

THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. V, No. 26.]

POONA—THURSDAY, JULY 27, 1922.

{ INLAND SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN s. 10.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	301
ARTICLES:—	
The Lesson of War.—I. ...	303
The Faith of Revolutionism ...	305
The Truth about the "White Australia" Policy.— III. The Real Reason. By H. George Franks ...	306
The Akalee Movement.—I. Its Historical Back- ground. By Prof. Gulshan Rai ...	308
A LETTER FROM LONDON ...	310
MISCELLANEA:—	
Mr. Sastri's Dominion Tour ...	312

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

' AT last the much-talked-of Bombay
Bombay City Municipal Bill. City Municipal Amendment Act
was passed by the Legislative
Council at Poona on Wednesday last. We heave
a sigh of relief, as the pre-reform Bombay Corpora-
tion was strongly opposed to its transformation
from a landlord corporation to a democratic one.
During the passage of the bill it was made evi-
dent that such minor communities as European,
Christian and notably the Parsi were, under
the proposed ten-rupee franchise, afraid of losing
their great influence which at present they have
out of all proportion to the municipal strength.
The ten-rupee rent franchise will increase the
number of voters to 90,000 or probably a lakh, and
the twenty-rupee franchise, so insistently asked
for by the old corporation, to about 60,000 only in a
population of over 12 lakhs. So even under the
lower franchise the percentage of voters to popula-
tion is less than eight, a much smaller figure than
25, the percentage of voters for the new Legislative
Council of Burma. The Parsi community—the
community of Dadabhai Naoroji and Pherozeshah
Mehta—we regret to observe cut a very poor figure
during the debate by showing great nervousness
for its own representation. The whole affair end-
ed in a compromise consisting in the retention of
the ten-rupee franchise, the interest of the mino-
rity communities being safeguarded by 16 mem-
bers nominated by Government and 10 members
co-opted or elected, on a single transferable vote
system, by 96 members, 76 elected at ward elec-
tions, 4 by special constituencies and 16 nominat-
ed. Thus the total number will be 106, instead of
150 as was proposed. We must frankly confess
our great disappointment at this dilution of the

democratic elective principle by the flank move-
ment of Government nomination plus co-optation of
as many as 26 members in a body of 106 in all.

* * *

A Compromise Solution.

THE anti-Indian policy of the Gov-
ernments of South Africa, Kenya
and Fiji was severely condemned at
an influential meeting held in Bombay on the 19th
inst. At this meeting a speaker gave expression to the
following sentiments: " At the last Imperial Confe-
rence India's fight for equal rights had been defini-
tely abandoned with the approval of the India Office
through the mouth of people who called themselves
India's representatives. In pursuance of that sur-
render Mr. Sastri had openly embraced the 'White
Australia' policy." If the adoption by the Imperial
Conference of the reciprocity resolution involves a
surrender of India's equal rights, this surrender
took place, not at the last Imperial Conference,
but at the one held in 1918. The speaker was how-
ever correct in stating that to Mr. Sastri, who had
accepted that resolution as a compromise, it was
not open to challenge the " White Australia " po-
licy, that is, he could not insist upon the right of
unrestricted emigration of Indians to Australia in
fact as well as in theory. In theory Indians possess
the right already inasmuch as there is no racial bar
against them; but by the Imperial Conference
resolution we have agreed to forbear exercising
the right in practice, as we believe that, by
relieving Australians of the fear of an influx of
the Indian population, we shall be able to
secure for those Indians who have already
settled in the Colony full rights of equal citizen-
ship. It is of course a compromise solution, very
similar to the one accepted by Mr. Gandhi in South
Africa. His passive resistance struggle there was
carried on with two objects in view: (1) to secure
equality, in the eye of the law, for Indians in the
matter of immigration, and (2) to obtain rights of
citizenship for those who had already emigrated
there.

* * *

Does the Country want it Upset?

IT is becoming fashionable now-a-
days to condemn Mr. Gandhi's
South African settlement as well as
the reciprocity resolution of the Imperial Confer-
ence. It is of course open to the country to change its
mind on these matters, but it must be remembered
that at the time these events happened they were
approved and endorsed by the public in general.
In regard to the South African settlement it is cus-

tomary to adduce the fact that Sir Pherozeshah Mehta was opposed to Mr. Gandhi's solution, but Sir Pherozeshah was almost alone in opposition and his policy was definitely rejected by the country. At a Sheriff's meeting in Bombay in 1912 a memorial was adopted in Sir Pherozeshah's presence, which gave unreserved support to Mr. Gokhale and Mr. Gandhi, and the Indian National Congress also endorsed the position of the latter statesmen in preference to Sir Pherozeshah's contention. Similarly when the Imperial Conference met there was every evidence in support of the reciprocity resolution and none to the contrary. While it was inconceivable, in Australia, for the Government of India's representative to reject the compromise already accepted, has the country given him since a clear mandate to reject the compromise? A few newspaper articles and some stray speeches are certainly not a sufficient indication of any decided change in public opinion. If the right of unrestricted emigration to all British Colonies is to be asserted—not only in law but in actuality—let the Congress and other recognised associations pass resolutions to that effect. It will be unwise in the extreme to do so, and it will create a division on a matter on which there has always prevailed a unity of sentiment: but then we shall at least know where we stand. Till such resolutions are passed, it is not only futile but unfair to blame Mr. Sastri, who is conducting his mission in strict conformity with the view approved by the country at large.

* * *

United Action.

THE appeal made by the "1921 Club" to the leaders of all parties in the country for united action on the basis of working the Reforms Act deserves every success. The appeal is very opportune, inasmuch as several prominent men who consented for a while to give a trial to the non-co-operation method are now convinced of its "monstrous futility" and are reconsidering their position in respect of the boycott of Councils. Mr. N. C. Kelkar, for instance, in his evidence before the Civil Disobedience Committee (the Committee by a curious fatuity has interdicted the publication of the evidence tendered to it but is allowing its members freely to air their conclusions based on that evidence) makes a cogent plea for the removal of all taboos—whether against the Councils or law courts, or schools. He asks for "a radical reconstruction" of the non-co-operation programme; the changes he proposes are so radical that there will be left precious little of non-co-operation in it when the changes are effected. Mr. Kelkar is not unconscious of this fact, and he therefore proposes, in order to obviate the objection, to change the very name of the movement. He would prefer to call it "responsive non-co-operation," in order to make it clear on the face of it that non-co-operation was not to be practised all along the line and in every particular, as if it were some religious principle to compromise which would be a deadly sin, but only on

those occasions when it would be expedient to do so. To offer opposition to bad Government measures in the legislature is to him also a form of non-co-operation. And it must be observed that if he favours re-entry into the Councils, he does not do so with the object of obstructing every measure of Government, good, bad or indifferent—he studiously refrains from making such a suggestion—but in order to carry out what is in fact the obverse of Mr. Tilak's "responsive co-operation," which was authoritatively explained by Mr. Tilak in the Congress Democratic Party's manifesto as "without hesitation offer(ing) co-operation or resort(ing) to constitutional opposition, whichever may be expedient." We ask for nothing better and would for ourselves extend the right hand of fellowship to all who unite in working the reforms, whatever their particular method may be of working them (short of indiscriminate obstruction).

