

THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. V, No. 3.]

POONA—THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1922.

[ANNUAL SUBSN. Rs. 6

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	25
ARTICLES:—	
Congratulatory ...	28
The Habeas Corpus Bill ...	28
The Firing at Matiar ...	30
SPECIAL ARTICLES:—	
Zionism. By H. C. E. Zacharias, Ph. D. ...	31
Sir George Lloyd's Tour in Kathiawat. By D. B. Shukla, B. A., LL. B. ...	33
Civil Disobedience. By V. N. Naik, M. A. ...	34

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

WE have no doubt that the Indian Government shares to the full the feeling of devout thankfulness which the Indian public experiences at the suspension of civil resistance and all other activities of non-co-operation which brought the adherents of that policy into collision with the Government. The suspension which has been tentatively sanctioned by the Working Committee will have to be confirmed by the All-India Congress Committee who, it is expected, will approve of the Working Committee's decision and suspend the "hostile" forms of non-co-operation *sine die*. We trust that the Government will lose no time thereafter to reciprocate this action of the non-co-operation leaders by a generous gesture on their part, viz. by revoking all the orders under the Criminal Law Amendment Act, or the Seditious Meetings Act, or Section 108 and the like of the Criminal Procedure Code, and setting at liberty all the persons detained under them. It is unnecessary to add any arguments to prove the expediency of such a step, as the Government themselves had nearly agreed to do so if only to bring about a round table conference which it was hoped would make the inauguration of civil disobedience unnecessary. Now that that devoutly wished-for result has been attained though not through such a conference, we feel certain that the Government will make no difficulty in taking action which they had undertaken to do in different circumstances and thus proving to the world how quick they are to react to a generous impulse on the part of their adversary. Even apart from any question of a round table conference or suspension of civil disobedience, Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer and other leaders pressed the Government of India in the Legislative Assembly to release all prisoners who are suffering confinement as a result of

the new policy of Government (excepting those of course who have committed or incited to violence). Today the Government surely cannot do anything less when the whole of the non-co-operation movement or rather its aggressive part is, by a providential circumstance, suddenly out of the way.

* * *

A CORRESPONDENT writes from Gorakhpur:—The story of the riots and murders of policemen at Chauri

Chaura, which is sixteen miles distant from this town, is indeed a blood-curdling one. It is the most dreadful tragedy that has occurred in the U. P. in recent times. Even the Malegaon riots seem to pale before it. How the affair began is not known. The matter is being enquired into. A responsible office-bearer of the District Congress Committee told me that a look at the corpses would have been sufficient to convince anyone that the policemen had been murdered in a most brutal manner. He said it was plain to him that the men had been killed slowly—they were beaten and wounded, and then kerosine oil was poured on one part of their bodies and then on another, and set fire to. They were practically roasted to death. He was emphatic that if civil disobedience were started in Bombay Presidency, the people in U. P. also would get out of hand and commit violence. Pandit Kunzru has come here and at his request the Collector, who is behaving courteously and, if anything, restraining the excesses of the police of which I hear some complaints, has allowed the President of the Congress Committee and Pandit Chandra Kant Malaviya, elder brother of Pandit Krishna Kant Malaviya, to go to Chauri Chaura. Pandit Kunzru is also going with them."

* * *

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL who recently enunciated the policy of squeezing out the Indian settlers from Kenya thus put the case for the British Indian in his book, "My African Journey" (1908):

His rights as a human being, his rights as a British subject, are equally engaged. It was the Sikh soldier who bore an honourable part in the conquest and pacification of these East African countries. It is the Indian trader who, penetrating and maintaining himself in all sorts of places to which no white man would go or in which no white man could earn a living, has more than any one else developed the early beginnings of trade and opened up the first slender means of communication. It was by Indian labour that the one vital railway on which everything else depends was con-

structed. It is the Indian banker who supplies perhaps the larger part of the capital yet available for business and enterprise, and to whom the white settlers have not hesitated to recur for financial aid. The Indian was here long before the first British official. He may point to as many generations of useful industry on the coast and inland as the white settlers can count years of residence. Is it possible for any Government with a scrap of respect for honest dealing between man and man to embark upon a policy of deliberately squeezing out the native of India from regions in which he has established himself under every security of public faith? Most of all must we ask, is such a policy possible to the Government which bears sway over three hundred millions of our Indian Empire?

By the whirligig of time it has fallen to Mr. Winston Churchill himself to answer the very questions which he had framed possibly for his opponents. Can his Government answer them, we ask, as he has answered them and yet claim to possess even "a scrap of respect for honest dealing between man and man"?

* * *

The Unfortunate Bhil.

THE Bhils of the Dohad sub-division of the Panch Mahals district (Bombay Presidency) are passing through very bad times for the last four years. The Bhil is to be found in every stage of civilization: from the wild hunter to the orderly and hard-working peasant, and the Bhil of Panch Mahals very nearly approximates to the latter stage. The official Gazetteer describes the Bombay Presidency Bhil as "truthful and honest, but thriftless, excitable and given to drink." Though not so hard-working as the Deccan Kunbi, he is not a lazy man but works in the field as much as may be expected from his wild traditions and miserably scanty resources. Jammed in on the one hand, between a Government, which will not allow him to revert to his old life of hunting and of committing depredations and which yet exacts its land revenue collections with a rigour which will not suit his condition, and on the other hand, a sowkar, who will ever be ready to take the meanest advantage of his thriftlessness in good seasons, his honesty and his simplicity, he is truly between the devil and the deep sea. In good seasons he quite enjoys himself, but in bad seasons the Government is not willing to discriminate in his favour as between him and the better class of cultivator, and the sowkar would not lend him the money required for payment of land revenue or for his maintenance, without squeezing him or making him his serf. When the monsoon of 1918 failed, he was thrown completely on Government relief work and on private charity till the rains arrived in 1919. He lost a large number of cattle also in this period. The Government suspended his land revenue for that year, one half of which was recovered later and the other half remitted altogether. The year 1919-20 was normal, and he paid the Government revenue in full and recovered partly from the effects of the previous bad season. The year 1920-21 again proved very bad for him, and the Government had once more to suspend the year's revenue. Once more he was thrown on bare subsistence wages and charity.

The next monsoon of 1921 brought him no relief. The rainfall was unevenly distributed, holding off for over a month in the beginning and later on pouring in torrents. The main crop, maize, was almost totally destroyed by excessive rain, though he had to undergo the expenses of sowing twice.

