

# THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. V, No. 11.]

POONA—THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 1922.

{ ISLAND SUBSN. Rs. 6  
{ FOREIGN s. 8.

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ... ..	121
ARTICLES:—	
Mr. Sastri's Dominion Tour ... ..	123
"Protection" of Indian Princes ... ..	124
THE WORLD OUTSIDE ... ..	126
REVIEW:—	
Prohibition in America. By V. ... ..	129
SELECTIONS:—	
Mr. Montagu's Resignation ... ..	130
The Shabby Business ... ..	131

## TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

Unity, not  
merely Union.

IT is well known that Pandit Malaviya is trying hard to bring about a union between different parties, and with that end has been counselling all to join the Congress; but on what basis the union is to be brought about is not made clear. Those who are new outside the ranks of the Congress cannot certainly be induced to join the Congress merely by creating for them, as Mr. Jayakar said the other day in Bombay, "a place of respect in the Congress camp." If only that was required for abstainers to go back to the Congress, it would mean that they had stayed away till now on purely personal grounds. It would be a black calumny to insinuate such a thing. What divides Congressmen from Liberals, at present, is not personalities but principles. If the Liberals are no longer of the Congress, it is because the Congress abandoned the principles which they espoused and adopted those which they condemned. Pandit Malaviya can usefully appeal to the Liberals only on the ground of principles. What hope does he hold out on that score? If there is a greater approximation now in the principles of both parties, surely they can coalesce. But Pandit Malaviya seems more anxious to have somehow an all-inclusive Congress than to secure the approximation of principles, which is essential to the fusion of parties. He says to non-co-operators, "If non-co-operation has failed, well, drop it and take to co-operation." He says to the "co-operators," "Do not pick holes in the non-co-operation programme; what is wanted now is harmony, and not"—clear thinking. If this method is pursued we are afraid even Panditji will not succeed in bringing together the two parties, and the resistance he will meet with at the hands of non-co-operators will not be less but more formidable. [Cf.

Hakim Ajmal Khan's insistence that despite the temporary abandonment of the aggressive parts of non-co-operation, the whole of the original programme remains intact.] For our part we shall be the last to throw any obstacles in the way of sincere union, but the union must be a unity, must be based upon a reasoned acceptance of common principles. If members of the present non-co-operating party are seriously thinking of reverting to the policy from which we have never deviated, i. e. of using existing constitutional machinery: we for one would be only too ready to join them in a reconstituted and reunited Congress.

\* \* \*

Machinery and  
Charkha.

IT has often been pointed out, how much of Mr. Gandhi's teachings and views are derived from modern Western tendencies. Thus Non-Violence (and the idea of married celibacy!) of course came to Mr. Gandhi from Tolstoy, whilst his animus against machinery clearly goes back to William Morris. Unfortunately for Mr. Gandhi (and therefore for India), he did not take over the whole of William Morris' ideas, but only half of them. Morris' famous precept was: "Have nothing in your house that you do not know to be useful or believe to be beautiful." The latter part of this injunction Mr. Gandhi suppressed altogether and "the useful" he is apt to interpret as "the necessary." Morris on the other hand was an artist first and last, not an ascetic. To quote from an article on William Morris in the *St. Martin in the Fields Review* for March:

Art is work, he used to say. Every work into which a man has put himself is art. There is no fine art except fine, honest workmanship. Every worker, every man or woman should be or feel himself to be an artist. The greater tragedy of the modern factory is not long hours for small wages, but mechanical labour which asks of human beings automatic dexterity and nothing more. Morris did not, like some devotees of handicraft, despise machinery. If he had been alive to-day he might have seen beauty in a steam-turbine or the lines of a motor-car, but he did believe that much machinery went to manufacture things that we should be better without. His ideal of life and work involved a return to simpler ways of living. "I have never been in a rich man's house which would not have looked better for having a bonfire made outside of it of nine-tenths of all it held."

Mr. Gandhi's kinship with these ideas is unmistakable: yet how impoverished have they become by his cutting out the claims of beauty! Beauty is not a synonym for the superfluous: its pursuit is as much of the essence of life, of the fullness of

human life, as is Truth and Goodness. Indians are naturally artistic: but to-day the appalling danger here is, that between the upper millstone of political puritanism and the nether millstone of scientific industrialism India's innate love of beauty for its own sake may be ground into powder and that nothing will remain in future but an arid, monotonous desert of utilitarianism. It is indeed fortunate that India to-day should have so great a prophet of the Beautiful, as Rabindra Nath Tagore. If only more would heed his message!

**Charkha and Pen.** THE difference between William Morris and Rabindra Nath Tagore on the one hand, and Mohandas Gandhi on the other, in their attitude to machinery, is the difference between men who would substitute right use for evil use, and men who would meet abuse by disuse. Exactly the same difference is apparent in their respective attitude towards English education. The one says—This English education is bad, let us do without education altogether; the other—This is bad, because one-sided; therefore let us have not less, but more varied education. The one would substitute the charkha for the pen; the other calls into being a University of learning, where all cultures of the world may find an opportunity of giving their message to India. As regards this latter idea, it is very instructive to find that China is proceeding on exactly parallel lines. The leaders of what in China is called *The Tide of New Thought* formed twelve years ago a society (the Shang Chih Hsueh Hwei) which was to promote the new learning. One of their members, Mr. Yuen-Lien Fan, an ex-Minister of Education, in 1913 during a tour in Europe and America conceived the idea of inviting scholars from Europe and America to be annual lecturers. On his return a definite plan was launched and as a consequence, Prof. John Dewey of Columbia and Bertrand Russell of Cambridge have already given their services to China in accordance with this scheme. Plans are now under way to invite next M. Bergson of the Paris and Prof. Einstein of the Berlin Universities.

**The World's Public Opinion.** THE cool reception that a similar scheme would receive in India to-day is indicative of the narrowness of our general outlook. We pride ourselves on being practical by refusing to "waste" public money on anything deemed nebulous, *i. e.* anything which does not promise a dividend for the very next day. Even friendly critics of Mr. Sastri's for instance cannot rid themselves of the recurring thought that London, Geneva, Washington are all very well, but after all, what solid advantage does India derive from being represented at such functions? Where is the dividend on the money invested in such tours of eminent Indians? The *Indian Social Reformer* of last Sunday dismisses as a "political reverie" Mr. Sastri's hope "by ope-

rating through the Dominions and America, in some mysterious way to prepare the British mind to relent towards India." We are sorry that the *I. S. R.* too should for once be found in that galley. There is no "mystery" about Mr. Sastri's hope at all. It is on the contrary based on a solid fact—viz. the power of public opinion throughout the world.