* * *

IT is doubtful if, after one sees the estimate which the non-co-operating Nationalists form of their own ability to preserve their independence of mind when in the midst of officials, one will have the heart to press them to enter the Councils. The *Servant of Calcutta* asks, of course expecting an emphatic reply in the negative, if their leaders have really shed their sense of helplessness and dependence. It says:

Are we sure that we are not in hypnosis still—in the leading-strings of others still? Behind all the bluff and bluster of leadership and heroism, does not the heart of a slave and sycophant quake and cramp, dilate and shrink still? If so, what stamina, what backbone do we expect to carry with us when we insinuate ourselves into the alluring trap of Legislative Councils which, constituted as they are at present, can only make the hero's occupation gone like Othello's. Once inside the Council Hall, the slave in us will not be late in putting itself in evidence. Backbone has to be acquired elsewhere—in actual service of the people and suffering for them.

Well, well. There is nothing like knowing oneself.

* * *

* RAO BAHADUR M. C. RAJA, M.L.C., leader of an important section of the depressed classes in Madras, has very good reason to complain bitterly against the *Justice* party, as he did while presiding over a conference recently. In the name of all non-Brahmans including the depressed classes and with their active help, that party secured the reservation of a number of seats in the reformed Legislative Council and got Government to accept a policy of giving nearly two-thirds of all appointments to the non-Brahmans. Mr. Raja complains that not only have all these reservations been exclusively enjoyed by the high caste non-Brahmins, but that the only department that was benefiting the depressed classes, the labour department, has been practically abolished by the *Justice* party on the insincere plea of economy. While sympathising with this complaint, we cannot, however, support his proposals that 20 out of 28 reserved seats in the Legislative Council and 30 per cent. of the appointments should

Depressed Classes and "Justice" Party.

be set apart for the depressed classes. At present there are five nominated members in the Madras Council, but excepting Mr. Raja they are all conspicuous for silence rather than for activity. It is impossible to find at present twenty persons among the depressed classes who can intelligently follow the Council proceedings, while not even half a dozen would be able to bear the expenses of an election. As to appointments we should be delighted to learn that the community possessed a sufficient number of qualified men to fill one per cent., let alone thirty, of the clerical and higher posts.

Communal
appointments

COMMUNAL consciousness has its uses within limits but those limits are usually forgotten by the advocates of communal representation on public bodies or in the public services. We agree that some special encouragement should be given to members of backward communities in the matter of appointments, as they are at present a very strong incentive to secondary and higher education. But that encouragement ought not to be given at the expense of justice or of efficiency beyond a certain degree. Where there are two applicants, both qualified for an appointment, we would not object to preference being given to a backward community though the other applicant may happen to be the better qualified of the two. But if the former did not possess the necessary qualification he should get no consideration whatever. And once in service the rules of promotion should be applied impartially to all alike. Failure in those two respects has created a good deal of ill-feeling between Brahmins and non-Brahmins in the Deccan and in Madras Presidency and between Hindus and Muhammadans in North India. It is absurd to say that the various castes and communities should be represented in the public services in about the same proportion as they are found in society at large because they are not equally educated and have not the same aptitude for all functions whether civil or military. The backward classes should not forget in their anxiety for jobs that the functions of the State have got to be discharged with due efficiency.

Interpellation.

ONE wonders, how many of our N.-C.-O. friends, who used to belittle the reality of the Legislature's powers under the Reforms, are aware that the great and free Republic of the U. S. A. grants no right of interpellation to its legislatures? When one knows the whips and scorpions of question time, as all Ministers only too well know them, it is distinctly amusing to read that Mr. Hughes has recently explained the function of the Washington dispatches purporting to elucidate the politics of the State Department as "our substitute for parliamentary interpellation". Fancy the government of India telling its M. L. A. that there is no need for questions, seeing that there is a publicity officer!

THE LESSON OF WAR.

I.

EIGHT years ago to-morrow there took place the first formal declaration of war (that of Austria-Hungary against Serbia), a declaration which was successively to lead to the famous General Mobilization order of the Tsar's, to Germany's declaration of war against Russia and so on, through the most horrible of concatenations, to the "Great War" which has to-day brought the whole of western civilization to the verge of utter collapse and, perhaps, final downfall.

Few indeed are they, who do not realize by this time the utterly terrorizing and degrading nature of modern warfare, its coarsening of every moral fibre, its unnerving agonies of mind and body. Books beginning with Barbusse's classic "Le Feu" are not lacking, to give a photographically accurate account of what the combatant had to endure. The question is, was it all worth it?

Whatever the motives and aims of the handful of people who at the fateful time, eight years ago, pitchforked the peoples of Europe, and eventually of the whole world, into this universal war: the people themselves at the time knew nothing of the follies and knaveries of these men. If the German people were rallying round their flag to defend their civilization against an onslaught by the barbarians from the East, the English on their part like one man rose to defend the rights of an outraged Belgium against the unprincipled monsters from across the Rhine. Subjectively, nothing has ever equalled the perfectly magnificent way in which—at least during the first year or two of the war—the men of British birth voluntarily enlisted in their hundred thousands to fight in what they felt was a fight to a finish for the highest ideals of international right against the brute force of an unbridled national selfishness. There is no question but that the English nation was swayed at the time by a most lofty idealism, that the enthusiasm was no mere outward, passing show, but a passionate determination to back Right against Wrong at whatever cost; to back it, be that cost even one's own life. And in passing, let us here state, that cynics make a fundamental mistake in confounding with this subjective mentality of the fighting masses the objective causes of the war and the aims of those responsible for it; just as sentimentalists go wrong by imputing the former ideology even to the latter. There is no doubt that a true judgment is only possible, if both aspects are kept steadily in view.