* * *

UNDETERRED by this misfortune, the Bhils who could afford to do so, sowed rabi crops, which, it is hoped, they will reap next month, without a hitch. But the number who will profit by this extra industry is smaller than those who will have to pull through the whole year without any crop. In the meanwhile the Government issued orders for the collection of land revenue in January, and the tax-gathering talati, as is usual with him, collected both the January and March instalments in January, thus driving the poor Bhil still deeper into the toils of the sowkar. Not only this, but the talati collected, once he went out on his collecting work, the takavi loan instalment and survey charges for field partitions at the same time. More than 90 per cent. of the Bhils have had to borrow in January in order to pay the Government dues, which about half the number could have easily paid from their rabi crops in March. The other half who had no rabi crops had no resources at all, and Government ought to have suspended their dues. In any case there was not the least justification for recovering the takavi instalment and survey charges in a bad year like this. The result is that the Bhil has added to his heavy load of debt and is now crowding on private works on ridiculously low wages of two to three annas a day and anxiously awaiting the opening of relief works by Government in order that he may earn a living wage for himself and his family. His condition is so bad that many women and girls can be seen collecting grass seeds in fallow lands and subsisting on bread made therefrom for some weeks past. Why is the Bhil treated so harshly? Is it because the non-co-operating agitator is abroad or is it because the depleted provincial treasury must be filled somehow? Could not the Bhil be given two months' grace for even half his land revenue? Even a hard-hearted Bania behaves more leniently.

* * *

THERE is one aspect of the question of Imperial Services, which was discussed in the Legislative Assembly, that deserves serious attention. The revisions recently made in the pay of subordinate services have thrown an enormous burden on the treasuries of all provinces and completely put out the budgets of this year. While the increases are quite reasonable in the case of the menial and subordinate services, one may argue that the imperial and provincial services are rather too highly paid. But if it is at all desired to retain Europeans in the service, they must be paid at the market rate, which it is contended is not very much below the present rate. The only way therefore of reducing expen-

Salaries of Indians in Higher Classes.

diture is to replace Europeans by Indians and pay the latter at the Indian market rate. Thus when services are being more and more indianised, we must abandon the present standard of pay. There is no earthly reason why Indian I. C. S. men should get the present high rates of pay which were fixed for Europeans. This question was not so pressing when an Indian I. C. S. was a *rara avis*, but now that 25 per cent. of the new recruits are to be Indians immediately, and this percentage is to rise in ten years to 48—and we hope that pressure of public opinion will make it much higher—this question must be faced. In this way several lakhs can be saved in every province, though the immediate result will not be considerable, as the present incumbents will have to be kept on the present terms. When we effect an appreciable reduction in the rates of pay of the Indian members of the imperial services, we can also effect a reduction in the rates of the provincial services.

* * *

Inspection of Liquor Shops.

AMONG the recommendations recently adopted by the Excise Advisory Committee of Poona, none is perhaps so important as that which suggests that liquor shops should be subject to inspection by members of the Committee. This is a reform which has become long overdue. Its introduction has so far been delayed on the utterly untenable plea of lack of responsible men; but a Government that is admittedly out to give us responsible government at an early date cannot well stick to that plea at the present time. If Indians are considered fit to take charge of the excise portfolio, can they not be trusted to inspect liquor shops with a due sense of responsibility? Moreover if the Government is the true friend of temperance that it has so long professed itself to be, they should lose no time in giving honest effect to the Committee's recommendation. For it is an open secret that the liquor contractor respects their excise regulations more in the breach than in the observance and thus to a certain extent nullifies their intentions as to the promotion of temperance. The fear that his conduct is subject to the scrutiny of independent men beyond the reach of any undesirable influence, will place a wholesome check on his profiteering tendencies and ensure a strict observance on his part of Government instructions. We feel that the Government can delay this reform no longer without creating a suspicion about their bona-fides in the public mind. The Excise Committee's other recommendations also are worthy of their favourable consideration and we have no hesitation in giving them our cordial support. The reduction in the number of country liquor shops, their late opening and early closing, their remaining closed on gazetted public holidays and the appointment of temperance preachers as proposed by the Committee are in our opinion an effective means of promoting temperance which the Government allege to have so much at heart.

* * *

Bowing to the Popular Will.

A TYPICAL instance of how even the clearly expressed wishes of the legislature are sometimes set at naught, or, to be more precise, circumvented in actual practice has just been brought to light in the Punjab. Mr. Shah Nawaz in October last raised a debate in the Punjab Council on the question of the separation of judicial from executive functions as a result of which the appointment of a Committee was decided upon. The Committee was evidently not to go into the question of the desirability or otherwise of the proposed reform: indeed by rejecting the Government's amendment to that effect the Council gave unmistakable proof of the fact that it such a preliminary enquiry unnecessary was expected of the proposed Committee was an estimate of cost of the proposed change and the solution of the administrative difficulties in the way. The wishes of the Council were so unequivocally expressed that there could hardly be any room for doubt or misunderstanding as to its intentions. And yet we find the Government, as Mr. Nawaz rightly complains, "giving more weight to the amendment which was lost than to the resolution which was accepted!" Nor do the Government make any attempt to explain away the obvious inconsistency between their intentions and those of their legislature. For their reply says that "the Government is not always able to act in precise conformity with the resolutions passed by the Council." In other words this is a confession of their having thwarted the intentions of the legislature in the present case. This is very unfortunate. The Government need not take action in cases in which they find themselves at variance with the legislature; but when an attempt is made to carry the wishes of their legislature into effect, let them do so honestly and with a desire for fair play. Else they will only strengthen the feeling of suspicion that the Government is still carried on in the old autocratic way.

* * *

E. I. R. Strike.

THE information vouchsafed to the members of the Council of State as to the genesis of this strike was to the effect that the report of an assault on the fireman Nandlal of Tundla by his Anglo-Indian locomotive driver was devoid of any substratum of fact. Accepting this reply as no doubt literally true in this case, one cannot but feel that the general dissatisfaction expressed by the strikers as to the habitual overbearing manner of the Anglo-Indian railway staff towards their Indian fellow-employees cannot so easily be disposed of. As long as Anglo-Indians are given exceptional treatment, as long as posts are reserved to them, as long as their European superiors foster the baneful idea of their race-superiority above the "native": just so long will that general feeling of resentment continue, which has now, rightly or wrongly, crystalized over the alleged assault on fireman Nandlal.

* * *

CONGRATULATIONS !

THE news from Bardoli—that mass civil disobedience and other hostile activities of non-co-operation are to be suspended—is the best that a distracted India has had now for ever so long. We sincerely and unreservedly congratulate Mr. Gandhi on the step taken by him and the Working Committee on their endorsement of it. His enemies may mock him for it: but for ourselves we consider that in nothing does Mr. Gandhi show such true greatness as by the frankness with which he avows his own mistakes. He is being reproached for the alleged facility with which he makes these avowals. He has often been told, that it is a poor reparation after a great disaster has been brought about to say, "I am sorry, I made a mistake." Comparisons are odious: but one cannot but compare the attitude of Mr. Gandhi with that of Mr. Lloyd George, after they had both made "Himalayan" mistakes. Mr. George's "policy" reduced Ireland to complete chaos and savagery, but when he found that he had perforce to retrace his steps and reverse his policy completely—never a word did he breathe of having criminally blundered; to this day we have never yet had from him any avowal, frank or otherwise, of the huge mistake his Irish repressive policy was from start to finish. From Mr. Gandhi we have learnt to expect a more lofty attitude—simply because he is not a mere opportunist, but a man of principle; a man quite unlike Western "statesmen," in that he believes that his principles, his ideals, his religion (call it what you like), because true, are therefore also practical politics.