\* \* \*

**The Importance of "Face."** SUCH public conscience does exist to-day and that it is not a mere airy nothing of pious aspirations is best proved by the large sums which every civilized Government to-day pays for publicity abroad. Every country to-day cares very much for "saving its face", as the Chinese say; none can afford to go on being branded and pilloried in the world's press as immoral, vicious, unrighteous. The result is not immediate; for international indignation is met by whitewashing propaganda. But in the end, even a bully, however big he be, cowers before the chorus of detestation which greets him on all sides. The Irish Peace would not have been possible, if there had not been a highly organised Irish propaganda throughout the world, not in the U. S. A. only, as the *I. S. R.* seems to think, where of course millions of Irish are domiciled, but also for instance in France, where there are hardly any. Would China have been able to make Japan relent towards her, had she not appealed without ceasing to the world's conscience and made the attitude of Japan look so vile, as to shame her, by sheer funk of losing "face," into some sort of fairness? Would Czecho-Slovakia, Finland, Latvia, Poland, &c., &c. to-day be sovereign States, if at the end of the war nobody had known about them; if for decades previously they had not in season and out of season pleaded their cause for national independence in all the capitals of the West? We cannot expect our average backwoodsmen and Nationalist die-hards to take any long view: but we must say we had expected a greater grasp and more statesmanlike insight from our Bombay contemporary.

\* \* \*

**A Hole and Corner Method.** IN the *Bombay Government Gazette*, of February 23 is published, at page 354, Part I, a Notification, the effect of which is to enlarge the scope of section 124 A, Indian Penal Code, by making its provisions applicable to criticism of Indian States by persons residing in Kathiawar Political Agency. That a change of such tremendous consequence, considered either in its constitutional aspect or in its practical effects, should have escaped public notice altogether is due to the habit of the Government of announcing momentous decisions in a corner of the *Gazette* in language which can be intelligible only after reference to half a dozen previous orders of Government, inaccessible to most people. We feel certain that when the Notification is known, it will give rise to a vigorous agitation, not only in Kathiawar

but in other parts of the Presidency as well. That the Princes were moving heaven and earth to obtain a special measure of protection for themselves was well known, but it was generally believed that if the Government decided upon any such thing—which seemed very unlikely in view of the Press Laws Committee's emphatic opinion to the contrary—they would at least have recourse to legislation for the purpose, and that the people would have a chance of making their views known through the Legislative Assembly. Sir John Wood also, in his evidence before the Press Committee, said that the desired protection could be given only by an "amendment of these two sections (124A and 153A) of the Indian Penal Code so as to include Indian States within their scope." But the Bombay Government have preferred instead to resort to what is perilously near a hole and corner method of attaining their end, thereby depriving the legislature of a voice in a matter which falls clearly within its purview.

"Less Majesty"  
for our Princes?

THERE is no doubt that public opinion in India is vehemently opposed to letting the Princes have a finger in the British Indian pie, and those who are willing to do so, give their consent on the distinct condition that the British Government will take to themselves the power, and impose upon themselves the obligation, of intervening in the internal administration of the Princes with a view of protecting the States' subjects from oppression. Without giving any sign of fulfilling this part of the understanding, the Government has now given to the Kathiawar Princes what Mrs. Besant appropriately calls a "one-sided protection." Nor are we sure that the Princes will be conciliated thereby. So far as we have been able to judge, what the Princes want is not that offences like sedition should be made punishable in British territory, but that they should be made extraditable offences triable in the courts of the States. For instance, the British law gives them sufficient security against defamation and blackmailing, but the Princes are not satisfied with it, for they have to subject themselves to cross-examination in British courts, which no doubt they consider to be *infra dig.* What they want is that the offenders should be handed over to them for trial in their courts. It is of course another matter altogether that sedition or disaffection cannot be made an extraditable offence, for the general rule of extradition is qualified among others by the following exception as given by Sir Fitzjames Stephen:

No person is to be surrendered if the offence in respect of which his surrender is required is one of a political character, or if he proves that the requisition for his surrender has in fact been made with a view to try or punish him for an offence of a political character.

Therefore the effect of such a Notification will be that, without appeasing the Princes or removing their nervousness, the Government will only give another legitimate grievance to the people in British India.

### MR. SASTRI'S DOMINION TOUR.

IT is perhaps well to state the grounds on which Mr. Sastri is about to tour in the Dominions. During the discussion in the Imperial Cabinet of last year, he was the spokesman of the Government of India, in this matter happily identified with the people of India, on the subject of disabilities of Indians in the self-governing Dominions. In the course of his advocacy anticipating difficulties in the way of fresh legislation in the Dominions, he suggested, with the full concurrence of his colleagues and the Government of India, that if the Premiers of Dominions would favour the idea, a deputation of competent Indians should visit those areas and confer with influential men and institutions. This idea was welcomed by the Premiers. Subsequently demi-official letters were exchanged and the Indian deputation was without any definite dates announced in the Dominions concerned. The Geneva Assembly and the Washington Conference necessarily delayed the fulfilment of this undertaking. Endeavours to secure other suitable members for the deputation proved fruitless and the authorities decided that Mr. Sastri should proceed alone on the mission. He will do so in the third week of May and not on the 24th of April, as announced previously.

Direct negotiation between representatives of the Dominions and those of India has been represented by some hasty critics as a sign that Great Britain has shirked her duty and washed her hands clean of the business. On the contrary we welcome it as a sign that Great Britain respects, in such matters, the autonomy of the Dominions and to the same extent of India. Some other misconceptions remain to be cleared. It is said that this Dominion mission is a waste of money and the results will not be proportionate to it. Nobody can predict the complete success of such a deputation because it is without precedent and the ground has not been prepared. But the work has got to be begun at some stage or other, and if these delicate negotiations do not bear full fruit all at once it should not be a matter for wonder or serious disappointment. If people would reflect on the enormous sums spent by other countries on similar objects they would not make much complaint on the ground of expense. Then it is said that the disabilities of Indians and their sufferings are most acute in Africa, but that continent is not included in Mr. Sastri's tour. This is true. The Government of the Union of South Africa has not responded to the request to receive a deputation from India and Mr. Sastri has been specially warned on high authority not to visit that Dominion until specially invited to do so. The Government of India could hardly be expected to countenance a move which in the circumstances may lead only to unpleasant incidents and embitterment. As for East Africa, the proper venue of settlement is Whitehall. It is always a point of doubt where the remedy is to be applied, at the spot where it will work quickest or

at the spot where it is most needed. There is something to be said for postponing Africa till after success had been attained in the other Dominions and it could be made clear that the Union of South Africa was the one danger spot in the Empire. Bitter comment has also been made as to the suitability of Mr. Sastri for this mission. But as happens in similar matters in the political field, the comment proceeds from opposite standpoints. Some say that he is unrepresentative, not sufficiently big and apt to lower India's flag. Others maintain that he is more required in India at this juncture and that he has been already too long out of India and must now give all his energy to his political party which does not suffer from an excess of workers. A little ruffle has apparently been created by the Government of India having deputed him to three different objects already. It is difficult to answer any of these points without going into unseemly personal matters. But it cannot be wrong to remind people that the forthcoming tour is only a sequel to the proceedings of the Imperial Cabinet, a fulfilment of an undertaking made to outside authorities and both approved and welcomed by them. The unanimous vote of the necessary expense by the Legislative Assembly, which showed itself such a vigilant guardian of the public money, is a conclusive proof that where personal considerations do not prevail and the general interests are best understood, this mission to the Dominions is looked upon with favour and the choice of the emissary meets with general approval.

Indirect opportunities will doubtless be available which Mr. Sastri may be trusted to utilise for correcting the bad impression produced abroad by the untoward events connected here and there with the Prince of Wales's Indian visit and for enlisting Dominion sympathy with the political aspirations of Indians towards the early attainment of Dominion status within the British Empire. This work is the more necessary because since the drawing together of the various parts of the Empire under the pressure of the war, British policy in all its branches has become increasingly responsive to American and Dominion public opinion.

