

THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. V, No. 10.]

POONA—THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 1922.

{ INLAND SUBSK. RS. 6.
{ FOREIGN SUBSK. S. 8.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	109
ARTICLES :—	
Justice or Opportunism? By H. C. E. Zacharias, Ph. D.	111
Insurance Money and Women's Property. By N. V. Bhonde, B. A., LL. B.	112
Non-Brahmans and Sadra Law. By R. M. Desh- mukh, M. L. C.	113
A LETTER FROM LONDON	116
REVIEWS	118
SELECTION :—	
"The Constructive Programme"	119

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

THE Right Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa
Our President. Sastri arrived in Poona late on
Friday night at the headquarters of
the Servants of India Society and after spending
here four crowded days, left again yesterday
morning. On Saturday he had a welcome meet-
ing and subsequent complimentary dinner at the
Deccan Sabha; on Monday there was a pleasant
function at the Arya Bhushan Press and later at
night the Society entertained some of its friends
at dinner; on Tuesday a brilliant "At Home" at
Mr. B. S. Kamat's was followed by a lecture given
at the Deccan Sabha. In addition, Mr. Sastri
spoke to his friends at the Society on three
afternoons on his impressions in London,
Geneva and Washington—and all these activities
were of course interlarded with Council meetings
and others of the Society, interviews, informal talks,
&c. &c. If it is possible amongst the multifarious
questions broached to find a key note, it surely is
that of the inter-relation between India and the
World Outside; and if one conviction above all
others was formed as the days passed, it was that
India will never come into her own until she
pulls her full weight in the Empire and in the
world; until the other Dominions and the other
Nations realize, what great contribution India
can and does actually make in the councils of the
Empire and of the world. A country that in these
days, when the whole world is one, refuses to take
an interest in anything outside domestic politics,
which refuses to take a hand in anything but pa-
rochial problems, thereby merely confirms the
prevalent prejudice against "coloured" people as
constitutionally incapable of ranking as equals
amongst equals in the comity of Nations. The

status of Indians abroad and the status of India
in the world depends in the last instance on our
motherland taking such share in the affairs of the
world, as to entitle her to a status which she will
thereby already have earned in the estimation of
all the great men of the Great World Outside.

* * *

HOW little the non-co-operators be-
lieve in the Bardoli programme is
best shown by the extracts which we
have made elsewhere from the comments of a Na-
tionalist paper of Poona on that programme. The
comments are crude and jejune, but accurately re-
flect the real mind of Maharashtra—Nationalist
Maharashtra. From Bengal the same cry is heard.
In an article entitled "The collapse of Non-co-
operation" ("the non-co-operation movement of Ma-
hatma Gandhi is definitely dead and awaits only to
be decently buried") Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal says:

"The Bardoli programme is said to be a constructive
programme. But a mere glance at it shows that it is
only an attempt to get out of an ugly hole without con-
fessing the ugly errors that drove them (the non-co-op-
erators) into it." "It is said that the feeling among the
general body of imprisoned leaders is that Mr. Gandhi's
programme of Non-Co-operation has been tried and has
failed, and if the political life of the country is to be saved
from complete collapse, there must be a thorough recasting
of the entire programme.... No body has any faith in
it (the Bardoli scheme)."

The fact is that the Nationalists have not only no
faith in the project of work sketched out at Bardoli
(it is "too tame to evoke fresh enthusiasm or even
to keep up the old enthusiasm of the people"), but
they have no faith in the very creed of the Congress
—Non-Violence. The Deccan Nationalists have
of course their antipodal differences with Mr. Gan-
dhi on the question of Non-Violence, which are
well laid bare in the criticisms of the Poona paper,
and Mr. Pal emphatically seconds these anti-Non-
Violence sentiments thus:

There is no essential virtue in non-violence, any more
than there is any essential sin in violence. The virtue or
the sin in either is determined by the motive and mentality
of the man.

* * *

"Anti-Waste" is a psychosis just as
any other, and people get carried
away by Retrenchment as by
any other fanaticism. The mania, after
raging devastatingly in England, has now
reached India, and in their general congratula-
tions on the various "cuts" carried in Imperial and
Provincial legislatures, people seem to have lost
all sense of the principles underlying economy.

Reducing Expendi-
ture or Reducing
Efficiency.

The *New Statesman* of March 4th has some wise things to say on that score. "The difference between waste and true economy", a writer there lucidly points out, "is not the difference between expenditure and no expenditure, but the difference between expenditure that is unproductive and expenditure that is productive. For example, the doles paid to the unemployed represent pure waste. It would be far more economical to pay unemployed builders 60s. a week to build houses, than to pay them 30s. a week for doing nothing." He then goes on to say :

Our only real national wealth is our productive capacity. In the last analysis everything that increases that capacity and its product is economy, and everything that decreases it is waste. You may reduce the apparent national expenditure by throwing new burdens on the local authorities, or by making parents pay educational fees, or by stopping public works and throwing the workmen on the poor law; but such measures amount to no more than a manipulation of book entries; they do not add a penny to the national wealth and therefore they are not economies. If Labour had its way, national expenditure would be increased, but the national wealth would be increased still more.

This cannot be too often repeated. To make curtailment of expenditure an end in itself, a fetish, would be one of the greatest national misfortunes. Expenditure must not be confused with waste. To stop the medical inspection of Bombay school children is not economy; for to economize in the health of the rising generation, is a most blatant form of national waste. The opposite of Waste is Efficiency and to expect anything good from shouting indiscriminately "Cut it down anyhow," as if it were a magic mantram, is, however understandable, decidedly not statesmanship.

Abolition of
Divisional
Commissioners.

AS in other provinces, the C. P. Council also has been hammering away at the posts of Divisional Commissioners with a view to their abolition. The Finance Member of the Provincial Government in the session of August last entered a powerful plea for the retention of these intermediate officers, using arguments some of which are special and others, if admitted to be valid, will be found to be of wider application. Speaking generally, the retention of Commissioners is urged on the ground that they are the co-ordinating and supervising authorities, the proper discharge of whose functions often results in considerable economies in schemes of expenditure pressed on Government by the local officials, under the compelling stress of local circumstances. These are plausible arguments no doubt, but there are other local agencies now available which can act as a check on local propensities to extravagance. The important point to know, however, is that in the Central Provinces it seems now likely that some of the expenditure incurred under the head Commissioners will be reduced, if not the whole of it. The expectation is that at least two out of the five Commissioners' posts will be ultimately reduced.