The directors of the war naturally made the most of the holy passion that had so spontaneously flared up in the hearts of the masses and were not slow to emphasize, embellish and intensify the generally already prevalent idea of a Holy War of Righteousness against all the forces of evil. The greater the horrors to be suffered, as the War wore on, the loftier and further reaching became the objects for which the combatants were

exhorted to hold out. This was to be a War to end all War; a War to make the world safe for Democracy; a War to make possible the social reconstruction of a New Earth, fit for such heroes to live in; a War to establish a new world-order between nation and nation, and between class and class, such as found final expression in Mr. Wilson's famous Fourteen Points.

To ask to-day whether all or any of these objects for which ostensibly this war was being waged, have been attained, can only seem cruel sarcasm. But if we are to learn the true lesson of the War and profit by the world agonies of our days, it is indeed necessary to go into the question and to analyze, just how far this war has failed in the attainment of its objects, and why.

Let us take one by one the objects for the sake of which alone these untold sacrifices were being justified, demanded, offered up.

Of these the first and immediate one, as far as English people are concerned, was the neutrality and independence of Belgium. Yet to-day, four years since the only power that was said to make such neutrality and independence impossible, four years since the German hordes had to release their grip on a prostrate Belgium: to-day, Belgium is no more neutral and independent than, say, Cuba is neutral territory or independent of the United States. Belgium, tied hand and foot by an offensive and defensive military convention to France, has become one of the satellites obediently circling round a French world. Why was the scrap of paper so infamously torn up by Germany, not reenacted with due solemnity, when victory was won? Who could have menaced again Belgian liberties, once Germany was out of the way? If Belgian neutrality was an object of the war, as it was, and if the war has not restored it, as it has not done, it is evident that war is incapable of ensuring neutrality and independence, at least to Belgium.

What about other countries? What about the self-determination of nations in general? That was another great object of the war; one made familiar to everybody by the revelations of the shameless oppression of racial minorities in the twin empires of the Hohenzollerns and Hapsburgs. Has the war, which smashed up both, made such oppression henceforth impossible? The treaties of Versailles, St. Germain and Trianon, transferred 72 lakhs of people from Germany and 369 from Austro-Hungary to other allegiances. Let us presume that these 441 lakhs of people were "liberated". But even granting this for the moment, we must set against it the new minorities now created, such as in Czekhoslovakia (70 lakhs), Italy (6), Russia (55) and Poland (72): 203 lakhs in all. In Yugoslavia it is true to say that not a single inhabitant outside of what used to be Serbia, desires to be ruled by the backwoodsmen of Belgrade: Montenegrin, Dalmatian, Croatian, Styrian, &c. has got anything but self-determination in the new Yugoslav kingdom and amongst them they account for no less than 72 lakhs. Again, there is Dantzic, Memel,

the Saar: all territories, whose inhabitants (16 lakhs) desire nothing less than the separate existence forced upon them. Austria, the poor bleeding rump that is left of it, wishes nothing more ardently than union with the *Reich*: but the 64 lakhs of her people, who rank amongst the most highly cultured in Europe, are denied the right of a self-determination which alone could save their country. Finally, what even of Alsace-Lorraine itself, which was handed over to France, without any more consultation of her 19 lakhs of people, than was thought necessary by Prussia herself fifty years ago. France by so vehemently opposing a plebiscite in these lands, once the war was won, lends but colour to the contention of close students of the Alsatian problem, that, if these people had been given the exercise of their right of self-determination, they would have voted neither for Germany nor for France, but for their constitution as a new neutral State of their own. As a net result of all these considerations we get the appalling total of 374 lakhs of people, whose right of self-determination has been deliberately thwarted; and deducting their number from the total of 441 transferred from former allegiances (from which must be deducted Austria's 64 lakhs), we are left with the comparatively speaking handful of 131 lakhs of people, whose right of self-determination has been gratified—at the expense of 374 lakhs whose equal rights have been ruthlessly sacrificed! This may be magnificent and war, but it can hardly be called the vindication of the sacred right of self-determination. No, as far as the latter is concerned, the War has utterly failed to introduce this principle as a norm of the New Europe.

At least, is the New Europe, though not organized on strict lines of self-determination, a better Europe? We will rule out the countries of the vanquished and speak of the victor nations alone. Is England a better country to live in than it was eight years ago? To ask that question, is to have answered it. Unemployment running into millions, complete stagnation in trade and industry, high cost of living, crushing taxation, a public debt of fantastic size, are facts which do not bespeak betterment in any material sense. Nor does England stand alone in this respect. Even the great and wealthy American Republic affords a spectacle differing in no essential respect from the picture just drawn. As regards class hatred, feeling has probably never run higher, though at present disguised by the sullen quiet of exhaustion. England's Trade Union labour has suffered a series of strike defeats, which have completely drained its resources and left it a helpless prey of the employers, who on their part are more firmly than ever entrenched in federations of their own. The great housing scheme to make up for the monstrous lack of decent dwellings has come to nothing owing to lack of funds; education which was to have given a chance to every child of post-war England has had to give way to the demands of "Anti-Waste". Of the Sankey

Report, which was to have brought sanity to the Mining Industry; the equally urgent nationalization of the transport system; national reorganization of agriculture; minimum wages; all grandiose schemes which were to have provided for a superior standard of life, for a higher status of labour and for greater opportunities for citizenship, which were to ensure not only the decencies but even the amenities of life to a nation of heroes: nothing remains but—unemployment, doles, England, so far from having been turned by the War into a country fit for heroes to live in, has become a country fit for heroes to beg in or to emigrate from.

The whole world was to have been made safe for democracy. Yet it is notorious that there have been few governments in recent times, whether in England, in France or in the United States, which have been more reactionary than those in power to-day. Everywhere the liberties of the individual have been curtailed and the powers of the executive enlarged. England, once the asylum of all fleeing from tyranny, has adopted the Continental idea of a "political police." The passport system—once the monopoly of Russia and Turkey—has become universal. Worst of all, Militarism, that antithesis of all democracy, is more rampant today than it has been in the palmiest times of Prussianism. It has changed its venue from Potsdam to Paris, but it has lost nothing by that change. Notwithstanding the total disappearance of Germany as a military power, France today keeps a standing army of 700,000 men in Europe alone; even a country like Yugoslavia cannot do with an army of less than 800,000. The British Empire which spent £77 millions on army and navy before the war, spends now 156, Japan 71 against 19, France 140 against 40, the United States 335 against 100. The whole of Europe from the Baltic to the Adriatic has been arranged on the pattern of an armed camp. Yugoslavia, Rumania, Poland, Czechoslovakia are so many French military outposts. Scientists go on perfecting the scope and precision of the engines of destruction: more effective airships, more powerful explosives, novel submarine craft and, especially—Washington or no Washington—still more devastating methods of "chemical warfare." Obviously, whatever else the war has done, it certainly has not furthered the cause of human civilization, of democratic progress, of peace and goodwill on earth.