#### " PROTECTION " OF INDIAN PRINCES.

THE transactions of the Press Laws Committee, which have just been published not far less than a year after the Committee's sittings, cannot be of any practical interest now to the general public after the repeal of the restrictive laws. But there is one point which is still of general interest, and it is in regard to the special protection which was afforded to the Indian States by the Press Act of 1910. The Press Act being repealed, the Princes now stand in the same position in which they stood before the Act was passed; that is to say, they can prosecute individual offenders for defamation or blackmail just as others can, but they are now left

without any special measures of protection against those who by their writings excite disaffection against them. And the question is whether the law of sedition in British India should not be so amended as to embrace within its scope the Indian States, in order that a man who foments sedition against Indian States from British India may be prosecuted by the British Government in its courts just as one who foments sedition against the British Government itself is liable to be. The Press Laws Committee definitely rejected this suggestion in the following terms:—

We understand that before the Press Act became law, it was not found necessary to protect Indian Princes from such (press) attacks, and we note that the Act, so far as the evidence before us shows, has only been used on three occasions for this purpose. We do not, in the circumstances, think that we should be justified in recommending on general grounds any enactment in the Penal Code or elsewhere for the purpose of affording such protection in the absence of evidence to prove the practical necessity for such provision of the law.

It may be imagined that in face of such an emphatic opinion the question of protecting Indian States against a malicious press campaign will not be revived. But we all know that it has been raised, and it would be interesting to discuss it here in the light of the views expressed before the Press Laws Committee.

In this connection it must be noted that the Princes themselves did not cause their view to be represented before the Committee: they must have felt it safer to ventilate it before the Princes' Chamber, which discusses public affairs with closed doors. But Sir John Wood, Political Secretary to the Government of India, submitted a memorandum to the Committee which might be taken generally to reflect the sentiments entertained by the Princes. Unfortunately even this memorandum is not published in full. Of the twenty pages it covers, it is vouchsafed to us to see only two. But this partial disclosure is enough to enlighten us on what the feelings of the Princes must be. The one stock argument of the Princes seems to be—and Sir John Wood has faithfully echoed it—that the kind of protection which they desire is required by the treaties which the British Government has entered into with them. Sir John does not tell us how exactly the treaties make it incumbent on the British Government, on the repeal of the Press Act, to insert in the Penal Code a provision similar to that contained in the Press Act, and why if such a provision is demanded by the letter of the treaties the Princes did not insist upon it *before* the Act was passed. The treaties which the British Crown has made with the Princes are ancient documents, dating at least three quarters of a century back. Surely if the treaties cast upon the British Government the duty of securing the Princes against unfair attacks in the press, it is strange that the Princes did not hold the British Government to the fulfilment of their undertaking till 1910! The fact seems to be that the obligation under which the Government is said to rest by virtue

of the treaties is of a very general character. Their Highnesses' reasoning seems to run thus: The British Government is bound by treaties to give us protection against external aggression by our enemies, but are the enemies only those who lead rebel armies in the field, and does the aggression always consist of armed invasions? If the enemy is apparently a man of peace, and wields not the sword, but the pen, and attacks us, poisons the minds of our subjects against us, even then it is obligatory upon the British Government to afford us protection against such an enemy and against such methods of attack. If the treaties are to be interpreted in this liberal fashion, we have not the least objection: rather we would welcome it; only we would insist that an equally liberal interpretation be given to the clauses in the treaties which secure the subjects of Indian States against the misrule of the Princes.

Apparently being very doubtful whether the British Government could be persuaded to interpret their duties in this wide sense, Sir John Wood adds another argument which he believes will appeal to the Government with greater force. He observes:

If protection against malicious and unjustifiable attacks in the press and elsewhere is denied to the States there is a serious risk of reprisals on their part. We cannot expect them to discourage agitation against British India if we allow such agitation against them in British India to pass unchecked. The obligation to prevent such agitation is, in fact, reciprocal. Further, unrest in States which is likely to be caused by malicious propaganda from outside is bound to react on British India. Attempts to promote revolution in the States cannot be viewed with indifference by those responsible for the good government of India as a whole. Unrest and revolution are infectious and it is clearly the duty of both parties to help each other in checking the infection.

As a matter of fact, the British Government need have no fears, as one witness told the Committee, that the Princes would allow the dissemination of sedition against the British Government to go on within their borders even if no measure of protection is given by the latter. But one would ask, what kind of propaganda is going on in the Indian States? From the language used by Sir John Wood, one would imagine that a revolution was being planned at innumerable centres in British India directed against Indian Princes. What is the real position? Journalists in British India take far too little interest in Indian States affairs beyond the borders of British India, and when they show some faint interest, it is more often than not in the direction of glorifying the Princes in the mistaken belief that exposure of the misrule of the Indian Princes somehow weakens the cause of Indian Home Rule. Take, for instance, the Nationalist press which is so loud in denunciations against the British Government. It is studiously silent in regard to the most abominable oppression going on in the Indian States in broad daylight, and is engaged, if anything, in inventing a suitable apologia for all the misdeeds. At any rate, there is no violent criticism against the Indian Princes. Let

two European witnesses who gave evidence before the Press Committee speak, who it will be allowed have no bias against the States or any particular tenderness for British Indian agitators.

First, Mr. Haward, Assistant Editor of the *Pioneer*:

Q. Have you heard of any instance in which attempts have been made to promote sedition against Indian Princes?

A. No, I know nothing of such attempts.

Then Professor Rushbrook-Williams, Director of the Central Bureau of Information:

Q. Now as regards the prevention of disaffection concerning Indian States?

A. I can only base my statement on my personal experience. During the course of my study I have not come across anything which in its substance went beyond the bounds of legitimate criticism.

Q. Would you suggest that if we repeal the Press Act we should take certain powers for the protection of these Indian Princes, not against criticism, but against sedition and disaffection?

A. I have been in the country only a few years, Sir, and I have not had immediately under my notice any concrete examples which might fairly be taken as falling under the description you give. I have seen plenty of criticisms, but nothing which I think can fairly be described as calculated to excite sedition against an Indian Prince.

Q. Suppose a newspaper made it a business to write articles against a Native Prince with a view to levying blackmail? Would you not deal with it effectively? Would you give us some special powers for that?

A. I should not have thought so. I think the Indian Princes are well able to look after themselves. If there is any truth in the criticism, they may rectify the matter of which complaint is made; if there is not, well it cannot damage them except in the eyes of Government who presumably well know the facts. If an Indian Prince does not like criticism, there is no reason why he should be obliged to read the journals containing it.

There was not a scrap of evidence before the Committee to prove that the criticism of the Indian Princes in the British Indian press transgressed in the slightest degree the bounds of legitimate criticism, and the Committee were therefore compelled to hold that there was no practical need for the protection asked for, whatever their view might have been as to the constitutional aspect of the question.