DURING the March Session of the Bombay Legislative Council, Bill No. VII of 1922, to further amend the City of Bombay Municipal Act, 1888, was referred to a Select Committee. The important clause of the amending Bill relates to the liberalisation of the constitution of the Corporation and its Standing Committee, both with respect to the number of members and the franchise. The Bill also seeks to remove the disability under which women are labouring at present, viz. that which prevented them from being members of the Corporation. At present the Corporation consists of 72 members, 36 of whom are elected at ward or general elections, 16 by justices of the peace, 2 by fellows of the University, 2 by the Bombay Chamber of Commerce, and 16 by Government. Thus Government nominate as many as 22 p. c.; justices, who are nominees of Government, elect from among themselves another 22 p. c., the truly popular representatives forming only 50 p. c. of the total. It is now proposed that the total number will be increased from 72 to 100 (against 80, as per the new Calcutta Municipal Bill now under consideration), 76 of whom will be elected at ward elections, 4 co-opted by them, the remaining 20 being partly nominated by Government and partly elected by associations or bodies, of course, capitalistic, and determined by Government. In other words, four-fifths will be representatives of the 10-rupee franchise voters and one-fifth, representatives of Governmental and capitalistic interests. Comparing this with the new constitution, now in force, of the Poona Municipality, whose constitution is the most advanced among mofussil local bodies, we find that the latter has 86 p. c. of popular representatives (43 out of 50), and the remaining 14 p. c. are all non-officials, though nominated by Government. No Government servant has been nominated on it, though under the Act it could be done. Is the Municipal Corporation of the *urbs prima in Indis* to be considered less fitted for popular representation than Poona? We think not.

* * *

On the Tight
Rope.

PANDIT MADAN MOHAN MALAVIYA in his speech at Bombay on the 31st ultimo advocated the abolition of untouchability "while observing as far as possible the religious and social injunctions in eating and drinking." The last issue of the *Mahratta* in its turn advocates "the production and propaganda of Khaddar", for, "whatever may be the differences of opinion regarding the economic value of this effort, there can be no two opinions regarding its use as a means of propaganda"! After the non-violent violence of the Khilafat and the violent non-violence of Civil Disobedience, it was perhaps only to be expected that somebody would sooner or later discover the further profundities of untouchable Touchability and of uneconomic Economics—fit subjects of a new "Wisdom of the East" series!

JUSTICE OR OPPORTUNISM ?

(BY H. C. E. ZACHARIAS.)

THE "Near East" Conference has at last been held and concluded. As usual, we are told that "complete accord has been established on all points." That of course goes without saying. There seems nowadays to be no alternative to this diplomatic *cliché*, except a declaration of war. Anything short of the latter is always described as "complete accord." During the early days of the war people were taken in by this phrase and thought it really meant what it said; latterly, one has come to interpret "complete accord" to mean "the usual discord;" which of course does not prevent at times a temporary, patched-up, "accord" of sorts being arrived at.

The "complete accord" between Lord Curzon and his French colleague on the Turkish problem seems to be of the latter variety. Lord Curzon has returned to London and his sigh of relief at having got rid of it *protem* was being made vocal in the press and in *Reuter's*. There is something almost pathetic in the conception that such a problem has been definitively disposed of, once a certain Frenchman and a certain Englishman can agree upon any solution. Turkey means 15 million people, Greece 8, Bulgaria 4—and their fate is decided by two gentlemen, who not merely are not, but even pride themselves on not being, in any shape or form, Levantines! Thus has the world been made safe for democracy; thus has autocracy been hurled from its last strongholds! If the democratic principle is triumphant in the world to-day, one is afraid, that the position it has attained to is that of a strictly limited Monarchy: democracy rules, but it governs not.

What is the Near East problem? Does it mean the welfare of three crores of human beings or does it mean the self-interest of a handful of French concession hunters or of British imperialists or of Indian politicians? Alas, what candid answer is possible? We scan the Curzonian compromise in vain for any expression of principle—unless it is the one that, since the Kemalists have been successful in their use of military might, they have therefore acquired a "right" to a greater share in the spoils.

What one really wants to know is, what do the people themselves want? What do the inhabitants of Smyrna want, of Constantinople, of Adrianople? What form of Government do *they* desire? We hear a lot about trade routes and strategic positions and political susceptibilities: but of the best interests of the people themselves there is not a breath. Capitulations are retained, to please the foreigners resident in Turkey; Constantinople is evacuated, to please Indian Khilafatists; Gallipoli is to have a Greek garrison; Smyrna to be handed over to the Kemalists. What principle underlies all this, except that of trying to please everybody, and what possible result can there be except that of pleasing nobody?

Yussuf Kemal Pasha and his Government at Angora are realists. They fully recognised that the Turkish hold on European districts was of the slenderest; that Constantinople was impossible as the capital of any truly independent government; that the military and political value of the Khilafat was disappearing. They were at one time quite ready for a peace which would have been a *real* peace, based as it would have been on the complete freedom and sovereignty of an independent Anatolia centring on Angora, with no more fetters of capitulations and financial controls of any sort. The Turks were entitled to this and they are entitled to this still, for it is the only possible, permanent solution of the Turkish question. The straits, *i. e.* the Peninsula of Gallipoli and Constantinople up to the Chataldja lines, are not Turkish, nor Greek, nor anything but cosmopolitan. If ever there was a clear home for the League of Nations, it is this historic strip of coast, which lies at the meeting of East and West. Constantinople, not Geneva, is the natural home of a League of the Nations of the world: Geneva can at best only be the home of a League of the Nations of Europe. The greatest importance attaches to making Constantinople and the Straits over to the League of Nations, an importance which derives from the fact that *eo ipso* the League would become a living issue for the East. Of course, well understood, the Asiatic shore should in no way be interfered with: the whole Anatolian coast should remain Turkish without any interference. But the Straits would become *de jure*, what they are *de facto*, the home of a cosmopolitan population and they should therefore be ruled by a cosmopolitan government as a cosmopolitan concern.

As for Eastern Thrace, the simple truth is, that it is neither Turkish, nor Greek, but Bulgarian. Let it go back to Bulgaria from which it has been taken and let religious shrines at Adrianople be extra-territorialized like the Vatican, if necessary. Personally we hardly think that this will be necessary, since Bulgarians and Turks are good friends and can be trusted to find their own *modus vivendi*.

What of the Armenians and Greeks in Anatolia? The former have already got a tiny republic across the Russian border; let this, if necessary, be enlarged to contain the whole population of Armenians who wish to settle there; give them complete independence and let them settle their own affairs in their own way. As for the dispersed Armenians, let them go there, or else put up with whatever country they find themselves in and choose to remain in. The same applies to the Anatolian Greeks—let there be an exchange of emigration of Turks from Salonika and of Greeks from Smyrna, if necessary. We do not for a moment believe, that as a matter of fact this will be much availed of—but let there be every facility for it given on both sides; let incompatibles be sorted out and irreconcilable minorities be mutually ex-

changed. Most will remain without doubt and will settle down quite happily, once extraneous influences are eliminated.

A similar solution suggests itself in regard to the Jewish question; viz. that every person of Jewish descent throughout the world should be given an opportunity of relinquishing his present, and acquiring Palestinian nationality, and that the future of Palestine (with the Holy Places extra-territorialized, if necessary) be left to the Palestinians themselves, whether actually or potentially domiciled in Palestine. Again we believe that the number of Jews, whose Zionism is so ardent as to be capable of turning them adrift from their present milieu, of making them to renounce the privileges and opportunities of their actual political status in favour of a shadowy and distinctly futuristic "National Home," will be found extraordinarily small, when matters are brought to a head and put to the test of an immediate and irrevocable choice. But we likewise hold that those, whose love of Palestine is such as to survive this ordeal, are without a question entitled to an equal voice in the disposal of their own country.