When therefore we now find Mr. Gandhi suspending mass civil disobedience, hitherto preached by him, "until the atmosphere is non-violent," we expect that he will now fully admit the mistake (to call it by no harsher name) he made in making himself and others believe after Bombay that this "atmosphere of non-violence" could be created within a week, or a month—or a year, for the matter of that. We trust sincerely therefore that Mr. Gandhi will have realized by this time that, in Sir Hormusji Wadya's words at the Malaviya Conference, if civil disobedience is to be practised at all, it should only be preached to individuals who are sufficiently educated to grasp the full meaning and all the bearings of it. And once Mr. Gandhi has realized this lesson of Gorakhpur, we look to him to say so unambiguously and to make, as far as he is concerned, the suspension of mass civil disobedience a permanent one.

In congratulating Mr. Gandhi and his Congress fellow-workers first, we would not imply that others deserve less congratulations. Pandit Malaviya's share in moderating Mr. Gandhi's civil disobedience enthusiasm is well known and to him and

to those striving with him to find a *via media* to peace the thanks of the country are due for their unremitting labours which have now been crowned with such splendid success. Incidentally it has proved that the best, in fact the only, way of stopping what now everybody admits was a wrong policy on Mr. Gandhi's part, was to have left him to settle it with his fellow-countrymen. Neither Prince nor Viceroy, neither repression nor bureaucracy can claim any share in the happy ending of what looked ominously like the greatest blunder of Indian history. One wonders whether this lesson will also sink in and be taken to heart by all those Englishmen who would be our friends—that to leave India to Indians is not only not to court strife, but the only method of ensuring—peace. Meanwhile, our congratulations are also offered to those Indian administrations, like those of Bombay and the Central Provinces, that during a nerve-trying time have shown the supreme wisdom of staying their hand, where their clumsier fellows have essayed the mailed fist.

Last but not least, our congratulations go out to the whole of our Motherland for having just in the nick of time been saved from a gigantic catastrophe. And more than that: India must be congratulated that at last her greatest son to-day has turned from a will-o'-the-wisp to devote once more all his energies to his great and truly germane task—of kindling the spirit of unity and quelling that of strife; of calling us all back to the ideals of plain living and high thinking; of promoting those additional opportunities for work and education, which are so dear to him; and above all, of delivering India out of the cruel bondage of vice and untouchability. In such work need we assure Mahatmaji that he will be able to count on the wholehearted co-operation and support of all men of good-will, of every party and of every race: and not least of those, who have all along been inspired along such lines by the memory of the man, whom Mr. Gandhi himself has claimed as his own Guru too—our late Mr. Gokhale.

THE HABEAS CORPUS BILL.

AFTER the tragic occurrences in the Punjab those who worked for an enlargement of the reforms, then under discussion in Parliament, were constantly asked by the more extreme section of Nationalists to put away the reforms as of no consequence and to concentrate their attention on obtaining adequate constitutional guarantees for civil liberty. "No reforms are worth anything," it was said, "so long as the elementary rights of citizenship are not publicly acknowledged by the rulers and secured from any possible invasion in an instrument of State above the ordinary law of the land, and beyond the caprice of the legislature." The Liberals confessed they had small faith in mere "Declarations

of Rights," for no statute declaratory of the fundamental rights of the subject could really afford any guarantee for their uninterrupted enjoyment unless remedies were provided for the enforcement of these rights, and since the reforms would enable Indians to provide effectual remedies in the ordinary law of the land against the infringement of any of the essential privileges of citizenship, the Liberals refused to give up the reforms but determined to work for them with greater energy, not because they were indifferent to freedom of person, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and so forth, but just because they cherished these elements of the liberty of the subject very highly. The Liberals and Nationalists were at one in thinking that steps should be taken to insure individual freedom to all, but they differed as to the best and most practicable means of insuring it. While the latter pinned their faith to the Declaration of Rights, the former argued that the rights thus secured were likely to be purely nominal—an opinion which was subsequently endorsed by Mahatma Gandhi and Lala Lajpat Rai—and that in order to convert them into effective rights, certain modifications in the ordinary law of the land were required; that if these modifications were not effected a mere recital of the constituents of public liberty would be of little practical use, and if the modifications were effected, they would prove as good securities as any other for the fundamental privileges of the subject, which would then be established in full practical efficacy. The Liberals thought that what was required was, first, the repeal of all existing laws, which were restrictive of public liberty; second, the provision of certain remedies like habeas corpus in the ordinary law designed to protect the liberties of the subject; and, third, the separation of the judicial and executive functions which would secure the independence of the judiciary. They contended that these measures would together constitute as complete a safeguard against the deprivation of civil freedom as it was possible to contrive by legal mechanism, and that the reforms would enable the Indians to a large extent to give effect to these measures.

We recollect that some exponents of reforms made bold to predict that, in their very first or second session, our reformed legislatures would afford practical evidence of their power to give legislative security to individual freedom, and though this prediction was then regarded as over-sanguine, it has in fact come true. The very first business transacted by the Indian legislature on the first day of its sitting was to appoint a Committee to inquire how far the legislature could go in repealing the repressive laws of the country. The investigations of the Committee have resulted in the recommendation, to which the Government of India have decided to give full effect, that a great majority of such laws should be abolished, and that those that were to be retained should be retained only for a short period, so long as the present abnormal conditions remained in the country. In view of the

use to which these laws have since been put, the public will perhaps demur to the reservation made by the Committee; but, whatever one may think of this decision it must be remembered that on a review of the existing conditions a Committee consisting of a majority of non-official members came to the unanimous conclusion that the repeal of certain laws should be postponed for a time, and the Government can hardly be blamed if we find one or two repressive laws still with us. While we have progressed thus far with the abrogation of repressive laws, we have also made some progress with the other two items, viz. making the remedy of habeas corpus more complete and severing the judicial from the executive functions. In respect of the latter, a Committee of the United Provinces Council has made certain recommendations and the question is being considered in some other provinces with a view to formulating practical schemes. In respect of the former, Mr. Rangachariar has brought in a Bill in the Legislative Assembly, extending the provisions of section 491 of the Criminal Procedure Code to the whole of British India. By this section in its present form the power of issuing a writ of habeas corpus is restricted, first to the three High Courts in the Presidency towns of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay, and, secondly, to cases of arbitrary detention arising within the original jurisdiction of these Courts. Mr. Rangachariar's Bill seeks to remove both these restrictions by extending power of issuing the writ of habeas corpus to all High Courts and enabling the latter to apply this remedy to cases falling within the appellate jurisdiction, also. This would bring section 491 into line with section 456 which deals with cases of wrongful confinement among European British subjects and remove the racial distinctions which exist at present. The Government of India have promised their support to the Bill and there is no doubt that it will be passed unanimously. It will effectively secure the personal liberty of Indians. The Liberals are entitled to feel a particular pride in this piece of legislation, for while the other parties were engaged in the more or less futile task of asking for a formal enunciation of the elementary rights of citizenship, the Liberals suggested practical means of safeguarding them, one of them being the perfecting of the remedy of habeas corpus. The Liberal Federation of December of 1919 and their All-India Council in June 1920 adopted a resolution to the effect that "the remedy in the nature of habeas corpus should be made available in all parts of British India."