But, strange as it may appear, nesses who scouted the idea that the Princes were in need of any sort of "protection," ultimately gave their consent, when the constitutional question was pressed home, that the ordinary law of the land mightily be suitably amended so as to afford protection to the Princes from possible attempts at the promotion of sedition against themselves. Before going on to explain this position, we will first give below, in the flaming words of Mrs. Besant, their opinion as to whether the Princes deserved or stood in need of any such protection:

There is no doubt that with regard to a considerable number of Native Princes, especially the smaller ones in parts like Kathiawar, there is no administration of justice at all, but oppression of the subjects. There are cases that have come under my own knowledge of imprisonment without trial, forfeiture of property, driving out of the State without any kind of trial, etc., without any remedy left to them. A Prince ought not to be protected both by the law of his own state and by the British Government

against a press which exposes acts of gross and shameful injustice and repression. He has no right to be protected.

If the Government of India has the duty of protecting an Indian Prince, then it has also the duty of seeing that he governs his dominion in a way that is not intolerable for decent people. I do not think the British Government is bound to protect a prince who behaves as some of the Princes do behave to their subjects, because it blackens the British Government to defend a man who is oppressing his people in the way some of the Princes at present are.

I contend that you cannot have a one-sided protection of a man who is doing wrong when you do not enforce upon the man whom you protect the doing of right.

In these expressions of opinion themselves lies the key to the consent which Mrs. Besant and other distinguished witnesses like the editor of the *Leader* and Mr. Barkat Ali gave to the widening of section 124 A so as to include the Native States in its application. Such consent, it must be remembered, was conditional upon the British Government pledging its support to the subjects of Native States in case they were oppressed or ill-treated by their Princes. That this condition was not merely implied but definitely expressed will appear from the following question put to Mrs. Besant and the answer she made :

Q. But if you assume that some power be conferred on the Government of India to intervene in cases of oppression or injustice, would there be the same objection, not to *bona fide* criticism, but to statements which definitely promote disaffection towards workers (*sic*) in Indian States (being subjected to the provisions of the Penal Code) ?

A. No.

This is but a fair reply to make. For at present the Government, on a too strict application of the policy of non-intervention in internal affairs, pleads helplessness in regard to protecting the States subjects from the oppression of the Princes. It is only when the misrule has reached the farthest limits and there is an imminent danger of a serious uprising of the subjects that the Government thinks of intervening. This is carrying things too far. We all expect in these days that the British Government will exert all its moral authority and wherever possible legal authority in the direction of getting the Princes to introduce modern and civilised methods of administration. If it is legitimate to entertain such a hope, it cannot be right to expect the British Government at the same time to refuse to amend its ordinary criminal law with the view of penalising disaffection against Indian Princes. If the present non-intervention policy is sought to be relaxed in one particular, it cannot be maintained in its rigidity in others. The provisional consent of Mrs. Besant and others to give protection to Indian Princes therefore only means that they are opposed to the extravagances of the existing non-intervention policy of the British Government.

Nor is such intervention in cases of oppression of States subjects in any respect contrary to the treaties, by which the Princes lay so much store. Sir John Wood himself admits that the British Government cannot stand apart and look on while

a revolution is being prepared in the Indian States. Now such a revolution can be prepared either by agitators residing in British India or by the Princes themselves. If the Princes do not introduce representative institutions in their territory, which their subjects passionately desire, or if they oppress their subjects and create bitter discontent among them, they are surely preparing a burst-up; and the British Government is bound by the terms of the treaties it has made with the Princes to intervene betimes and prevent the revolution. This is not certainly a more strained interpretation of the treaties than the one by which the Princes claim that the Government is bound to give them protection from press attacks in British India. If such protection is required by the treaties, the protection of States subjects from the Princes' oppression is at least allowed by them. And in all these discussions the Government of India must remember that such of the witnesses as waived their objection, before the Press Laws Committee, to extending the sections of the I. P. C. to criticism of Indian States did so on the clear understanding that the British Government will definitely recognise its right—and duty—to save the subjects of States from injustice and tyranny.

### THE WORLD OUTSIDE.

THE *London Observer* has recently published an interview with General Mangin, one of the French military leaders whose fame has survived the War. During the latter he was commanding the Negro troops on the Western front and the close and constant contact into which he was thus brought with this race, seems to have destroyed effectively any lingering colour prejudice which he may previously still have been subject to. In the interview in question he stated plainly that he

"loved the blacks", who, "where the natural conditions are favourable, have a civilization of their own that in many respects is equal to ours. Potentially, the black race is probably as good as the white. We have to distinguish between moral progress and scientific progress. I am convinced that morally many Africans have nothing to learn from us." As regards the scientific civilization of the white race "consider, of what recent date it is ! We have gone ahead, and the records of our dealings with the black people, armed as we were with certain advantages, is not flattering to us. We looked upon them as slaves, and we continue in some sense to regard them as slaves. But what in the history of the world is an advance of a few hundred years? If one takes a wider view than Africa, if one looks at the coloured peoples in general—and I have spent some years in the Far East, as well as in Africa—one sees that our own civilization has its sources in Asia, which is yellow; in India, which is bronzed; and in Egypt, which is black. Greece and Rome are comparatively late comers."

And of the latter he might have added that the Mediterranean races owe much to Negro infiltration.

A *Negro Thackeray*.

AS if to bear him out and to show how—slowly perhaps, yet surely—the Negro race is coming into its

own, we read almost simultaneously of the French literary event of last year—the *prix Fouchet*, (one of the chief literary prizes of France) going to M. René Maran, a West Indian Negro, for his novel "Batouala". The *succès fou* of this novel is indicated by the fact that at one time 8000 copies of it were being sold *per day*! Born in 1887 at Martinique, M. Maran accompanied his father (who was in the Colonial Civil Service) to Senegambia, but in 1894 went to France for his education. His great novel depicts from the inside African life as it still survives to-day in West Africa. Apart from its literary merit, the novel should prove a very valuable document from the historical point of view; since it is only too true that Africa is changing very fast and that a place like Elizabethville is perhaps to-day more typical of Africa than the old time African village described by the explorers of what was once "Darkest Africa." Elizabethville, we may say, is situated in the Belgian Congo, near the North Rhodesian frontier and is a mining centre for some of the richest copper mines in the world. The town itself is in that state of transition from wilderness to civilization, through which all African towns have to go, and reminds one recent visitor of what Joburg was only twenty years ago. The editor of *Central Africa* for February pertinently asks: "Will the old Africa soon be as purely a memory as the old America of the Far West?" In one respect there will certainly be a difference, for while the "Red Indian" is almost extinct, the Negro gives no indication of being so easily eliminated. The Negro, whose literary and moral equality has already been vindicated, is in a fair way to make his own that scientific civilization of which alone the practical materialism of the Occident takes real cognizance. All the more satisfactory to hear of the foundation of a school of African Life and Languages at Cape Town University, at the inauguration of which the first professor of Bantu Philology, Rev. W. A. Norton, pointed out, how important it was to recover the history of the Bantu tribes before all the old people had died, and to get written records of all the Bantu languages for the sake of comparative philology—no light task, seeing that there are said to be 338 different dialects in that language group!