As for the "Arab Island," it is obvious that this country, like all others, should be dealt with according to the wishes of the Arabs, and not according to that of oil concessionaires. Iraq for the Iraqians, Syria for the Syrians will in the end be found the only possible permanent solution. For the Sherif of Mecca to receive an English subsidy is just as obnoxious, as it was formerly to subject the Hedjaz and Yemen to the rule of an alien Turk. These peoples, like all people, must be accorded complete independence, which means an opportunity of making the best or the worst, the most or the least, of their countries and their resources. That and that alone is a principle capable of rigorous application, because alone it represents the equipoise of Justice, where all conflicting interests can and must meet.

There remains the religious question of the Khilafat. As such it is one for Sunni Moslems and for nobody else. The moment however it impinges on the secular, it must be dealt with in accordance with the modern principle which has stilled religious strife the world over—the principle that religion and politics must not be mixed up; and that the spiritual is the domain of individual persuasion, not of State compulsion. India of all countries is the last which can afford to open the doors to sectarian prerogatives and pseudo-religious pretensions. India can recognize only citizens—it calls its own, Moslem citizens and Hindu citizens, *qua* citizens, not *qua* Moslems or Hindus. India as a modern State cannot espouse any religious cause, if it is to hold together, and it is therefore that we deplore so much the great mistake made by those who deluded themselves that Moslem-Hindu Unity could be attained by Hindus becoming Khilafatists. The Moslems have been content to accept their Hindu allies *pro tem*, but they do not pretend that this "unity" is to be

maintained "when it becomes a hindrance," as Maulana Azad Sobhani said the other day at Cawnpore. Let us candidly admit that the Turkish Khilafat question is not one that stirs the Moslem conscience at large and that it has been in India merely a convenient stick wherewith to beat a certain dog. There is no call on Hindus to be *plus Khilafatistes* than the Khalifa himself. Not as Hindus nor as Moslems, but as Indians, it behoves us all to stand up for fair treatment of the Turks, as of a sister Asiatic nation. We want the solution of the Eastern Question on the principle of the self-determination of peoples, just as we claim that inherent right ourselves. We want it, we press for it—but not to gain preferential treatment for people who happen to be Moslems, because they are Moslems. Whether in India or in the World Outside, let India's voice ever be raised in the cause of equal status, equal treatment, equal opportunities for all people. Living as we do in this great Indian Continent of innumerable religions and races, let us not be carried away for imaginary, temporary, advantages into an attitude which can never result in peace abroad, but must inevitably end in chaos at home.

INSURANCE MONEY AND WOMEN'S PROPERTY.

"We must remember that a wife's contribution to the family wealth did not usually consist in payment of money. She may bring to her husband no money at all and yet may be a very treasure to him if measured by pecuniary standard. If the wife kept the household together, brought up children, governed his servants, conducted all his petty dealings with tradesmen, and performed other similar domestic duties, the husband might be a far richer man for her services although he might provide all the actual money that comes into the family. Then if he chose that his wife should take every year so much out of the common stock and spend it in insurance for herself or her children why should she not do so? . . . It might be the most prudent, the most wise and the most beneficial arrangement for the whole family, the very best mode for making a provision for them and it also might be right and often was a matter of absolute justice as between husband and wife which he or his creditors ought not to disturb at any future time."—*Hobhouse*; Extra Supplement dated 6th Sep. 1873, Gazette of India.

RECENTLY Mr. B. S. Kamat introduced in the Legislative Assembly a bill to amend the Married Women's Property Act, 1874. Though the proposed Bill is small, it is pregnant with deep meaning and momentous results and its passage will do an immense service to the cause of Indian womanhood and help a married person to discharge his onerous duties and fulfil his natural wishes more faithfully. The intention of the Indian legislature in adopting Act III of 1874 was to protect the earnings of married women and also to create a vested interest in the wife and children of a married man effecting a policy of insurance for the benefit of his wife and children or either of them. The object of the Act appears to be that if a man wishes to make provision for the benefit of persons for whom he has natural love and affection and for whose maintenance he is in duty bound to make

some arrangements, he should be able to set apart and earmark some share of his income in the shape of an insurance policy, which should be considered as a beneficial trust for those dependent relatives. For often a luxurious or drunken husband, after effecting a policy for the benefit of his wife in sane moments, subsequently borrows money from the insurance office by pledging the policy and thus defeats his own purpose. Similarly, the creditors of the assured attack the policy money by attaching and getting it sold by auction. To guard against these dangers, the Act declares that so long as the object of the trust (wife or children) survives, the policy moneys "shall not be subject to the control of the husband, or to his creditors or form part of his estate."

It is interesting and significant to note that the Indian legislature based the Act upon, and incorporated therein most of the provisions of, the English Married Women's Property Act of 1870 (33 and 34 Vic. c. 93), which had a direct reference to the marriage laws of England, but sec. 10 of the English Act (a part of which corresponds with sec. 6 of Act III of 1874, which is sought to be amended) stood upon a different footing and dealt with the question of contract or trust. Under the old English law parties to a contract alone were entitled to take benefit of the agreement; that is to say, if a man effected a policy of insurance expressly for the benefit of a stranger, the latter could not require the insurance office to pay him the money payable under the policy inasmuch as no premia were paid by him; but as far back as 1860, Lord Romilly propounded a very happy doctrine and recognised exceptional cases. Thus according to the English law, recently if a man purchased real property or stock or bonds in the name of a stranger, "the equitable ownership results to the person who advanced the purchase money," recognizing at the same time an exception, that if the person from whom the consideration (money) moved stands *in loco parentis* to the person in whose name that purchase is made, then a gift or advancement may be presumed in favour of that person. This decision was confirmed and upheld in a series of decisions by the English Courts, and subsequently found a place in the English Act of 1870. In the celebrated case *Re Richardson* the question arose whether a policy of life insurance effected by a man on his own but left in his daughter's name, was for his own benefit or for that of his daughter. He retained the policy in his own possession and paid all the premia. Kay J. held: "The legal right to call upon the office to pay the sum assured was clearly in the daughter and not in the executor, the contract of the Insurance Company having been to pay her. That she was a daughter was sufficient to raise the presumption that there had been an advancement to her." So the point was, not who advanced the money, but who was sought to be benefitted.