THE FAITH OF REVOLUTIONISM.

ASSUREDLY there is nothing quite so illuminating as a clear-thinking and sincere opponent. As such we have read with much pleasure Evelyn Roy's article on "The Dèbâcle of Gandhism" in the July number of the *Labour Monthly*. This magazine is an organ of the British Communists who stand for the "dictatorship of the proletariat", for a close compliance with the decrees of Moscow, and for Revolutionism as against Reformism. Revolution-

ism is convinced that no better order can ensue until the present order is completely smashed up; that anarchy and chaos are a necessary stage through which a successful movement must pass; and that even when the anarchic stage has been passed, the ultimate order cannot emerge without a—more or less transitory—period of dictatorship, during which force is wielded against the bulk of the people, who do not yet know what is good for them. As will be seen, the latter idea and the appeal to force as a remedy is common to the revolutionary Communists and to the reactionary Die-hards: both despise what they call "a milk-and-water Reformism" and with it democracy. Starting from such premisses it is illuminating—not least so when "Civil Disobedience Committees" are taking evidence—to see how people of that ilk view recent events in India.

According to Evelyn Roy, Mr. Gandhi was splendid up to the Ahmedabad Congress, when, having stirred up the whole country to its depths and made it ripe for revolution, he got himself appointed dictator. Then was the time to strike, as Evelyn Roy and everybody believing in dictatorship would naturally believe. To the latter Mr. Gandhi lost the game by not using his dictatorship then and there at Ahmedabad, when he failed to "issue an edict to the waiting peasantry to cease payment of taxes." Not to enter upon mass civil disobedience when he could have done so, but to go on using a mere idle threat of it, was to prove to Lord Reading that there was no need for peace negotiations: "Confronted by a show of force and firmness, backed by mass action on a large scale, Lord Reading might have wavered and accepted negotiations with the non-co-operators." As it was, he merely "called Mr. Gandhi's bluff." Mr. (or Miss?) Roy talks of "N.C.O.'s intoxicating themselves with the spirit of non-violence", to him Chauri Chaura was a mere "pinprick" (!) and "frankly no leadership for a time is preferable to Mr. Gandhi's misleadership." We know such sentiments are felt here in India too, though they be not expressed with the same candour. For the latter we are grateful to the *Labour Monthly*; for we believe that nothing will open the eyes of people better than the realisation that non-payment of taxes can only be logically advocated by people who believe that the country must first be reduced to complete anarchy, before another *raj*, the Swaraj, can emerge. "Firmness," whether in the mouth of a Bolshevik or of a Die-hard would-be dictator, is one and the same thing: to rule by violence without law and to spurn democracy.

The article in question distinguishes between Mr. Gandhi as a saint and a patriot on the one hand, and as a political leader on the other. To us who believe in capturing and improving, rather than in smashing the machine, Mr. Gandhi has never seemed greater or led more truly, than when he called off a civil disobedience movement, the moment he realised (however late in the day it was) that it could but lead to universal anarchy. We must say, we would think much higher of some-

of our N. C. O. stalwarts if they had the pluck to speak in the tones of the *Labour Monthly* and ceased to pay to Mr. Gandhi's leadership a lip-service which is as insincere as it must be nauseating to all true followers of the Mahatma. And doubly would we welcome it, if to sincerity they could add clear-sightedness, and would frankly avow that they have no use for democracy, since they have no use for persuasion; and that, believing in the virtue of violence and revolution, they realise that Swaraj, as understood by them, must, for a long time to come, mean the dictatorship not of a saint and a patriot like Mahatmaji, but of a tiny group of the most violent and least scrupulous, whose dictatorship must necessarily spell, not the beginning, but the end of all freedom.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE "WHITE AUSTRALIA" POLICY.

III—THE REAL REASON.

HAVING considered in reasonable detail the so-called political and social causes of Australia's adoption of the policy so erroneously and unfortunately named, and having also realised that the official arguments are by no means the same as the ordinary explanation of the man in the street and the man on the farm, we are now in a position to study the underlying cause of the ingrained and inborn idea of every Australian—namely, that he is himself vitally concerned in the keeping of his country free from all trace of "coloured" immigration. From hearsay and from an occasional paragraph in the newspapers the average Australian may glean some ideas concerning the political "necessity" and the scientific "advisability" of the closed door policy; and without thinking very much about it, he may nod cheerfully in agreement with the sentiments expressed, especially when he recalls certain little experiences he has had with the only Asiatics he ever met—the Japanese and the Chinese. But get into conversation with this "average" Australian, ask him just what he thinks of the question and how the abolition of the policy would affect him, if at all; and within half an hour you will learn more about the real principles that lie behind this fundamental national ideal than you would from a whole week's solid reading of the literature on the question. And, after all, it is the Australian's own private opinion which counts when it comes to making decisions. The politicians may fulminate with their suave and silvery oratory; the press may wield its mightier-than-the-sword power by day and by night; the preachers may exhort from the pulpit week after week; but all these, while perhaps helping a little to mould what we call "public opinion", never *make* the Australian do the thing that is merely convenient or easy or just "possibly" helpful. He hears what others have to say, thinks over both sides, and then makes up his own mind, and sticks to his decision. This peculiar characteristic, this strange limitation of

the power of the press, the platform, and the pulpit was remarkably evidenced during the campaigns conducted just previous to the two conscription referendums that were taken during the war. All the three great forces of the press, platform and pulpit—together with the usually magical call of patriotism—did their utmost to produce an atmosphere favourable to the introduction of conscription, and it was generally believed in press, political and preaching circles that they were very successful. But the ballot box showed otherwise, revealing that, despite all the arguments, pleadings, cajolings, and callings of the country's leaders, the Australian had his own ideas which were practically immovable; ideas, however, which were only personally agreed upon after a careful summarising and weighing of the facts.

This illustration has been cited here to outline the character of the people who are born with this "White Australia" doctrine as part of their make-up. So that even should any of the Governments decide to relax the policy, and should the decision receive the unanimous support of the press and the churches, even then, I fear, it would be a next-to-impossible task to make the Australian himself follow suit—unless he could be convinced that the logic on which he has based his principles was faulty from the beginning. And when this logic has been attested by things which he himself has seen, then the thought of changing his ideas were nearly as hopeless as that of climbing Everest with a four foot step ladder.