*Violence and  
Vice.*

MEANWHILE the uphill fight for racial equality is being waged by negroes the world over. In America, the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People has got a fine record for the past year to its credit; for it has not only succeeded to show up and thus break the infamous *Ku Klux Klan*, but also to push the Dyer Anti-Lynching Bill through Congress. The House on January 27th passed this bill by 230 to 119 votes and thus did something to remove the stain of mob-law from American public life. Of course the bill is not yet law, as it has still to run the gauntlet of the Senate. But to think that one has to hail as a great achievement that in the greatest Western country it will in

future be made somewhat difficult to kill "niggers" out of hand! If such is the rate of progress made in the U. S. A., one necessarily turns with relief to France, where, according to an article by Mr. Norman Angell in the *Freeman*, the position is such, that, "speaking broadly, the Negro living there is all but unaware of the monstrous shadow that darkens every hour of the negro's life in Anglo-Saxon communities." As a climax this writer reminds his readers that white prostitutes are provided for coloured soldiers in France; and on this latter statement the *March Crisis* waxed indignant at the mentality underlying the implied surprise at such a state of affairs, as if it was in the order of nature that "white men should own and use all women, coloured and white, and rightly resent any intrusion of coloured men into this domain." We agree; but we must say, we would willingly and gladly have left that invention of hell, the brothel, to remain forever the sole monopoly of the white race. If one claims equality of opportunity for all races, one thereby does not wish to suggest equal opportunity for indulgence in vice, but rather that the highest standard, whether found amongst the pigmented or the unpigmented, should universally prevail. And as regards sexual morality, God preserve us from continental standards!

*A Tribune of  
Negro France.*

UNFORTUNATELY the fact that France is "colour blind," does not mean that France is superior in her relationship to the coloured races: it only means that these relationships are bad in a different manner from those of Anglo-Saxon countries. A Negro deputy in the French Chamber, M. René Boisneuf of Guadeloupe, averred that the French African possessions had been decimated since the French régime and that the exploitation of the defenceless natives by French concession companies was such, that the mortality rates had increased tenfold and that whole populations had fled to neighbouring colonies to escape forced labour under these concessionaires. Of the French Congo and of French Colonial policy in general M. Boisneuf can say that everywhere he sees "budgets collapsing under the cost of government personnel, and nothing being done to further social or economic progress of the natives." The melancholy truth is that France cares for nothing but for France—black Frenchmen in France she will no doubt treat as she does white Frenchmen; but of any understanding for alien cultures, of any desire to help the defenceless abroad, to uplift the underdeveloped in her charge, there is no trace. The Colonies, the millions of dumb Negroes, Anamites and the rest, only exist for the benefit of France; these hopelessly exploited drudges are apparently never deemed to be an end in themselves, but only a means for the enrichment and dominance of France. If black men will help in that, they are welcomed and made free of the gaieties of *la ville lumière*. We don't envy them—not even with all our colour bars of Anglo-Saxondom.

**Overwork and  
Out-of-work.**

THE French of course are strictly logical. Exploitation first! And where is exploitation easier than in the tropics? There is no labour so sweated, so starved, so ignorant. Why then bother about these insolent members of trade-unions in Europe? Let them starve, or else let them accept equatorial standards of life and of wages. For if not, tropical labour will produce on our terms. After the bad fright which Capital had at the close of the War, it tries to make most of its opportunity to-day. Three millions unemployed in England to-day; six millions in the United States: do you wish to join their ranks? If not, come to heel; accept these further cuts in wages, accept these longer hours for lesser pay! Take the latest news from England—the provocative action of the Engineering Employers' Federation, who against every effort of the men's union to reach a compromise, have insisted on unfettered discretion to ordain what overtime they please, and this at a time when *one-third* of the engineers are actually out of work! Could brutal selfishness and callous contempt go further? But it's the capitalists' day—labour is out and down, with its reserves drained, its spirit broken. With a world slump in full blast, with no sign of improvement visible anywhere, what can labour do, but give in? Indeed one almost is inclined to agree with Jonathan Wild in *The Commonwealth of March*, who discerns a great desire on the part of the rich in Europe to get rid of their inconvenient poor altogether, by extermination, and preferably by extermination before they come into existence! A new journal, advocating measures to prevent babies from being generated (*vulgo* "Birth Control"), and therefore (?) calling itself *The New Generation*, has just been published.

**Killing the Poor** THE mentality of these birth-controllers is truly a masterpiece of subconscious humbug. They all are rich people whose heart is bleeding for the poor with their large families and small means of subsistence—and so what do they propose to do for the poor? succour them? raise their standard of life? increase the earning power of labour? No; the best that these philanthropists can devise for the poor, is to exterminate them! As the *Commonwealth* rightly observes, *The New Generation* stands for funk of the poor. To destroy the poor is the only hope of those people. The rich have tried everything else to rid themselves of these troublesome people, and have failed. The poor persist. And why? Against the unsavoury pseudo-science of this latest sixpenny rag and its supporters, science has long ago given the true answer, viz. that there is a compensating law of biology which runs through all animate matter and which makes up by increased fertility of the endangered individual for the danger accruing to the species through the threatened death of that individual. Mortal injury both in plants and in animal life leads immediately to abnormal stimulation of the procreative

system: as a sterile coconut tree will flower and fruit, when deliberately injured by fire or axe, so also in the animal kingdom do injurious conditions of life raise the fecundity of the individuals affected. Overfeed animals, shelter them from danger, give them a life of complete ease—and all their vital powers will run to the building up of adipose tissue: the individual's life is safe—no need for Nature to worry about the maintenance of the species!

—By Kindness? THAT being so, we venture to make a novel suggestion to these rich philanthropists: viz. why not try to exterminate the whole race of the poor by the only truly scientific method known, i. e. by overfeeding and pampering them generally? "A land fit for heroes" would as a natural and necessary consequence soon become a land of few children, but to restrict the number of children will never make a land fit for heroes to live in. Wherever the workers' standard of life is highest, there we find the smallest birth-rate—as for instance in Australia, France, America. The latter country is particularly instructive: for whilst the birth-rate amongst families settled in the United States for a generation or more is very low, that of recent immigrants is very high—and it is of course notorious how wretched the conditions of life are for the just landed bottom dog labourer imported from Eastern Europe, whilst the 100% American is without exception enjoying the highest standard of comfort attained to anywhere in the world of labour. So here these charming philanthropists have really got a magnificent opening for experimentation. Will they avail themselves of it? In the meantime, labour has itself got to do the best it can to improve its conditions, without waiting for these philanthropic birth controllers, else it might conceivably have to wait a fairly long time. And the annual report of the National Guilds League for 1921-22 is a monument of the most promising of all the endeavours that labour itself is making, to raise its standards and status.