The Home Member in the Government of India, Sir William Vincent, when speaking on this Bill, remarked: "The law (of habeas corpus) is most valuable and probably a much greater guarantee of the liberty of the subject than those principles which we frequently see enunciated at the commencement of European Constitutions." This view is supported by the highest authorities on constitutional law: *e. g.* Professor Dicey has the following: "There is no difficulty, and there is

often very little gain, in declaring the existence of a right to personal freedom. The true difficulty is to secure its enforcement. The habeas corpus Acts have achieved this end, and have therefore done for the liberty of Englishmen more than could have been achieved by any Declaration of Rights. One may even venture to say that these Acts are of really more importance not only than the general proclamations of the Rights of Man which have often been put forward in foreign countries, but even than such very lawyer-like documents as the Petition of Rights or the Bill of Rights."

FIRING AT MATIARI.

THE report of the Committee appointed by the Bombay Government to inquire into the firing that occurred at Matiari (in Sind) on July 21, 1921, with the Government's decision as to the action to be taken on the report, is now published. The Committee was appointed on August 6 and reported on September 15; the Commissioner of Sind received the report on September 17 and forwarded it to the Government on September 23 with his remarks on it. The Committee took only five weeks to conduct its investigations on the spot and the Commissioner five days to form his conclusions, but the Bombay Government sat cogitating over the matter for no less than four months and a half, and one is tempted to think that if the sitting of the Bombay Council had not drawn near, their cogitations would not have been over even now. The public of the Bombay Presidency have a legitimate grievance in that while the Commissioner could, with commendable celerity, whitewash the police of Matiari in five days' time, the Bombay Government should have taken nearly as many months for the same process, only carried out a little more clumsily. The one attempt of the Home Member of the Bombay Government in this affair seems to be to aggravate, by using exaggerated expressions, the seriousness of the situation with which the police were called upon to deal and to minimise the criminality of the action which they took. Amidst a mass of lying statements and fabricated evidence, in which the officials had a large share, the facts of the disturbance stand out quite clear. A meeting of the local Aman Sabha, not open to the public, is held at Matiari, which is a stronghold of the Khilafat agitators, to the deep chagrine of the latter. An attempt is made by them to dissuade the people who came for this meeting from attending it, and even some intimidation is used to that end. Still the Aman Sabha's meeting is held; thereupon the Khilafatists arrange a rival meeting at some distance. A number of boys come over to the meeting of the Aman Sabha, and create some disturbance by hooting and jeering and throwing sand. The Inquiry Committee, whose report signed by Mr. E. Raymond, Additional Judicial Commissioner of Sind; and Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas is a model of close reasoning and strictly impartial judgment, express the opinion that the boys' "actions were not calculated to

seriously disturb the Aman Sabha meeting." The meeting is terminated and the Amans set out to go home. They are prevented from doing so by the Khilafat workers. But on neither of these occasions is any personal injury sustained by any of the men who attended the meeting of the Aman Sabha. The latter are then given a police escort, but are again molested. Thereupon firing is ordered. Among the circumstances which, according to the Police Sub-Inspector's version, justified the firing were: (1) that there was a report of a gun fired by some one of the Khilafat party before the police fired; (2) that the majority of that party were armed with hatchets and *lathis*; and (3) that the Khilafat leaders, who are named, incited the crowd to beat and kill the police. The Committee show conclusively that there is not a shred of evidence, which can be relied upon as credible, to support either of these three statements. The Commissioner, significantly enough, passes over all of them in complete silence. The Government accept the Committee's conclusion with regard to (1) and (2), and with regard to (3) they say, "Incitements there must have been, though it is not possible to ascribe them to any particular individuals." If the Government follow the Committee in rejecting these grounds as supplying any justification for the firing, they cannot but accept the Committee's finding that "the subordinate police officials at Matiari so worked up the police case as to picture a most desperate situation leaving the police no alternative but to fire on the mob." The Sub-Inspector himself is implicated in this business and yet the Government resolution has not a word to say about the conduct of the police officials whom the Committee have convicted of tampering with evidence. The only reasons which could be held to have provoked the firing were that the Khilafat crowd persisted in preventing the Aman Sabha people from going to their houses, that in offering resistance to the police, they threw stones or clods at them (though the Committee adduce conclusive grounds to prove that these missiles could not have been many), and that one of such stones struck the Sub-Inspector, upon which the latter official, being enraged, directed the firing. The Committee's unanimous conclusion is that these grounds could not justify firing, when it is clear that there was no danger to the lives of the police or the banias, against whom the hostile activities of the Khilafat crowd were directed. The Government contend that the excited state of the crowd and the violence committed by them in the shape of throwing stones are sufficient grounds of justification; how flimsy they are will be clear to all those who read the Committee's report. The Committee further say that "admittedly no warning was given to the crowd; the Sub-Inspector was specifically asked as to whether he warned the crowd and he said he did not," and yet the Government resolution has the hardihood to claim that the Sub-Inspector's remonstrance that the crowd should make way for the Aman Sabha people amounted to a warning as

required by law before opening fire! It is explicitly laid down in the Police Manual that the warning must be in the clearest terms, to the effect that force will be used if the crowd does not disperse, and notwithstanding this, and notwithstanding the fact that the Sub-Inspector did not care to fortify himself with the sanction of a magistrate, although one was available just about 100 paces from the scene of disturbance, the Government completely exculpate him on this crucial point. The firing that took place is said to have been in the air. If so, it is in contravention of a rule in the Police Manual. If the Sub-Inspector ordered it, he would be in fault. As a matter of fact he himself admitted that he had ordered it, for the Committee say, "According to Fateh Mohamed and the Sub-Inspector, the latter directed him to fire in the air." Still the Commissioner must save the Sub-Inspector in spite of himself, and he attempts to do so by saying that "he (the Sub-Inspector) probably did not order the firing to be in the air"!! It appears, however, in evidence that all the firing was not in the air, but that some of it was "the result of a deliberate aim." "Indeed, the Deputy Police Superintendent was constrained to admit that on some occasions the gun must have been fired by Fateh Mohamed either recklessly or deliberately," and medical evidence shows that the wounds that were caused could not be due to "accidental or stray shots" but must have been due to shots deliberately aimed. Yet this conclusion is rejected by the Commissioner and the Government, who put forward a hypothesis which we would not insult the intelligence of our readers by quoting here. The curious may turn to para. 7 of the Commissioner's note. The Committee's conclusion that the firing was kept up much too long, entailing unnecessary injury, the Government is forced to accept, but it is only "a serious error of judgement" and no more. The Commissioner rightly observes that if the findings of the Committee are accepted as correct, the only action that would be appropriate on the part of Government is to put the police officers on their trial in a court of law. But the Government do not accept the findings as correct; they hold that the evidence adduced by the Committee is insufficient not only to obtain a conviction of the officials, but even to constitute a *prima facie* case against them!! If the Government is always to shield their subordinate officers so that the unanimous conclusions of a Committee appointed by them and possessing such legal acumen and freedom from bias as the Committee show in this instance are to be rejected as not even fit to found a prosecution upon, what is the use of the appointment of any Committee at all? The people of the Presidency expressed much disappointment when they failed to get an investigation instituted into the Dharwar firing, which by the way was as unjustified as this firing in Matiari, but after the experience they have had they will be compelled to revise their notion of the value of an Inquiry Committee. The only remedy that seems open to the people of Matiari is