The English Married Women's Property Act incorporated these principles and the Indian le-

gislatore also sought to adopt those salutary provisions by Act III of 1874. In fact in introducing the Bill Mr. Hobhouse said some gentlemen connected with insurance offices in this country applied to the Government that the provisions, which overruled the earlier English decisions, subjecting the policy to the ordinary risks, were exceedingly beneficial and should, therefore, be extended to India. It is clear from the quotation that the religion of the parties had nothing to do with the introduction of these provisions in the Act. But in our opinion the necessity and utility of such provisions in India is stronger and more urgent in view of the peculiar usages and traditions obtaining in this country from time immemorial. The English law does not directly impose upon the husband the duty to maintain the wife though there are indirect methods to fasten upon him this responsibility." In England the wife may either pledge her husband's credit which she is lawfully entitled to do or she may go into the workhouse and become a public charge and the husband may be sued by the guardians for money for her support." But in India (especially in the Hindu community) it is a truism that a wife is entitled to be maintained by her husband. It is a sad truth that an overwhelming majority of the ladies of Brahman and other high caste communities have no independent means of livelihood, nor can they follow a decent profession without being exposed to public ridicule and calumny. A woman is left to the mercy of her husband after whose death her condition is forlorn and miserable. The Hindu law declares that after the death of a male member in the joint family his share in the estate passes by right of survivorship to the surviving coparceners while his widow is entitled only to maintenance. Under these circumstances it is absolutely essential that women should have a sure means of maintaining themselves, say in the nature of insurance policy.

The Married Women's Property Act of 1874 which was designed to better the lot of the fair sex was rather vague and ambiguous in respect of its extent and application. The Act is admittedly applicable to the European and Parsi communities. But the Bombay High Court has declined to extend its benefit to the Mohammadan, Sikh, Jain and Hindu communities and in 1913 Scott C. J. held that the Act was not applicable to the Hindus, and declared that the monies payable under a policy effected by a Hindu husband for the benefit of his wife did constitute an estate of the assured over which he had "a disposing power" which he might exercise for his benefit, maintaining further that "the policy being a contract between the deceased and the Company the woman cannot avail herself of the money." The result was that the creditor of the husband might attach the policy monies and thus frustrate the husband's object. The Madras High Court however has taken a contrary view which considers the policy to be a trust for the woman and held that sec. 6 did apply

to the Hindus and similar communities. We are unable to determine which view is more logical and sound. Suffice it to say that the point should be finally decided by an Act of the legislature in such a way that its benefits may be extended to the various Indian communities.

There is a twofold objection advanced by the opponents of the proposed amendment: (a) although the premiums for the insurance policy are paid by the husband out of his own pocket, still he cannot exercise his right and has no control over the moneys; on the contrary, although consideration does not proceed from the wife or children, still the latter have a complete ownership over the property. This is an anomalous position which no legislation should allow or encourage. But this argument is flimsy and superficial. Because the husband is under a moral, religious and legal obligation to maintain his wife and children, so he is bound to make a suitable provision for them. Moreover the Act does not say that he shall effect an insurance policy for their exclusive benefit. He has an option which he may or may not exercise. But when once he writes on the policy that it is for their benefit, he should not be allowed to resile from that position. Besides to enforce a contract it is not absolutely necessary that the money must proceed from the woman. Under the Contract Act, consideration need not move from the promisee. In the case of surety, the debtor receives the amount, the surety is not directly benefited, still the law does not exonerate the surety from the liability to pay the debt. In this world a man does more things for the family than for himself. Natural love and affection, promptings of truth and conscience, and the consciousness to discharge a moral and pious duty—these constitute the motive and the legal consideration for creating a trust in favour of the dependent relations. In the Indian communities marriages are contracted for minors by parents and guardians and consequently "it might occasion serious injustice if the (old) common law doctrine was applied to agreements entered into in connection with such contracts".

Another objection advanced against holding such policies as a trust for the dependent relatives is that these trusts would in many cases be a cloak to defraud the creditors of the assured. The assured may recklessly borrow money, extravagantly spend the same, invest the balance in the Insurance company, and assign the policy to his wife and thus fraudulently deceive the money-lender. But this argument does not stand upon a sound basis. Because in the first place, fraud vitiates all contracts which are considered void and unenforceable. Secondly, experience shows that scarcely has any person insured his life, ostensibly for the benefit of his wife but really to defraud his creditors. Thirdly, the last clause of s. 6 clearly affords protection against fraudulent transactions which runs thus:— "Nothing herein contained shall operate to destroy or impede the right of any creditor to be paid out

of the proceeds of any policy of assurance which may have been effected with intent to defraud creditors."

For these reasons expediency, sound family arrangement and wise statesmanship demand that to ameliorate the condition of Indian womanhood, to safeguard their interests in the future and to enable a person more faithfully to discharge his moral obligations, the public in general and the Legislative Assembly in particular should accord its sanction to the proposed Bill on the legislative anvil.

N. V. BHONDE.

NON-BRAHMANS AND SUDRA LAW.

MR. LATTHE has raised the question of changes in Sudra law, as applied to certain Non-Brahman communities.

It is a matter of great surprise that the law about the succession of illegitimate sons should have been developed the way it has been. It is practically putting a premium on immorality and is therefore contrary to all public policy.

When one finds that the law is administered by British judges, who come from a land where public policy plays an important part in the administration of justice, one wonders whether on their outward journey from home they dropped their sense of public policy somewhere in the ocean. We find for all practical purposes that the tendency of the law courts for some mysterious reason has been to exclude as many people as possible from what are known as the "Dwija" classes. And thus class after class has gradually come to be pushed out of "Dwijahood", till we have to-day the Hindu society divided into Brahmans and Sudras, with a few exceptions.

One wonders what has become of the once great Kshatriya class? and whether the British administrators have also become possessed of the absurd myth of the twenty and one destructions of the Kshatriyas?

As an illustration of the fact, how a class hitherto considered a Kshatriya may be pushed into "Sudrahood," and of the reasoning by which our courts arrive at such decisions, some extracts from the judgments in a local case in Berar recently decided, may be found instructive and interesting.

This was a case about Deshmukhs of Berar, who have a tradition of being Kshatriyas, as would be apparent from the extracts themselves. I might, however, state that the intention of mentioning this case is illustrative and not in any sense to prove that Deshmukhs are the only Kshatriyas in Berar.

The first court has to observe:

"No Munj ceremony is observed among the Deshmukhs. The wearing of sacred thread at the time of the marriage cannot be regarded as a sort of sacred ceremony."

Further:

"The gotra ceremony and the remarriage do not in any way help to bring the Deshmukhs in the regenerate classes."

According to this court, the fact that the Deshmukhs cannot celebrate their marriage, nor indeed any religious ceremony without wearing the sacred thread, nor the fact that all of them have their "Gotras," nor that their poor widows have to suffer the penalty of civil death, are matters of any significance. The all-important fact is that there is no Munj ceremony. The court therefore concludes:

"The natural presumption is, therefore, that the defendants are Sudras."

Where and how this so natural a presumption was discovered by the learned judge is not disclosed.

The Appellate Court has to observe in the case:

"The claim to their being Kshatriyas is based on what is nothing more than a tradition."

What on earth did the learned judge expect them to base their claim on, if it were not on tradition? Did he for instance expect them by some feat of jugglery to produce all their forefathers right up to some ascendant who is beyond all doubts a Kshatriya to descend from wherever he may be and admit the fact before his honour? Supposing some lunatic were to take it into his head to-morrow that "Munj" ceremony is not the real test of regeneration, since there is nothing to prevent any one performing it, any one in the past might have taken to do it just as much as any one enjoined to do it might have neglected it and ultimately given it up. How would any one then be able to prove that he is a "Dwijia" except by a reference to the traditions? Yet the appeal court does not see any force in such a tradition.