The average Australian, for instance, is fond of his garden and fond of his work, but he is also fond of his leisure and his recreation. Hence when he goes out and sees a Chinaman at work for sixteen hours a day, never looking up at the sky, never straightening his back, never stopping from dawn till dark, he resents the untiring, unswerving industry—or slavery—of the man who has no soul beyond early tomatoes and peas and lettuce and cabbages. But I hear some of my Indian friends asking, why should he resent this unceasing labour of his neighbour? Simply because Australia has made "non-sweating" a national ideal, because the people of the young nation fifty or sixty years ago decided that Australia, at any rate, should be the "working man's paradise" a land in which every labourer—be he clerk or shopman or farmer or navy—should work respectable hours under healthful conditions and receive in return a living wage. For years the workers have been working to this end; and hence the sight of these "Asiatic immigrants" living with their accustomed frugality, on what appears an insufficient quantity of food, and working with their accustomed ceaselessness and absolute unconcern of time seems to the Australian the very antithesis of his national aim, and so he decides that an open door policy would, in the end, mean the failure of all his efforts to reach his ideal of labour hours, conditions and wages.

Now I admit that this principle will be hard

of understanding to the average eastern mind; but its acceptance is a vital step in the correct interpretation of the "White Australia" policy as seen through the spectacles of the average Australian. From actual experience he has seen that cheap immigration labour forces down the standard of life, that it tends either to lower wages or to increase unemployment—neither of which results he will tolerate. If there is one thing above all others of which the Australian is jealous and for which he is zealous, it is his rights of labour. To him it certainly is more than religion, more than home, more than money itself, and so we find him doing the most absurd things, the most illogical and self-robbing things, to preserve those established rights. For instance, it is laid down by the rules of his trade that only a certain amount of work must be done in a day for certain wages. If perchance he should see a fellow-workman doing a trifle more work, but for the same pay, he will insist either on that man reducing his output or being dismissed on the spot. And if neither of these demands is obeyed, then a strike will be called throughout the whole of that trade. And all because one man thought he would be earning his money better by working a little harder. So it is plain that what the Australian will not permit of his fellow-countryman he will certainly not tolerate in those of another nationality, especially when his worker's rights are at stake.

The trouble really is that the condition of the worker in the early days in Australia was an absolute disgrace to any land, with the inevitable result that gradually the workers so united and organised themselves that a most elaborate system was built up to protect the labourer. Of this system we shall have more to say in the next article. Here we simply give its attitude towards, or relationship to, the "White Australia" policy. First of all there is the conviction that "coloured" immigration means either cheap labour or inferior production. If the former, then he believes that no employer will pay one man high wages when he can get another for half the weekly expense. This, then, seems to justify the Australian in believing that an open door policy will materially affect the employment question and it will also tend automatically to reduce the wage level thus defeating the system so laboriously worked up. If, on the other hand, he also believes that inferior workmanship will result from the policy, then here again his "rights" are interfered with, because inferior work means a lower standard of wage, a lower price of retailing, and a consequent decrease in the demand of the superior article, this latter contingency being a certainty in the case of many articles where perfection is not absolutely essential.

But, some one will say, why not make it compulsory to pay the general wage to all and sundry, irrespective of colour? This arrangement might be made in other lands, but never in Australia, because the Australian worker, who has spent

years in learning a trade and who is a master of his craft, knows from experience (chiefly Japanese goods, I admit) that the native foreign article is not made by a good tradesman, and so he objects to this inferior workman receiving the same rate of pay as they themselves would be receiving. Of course I freely admit that Australia could well do with four times as many tradesmen and skilled workmen as are at present employed; but to utilise these extra men would mean capital. This gives us the Australian's reason for not being willing to allow wealthy Asiatics into their land: they fear that these capitalists will set up factories to employ the "coloured" labour which the ordinary employer is not permitted by the workers' unions to employ. But here again, as in the realm of politics, it is Japan that is feared, because that market is Australia's nearest and greatest competitor.

Now it is true that these objections or arguments would never be raised in many other lands, such as England, for instance; but it must be definitely recognised that the Australian national temperament is probably the paramount consideration in this question. We emphasise this point because it is an essential. For what he considers his principles, his worker's rights, the Australian will sleep under the sky instead of a roof, go to bed hungry, get still more hungry, and tramp the streets all day, refusing work a dozen times rather than bury his principles of labour. He will go out on strike and remain striking for weeks on starvation pay rather than return to work before what he believes are his rights are granted to him. He has a natural dread of cheap labour, of "sweated" industries, and his limited experience of Asiatics—particularly Chinese and Japanese—has confirmed his belief in the advisability of keeping Australia white. At the back of it all there lies the fear, not that he will be driven out of his heritage by armed force, but that he will find himself worked out of his position and driven to low wages, should the immigration laws be relaxed. Whether or not there is this possibility in connection with Indian immigration is a question none too easy to answer. Past history and figures will count for little in this matter, nor will the Fiji experience, because never before would such a land of wealth and prospect have been laid open to occupation. We must put aside all speculation on that score, for it can be nothing but speculation; and we must accept the position as we find it, namely, that the question of choosing how, when, where, and with whom he shall work has been adopted by the Australian as a worker's right. And surely Indians, after having had the experience of a coloured (in their case, a "white" colour) race entering their country, can at least appreciate the feelings of the Australian at any prospect of his being swamped by what would be to him an alien people. The Indian has national principles and urges them with the utmost power; hence he should be the very first to acknowledge Australia's right to adhere to her principles, even

though to the Indian they may be foolish and inexplicable.

This investigation, however, must not stop here. Further light on the subject—and essential illumination it is—can only be obtained by a brief study of the organisation of Labour in Australia, when it will be readily seen that yet other "principles" enter into the "White Australia" policy, as it is accepted by and outlined by the Australian worker. This, therefore, will be the subject matter of our next article.

H. GEORGE FRANKS.

THE AKALEE MOVEMENT.

I.—ITS HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.

IN order to understand the Akalee movement in the Punjab we need to go a little bit into the history of the rise of sects in Sikhism. The Sikh religion like Hinduism contains many sects. The first and the earliest schism was that created by Baba Srichand, son of Guru Nanak. Baba Srichand is in the Punjab considered to be one of the founders of the Udasi fraternity of Hindus. While the Sikh faith lays stress on the purity of family life, the Udasis believe in withdrawing from worldly life. After the death of Guru Nanak, his son Baba Srichand became the head of the Udasis, and Guru Angad, one of the disciples of Guru Nanak, carried on the mission of the new Sikh faith. The third Guru, Amar Dass, definitely declared the new Sikh Church to be separate from the Udasi fraternity. The fourth Guru, Ram Dass, laid the foundations of Amritsar, and established in that place the headquarters of the Sikh Church. Nankana Sahib, the birth place of Guru Nanak, was by the Sikh Gurus not considered to be quite the central place to become the headquarters of the new Sikh Church. Later on, an Udasi Sadhu, a follower of Baba Srichand, fixed his headquarters at Nankana Sahib, and this place became one of the centres of the Udasis. The Sikh Gurus, after the declaration of the third Guru Amar Dass, never interfered with the administration of Udasi centres.