themselves to ask for the Governor's sanction for a prosecution. If, after such an emphatic finding of the Government's own Committee, the sanction is not given, it will mean that in India obtains that administrative law which is in force on the continent of Europe and upon the absence of which England prides herself so much.

ZIONISM.

LAST week's cables informed the Indian public that a constitution foreshadowing self-government was about to be granted to Palestine and not a few papers took this opportunity of regaling yet once more their readers to the usual attack on the folly of Zionism and the wickedness of the policy of turning Palestine into a National Home of Jewry. One feels, what with the anti-Semitism of average Anglo-Indians and with the Moslem clamour for Palestine as essentially Moslem Holy Ground, that an Indian public has little opportunity of ever knowing the other aspect of the question: all of which may perhaps be sufficient reason for allowing me to-day to present the other side.

Let me, as a start, accept the figures usually given viz. that the present population of Palestine consists of six lakhs of people, of whom 10% are Jewish, 10% Christian and 80% Moslem. But in accepting these figures, I must add that if six lakhs is the actual, six millions is the potential population of the country. In former times Palestine did actually carry that number of people and all experts are agreed that it could once more do so. All that is needed, is intensive agriculture, cottage industries and the scientific exploitation of all the natural resources of the land by way of hydro-electric installations, afforestation, drainage, irrigation systems &c. Under Turkish rule, of course, the whole fair land became derelict, depopulated and exploited for the sole benefit of the effendi class who as large zamindars cared nothing for the interests of the people and in their happy-go-lucky style were ready at all times to sacrifice future enhanced returns rather than apply the revenues of the present to improving the capital value of their properties. The ruins of beautiful and flourishing cities of Roman times cover the land still: silent and yet eloquent witnesses to the density of population and high culture which Palestine enjoyed during the first centuries of the Christian era. The water supply of Jerusalem is a good illustration: up to the time of the English occupation the only aqueduct supplying the capital with spring water was one dating from classic times, and even that supply had been allowed to decay. The Arabs that overran Palestine and overwhelmed the Byzantine civilization there were sons of the desert, nomads who cared nothing for settlements and were only looking for pastures and for loot. From that invasion onward Palestine has declined down the road to ruin, depopulation and desolation, and it is perhaps only fair to the Turks to say that they merely accelerated and sealed a doom which began centuries before.

This doom however is not irreversible. The damage done during centuries of misrule and no-rule can be repaired. All over Palestine there are colonies, Jewish colonies, founded since the middle of the last century, which prove what modern enterprise, capital and science could make of the whole country. No visitor to these colonies but has been struck by the extraordinary contrast between these thriving, smiling settlements and the decay and semi-desolation of the countryside everywhere else. And these colonies were founded, not on picked land, but necessarily on land, which was least valued by its former owners, even if it had any owners at all. The modern Jewish colonies therefore prove that the resettlement of Palestine is not a Zionist chimera, but that such methods, if universally applied to all waste and underdeveloped land, would guarantee the economic feasibility of bringing the population of Palestine once more to its pristine level of millions, where to-day a few lakhs only carry on a precarious existence.

The point of Zionism therefore is that since Palestine can carry a population of several million inhabitants, the Jews of the world should be allowed to supply these numbers. And it is not, as if in this would-be immigration the Jews were competing with any other people, eager to settle in and colonize Palestine. Nobody else wants to go there and to spend very hard work and very much capital on bringing back the old productivity of Palestine, when with less work and money he can get ever so much greater returns from the rich virgin soil of Canada, of the Argentine, of Australia.

Why then does the Jew, and the Jew only, want to go to Palestine and settle in this at present so little hospitable land? Undoubtedly and primarily for sentimental reasons—because, although for 2000 years no longer actually in his occupation, the Jew has never yet ceased to regard that little strip of land as his by ancient and in defeasible right, to be again his by unquenchable hope and indomitable faith. That is, why he and he alone is prepared to sink in that country all his fortunes, to water it with the sweat of his brow, to fertilize it with brain and muscle, if only he can thereby bring back the glories of his ancient patrimony and leave it as a sure inheritance to his children and his children's children.

Let me add, however, that, powerful as this sentimental reason is: standing by itself, it would not suffice to make Zionism practical politics. If Jews were uniformly well treated, if everywhere they were accepted, legally and socially, as the equals of the people among whom they lived: if even they were only everywhere tolerated, as the rich and successful amongst them are to-day put up with in England, in America, in France even, and in Germany: I for one have little doubt that the sentimental appeal of Palestine would not avail to lure them, any more than it has power to-day to lure out of their Wall Streets and Bayswater Roads, their Bourses and Tiergarten Viertels, the

comfortably off of Hebrew race who are quite satisfied to remain where they are and to keep Palestine as a pious memory and nothing more. It is this class which the Western non-Jew always visualizes, when he talks of Jews—he thinks of the Rothschilds and Sassoons, of the Samuels and the Montagues. He never considers that the bulk of Jewry is not merely poor, but abjectly so; that in those countries where Jews are to be found *en masse*, in Poland, in Ukraina, in Rumania, they are people without rights, outside the pale of citizenship, herded together in ghettos, never safe against some sudden outburst of mob frenzy which will invade their slums to pillage and burn, to kill and rape.

That is the condition of existence of these wretched Jews of Eastern Europe and it is this solid fact which has turned Zionism from a sentimental hobby into the only practical politics of what is to be done with the millions who are neither wanted by the country of their birth nor anywhere else welcomed as immigrants. The proverbial generosity of their wealthy co-religionists, though they do not themselves wish to stir from their homes of ease, will provide these outcasts of Eastern Europe with all the necessary funds to start them on colonies of their own in Palestine and they on their part of course are only too glad to return to the Holy Land of their forefathers, to a land which is to be again a true home for them, as no other country ever can. Here then we have the five million surplus population which Palestine under wise and loving management could carry; here we have got the reason why Palestine should find room for them; here also we have the answer to those who sneer that the Jews don't want to go to barren Palestine when they can batten on the Gentile world. Out of a total of 15 million Jews in the world to-day it is not even possible that more than a third should go to settle in Palestine: but is that a reason why one Jew in three should not be allowed to go back to the ancient homeland of his, if he is anxious to do so?