Our Judicial Commissioner's court surpasses both the lower courts in the absurdity of its judgment:

"I have dealt with Kunbis and Marathas from Berar," says the judge, "for a period of some thirty years and have never known it alleged that these castes were anything except Sudras, except in a civil suit when a plea that they were of a regenerate caste has been advanced in an attempt to defeat a claim made for property."

Nothing could be further from the truth. The learned judge's alleged thirty years' experience should have told him that Maratha as a caste-name in its present sense is an innovation in Berar, resulting mainly from the tendency consequent on the activities of the Maratha Educational Conference. Again I beg most respectfully to point out that the plea of "Sudra" is not taken up "to defeat a claim," but, as in the case before the learned judge himself is usually taken up by the illegitimate sons in order to encroach upon the rights of the legitimate ones. And the immoral tendency of the courts to show favour to them is in no small measure responsible for their coming forward with such a plea more frequently now than used to be the case thirty years ago. By a similar extension of this claim of reasoning it is conceivable to see that even Brahmans could be proved to be Sudras. We are all aware of the tendency of including Brahmans in the term "Maratha" in the more comprehensive meaning of it. Some day a judge might get up and say that "Maratha" is not

a caste, but a nationality, and "Marathas" are held to be "Sudras." Therefore all "Marathas" are "Sudras", whether Brahman or otherwise!

I can hear some one muttering "absurd," and yet such was the line of reasoning adopted in the case before us.

Again says the learned Additional Judicial Commissioner:

"One of the tests by which a Sudra is known is that they do not don the sacred thread; inter-caste marriages amongst them are customary, they eat forbidden flesh such as the flesh of fowl."

Enough has already been said about the sacred thread. The inter-caste marriages in the sense referred to never take place. It is supplied entirely from the imagination of the officer who professes to have dealt with Deshmukhs for 30 years, and therefore probably considers himself entitled to make any misstatement he chooses. About the third test, that about eating fowl, any child in India knows that the test is absurd. But perhaps an European official may be forgiven this absurdity, especially when he does it with a purpose. And here is the purpose. The learned judge observes:

"Now Kunbis eat fowl."

Ha! Something has been found at last which the learned judge knows. He therefore inevitably links "Kunbis" and "Deshmukhs" together, because both of them eat fowl. Supposing I were to say that all Europeans eat fowl, therefore they are all Kunbis or that both Mohammadans and Christians eat beef, therefore all Christians are Mohammadans. What would anyone think of my deduction, if I were not so highly placed as the Additional Judicial Commissioner?

Further in the judgment I find:

"It is also clear that the thread ceremony is performed only in some families."

So there is also even that supreme test satisfied in some cases at least. However all these circumstances can safely be ignored because from thirty years' experience the learned judge knows:

"It is notorious that Kunbis and Marathas are Sudras."

Even then, as I have pointed out, Deshmukhs are not strictly covered by either of the above terms.

I may be pardoned for having quoted at such length. But this is just illustrative of the indifferent kind of reasoning which leads to judgments of far-reaching consequences and condemnatory of the class as a whole. Thus passes another class into "Shudrahood".

The phenomenon can perhaps be explained by the fact that all the three judges concerned were alive to the structure of society in Berar. They either draw false analogies or are misled into believing, something which did not exist, on illusory grounds. The whole process is perhaps inevitable. Time therefore has arrived when the Indian legislature must be approached for an amendment of the existing law.

A wholesale repeal of Sudra law would not be welcome, as this would embarrass the people who will find their more liberal kind of personal

law replaced by a comparatively stricter one. I would therefore suggest that the law as regards the inheritance and adoption may be changed for the present. Perhaps it might be better to let the communities themselves apply for the change, by allowing a provision of that kind in the law. Thus we shall have those communities, who earnestly desire the change coming forward to avail themselves of the privilege.

About giving a right to the communities to declare their own status the matter may not be quite so simple. We do not know whether people will take such a step lying down or whether it will give rise to internal and intercommunal storms.

Once the disabilities are removed it merely becomes a matter of sentiment whether one likes to be the one or the other. Unless therefore we can see that the declarations of statute will be well-nigh unanimous, it would not be much use to invest communities with that right.

Besides the change in the status of the community will not serve any useful purpose without the changes with regard to inheritance and adoption. It will only change the nature of the objection. A "Dasiputra" then will start by saying that the body who declared the community to be twice-born was not properly constituted and authorised to make the declaration.

It seems to me therefore necessary at present to amend the law on these two points and await results.

The idea that in Kaliyuga there are only two classes, Brahman and Sudra, is undergoing serious revision, and we will, let us hope, come to some agreement about it.

These reforms together with the removal of untouchability movement should have far-reaching effects. Perhaps it might be hoped that the present prejudice against "Sudras" will gradually disappear and the moral stigma will disappear with it. We might some day realise that the so-called Sudra is not so degenerated and degraded a being as the regenerates in their self-styled and self-centred superiority imagine him to be. Let us hope we might learn to respect him more and thus help to destroy the mental attitude which is more than anything else responsible for his supposed inferiority. Regenerates perhaps will see them carried out that the Sudra has already all the social reforms, which they have been striving hard to achieve.

R. M. DESHMUKH.

A LETTER FROM LONDON.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

LONDON, MARCH 16.

THE KENYA QUESTION.

LAST week, the Kenya Indian delegation, composed of Mr. Jeevanjee, Mr. G. B. Tadwalker, and Mr. Polak waited upon Mr. Churchill, at the Colonial Office to discuss the situation that had arisen out of his speech at the end of January. Others present were the Under Secretary of State,

the Permanent Under Secretary, the head of the Crown Colonies Department, and the head of the East Africa Department. The proceedings were private and exceedingly informal, lasting for about an hour and a half. I learn that a somewhat sultry atmosphere prevailed during the greater part of the time, when the Secretary of State for the Colonies was obliged to listen to home truths that he had never before, or any of his predecessors, had to listen to from or on behalf of Indians from non-official quarters. The delegation is satisfied that it had cleared up some of the issues and had placed quite a new complexion upon certain others, but it may still be necessary for the Cabinet to give its decisions in the absence of agreement between the contending parties. The Colonial Office is very deeply committed, and will not willingly move from the impossible position into which Mr. Churchill deliberately forced it.

Our friends in Parliament are loath to bring this matter up at the present juncture, as they feel that the present situation in India and recent political events here, of which I summarise the facts below, are hardly calculated to produce a sympathetic atmosphere, even though, in their opinion, and that of most unbiassed people here, the Indian case is a good one. In all probability, therefore, it will be some time still, before a settlement is reached. But the delegation is very far from being pessimistic as to the prospects, for it believes that political and economic causes alike are working on lines that can only, in the long run, benefit the Indian community. Certainly, Mr. Churchill is not so blatant on the question as he was under the influence of Lord Delamere's generous hospitality.

MR. MONTAGU'S RESIGNATION.