Two other modern sects of the Sikhs, Akalees and Nirmalas, rose in the time of the tenth Guru—Guru Govind. The Akalees, or the immortal ones, were originally that faithful band which fought Guru Govind's battles against the Mussalmans. These Akalees inherited the military and political teachings of Guru Govind. The Nirmalas were originally those Sikhs, who at the command of Guru Govind had gone to Benares to study Sanskrit. They were intended to give shape to the scriptural writings containing the teachings of the Gurus. The Nirmalas, or the spotless ones, after the death of Guru Govind developed the philosophical side of the new religion taught by the Gurus. After the death of Guru Govind in 1708 the military and the political work of the Guru devolved on his follower Banda, who was originally a Bairagi Sadhu. He wanted, during the period of his leadership, 1708-1716, to make certain radical innovations into the Sikh Church as recognised by Guru Govind. But in this he met with opposition from the Akalees, who organised themselves under the name of Tat Khalsas (the real Khalsas). In the time of Guru Govind there also arose another division among the Sikhs. Those who adopted all the reforms introduced by Guru Govind, viz. kesh (long hair), kangha (hair comb), kara (iron-wrist ring), kachch (nickers), and kirpan (dagger), and underwent the ceremony of amritpan, (bap-

tism), became the Amritdhari Sikhs, and those followers of the previous nine Gurus who were slow to adopt the innovations of Guru Govind, began to be called the Sahajdhari Sikhs. These Sahajdhari Sikhs, though following the teachings of the Guru are not in outward appearance at all different from the ordinary Hindus. I have now described all the more important Sikh sects. After the death of Guru Govind the householders were divided into Amritdharis and Sahajdharis. The Nirmalas formed the priestly class of the Sikhs, and the Akalees were the national volunteers of the Sikhs to carry on the military and political mission of the last Guru. The Udasis, no doubt following the teachings of the first Sikh Guru, Baba Nanak, were since the ministry of the third Guru, Amar Dass, outside the pale of the main Sikh Church.

In the time of Maharaja Ranjit Singh, the Akalees, joined his newly organised armies, and helped to no small extent in building up the Empire of the Sikhs. In his campaigns against the Pathans the Akalee troops were always in the forefront. After the death of Ranjit Singh the Akalee officers and soldiers in the Sikh army constituted themselves into guardians of the faith, and they assumed to themselves the right of convening Panchayats for settling even the administrative questions of the empire. But in the reign of the minor ruler Dalip Singh, the army became so powerful through the Akalee organisation, that it became quite uncontrollable by the civil authorities. It was with the object of destroying the army thus organised by the Akalees, that the civil authorities foolishly pitted it against the British Government. This brought about the Sikh wars and the eventual annexation of the Punjab. In the reign of the minor ruler Dalip Singh the Civil administration in the Punjab happened to be controlled by certain unscrupulous Brahmans. The destruction of the Sikh army was no doubt to some extent planned by two of these Brahmans. It was therefore natural for the Sikhs to become antagonistic to the Brahmans. In 1846 shortly after the First Sikh War there arose one Udasi, Sadhu Balak Singh. He made it his mission in life to break the power of the Brahmans over the Sikhs. He wanted to exclude the Brahmans from presiding over Sikh religious ceremonies, and he also wanted the Sikhs to give up such religious ceremonies as could only be conducted by Brahmans. He found some adherents among the Sikh garrisons of some of the forts in Northern Punjab, which were then under the occupation of the British Government. Balak Singh died in 1853, and his teachings were pushed forward by one Ram Singh, a native of Bhaini in Ludhiana district. His ministry lasted from 1853 to 1872. He is now well known as Ram Singh Kuka. He is the founder of the modern sect of the Kukas. The Kukas, like the earlier Akalees, believe themselves to be the guardians of the Sikh faith and consider it their duty to restore the power and the prestige of the Khalsa as it existed in the time of Ranjit Singh. The activities of Ram Singh and his followers made the new sect of the Kukas suspicious in the eyes of Government. He was at length, in 1872, deported by Government to Rangoon under Regulation III of 1818.

In 1877 the Arya Samaj was established in Lahore, and then commenced the growth of the national religious movement in the Punjab. By that time the western system of education also had become established in the province. All communities in the Punjab were influenced by western thought, and it began to have its effect on the religious systems of the different communities. In those days it was the fashion among the educated

people to impute all the defects in Hindu society to the influence of Brahmans. The Brahma Samaj and the Arya Samaj both commenced their campaign against Brahmanical and priestly influences. The Kukas, as I have shown above, were already out to destroy Brahmanical influences from among the Sikhs. The Kukas, on account of their alleged political activities, were suppressed, but it seems the idea of eliminating the influence of Brahmans was taken up by educated Sikhs, who like the Hindu reformers of the day considered it desirable to purge their community of all priestly influences. The Nirmalas, or the Sikh priestly class who had modelled the philosophical side of the Sikh religion after the fashion of Hinduism, now began to lose their hold on educated Sikhs. These Neo-Sikhs, the products of western education, wanted to lead Sikhism back to what was in their opinion taught by Guru Govind. All the religious commentaries and expositions of Nirmalas and Udasis were to be rejected, just as the Arya Samajists had rejected all the Puranas and most of the post-Vedic sacred literature. The cry of the Arya Samajists was, "Back to the Vedas"; the cry of the Neo-Sikhs was, "Back to Guru Govind." The Neo-Sikhs believed that the purity of the Sikh religion had been sullied by the Brahmanical teachings of the Nirmala priests. They thought it was their duty to resist and reject the innovations of the Nirmalas and the Brahmans, just as in earlier times the innovations of Banda had been resisted by the Tat Khalsas. The Neo-Sikhs also adopted the name of Tat Khalsas. A Sikh organisation consisting of educated Sikhs was established in Lahore under the name of Khalsa Diwan. In 1893 the foundation stone of the Khalsa College was laid, which by 1899 became a First Grade College. Since then there have been held annual educational conferences in principal towns of the province, at almost each one of which one Sikh High School has been started. In general literacy the Sikhs are now more advanced than even the Hindus. The Sikh Educational Conference has brought about a great awakening in the Sikh community. It has also helped very much to purge Sikhism of Brahmanical influences. The Tat Khalsas, the organisers of this conference, have raised Sikhism from a sect of Hinduism to the position of a separate religion. Up to now the old sect of Akalees, the national volunteers of Guru Govind, had since the fall of the Sikh kingdom, remained quite neglected and without any influence worth the name.