**The Glean of  
Hope.**

THIS report, a draft of which appears in the March issue of the *Guild Socialist*, is all the more cheering because of the encircling gloom. It not only records "the sensational development of the Building Guild, but also the attempts on a less ambitious scale by workers in many other industries to put the Guild principle into practical operation." To many of these attempts we have already referred in previous issues—we therefore will only mention to-day those still new to the reader, such as an Agricultural Guild at Welwyn, a Guild of Vehicle Builders, Packing Case Makers and Clerks at Manchester, the Lea Valley Co-operative Society doing horticultural work on guild lines, London Bookbinders' and Musical Instrument Makers' Guilds and a Guild in process of being formed by the Dairy Workers' Union. Whilst



course it is obvious that "a National Guild in the full sense of the words cannot be established until the capitalist system has been disestablished: yet the guilds which have been created are manifold efforts of the workers to lay the foundations of the new economic system; though they are limited by the conditions which a dominant capitalism is able to impose upon them, and must therefore not be taken as representing the fully developed guilds which will become possible only in an economically free Society. They are valuable chiefly, not for what they are, but for what they can become, and for the example of workers' self-government in industry which they afford." In the meantime the guilds are receiving the custom of people on a most gratifying scale. Although for instance the furniture trade was supposed to be in a state of abnormal depression, the Manchester Furniture Guild was overwhelmed with orders both for repairs and for new work, as soon as it had been started. The Clothing Guilds in London, Glasgow and elsewhere are on the point of coming together into a National Guild—a good indication of the strides the local guilds had made. We only wish more were known of the whole movement in India. The pamphlets of the National Guilds' League contain most interesting material: may we venture to recommend to our readers to get in touch with the League? Its address is 39 Cursitor St., London E. C. 4.

### REVIEWS.

**PROHIBITION IN AMERICA.** By SIR ARTHUR NEWSHOLME, K. C. B., M. D. (P. S. King and Son, London.) pp. 68. Price 2s. 6d. net.

This little volume confirms in every particular the report on the effects of Prohibition, extracts from which were published in the *SERVANT OF INDIA* of March 30. The latter described the working of the U. S. A. National Prohibition Act for two years at greater length, while the present volume describes its working only for one year and without going into as much detail. But the corroboration one derives from the other is most striking, and in this lies the value to Indian readers of Sir Arthur Newsholme's book. Sir Arthur was late Principal Medical Officer of the Local Government Board of England, and is Lecturer on Public Health at Johns Hopkins University, U. S. A. Being thus an independent testimony, his opinion is entitled to considerable weight.

It of course strikes one that the United States—"sweet land of liberty"—should be the seat of the greatest experiment in personal coercion which the world has known and the author sets out to explain how it is that the American people who are jealous of personal liberty thought it necessary to work into their fundamental Constitution the most drastic of sumptuary laws. The whole of Part II of this book—covering one-third of the whole—is devoted to an exposition of "Prohibition in relation to good government," rebutting objections urged on the ground of interference with individual freedom. Few people in India will appreciate these objections at their highest value and therefore few stand in need of any elaborate refutation of them in this country. But if the objections are really to be considered on

their merits, it must be confessed that the answers given in this volume are not quite convincing, particularly in regard to allowing the use of very light wines. In the United States the sale of all beverages with a greater alcoholic content than half a per cent. is prohibited, and the question is raised by men who are zealous advocates of temperance whether such a rigid limit is necessary or desirable, and whether it would not be preferable—since the use of alcohol in moderation does no harm, but it is only the excessive alcoholic indulgence that has injurious effects—to allow, and indeed provide, drinks of slight alcoholic strength but of excellent quality at cheap rates and prohibit the use of only intoxicating liquors. This is not a question of much practical importance in India, but in Europe and America it is a vexed question, and the treatment which it receives in this book is, one feels, rather perfunctory. Sir Arthur says:

It is urged that the prohibition of the sale of spirituous drinks, except on medical prescription, with a limitation in the alcoholic contents of wines and malt liquor would have been preferable. Such action might have succeeded in a small compact country like England. In the province of Quebec action on these lines is said to have failed; and evidently it was the predominant opinion that no middle course was practicable between the *status quo* and a "bone dry" Prohibition.

What would interest Indians most in this book is the emphatic contradiction which Sir Arthur Newsholme gives to the reports widely put about that Prohibition, far from eliminating or even reducing the evil of drunkenness, has only aggravated it, and that it has had no other result than that of instilling into the American people a general disrespect for the law and of converting those who would otherwise be thoroughly law-abiding into the most strenuous law-breakers in the world. The author seems to us to be quite impartial in his researches into the actual effects of Prohibition. He says:

Numerous channels of the introduction of alcoholic drinks in the States have remained. A large quantity of liquor has been brought across the Canadian and Mexican borders, much from overseas, and there has been a greater increase of illicit manufacture and of domestic manufacture. The permit system allowing the use of alcohol for medicinal purposes has been greatly abused; and patent medicines containing a large amount of alcohol have had an extensive sale.

Thus it is freely admitted that the enforcement of the Act is not perfect, but making due allowance for the imperfections the net result is still a reduction of consumption. Sir Arthur says:

In balancing up results, it must, I think, be agreed that smuggling, illicit manufacture and sale, and increased domestic production of alcoholic drinks, together are not on such a scale as to counterbalance the increased abstinence resulting from Prohibition.

Further:

There is no evidence that prohibition has caused increased consumption of drugs in substitution for alcohol.

Figures are copiously given to illustrate these conclusions, but it is hardly worth while to quote them here. As to the extent to which Prohibition actually prohibits, the author says that "probably in over something like nine-tenths of the territory of the United States, Prohibition is being enforced fairly well;" that "it is highly probable that not 10 per cent. of former drinkers can now regularly or frequently obtain alcoholic drinks;" and that "the majority of the American population were rapidly losing their

appetite for alcoholic drinks, and young people have no opportunity to acquire this appetite." "In conversation with moderate drinkers I have been repeatedly assured that although they voted against Prohibition, they would not vote for retracing the action taken, in view of the beneficial results already derived from the abolition of saloons." If in this first year of Prohibition (1920) the Act was only partially enforced, "it has to be noted the main Federal agents alone during this year have been responsible for the enforcement of the new law; and the aid of the State and city police has commonly not been forthcoming." But the American people are determined to enforce the law and there is no doubt that its operation will be tightened up as time goes on. Both the Federal Government and the States have co-ordinate powers of enforcement and the Federal Government will assuredly receive loyal co-operation at the hands of the State authorities.

Sir Arthur Newsholme wisely insists that alcoholism must be regarded as but "one link in a vicious circle" or as "one part of a mesh of evil circumstances needing to be combated if a cure of alcoholism is to be effected." Some of these several co-operating influences conducing to intemperance are overwork, which gives rise to a feeling of need for stimulants; bad housing, with unsatisfactory sleeping accommodation; poor and badly cooked food; shiftlessness; etc. Even when the short-cut of compulsory abstinence has been taken, the efforts indicated above are still needed—though the short-cut may prove to be the most important means for aiding efforts against the bad social habits, the overwork, the unsatisfactory feeding, the deficient sleep, the lack of wholesome recreation, all of which have a share in the problem, and attention to which is still necessary, even when alcoholism is put out of court."

It will be useful to quote here the declaration of the American Medical Association against alcoholism, which had no insignificant part in the ultimate adoption of nation-wide Prohibition. The resolution that was passed by that body was as follows:—

"Whereas we believe that the use of alcohol as a beverage is detrimental to the human economy, and whereas its use in therapeutics, as a tonic or a stimulant or as a food has no scientific basis, therefore be it resolved that the American Medical Association opposes the use of alcohol as a beverage and be it further resolved that the use of alcohol as a therapeutic agent should be discouraged."

The general conclusion of the author is that if the facts stated above be admitted, "it must be agreed that people can be made sober by legislation, and that temptation to be otherwise can be removed by this means."