When therefore writers and their readers wax indignant at the impertinence of the 75,000 Jews actually in Palestine wanting to lord it over the 500,000 Moslems and 75,000 Christians also living there; they are waxing indignant at a man of straw set up by themselves. Zionists do not want to 'lord it' in Palestine to-day; Zionists believe whole-heartedly in the democratic rule of the majority; Zionists are anxious to safeguard in every possible way the rights of the present non-Jewish population of Palestine. But they do claim that the present population should not be given the power of closing the door to all further Jewish immigration; they claim that as the country can absorb them, Jewish immigrants should have a right of entry; they claim that the present majority has no title to remain a majority by a dog-in-the-manger policy of keeping out prospective immigrants who, in time, would turn their majority into a minority.

This is what Zionists claim and in doing so they recall the solemn pledge which the British Government gave during the war to all Jewry, guaranteeing that Palestine should become henceforth the potential Home Country of all those Jews, as desired to make it such for themselves.

Why should this solemn pledge be broken?

The Moslems, we are told, resent the idea of a Zionist Palestine as they claim the country for themselves on religious grounds. I appeal to the reason, to every generous and chivalrous sentiment of my Moslem friends, whether it is not possible to safeguard every single religious scruple of theirs by confirming them for ever in their holy places, the Mosque of Omar at Jerusalem, the tomb of Moses at Hebron, and all the others, safeguarding them, I say, if necessary by extra-territorializing such places: without their claiming for themselves the whole of this little country, mostly lying fallow as it is, when they have got the whole Muslim world open to them, from Morocco to Peking and from Kabul to Zanzibar. What right is this that they claim for their religion in Palestine, which a more ancient religion does not give to the Christians, and a religion, more ancient still, to the Jews? If they base their right on military conquest, how can they deny that right to the English? Why covet this tiny Naboth's vineyard? The Arab delegation now in London is astutely playing on the avowed anti-Semitism of certain people who are prominent in Government, in Parliament, in the press: but the interests they wish to safeguard, are not the interests of Islam, nor even the interests of the common people of Palestine, though fellow Arab. It is their own privileges they wish to safeguard, their own ascendancy over a peasantry, whose economic and political awakening under the stimulus of Zionist immigrants it is, that they really and truly are concerned about.

Similarly with the opposition of the Christians, especially of the Roman Catholic Church. No Zionist but is glad to have their rights to all that is 'Holy Land' to them guaranteed and safeguarded in every possible way. After all, Palestine is only a mandated country and the Christian and Moslem Powers in the League of Nations will always be able to ensure strict observance of all such guarantees—even if it was possible to conceive such folly on the part of a Zionist administration, as the meddling with the religious susceptibilities of Moslems and Christians in Palestine would be. After all, Palestine is the Holy Land of all the three great religions which took their rise amongst Semitic races; it is a land of pilgrims and tourists whom to attract, not to offend, is of the most obvious interest to all people who have made Palestine their home. Again, there is the misconception, as if Zionism was a religious movement: it is so only incidentally; primarily it is a national, a racial movement and amongst its leaders are men of no religion as well as men who happen to be orthodox Jews. It is therefore a fallacy to look for religious antagonism on their part against Moslems or Christ-

ians; Zionists claim Palestine as a homeland, a haven of refuge, not for a Faith, but for a race.

At present about 10,000 new immigrants per annum are admitted in Palestine: which means that at this rate it will take 50 years, before the majority of non-Jews is turned into a minority; and even if the present rate of immigration was increased five-fold, it would take a century to fill up the country. What then is this "danger", this dreadful immediate peril which menaces the whole of the Moslem World and the whole of Christendom to boot?

Is it not really time, that all men of good will, all sober and right-thinking people, should make a stand against this mischievous propaganda which is trying to befog an eminently simple, clear and straightforward issue, and that they should help the just cause of a little nation, whose standing reproach hitherto has been that they were homeless, but unto whom it is now counted as a new crime that they should desire to return—home?

H. C. E. ZACHARIAS.

SIR GEORGE LLOYD'S TOUR IN KATHIAWAR.

To put it plainly, His Excellency the Governor's tour in Kathiawar has been disappointing. His Excellency had no word to say which would improve the lot of the people living in Indian States or cheer them in their endeavour to mitigate the rigours of autocratic rule and he authorised in the very area, which is directly administered by his Government, arbitrary arrest, imprisonment and extenuation of two "agitators" which were not sanctioned by any Law in existence and which were merely the outcome of the executive will. His speech at the Banquet given to him by the Princes and Chief of Kathiawar was remarkable for the preference he showed to the autocratic form of Government. Of course, what he preferred was benevolent autocracy, which he was prepared to uphold in the States, "for" as he said, "autocracy in East can show some excellent Government and of a kind and character moreover that the people can often understand better than that which we give them". In his opinion this benevolent and good autocracy was the rule in the States, but he acknowledged that "unfortunately, very occasionally, not very often I am glad to say, we do find autocracies that are not benevolent" and then he gave his views as to how the Paramount Power should deal with these bad autocracies. All that one can say is that it is very regrettable that His Excellency should be so misinformed about the character of the autocracies in the States and about the people's feelings in regard to them. Does he know or realise what this autocratic rule means to the people? Has he consulted any one of the people who daily taste of this rule? Has he noticed its consequences, not in the very occasional instances he acknowledged as being bad autocracies but in the others which he takes to be good? It is to be hoped that His Excellency will mention only two or three which he regards, *par excellence*, as benevolent autocracies and state in what respects they are superior to Governments where people's voice is heard and has weight. Does he know that with solitary exceptions here and there, autocracy means intrigue, oppression, absence of law and justice, either waste or hoarding of ryot's money?

slavishness of the people or their object submission. It is surprising that so shrewd and capable a statesman as Sir George Lloyd should in this third decade of the 20th century subscribe to the cant that the East can only appreciate a benevolent autocracy and is not fit for popular government. One does not like to read more into the speech than appears on the surface. But the speech was unfortunately so constructed that it tended to confirm the suspicion which had already entered the minds of a large number of thinking men that the present policy of the British Government was to use the Indian Rulers to suppress all legitimate aspirations of the people, subject to their rule, and to arm them with means to do so in the shape of the new organization of State forces, which are to be well equipped and trained and which can be used by the States to put down internal commotion and can be lent to the British Government also for a similar purpose. Happiness, security, prosperity, and advancement of the people in Indian States cannot be brought about by lopping off one or two extremely bad cases of autocratic rule, as His Excellency thinks. They can be achieved only by effecting radical changes in the present form of Native States rule and by making the ruler himself respect and act according to law and spend his people's money for their benefit according to their choice and not his own.