RECENT HISTORY.

It would be interesting to trace the process which has in these days transformed the majority of the Sikh community in the Punjab into Akalees. The calm in the political atmosphere of the Punjab was first disturbed in 1907, when the Government proposed to modify the terms of the Chenab canal colony tenures and decided to raise the canal water rates in the Bari Doab canal area. Both these areas are the strongholds of the Sikhs, and the proposed agrarian measures were considered by the Sikh peasantry as breach of faith on the part of Government. There was great unrest on this point in the rural areas, and at length the Government deported Sardar Ajit Singh, one of the leaders of the agitation, under Regulation III of 1818, but at the same time dropped the proposal for modifying the colony tenures and for raising the canal water rates. As the Kukas and the Akalees had then no great influence with the masses and the educated Sikhs who controlled the Tat Khalsa movement had not as yet begun to take interest in political agitation, the deportation of Ajit Singh, did not, outwardly, much affect the Sikhs,

but it is clear that after this the Sikhs began to insist more generally on wearing the kirpan (short sword or dagger), one of the five articles always to be kept by a pious Sikh under the injunctions of Guru Govind. During the seven years from 1907 to 1914 the wearing of kirpans by the Sikhs became more common. The size and the length of kirpan also became bigger. It is known that during one or two years before the outbreak of the great war, there were several prosecutions of the Akalees for possessing long and big kirpans. In 1914, however, perhaps in consideration of the military importance of the Sikhs, the kirpans in possession of the Sikhs were exempted from the operation of the Arms Act, at least so far as Northern India was concerned. I believe that during the years when the war continued, a very large proportion of the Sikhs became armed with this weapon.

But towards the end of 1914 happened the Kamagata Maru incident. A very large number of Sikh emigrants to Canada were turned back and in the beginning of 1915 almost all of these emigrants were either arrested, interned or imprisoned. The way in which these emigrants were hunted out, persecuted and convicted roused for them much sympathy among the Sikhs. These emigrants may or may not have been imbued with revolutionary or anarchical ideas, but it is a fact that the man in the street considered these people to be the unfortunate victims of Colonial prejudice against Asiatics. The emigrants belonged mostly to Ferozepore, Ludhiana, Jullundhur, and Hoshiarpur districts. The Ludhiana district is a stronghold of the Kukas, and the Hoshiarpur district of the Akalees. I believe the sufferings of the emigrants served to strengthen the links between the Akalees, the Kukas and the Tat Khalsas. These three parties were already agreed on purging Sikhism of all Brahmanical and priestly influences. All these three parties were agreed on the desirability of having all Sikhs armed with kirpans, and finally all three sympathised with the persecuted emigrants.

In 1917 arose the Reforms Scheme controversy. The grant of communal representation to Mussalmans in 1909 had raised similar hopes among the Tat Khalsas. The military services of the Sikhs had raised among them false hopes of preferential treatment. If the doctrine of political importance had secured for the Mussalmans excessive representation in legislative councils, surely political plus military importance could secure for the Sikhs also excessive representation. In the Punjab the Sikhs form 11 per cent. of the total population, the Hindus 33 per cent., and the Mussalmans 55 per cent. If we take the taxpaying franchise qualification of Council voters into consideration, the Sikh voters form 30 per cent. of the total number of voters, the Hindus another 30 per cent. and the Mussalmans the remaining 40 per cent. The Sikhs argued that on the strict basis of population and taxpaying strength they were entitled to 20 per cent. of the seats (i. e. a mean between 11 and 30), but that on account of political and military importance and in accordance with the principle of giving excessive representation to minorities, they could claim 33 per cent. The Congress-League compact had awarded 50 per cent. seats to Mussalmans in the Punjab and the remaining 50 per cent. to non-Muslims. If this compact was to be given effect to and the demands of the Sikhs were not to affect Muslim representation, the Sikh claims could be satisfied only at the expense of the Hindus. In that case the 33 per cent. Hindu population would get 17 per cent. seats and the 11 per cent. Sikhs 33. Consequently

the Hindus opposed the claims of the Sikhs. This attitude of the Hindus strengthened the separatist movement among the Sikhs still further, and must have strengthened still further the idea of preserving Sikh religious places against Hindu influences.

Since at this time most of the Sikh Gurdwaras (shrines historically sacred to the memory of the Gurus) and Dharmshalas were under the control of Nirmala and Udasi Sadhus, it was considered desirable to reclaim them from Hindu influences. On the other hand in the new reformed Councils, the Sikhs were actually given 12 out of 64 elected territorial seats, i. e. 19 per cent. This representation was considered quite inadequate by the Tat Khalsas. Up to now they had relied on Government patronage, but now they decided to attain their objects by political agitation. A Sikh League was now established to organise political agitation in behalf of the Sikhs. On the top of all this came the Jallianwala Massacre of 13th April, 1919. The 13th of April (1st of Baisakh) is for the Punjabees the new year's day. On this occasion hundreds of thousands of Sikhs gather together in Amritsar to have a bath in the sacred tank. It happened that the majority of the audience in the Jallianwala Bagh meeting consisted of the rural Sikh peasants. Many of them had done military service. It was these Sikhs then who suffered most in the massacre. Naturally the survivors of the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy and the relations of the victims carried feelings of indignation and resentment against Government to the remotest nook and corner of the central districts which are the home of the Sikhs. The rural population thus affected became excellent material for the political agitators to work upon.

GULSHAN RAI.

A LETTER FROM LONDON.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

LONDON, JULY 6.

DEBATE ON KENYA.