V.

### SELECTIONS.

*We reprint below two leaders from two widely different English papers, just to hand by the mail, on Mr. Montagu's dismissal. "Palestine" is a Zionist weekly and the leader we reproduce is valuable in showing to what extent Mr. Montagu sacrificed every other interest of his to those of India. It should also be useful, because it gives a point of view which is all but unknown here.*

*The second article is from weekly the Labour organ, the New Statesman. It gives a very fair critique of the whole question and casts a lurid light on the extent to which Lloyd-Georgism has lowered political standards in England.*

### MR. MONTAGU'S RESIGNATION.

MR. MONTAGU was perhaps the strongest enemy that Zionism had in the Cabinet. His interest in the East, except where his beloved India was concerned, began and ended with Turkey. Islam to him was Turkey; and Constantinople a kind of *in hoc signo vinces* of Mohammedanism. If he understood it, he had not the slightest sympathy with that branch of British policy, which aimed at the renaissance of the Arab nationality; and as for the Jew, he was for Mr. Montagu a Westerner, domiciled in Europe and America but without political future in the Near East. If Mr. Montagu was right in his views on our Eastern policy, we are very much wrong. Indeed, we are not sure that his strong anti-Zionism did not colour even his Indian policy. Those Arabs who regard Zionism as the enemy of Arab nationality are, in our opinion, profoundly mistaken.

Little as the Zionists owe to Mr. Montagu, it is none the less a cause of sincere regret to them that his quarrel with the Government should have occurred. For he was a good Jew though an anti-Zionist, and when all that can be said against him has been said, he had a very real faith in the progress of the East. One of the functions of the Jew in the East is to reconcile it with the West; to give the East to which he belongs something of the inner spirit of the West from which he comes; to carry into the home of the age-long despotism, something of the spirit of the Dominion colonist, his independence of mind, and his love of freedom. In introducing the political ideas and practice of the West to India, Mr. Montagu was attempting an heroic task; the experiment, however interesting it is, is one for which one cannot predict success. It may be that the great experiment which Mr. Montagu began in India will fail; but, at any rate, it should be given a fair trial and not dropped as soon as its difficulties become apparent. Zionists would certainly be taking a very short-sighted view if they were to rejoice over Mr. Montagu's fall because he happened to be opposed to their ideas. The constancy of the Imperial Government and its fidelity to a great experiment once embarked upon stand for far more to Zionists than the removal of a powerful enemy from the councils of the Government.

Happily, this constancy is assured to us. The extremely important letter from Sir A. Balfour to Dr. Weizmann, and Mr. Churchill's reaffirmation of his belief in the Palestinian policy of the Government, bring down the schemes, of our enemies. We have constantly exhorted our readers that the case of these enemies was weak and would collapse if only it were vigorously opposed, and so far events support us in that contention. Inconstant in certain directions, this Government is absolutely firm on all questions—such as Zionism—in which the honour of the country is involved. And, similarly, we believe it will be faithful to the principles of Mr. Montagu's reforms in India. These reforms can only be defeated by the Indians themselves, as Jewish chances in Palestine can now only be defeated by Jewish failures in enthusiasm for the ideal or in the practical spirit that brings ideals down to earth to walk about like angels amongst men.

Mr. Montagu's reforms, then, are assured of a further trial, notwithstanding his own fall. It was not the failure of these reforms which have not yet been adequately tested, but Mr. Montagu's pro-Turkish policy that led to his rupture with the Government. The Jew as such has usually been well-treated by the Turk, but that fact need not blind us to the frightful failure of the Turk as a politician. Palestine ultimately independent and self-governing is incompatible with the revival of the old pre-war Turkish Empire. Jews hold their liberties in Palestine by the same general charter of justice as the other nationalities of the old Turkish Empire, and the restoration of the Empire would in the long run be as fatal to Jewish liberties in Palestine as to that of other peoples in the Near East. The programme put forward at Delhi by the Indian Government is, as has been observed more than once, more pro-Turkish than the Turk himself has ventured to be. The Turkish suzerainty over the Holy Places, for example, advocated by the Indian Government, would certainly be in-

consistent with the full development of an independent Arab nationality. That the Indian Government meant Jerusalem to be numbered amongst these Holy Places, and, therefore, under Turkish suzerainty, has been very widely assumed, but is exceedingly doubtful. Some modifications in the Treaty of Sevres there will certainly have to be, but they need not—in our opinion, should not—come south of the Taurus.

### A SHABBY BUSINESS.

MR. MONTAGU'S address to his constituents last Saturday was at once a brilliant and a discreditable performance. We cannot recall any recent incident which has afforded so significant and remarkable a proof of the state of general demoralisation into which politics in this country have fallen during the past few years. We do not suppose that Mr. Montagu has ever delivered an abler or a more effective speech. He recognised his opportunity, and he seized it with both hands. It was not the sort of speech which we have learned to expect from fallen Ministers. He hit and he bit his old colleagues, one after another, but he did it all with hardly the trace of a whine. Even when he presented himself to his audience in the guise of a political martyr sacrificed to the base appetites of the Die-hards, he spoke with a gusto which suggested that he was far more concerned to damage his executioners than to obtain sympathy for himself. And when he referred to the grave dangers which a change of policy at the India Office at this critical moment might involve, his sincerity was so obvious as to leave no room for the suspicion that his apprehensions were dictated by personal vanity. In short it was a great speech, worthy, in its strength at least, of the administrative record of the man who made it; and taken as a whole it was by far the most scathing and damaging attack which the Coalition Government has yet suffered at the hands of any of its critics.

Mr. Montagu has many enemies. He is a Jew. He has offended Tories by his Liberalism, he has alienated Liberals by his long apostasy; and he has none of those gifts which enable men to win personal popularity amongst their fellow-members in the House of Commons—possibly on account of certain characteristics which are illustrated by this latest episode in his career. But he has a great many friends and admirers in the country, besides enjoying in India a popular prestige which perhaps none of his predecessors had ever rivalled. And this position he has earned. For many years he has devoted himself heart and soul, first as Under-Secretary and then as Secretary of State, to the real interests of India, to the splendid conception of creating a great and progressive Indian democracy which may one day take its place among the self-governing Dominions of the British Empire. It is not impossible that his own racial inheritance has been of great assistance to him in giving him a more sympathetic grasp of the peculiar problems of modern India than any Anglo-Saxon could have achieved. At all events, he has identified himself with his special task to the apparent exclusion of all other political interests; and the very blunder which has ended for the time being his Ministerial career is the direct result of his absorption in the self-imposed duty of representing the Indian point of view. His actual administrative achievements have still to face the tests of time, but we believe that they will survive all tests, and that, apart from possibility of some disastrous change of policy, the "Montagu Reforms" will go down to history as one of the greatest and most courageous experiments in the long record of the development of the British Empire. If any Liberal has had a good excuse for remaining in the Coalition Government in order to complete a piece of work, it is certainly Mr. Montagu and in the manner in which he had made his escape from a dying and discredited administration had been different, there would have been few, we imagine, to deny him the political absolution which on the ground of his public services, he might have claimed. It might even have been forgotten that he accepted responsibility for the policy of "Black-and-Tannery" in Ireland.