At last the Prime Minister has had to succumb to the pressure of the intransigents among the Tories upon whom he depends and he has had to jettison part of his Ministerial cargo in order to weather the storm and make port. Whether he will do so is yet to be seen. Meanwhile, he has thrown Mr. Montagu to the wolves. The Diehards have been howling for his blood for a long time, but even Mr. Lloyd George would not have made this sacrifice but for the fact that Mr. Montagu has fallen foul of him upon the subject of his favourite policy. I do not suppose that the Prime Minister has ever forgiven his Secretary of State for India for making it clear at various times that, in his opinion, the Prime Minister's Turkish policy is altogether wrong and a breach of pledge to the Indian Mussulmans. Mr. Lloyd George has a retentive memory for such things and bides his time and opportunity. Even now, in view of the great need for the retention of as many Coalition Liberals as possible in the Government, he would not have willingly sacrificed one of them, having so recently lost Sir Gordon Hewart, the first editor of *India* to become Lord Chief Justice of England—had he not seen the Coalition rapidly collapsing and feeling that his own work, as head

of the State, was yet undone. So it was a question of a combination of need and opportunity.

THE OSTENSIBLE REASON.

By one of those pieces of good fortune that have so far waited upon the Prime Minister Mr. Montagu himself provided the opportunity and the occasion. He received an urgent telegram from the Government of India setting forth its views on the question of the Turkish settlement, in view of the forthcoming Paris Conference, and asking, in view of the seriousness of the situation in India, permission to publish its views. He at once gave orders for the circulation of this document among his colleagues of the Cabinet, but there seems to have been some unexplained delay in circulation, for it was not until Saturday of the week before last that the Government of India's views were circulated to the Cabinet. On that day, he received from India a further urgent representation asking for permission to publish, and on his own responsibility, thinking that he had done all his duty in having circulated the original message to the Cabinet and having had no response of protest from his colleagues, he gave telegraphic permission for publication the same day. For two days the members of the Cabinet had the Government of India's views before them, but not Mr. Montagu's reply, in which he had warned that Government that it was unlikely that the British Government, having to take into consideration larger views as well, would be able to support the demands put forward on behalf of the Indian Mussulmans in full. On Monday of last week there was a Cabinet meeting, Mr. Chamberlain presiding in the place of the Prime Minister, who was unwell. Just before this, and at the Council Chamber, Lord Curzon, who himself was far from well, and had come down especially to deal with certain Foreign Office matters, mentioned the matter of the Government of India's request for publication to Mr. Chamberlain, and both agreed, but without mentioning anything to Mr. Montagu, that the request ought, in the interest of the British Government representing the Empire, to be refused. During the proceedings of the Cabinet meeting, in private conversation, Lord Curzon told Mr. Montagu what his views were on the subject. Mr. Montagu thereupon informed him that he had on the previous Saturday already given permission for publication. Lord Curzon says that he was so taken aback by the admission and the immense danger that in his opinion would result that he could say nothing, either to Mr. Montagu or to his colleagues. Mr. Montagu remarks in reply to this that had Lord Curzon mentioned the matter at the Cabinet and his colleagues been in agreement, he could, as it turned out, probably have prevented publication by sending a "clear the line" message. But Lord Curzon kept silence and shortly afterwards left the meeting. The same evening he sent Mr. Montagu a curt and extraordinary private letter denouncing his action, censuring the Government of India both for its demand and for its policy, and asking Mr. Montagu in

future to refrain from taking independent responsibility in a matter requiring joint action by the Cabinet. It is clear from Lord Curzon's letter, of which the text must already have appeared in the Indian press, that at that time, at any rate, he did not think the matter was serious enough for him to look for Mr. Montagu's resignation or to call for his dismissal from office. On Wednesday of last week there was another Cabinet meeting, but again there was no mention made of the matter. On Thursday the Government of India's views were telegraphed here from India by Reuter, having been previously published in India, and then, apparently for the first time, the Prime Minister became aware of Mr. Montagu's action. He at once sent for the Lord Chancellor, Mr. Chamberlain, and Mr. Churchill, who agreed that the matter was so serious that it could not be overlooked, and then he sent for Mr. Montagu, with whom he had a short and sharp discussion, resulting in the latter's return to the India Office to write his letter of resignation, which was promptly accepted by the Prime Minister and the King upon the Prime Minister's advice.

The reason officially given for demanding the resignation was the breach by the Secretary of State for India of the principle of joint Cabinet responsibility in decisions of primary importance. It is one of the amazing paradoxes of the times that one member of the Cabinet Committee of discipline in this matter should have been that notorious offender against the constitutional principle, Mr. Churchill, notably in the case of Kenya, at the Kenya Colony dinner scarcely a month before. Mr. Montagu was not slow to take action to protect himself against the imputation. Instead of at once going to the House of Commons for vindication, he made the tactical error of going down to his constituency and there addressing a party meeting. But on the Thursday, Mr. Chamberlain, without a word of appreciation of his services to the State and to India, publicly castigated him for his lapse from constitutional principle and announced his resignation, amid a hoarse shout of approbation from almost the whole House. The Diehards exulted, but in scarcely more restrained mood were the bulk of other Conservatives in the House who had only supported the Government in maintaining Mr. Montagu in office under the pressure of the Party Whips. It was a memorable scene, and one which, though he was not present to witness it, will remain for long within his recollection, as he remarked in pathetic tones last night in the House. His speech at Cambridge was chiefly notable for his powerful attack upon the Prime Minister for having sought this opportunity to throw him to the wolves upon a pretext that was demonstrably false, coming from so notorious a breaker of the constitutional principle as Mr. Lloyd George. He also attacked several of his colleagues who had, like himself, been guilty of this breach of principle, and asked why they had not been dismissed from office. He was impenitent, as to the

Government of India's views, and satirically asked the Diehards, now that the Prime Minister had given them, what they had failed by their own efforts to gain, his head upon a charger, to give him the support that he had so well earned at their hands. Since then, Lord Curzon has explained where he stood in the controversy, and Mr. Montagu last night had his say in reply in the House of Commons.

It is only right to recognise that Mr. Montagu's departure from the India Office is regretted only in Liberal and Labour circles. The Conservatives almost to a man—with such exceptions as are represented by members of the type of Major Ormsby-Gore, who has recently returned from the West Indies,—rejoice at his dismissal. The *Morning Post* indecently exults. The less rabid Tory papers fasten upon the constitutional principle and Mr. Montagu's alleged general weak handling of the Indian situation. Except for a mild appreciation of Mr. Montagu's services last night by Mr. Chamberlain, it has fallen to Lord Crew in the Lords and Mr. Asquith in the Commons to say kind things of the fallen Minister's work for India and the Empire, and it was the Labour members who cheered his speech last night. But almost everybody thinks that Mr. Montagu's censure of his colleagues' repeated lapse from the correct constitutional principle does not exonerate him from the charge of having made a serious constitutional mistake, and it will be, I am afraid, a long time before he will be able to return to Cabinet office. Both Lord Crew and Mr. Asquith were equally emphatic in condemning his error of judgment.

