail perhaps hardly any work for the whole year. Is it not possible that some comparatively simple type of spinning machinery, something that can be worked by the power of oxen, more or less resembling the spinning jenny, can be found to give the agricultural population a subsidiary source of income for the idle months and an emergency occupation for famine years? Even the unimproved charka, it appears, will earn about three annas a day, and this, it is said, is more than the wages for famine relief work.

I have no doubt the Minister for Development will be glad to do anything that can be done effectively for hand-spinning as well as hand-weaving if it can be made helpful to the population; and I hope he will cause investigation to be made into the possibility of making comparatively cheap and simple spinning machinery available for the villages.

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.

Can be had of:

- (1) The Manager Aryabhushan Press,
Poona City.
- (2) Servants of Society, Poona City, India.