It would be preposterous to suppose that the arrest, imprisonment and externment of Messrs. Mansukhlal Mehta and Manilal Kothari were intended as specimens of "good autocracy". But coming as they did about the same time as His Excellency's speech, in which he propounded the virtues of benevolent autocracy, they are sure to be adopted by the rulers as an example to follow. It goes without saying that none of these acts have their sanction in any law in force in the Kathiawar Political Agency, but are purely and frankly an arbitrary exercise of power. It is not necessary to examine the nature of the agitation for which action was taken against these two "agitators". If they had committed any offence, they should have been proceeded with according to law. It is no exaggeration to say that these illegal acts of the executive have profoundly stirred the minds of people and that everywhere there is a feeling of despondency and sullen resentment. If Government in their Political Agencies can behave as if they were above law, no public worker, who is not subservient to or fails to keep himself in the good graces of the authorities, would be safe outside the limits of British India. He can at any time be deprived of his liberty, his home and his means of livelihood by a stroke of the executive pen. The condition of the Province is bad enough, but with such a terror hanging over people even in British-administered area, they must bid good bye to all hopes of progress as it would be impossible to achieve any progress without healthy agitation and ventilation of the people's legitimate aspirations.

The other features of His Excellency's tour, which are most discussed are the vast expenditure incurred by the States on spectacular displays and the unctuous self-laudation with which the Princes entertained His Excellency almost everywhere. As to the first, Kathiawar has always been noted for its open-handed hospitality. It is not therefore surprising that His Excellency was sumptuously entertained wherever he went and that the Rulers vied with each other in putting forth best show. No doubt there was, as was to be expected in these days of popular awakening, agitation against

the expenditure of lacs of rupees derived from the people's toil; but in Kathiawar the agitator is regarded as a pestilential nuisance and it appears to be a point of honour with almost every one of our Rulers to persist in the course which the agitator has denounced. The self-laudation hurt no one. It was only characteristic. One need not fear that it was all taken literally, but all the same it forms good reading. It can hardly be taken as a text to support His Excellency's fond idea that in Kathiawar, which boasts of numerous large and petty States, there was to be found that rare thing in the history of the world—a really benevolent autocracy, not in one or two or three States, but in almost every one of them barring very occasional lapses.

D. B. SHUKLA.

Rajkot.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE.

(FROM THE STANDPOINT OF METHOD.)

EACH one of us, whatever his views on social, political or religious questions, seems, in these days, to be dissatisfied with things as they are. We are not satisfied with our religion; we would materially alter our social arrangements; our industrial and economic life also needs overhauling. And in politics, which constitutes, for the time being, the most burning topic of them all we desire each one of us, nothing short of the fullest devolution of responsibility and power—which we term *swaraj*.

It is but natural that this general discontent and awakening should breed in us the spirit of importance. So long as we do not perceive things, we all behave as if we were so many Rip Van Winkles. But when our eyes open and we begin to rub them, the change comes like a shock—like an electric shock that throws us off our balance.

Impatience is an indication of earnestness. But mere impatience will take us nowhere. Nay, worse, when it assumes the dimensions of mass impatience, it may lead the country, if it is not controlled by knowledge, insight and a practical grasp of affairs, into sure disaster.

We realize this, pretty correctly, in social and religious discipline. The innate conservatism of human nature is always prone to strengthen our defences against sudden onslaught. A non-conformist in religious and social reform is, not infrequently, a solitary individual. And in the beginning he often passes for an eccentric. Society is always on its guard against sudden encroachments and rapid marches. The non-conformist, who first passes for an eccentric, if he is able to keep his personal life above reproach and suspicion, gradually begins to influence the community. Like a stone thrown in the centre of a stream of water, in growing circles, his influence penetrates all over the field. And thus, slowly a change comes over men's views and opinions. The lump is being gradually leavened. And, in a generation, the non-conformist is adopted and canonized as a reformer and remembered as an asset. People imitate him, unconsciously imbibe his tone, discuss and adopt his phrases. And the change passes into a settled mood of the society.

In religious and social matters, again, at least so far as modern times are concerned, we are far away from the era of persecution, tyranny and martyrdom. Among many other reasons that may account for it, one sure reason is that the State, which is an emblem of power, has long ceased to be a theocracy, as it was in the days of the Jews.

or, in post-Constantine Roman period, or, in some period of the Holy Roman Empire. Perhaps in India, though we have no adequate data to speak with a certainty, such a persecution never was, if we except from our purview the Mahomedan period of Indian history. Hindu India was tolerant of all faiths, and, of all phases of the same faith, from downright atheism and materialism, on the one hand, to pantheism and polytheism on the other. And even in polytheism how many forms has it not adopted as its very own? We are not discussing here the wisdom and unwisdom of it. But we are stating a fact. Of social persecution we have our own tale to add to the world's history, to fall into line with other members of the human family.

But social and religious non-conformity has never assumed the proportion of a great mass movement. And where it has done so, as in the history of Christianity and Islam as church militant, it has not failed to work havoc among mankind. The Christians were persecuted by their opponents in its early history. And in later times, throughout periods known as the Dark Ages, it has not spared heretics or schism. Readers of Kingsley's "Hypatia" get some idea, apart from the narrative of accredited historians, of the kind of mood and temper, of the fanaticism of the early Christians when they found power in their hands to do as they liked. Islam has its own tale to tell. And we need not dilate upon its methods of conversion. Civil Disobedience, therefore, as a term applied to social and religious non-conformity, is a misnomer. Every word has its history, its pedigree and its inseparable accidents. And it is not wise to translate it into spheres where its meaning and application are not so clear. If, at all, we are tempted to adopt that term, we must at once make it clear that it was never beyond and above an individual protest, an individual rule of conduct. Non-conformity is the proper word for it. These registers of social and religious discipline loom in history as shining and lofty peaks of a vast, irregular range. The stake that burns the martyr or the rack that tortures the heretic may make the cause speed forward. But who knows? A sage like Goethe has expressed deepest doubts in that matter. When we give off-hand decisions, we do not pause to think how much must have been really lost to humanity, because of these extreme methods both on the part of the would-be reformer and his persecutor!

But personal example as contrasted with the organized activity of a mass is altogether different. It has to be judged by different tests and standards. Let us not be misunderstood. We do not mean anything like a difference in moral evaluation of a private and a public act. Far from it. Looking to its results, what may do positive harm in the mass, works only as a necessary irritant and solvent through the force of personal example.

A social and a religious reformer is indeed a revolutionary. But the conservative instincts of society are too powerful to succumb under him. But a political revolutionary, because of the difference of methods, is a serious menace. And therefore the parallelism does not work accurately. The confusion in social and religious life and discipline comes home to every individual in so swift and telling a manner that the community and society offer a strong and effective resistance to it, of their own initiative. The social impulse works here like reflex action in the human body. Society subjects every new opinion and every non-conforming act on the part of the individual to a very acid test. It is literally "like the halter round the neck

of the Roman Senator." And by the time the test has been passed, the opinion and the change are either wholly adopted, rejected or modified to suit the mould. The line of least resistance, perforce, operates as a law of change in these matters, though it may not be adopted and cannot be justified as a motto of individual initiative and conduct.