What sober people are now hoping is that, at the end of it all, irreparable injury may not have been done to the Turkish settlement possibilities. I do not believe that, in spite of Mr. Lloyd George, upon whose pro-Greek toes Mr. Montagu has had the unpardonable effrontery to tread so heavily, the British Cabinet intends to ignore the views of Indian Mussulmans, nor does Mr. Montagu, judging from his remarks last night. Nor do I think that His Majesty's Government intend to go back upon their Indian policy. The very fact that they invited Lord Derby to accept the Secretaryship of State for India is a pretty clear indication of that, and that Capt. Colin Coote, Mr. Montagu's Parliamentary private secretary, is seriously mentioned as Under-Secretary, is further evidence. Lord Derby has refused the offer, and has thereby still further weakened the Coalition. The Duke of Devonshire is now mentioned, but all is for the moment guesswork.

One of the worst features of the recent political catastrophe was the insistent demand in some, and particularly anti-Semitic, quarters for Lord Reading's head in addition to that of Mr. Montagu, but the critics are beginning to recover a sense of restraint and proportion. It would be a first-class disaster if the Viceroy, too, were to feel himself obliged to tender his resignation, and

that view is now gaining ground. I could quote newspaper opinions by the yard on the events of this week, but as you will doubtless be getting at least summaries of these, my doing so would be waste of space and energy. But it is of the utmost importance to note that what has occurred is mainly noteworthy in its personal aspects, and not as indicative of a change of policy in this country, in spite of the hostile tendency everywhere prevalent here in the light of the boycott of the Prince, a blunder of first-class political importance. It will take long before friends of India will be able, with any hope of success, to advocate effectively the Indian point of view even in a good cause.

REVIEWS.

THE OPPRESSION OF THE POOR. By Mr. C. F. ANDREWS. Published by Ganesh and Co. Madras. Price Rs. 1. 171 pages.

THIS little book contains everything that Mr. Andrews wrote and spoke in connection with the well-known Gurkha assault on starving Assam plantation coolies at Chandpur in East Bengal, followed by a cholera epidemic, strikes by employees of steamship and railway companies, repatriation of the coolies and Government effort at whitewashing the Commissioner's inhuman conduct in calling out the Gurkhas at midnight to drive away by force the coolies, men, women and children, from the railway station platform. The introduction specially written for this book, the chapter on "oppression of the poor" and those on the strikes, are all worth reading, especially as it can now be done in a dispassionate mood, months after the gloomy event. Making due allowance for the emotional nature of the author, the conclusions arrived at and the moral drawn by him with regard to the sufferings of the poor in this country from various causes—political, social and economic—should convince any hard-headed man that "the poor of India, who have been so terribly oppressed by governments and priestcrafts, by landowners and profiteers, have cried to God for deliverance" and now feel that the hour of their freedom is at hand. Any social worker who has lived among the poor in rural areas, will without the least hesitation agree with Mr. Andrews' experience: "The incidents with regard to oppression which the poor relate—with reference to forced labour and forced supplies and forced impositions by the police and subordinate officers, and also with reference to the forced impositions, equally tyrannical—have made my blood boil with indignation". Commenting upon the present almost complete aloofness of the officials, foreign as well as indigenous, from the common people and the complete absence of the spirit of *Seva* to the people, whose salt they are eating, Mr. Andrews gives a sound warning to those Governments that find delight on the heights of Simla, Darjeeling or Mahableshwar away from the common herd, and

surrounded either by landlording, teaplanting or mill-owning interests. He says: "The Day of Judgment has begun for all. There is now one question which the Government will have to face. Are you on the side of the rich, or are you on the side of the poor? Are you on the side of Mammon or are you on the side of God?" We are glad to observe that along with his word of praise for the sacrificing services of young volunteers—some of whom died from cholera contracted while nursing the poor at Chandpur—Mr. Andrews does not mince matters when he addresses our educated countrymen. He says: "The Day of Judgment has come for the educated leaders of the people of India also. They will have to face the same issue. What are these outcastes? the question will be asked. What are these untouchables? What are these oppressed ryots, crushed down by their landlords, whose misery in the plains has driven them to seek refuge in Fiji and Natal, in Ceylon and in Assam?"

We recommend the book to every public worker in the country to ponder over the contents.

A. V. T.

SELECTION.

"THE CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAMME"

DECCAN NATIONALIST OPINION.

A DECCAN Nationalist paper, the *Lokasangraha*, has the following comments on the so-called constructive part of the Non-Co-Operation Programme:—

Mahatma Gandhi has introduced certain new principles into Indian politics. But they are not presented to the Indian public in isolation, being mixed up with others which are quite old to Indian politics, and the whole attempt of Mr. Gandhi during the last two years or so has been to carry on a propaganda in favour of this jumble of old and new philosophies so that, along with the old ideas, the new ones special to him might also go down with the people. If his propaganda had been confined only to the new ideas which he sought to introduce is there any doubt that no one would have listened to his political philosophy? Ever since he came from South Africa he has been preaching the tenets of his creed, but no one very much cared for them till 1920. And the vogue they have obtained since then is attributable only to the principles of orthodox Indian politics which he has made the basis of his new philosophy. Who, except a handful of his immediate followers, ever heard of khaddar, non-violence, or satyagraha before he tacked them on to the political agitation?

These principles appear quite attractive at the first blush, but if seriously put in practice they are bound to prove injurious in the end. Take, first, the principle of so-called Non-Violence. What more plausible than this? Ethically, perhaps, it is quite unobjectionable; but considered from a practical point of view, is it sound? Our every-day experience is that politics and ethics are mutually contradictory. And even from the abstractly ethical point of view, we are not sure that strict Non-Violence is a right principle, for an excess of moral virtues is a vice. But politics has for its groundwork not spirituality or commercialism, but the brute force; therefore, it is fundamentally opposed to Non-Violence. One might counsel non-violence as suited to the peculiar conditions in India, but it is certainly not beneficial to preach to the younger generation in season and out of season that Non-Violence is an indispensable means of obtaining Swaraj. Violence or a spirit of retaliation is inborn in man, and to

insist that at all times and in all circumstances Non-Violence should be practised is nothing less than to do violence to human nature. To observe such absolute non-violence is perhaps possible to God; it is not competent to man.