But he has chosen to deprive himself of any such claim. He has attacked the Government in a manner which is not

consistent with the supposition that he has remained emotionally aloof from the internal intrigues and disputes which have governed the general policy of Mr. Lloyd George's Cabinet; and in a manner, moreover, which cannot be reconciled with even the most modern standards of private or public decency. It is not decent that, within forty-eight hours of resignation, a man should speak as Mr. Montagu spoke, of colleagues with whom he has been willingly and intimately associated for five years—especially since it was by no initiative or desire of his own that that association had been terminated. If he had had his way he would still be a member of the Cabinet, about whose policy he is now so contemptuous and so indignant. He would be defending the very thing which he is now attacking. We do not doubt that the attack is sincere, and that the defence would have been insincere, but that is no justification for the principles which permit so instant and complete a change of front. How can the public be expected to repose any faith in the professions of "statesmen" who show themselves so adept and so patient in the concealment of their real views! On Thursday, Mr. Montagu was a senior, and apparently a contented and loyal member of Mr. Lloyd George's administration, in unqualified defence of which he had addressed his constituents only a few days before. On Saturday he publicly described the Prime Minister and his methods in terms which made it impossible for ordinarily honest men to understand how he could have consented for so long even to profess loyalty to a man of whose character he held such an opinion. We are far from regretting his outburst, just as we are far from regretting the particular indiscretion which led to his expulsion from office; but the fact remains that his sincerity on Saturday afforded the most complete proof that he could possibly have given of the abysmal insincerities to which modern politicians, even of his calibre, are prepared to descend for the sake of retaining office.

The root of the matter is that Mr. Montagu has shown himself particularly susceptible to the atmosphere in which for the past five years he has lived. We do not suppose for a moment that if he had been serving under Mr. Asquith or Mr. Balfour or Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, he would ever have dreamed of acting in such a manner. But Mr. Lloyd George has established new standards of political conduct and apparently Mr. Montagu has, at least temporarily, accepted those standards. We are not so pessimistic however, as to believe that they will be permanently accepted by the nation or even by Mr. Montagu himself; for, if they should be, then public affairs in this country will very soon cease to offer a career which decent and reputable men will care to pursue. There is a Gresham's Law in politics as well as in economics; a debased currency, if it is widely circulated and accepted, must drive all good currency out of circulation. The nation cannot afford to dispense in its political life with the everyday virtues of honour and loyalty and sincerity, no matter how strikingly the example of one man may have proved that the very greatest personal success is possible without them, nor can it afford to accept without protest the picture of Lloyd-Georgian politics which Mr. Montagu has so vividly drawn and so forcibly illustrated by his own conduct. There is no permanent or profound reason why politics should be disreputable, and one of the greatest advantages which we may reasonably hope to derive from the impending destruction of the Coalition is that there will then be an opportunity of re-establishing decent personal standards, the memory of which at any rate Mr. Lloyd George has not yet succeeded in wiping out, and of lifting political life from the common disrepute into which it has fallen.

## THE SERVANT OF INDIA

A WEEKLY OF TWELVE PAGES

Annual Subscription Rupees Six.

POONA CITY.

## "LALVANI'S NERVENTINE"

The Supreme tonic restorative.  
Valuable in the treatment of

Digestive disorders, Anaemia, Neurasthenia, nervous disorders, wasting diseases, overworked Brain, Habitual constipation, 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.

## THE Servants of India Society's PAMPHLETS.

1. Self-Government for India under the British Flag— 0-8-0  
by the Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, President,  
Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. pp. 91.
  2. The Public Services in India— 0-10-0  
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— 0-8-0  
by an I. M. S. Officer. Crown 16 mo. pp. 58.
  6. Trade Union Legislation— 0-4-0  
by A Labour Advocate. Crown 16 mo. pp. 32.
  7. The Conscience Clause for Indians in Indian Education 0-8-0  
Codes (With a reply to certain Criticisms)—  
by the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri President  
Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. size pp. 67.
1. Arya-Bhushan School Dictionary— 3-0-0  
*Marathi-English.* by S. G. Vaze, Esq. B. A. Demi  
8 vo. pp. 600. Cloth Bound.
  2. Life of G. K. Gokhale— 0 4-0  
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— 0-4-0  
The Great Social Reformer, by the Hon. Mr. R. P.  
Paranjpye. Crown 16 mo. pp. 72.
  4. Native States and Post-War Reforms— 1-0-0  
by Mr. G. R. Abhyankar, B. A. LL. B., Sangli State.  
Crown 16 mo. pp. 96.
  5. A Gist of Gita-Rahasya— 0-8-0  
(2nd edition, reprint) by Mr. V. M. Joshi, M. A.
  6. Writings and Speeches of the late Hon. R. B. G. V. Joshi.  
Demi 8 vo. pp. 1400. Cloth Bound. 5-0-0
  7. Writings and Speeches of Sir N. G. Chandavarkar. 2-8-0  
Demi 8 vo. pp. 660. Cloth Bound.
- (N. B.—The above prices do not include postage, which will be extra.)

## 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 GUSSE 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.....

## Hon'ble Prof. V. G. Kale's Works.

- |   | Re.a.p. |
|---|---------|
| 1. Indian Economics—  | 6-0-0   |
| by Hon. Prof. V. G. Kale, M. A., Fergusson College,<br>Poona. (3rd edition). Demi 8 vo. pp. 590. Cloth<br>Bound.  |         |
| 2. Gokhale and Economic Reforms—  | 2-0-0   |
| by Hon. Prof. V. G. Kale, M. A., Fergusson College,<br>Poona. Crown 16 mo. pp. 250. Cloth Bound.  |         |
| 3. Indian Administration—   | 3-0-0   |
| by Hon. Prof. V. G. Kale, M. A., Fergusson College,<br>Poona (4th edition). With additional chapters<br>on the Reforms Act. Demi 8 vo. pp. 528. Cloth<br>Bound. |         |
| 4. The Reforms Explained—   | 1-0-0   |
| by Hon. Prof. V. G. Kale, M. A., Fergusson College,<br>Poona. Demi 8 vo. pp. 100.   |         |
| 5. Indian Industrial and Economic Problems—   | 1-8-0   |
| by Hon. Prof. V. G. Kale, M. A., Fergusson College,<br>Poona. (2nd edition). Crown 16 mo. pp. 340.  |         |
| 6. India's War Finance and Post-War Problems—   | 2-0-0   |
| by Hon. Prof. V. G. Kale, M. A., Fergusson College,<br>Poona. Crown 16 mo. pp. 164. Cloth Bound.  |         |
| 7. Currency Reform in India—  | 1-0-0   |
| by Hon. Prof. V. G. Kale, M. A., Fergusson College,<br>Poona. Crown 16 mo. pp. 120.   |         |
| 8. Dawn of Modern Finance in India—   | 2-0-0   |
| by Hon. Prof. V. G. Kale, M. A. Fergusson College,<br>Poona: Crown 16 mo. size pp. 154.   |         |

(N. B.—The above prices do not include postage, which will be extra.)

These books can be had of:—

1. The Arya-bhushan Press, Poona City.
2. The Bombay Vaibhav Press,  
Sandhurst Road Girgaum BOMBAY No. 4.

## 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.

## 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.

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