Such is not always the fruit of impatience in political agitation. The infection catches more rapidly. Precisely because every one does not and cannot realize how *he* is affected by the change; at least, to the vital extent that social and religious opinion affects him. Therefore the mass mind cannot visualize the danger correctly. In politics the effects of the change on personal life are so indirect as to be considered as almost nil. Every one believes that the changes proposed are at the expense of an organization alien to himself. We realize the organic unity of our individual lives with the body-politic, as we realize the dependance of our lives on the atmosphere we breathe in, only when and after something cataclysmic has happened. And as cataclysm leads to dissolution, the danger is still better realized. But then, as is often discovered, things may have gone too far. That is why what is permissible as a method in social and religious reform is not permissible in politics. And therefore the political machinery that covers and protects and moves all other wheels within it has to be hauled and repaired and set up with the utmost care and caution.

In social and religious matters society protects itself. In political matters society has to be protected against itself by those who know the danger, have studied the chart and compass, and have done good steering amidst shoals and eddies and currents of divergent waters, and, in different longitudes and latitudes. The mariner must be a man of experience. In social and religious matters heroism of an uncompromising character has its great moral value. A hero lifts up the vision, and, reveals sunny landscapes that brace up the straggler and the wobbler. But in politics, uncompromising heroism, however much it may appeal to the dramatic instinct in man, is entirely out of place, except for the rôle of creating a moral force. And that heroism must have nothing of the adventurer in it. It must be free from and above the shifts of a mere agitator, or "an embodied theory." It must be like the heroism of Abraham Lincoln in American politics, who knew how to wait, when to wait, where to yield and how to strike. Martin Luther and Savonarola were great religious reformers. But though Martin Luther wrote on politics, he never took upon himself the responsibility of working out the political regeneration of his countrymen by direct method. He knew the danger and also knew the limitations of his genius and power so far as *that* field of activity was concerned.

Politics is, in a sense, the most superficial of all human activities. But in another and a more important sense it is the most vital and difficult of all human activities. The skin of the human body may not seem so important, after all, as the vital organs of the human system. All the same, you cannot flay a man alive without doing him to death by that process. So also with politics. It embraces the interests of by far the largest number in a society, and, regulates and adjusts them to perfection. Therefore the changes in political institutions are necessarily tardy and slow, even as skin diseases are very slow to cure and have to be cured not by drastic applications but by indirect treatment.

The difference between politics and other reforming activities is lost sight of by those who discuss them in an abstract manner, and apply the same test and standard to appraise the wisdom or otherwise of methods that are like swift surgical operations. We cannot conclude these stray observations better than by quoting the following remarks of Bertrand Russell which sum up the essence of the argument sought to be developed here: "Those who have the happiness of the world at heart will shrink from attitudes and the facile hysteria of 'no parley with the enemy.' They will not embark upon enterprises, however arduous and austere, which are likely to involve the martyrdom of their country and the discrediting of their ideals. It is by slower and less showy methods that the world must be built, by a prolonged and devoted propaganda of ideas rather than tactics. To find fault with those who urge these considerations, or to accuse them of faint-heartedness is mere sentimental self-indulgence *sacrificing the good we can do to the satisfaction of our emotions.*"

Comment is superfluous. Let each one look about with this lamp of knowledge to discover the lurking danger.

V. N. NAIK.

JUST OUT

NEW NOVEL. By G. M. Reynolds.
THE MEMOIRS OF AN ACTRESS

IN 8 VOLS.

Highly interesting from top to finish. Very thrilling and amusing and pathetic. The best masterpiece.

Price Rs. 5-8 Postage free.

Apply to:—**MORTON & Co.**
Park Town Madras, E. C.

DAWN of MODERN FINANCE in INDIA.

A critical Review of Indian Finance in the early stages of its evolution and an Exposition of the present Financial Position in relation to recent developments. A helpful guide to a study of Indian Finance.

PRICE Rs. 2, Postage extra.

This book can be had of:—

ALL BOOKSELLERS
and

ARYABHUSHAN PRESS, POONA CITY.

READY BOOK-KEEPING & SHORT-HAND BOOKS

With Complete Explanations and hints within Rs. 10 only. Helpful to Students to learn the same without the aid of a Teacher at home. Apply to:
THE TYPISTS AND COMMERCIAL-TUTORS
Baroda, 25.

DON'T SUFFER WITH NEURALGIA.

DR. V. G. S. MEDICATED SNUFF

Cures all diseases of the brain, eyes, Catarrh, nose troubles and all disorders of the brains. Prepared from pure selected tobaccos and highly scented. Used all over India.

1 bot. 4 as. 12 bots. Rs. 2-8

AGENT—MORTON & Co.,
Ratan Bazar, Madras E. C.

The "CITIZEN"

AN ENGLISH WEEKLY,
PUBLISHED IN MADRAS.

Subscription :

Annual Rs. 5. Half-Yearly Rs. 3.

For Rates of Advertisement

Apply to:—THE MANAGER,

THE "CITIZEN,"
Royapettah MADRAS, S. W.

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 G. SSI 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. NAIK.

Price Re. One.

Please order your requirements at once from:—

THE ARYABHUSHAN PRESS,
POONA CITY.

THE Servants of India Society's PAMPHLETS.

1. Self-Government for India under the British Flag— 0-8-
by the Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, President,
Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. pp. 91.
2. The Public Services in India— 0-10-
by Mr. Hirday Nath Kunzru, Senior Member,
Upper India Branch, Servants of India Society.
Crown 16 mo. pp. 175.
3. The Congress-League Scheme: An exposition— 0-6-
by the Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri. Crown 16
mo. pp. 66.
4. The Co-operative Movement— 1-0-
by Mr. V. Venkatasubbaiya, member, Servants of
India Society and Mr. V. L. Metha, Manager,
Bombay Central Co-operative Bank Ltd. Bombay.
Crown 16 mo. pp. 191.
5. The Medical Services in India— 0-8-
by an I. M. S. Officer. Crown 16 mo. pp. 58.
6. Trade Union Legislation— 0-4-
by A Labour Advocate. Crown 16 mo. pp. 32.

1. Arya-Bhushan School Dictionary— 3-0-
Marathi-English. by S. G. Vaze, Esq. B. A. Demi
8 vo. pp. 600. Cloth Bound.
2. Life of G. K. Gokhale— 0-4-
by Hon. Mr. R. P. Paranjpye. With nine fine illus-
trations and facsimile of the dead patriot's hand-
writing. (4th edition). Crown 16 mo. pp. 88.
3. Life of Prof. D. K. Karve— 0-4-
The Great Social Reformer, by the Hon. Mr. R. P.
Paranjpye. Crown 16 mo. pp. 72.
4. Native States and Post-War Reforms— 1-0-
by Mr. G. R. Abhyankar, B. A., LL. B., Sangli State.
Crown 16 mo. pp. 96.
5. A Ghat of Gita-Rahasya— 0-8-
(2nd edition, reprint) by Mr. V. M. Joshi, M. A.,
(N. B.—The above prices do not include postage, which
will be extra.)