Now to khaddar. Very few people take the trouble to think for themselves on this subject. That in order to put a stop to the trade in foreign, and especially British cloth, we must promote Swadeshi there is not the smallest doubt. But Swadeshi is not identical with khaddar; nor do we think that the desired end will be attained by a khaddar campaign. So far as our aim of eliminating trade in foreign cloth is concerned, khaddar and mill-made cloth stand on the same footing. We can perceive no distinction between them. We will go even further and say that the best means of stopping India's trade with Manchester or Liverpool is, not the charkha but an Indian mill. If so, why do the Mahatma and the Mahatma's followers give greater prominence to the charkha, and preferably the simplest of charkhas? For we have heard that even the smallest application of power or machinery makes even the charkha taboo to the Mahatma. If our aim is to kill British trade, is it wise to insist that it must be killed with one weapon, but not with the other? But since Mahatma Gandhi does so insist, his object must evidently be to discountenance and if possible abolish machinery. By giving preference to the charkha over other more effective means, the Mahatma virtually invites the people of India to revert to an age anterior to the age of machinery. Through his khaddar propaganda, he is as a matter of fact imposing his anti-machinery ideas on the country. To accept khaddar as the Mahatma offers it is to share with him his strong opposition to machinery. Those who are opposed to machinery as Mr. Gandhi is may well wear khaddar; but to us who are not so opposed there is not an iota of difference between the khaddar produced by the Satyagrahashrama in Sabarmati or any cloth produced by a Bombay mill. There is shortly going to be a great boom of khaddar; those who take a hand in it should beware that they will naturally be taken to have embraced Mr. Gandhi's anti-machinery ideas and will be forced for consistency's sake to discard every single machine that they may be using. Every nation depends for its existence upon the use of machinery; the whole world's operations are being carried on with the help which machinery affords. In these circumstances we are firmly convinced that, by a khaddar campaign, to create in the public mind a hostility to mechanical skill is, unwittingly but no less surely, to throttle the country in its onward march. Already in regard to industrial progress we are lagging behind. The Government itself does little else but talk about it. If in these conditions we were, for Mahatma Gandhi's sake, to adopt his pernicious principle of opposition to machinery, we would thereby be only rivetting the fetters which bind India's feet. To how many different philosophies India has not subjected herself in the past—to her complete ruin? Is it still her lot to succumb to another fatal philosophy?

Charkha and non-violence are to Mahatma Gandhi principles which are true without exception: they thus form his creed and the non-co-operation campaign was indeed designed to set up a sect of his own. It was really wrong to exploit the National Congress for such sectarian purposes. The object of the Congress is to attain Swaraj, not to foster any particular sect. Our last word therefore to the people of Maharashtra is that the present crisis in the fortunes of the country is so grave that everyone must speak out his inward convictions and must take only to those ways of political agitation which he really considers beneficial. In freeing ourselves from the fetters of the bureaucracy, we must not submit to the fetters of any other-craze. If we do so, we shall certainly destroy ourselves as a nation. What we have said above will perhaps not be palatable to our readers, but we feel certain that, after a short while they will be disabused of their present ideas and will take kindly to those set out here.

THE Servants of India Society's PAMPHLETS.

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 1. Self-Government for India under the British flag—
by the Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, President,
Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. pp. 91. | 0-8-0 |
| 2. The Public Services in India—
by Mr. Hirday Nath Kunzru, Senior Member,
Upper India Branch, Servants of India Society.
Crown 16 mo. pp. 175. | 0-10-6 |
| 3. The Congress-League Scheme: An exposition—
by the Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri. Crown 16
mo. pp. 66. | 0-6-0 |
| 4. The Co-operative Movement—
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. | 1-0- |
| 5. The Medical Services in India—
by an I. M. S. Officer. Crown 16 mo. pp. 58. | 0-8-0 |
| 6. Trade Union Legislation—
by A Labour Advocate. Crown 16 mo. pp. 32. | 0-4-0 |
-
- | | |
|---|-------|
| 1. Arya-Bhushan School Dictionary—
<i>Marathi-English</i> . by S. G. Vaze, Esq. B. A. Demi
8 vo. pp. 600. Cloth Bound. | 3-0-0 |
| 2. Life of G. K. Gokhale—
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. | 0 4-0 |
| 3. Life of Prof. D. K. Karve—
The Great Social Reformer, by the Hon. Mr. R. P.
Paranjpye. Crown 16 mo. pp. 72. | 0-4-0 |
| 4. Native States and Post-War Reforms—
by Mr. G. R. Abhyankar, B. A., LL. B., Sangli State.
Crown 16 mo. pp. 96. | 1-0-0 |
| 5. A Gist of Gita-Rahasya—
(2nd edition, reprint) by Mr. V. M. Joshi, M. A.,
(N. B.—The above prices do not include postage, which
will be extra.) | 0-8-0 |

HINDU LAW.

(3rd Edition.)

BY

J. R. GHARPURE, Esq., B. A. LL. B.,
High Court Vakil, Bombay.

Price Rupees Ten, Postage Extra.

Copies can be had at.—

The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City.

A Conscience Clause

FOR INDIANS

In Indian Education Codes

(WITH A REPLY TO CERTAIN CRITICISM)

BY

The Right Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri

President, Servants of India Society.

Crown 16 mo. 67 pp. Paper Bound.

Price Annas Eight.

A pamphlet very helpful to members of the Provincial Councils and of the Central Indian Legislatures, Educationists and persons taking interest in public questions.

Copies can be had of:—

THE MANAGER, ARYABHUSHAN PRESS,
POONA CITY.

“LALVANI'S NERVENTINE”

The Supreme tonic restorative.
Valuable in the treatment of

Digestive disorders, Anaemia, Neurasthenia, nervous dis-
orders, wasting diseases, overworked Brain, Habitual con-
stipation, loss of nerve power, disturbed sleep, defective
memory, organic weakness, lack of vital force, etc.

Surprising results in thousands of cases.

Price Rs. 2-8 a Bottle or Shillings 3-9

at all chemists and stores or from

J. Tirath and Co:

Sole distributors for Lalvani's Preparations.

Chemists and Druggists

BUNDER Rd. KARACHI (India).

Sub agents wanted everywhere.

Books of the Day.

Gokhale & Economic Reforms: 2-0-0

By Professor V. G. Kale, M. A., Fergusson College,
Poona, Crown 16 mo. pp. 250. Cloth Bound.

Indian Administration: 2-8-0

By Professor V. G. Kale, M. A., Fergusson College,
Poona. Demi. 8. vo. pp. 432. Cloth Bound. Fourth
Edition thoroughly revised, enlarged and brought
up-to-date.

Indian Economics: (In Press)

By Prof. V. G. Kale, M. A., Professor of History
and Economics, Fergusson College, Poona; Demi
8vo. pp. 520 Cloth Bound. Second Edition thorough-
ly revised and enlarged.

Writings & Speeches: 5-0-0

Of the late Hon. R. B. Ganesh Venkatesh Joshi.
Demi. 8vo. pp. 1300. Cloth Bound.

The Writings & Speeches: 2-8-0

Of Sir Narayan Ganesh Chandawarkar. Demi 8vo.
pp. 660 Cloth Bound.

The 'Aryabhushan Press,' Poona City.

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 **COSSI 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 me a trial

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

INDIA'S WAR FINANCE.

AND

POST-WAR PROBLEMS.

By Prof. V. G. Kale, M. A.

The book lucidly reviews the administration of Indian finance during war time and clearly brings out the great services rendered and sacrifices made by this country for the successful prosecution of the war to a victorious issue. It describes the effects of the war upon Indian finance, currency, exchange, trade and banking and points out in what directions urgent reforms are called for in view of the requirements of the country's progress in the era of reconstruction and rapid development. Every student of public questions and of Indian Economics ought to buy a copy. Cloth bound Rs. 2.

Copies may be had of leading booksellers
and the Aryabhushan Press, Poona, and
Bombay Vaibhav Press, Bombay.