A VERY interesting and important debate took place in the House of Commons on Tuesday on the Colonial Office Supply Vote. Mr. Wood, the Under Secretary of State, traversed the whole of taxation of colonies and eventually came to Kenya, where he said the problem was complicated by the presence of a large Indian community. In dealing with the Highlands, he said, "My right hon. Friend always is prepared to offer other lands to the Indian community for their exclusive use, but he still takes the view that with regard to the area of the Highlands his hands are tied by past history, and that to throw the Highlands open to universal colonisation would not be consistent with that understanding. With regard to segregation, it would seem impossible without any action based on racial discrimination to secure those general objects of public health and social convenience." But the real difficulty, Mr. Wood thought, was the franchise. "I think there is little doubt," he said, "that with the full consent of the white community it would not be impossible for my right hon. Friend to-day to secure such representation for the Indians as will enable them actively and effectively to participate in the public affairs and government of the Colony." Colonel Wedgwood made a spirited attack on most of the matters Mr. Wood had dealt with, and after many words, he also came to Kenya, and the Indian question there. He dealt at length with taxation, showing how it hit hardest the Asiatic. In dealing with the fran-

chise, he said, "You are quite right in saying this is the most vital question of all, and the Indians are quite right in seeing that this question is the one question on which they cannot give way." In conclusion, he said, "You have got there the acid test of whether the British Empire is worth while and it is not a question of the rights of Indians, or the rights of settlers, it is not a question whether it is to be a white man's country or an Indian's country, but it is the test question for the whole of the Indo-British Empire. If you are going in to set up in that country, which is not a self-governing Dominion but is a Crown Colony, through your own Colonial Office, directed by this House, a colour bar between Indian and European, by that colour bar you will be judged by 315 millions of Indians. If you do right by that country, even sacrificing the prejudices of a handful of settlers there, then you will have a standing example of what we ought to stand for, and you will do more, even, than by developing Home Rule in India, to re-establish the English justice." Throughout the whole of Colonel Wedgwood's speech, he was listened to with little interruption, but when Major Ormsby-Gore rose to speak, which he did immediately after Colonel Wedgwood, it seemed as though the same courtesy was not to be extended to him. He almost immediately came to the Indian question in Kenya, and said personally he was glad that the immigration fee had been raised, for he did not believe the economic conditions in Kenya would stand another man, Indian or white, going to that country. Here he was interrupted by Colonel Wedgwood calling out "Bureaucrat", and during the early part of his speech similar interruptions occurred.

Lieut.-Colonel Guinness made a lengthy contribution to the debate, but he upheld the case of the East African Negro against the Indian, and said that if an equal franchise was given to the Indian it would mean his virtually becoming ruler in East Africa; that the presence of the Indian there meant perpetual subordination of the black people; the educated African native naturally looked to junior clerkships and trading for his outlet; this field however was entirely occupied by the Indian and gave the man, natural to the country, no chance.

MISCELLANEA.

MR. SASTRI'S DOMINION TOUR.

MR. POLAK'S DEFENCE.

THE following are extracts from a speech of Mr. H. S. L. Polak on the question of "Indians Overseas" at Allahabad:

There is one other matter that I should like to refer to before I resume my seat. It is a cognate subject upon which various views and criticisms have been expressed in this country. Some of them, I fear, have been passed under a misapprehension of facts. I refer to Mr. Sastri's present tour. I have heard a great deal of criticism expressed with regard to the person, manner, and object. As regards Mr. Sastri's person, I would only like to say that he is one of the very few citizens of this country who have taken the trouble to make themselves expert in matters of principle and detail relating to Indians overseas, and he speaks with knowledge and authority. I cannot myself appreciate any disparaging criticism in these matters in regard to him. As regards the manner, I have heard that Mr. Sastri ought not to have gone to Australia, or New Zealand, or Canada, where the trouble is less acute, but that he should have gone to South Africa and to Kenya, where it is acute. Now, I have no doubt that if Mr. Sastri had been a private individual, and if

he had had a free hand, he would have very dearly liked to go there; but in his present capacity he is not a private individual and he has not got a free hand. He was the representative of the Government of India at the Imperial Conference and there he urged his colleagues to allow the matter of the status of India and Indians in regard to the self-governing Dominions to be discussed on the spot, because he felt sure that if they were openly and honestly discussed, something might be done to rectify them, many errors of judgment would disappear, and a way to a solution would probably be found. His appeal succeeded almost all along the line. To begin with, excepting South Africa, every one of the Dominions, as well as His Majesty's Government and the Government of India signed that resolution to which I referred lately, agreeing to the principle of equality of citizenship for Indians residing in overseas territories. Then, those Prime Ministers who had signed the resolution offered Mr. Sastri a pressing invitation as the representative of the Government of India, to come to their Dominions and help them to explain the doctrine that he had advanced to their people. Would it have been wise to decline? Would it have helped anyone? I think it would at least have been grossly discourteous. South Africa did not extend an invitation to the representative of the Government of India. Do you think, in the circumstances, that the Government of India could have forced a visit upon the Government of South Africa? It is not conceivable, and in the circumstances you will readily understand how it is that Mr. Sastri is not going to visit South Africa at the present time. As regards Kenya, it is true that the trouble is acute, but whereas the solution of the South African problem lies in South Africa, the solution of the Kenya problem lies in Downing Street. Now, when Mr. Sastri was in London, he saw the East African, Indian and European leaders, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and the Secretary of State for India. He knows exactly what the problem is in Kenya; he has discussed it at great length, and I have no doubt that when he returns to London he will press for a speedy settlement of the problem, if it is not already on the way to solution. Judging from some of the criticisms, it would seem as if there is an idea abroad in some quarters that Mr. Sastri has gone to Australia and to the other self-governing Dominions in order to force open the door for Indian immigration, and that he has surrendered that which he had no right to do. I think that this impression is wholly erroneous. To begin with Mr. Sastri was not invited to go to those countries in order to force open the door. He was not sent by the Government of India or by the people of India to force open the door for Indian immigration, but to seek equality of citizenship for Indians resident in those Dominions. He has surrendered nothing. The Government of India, in the resolution that was passed at the 1918 Imperial Conference, when Lord Sinha proposed it, accepted the principle of what is sometimes called "White Australia" and the principle then laid down was this, that the self-governing Dominions of the Empire and India, as a country advancing towards the status of a self-governing Dominion, equally had the right to control the composition of their populations by restrictions upon immigration from any or all of the other territories. Now, that was merely the recognition of a policy that had been given effect to several years before, and in fact, Mr. Gandhi himself was, if not one of its authors, at least one of its supporters, and Mr. Gokhale, after examination on the spot, followed him. If Mr. Sastri has recognised this principle, he has done no more than what was done by Lord Sinha, his predecessor, at the 1918 Imperial Conference.

DOCTRINE OF "WHITE AUSTRALIA."

There seems to me to be a considerable misapprehension about this doctrine of "White Australia." I think it is most unfortunate that the Australians chose such an invidious expression as that, because it does not precisely represent the situation. Unlike South Africa, unlike Kenya, the problem in Australia, New Zealand and Canada is less a racial one than an economic one. I do not accept the position that it is wholly economic. I deny equally that it is wholly racial.

The people of Australia claim to live according to certain economic standards. They have pioneered that country—I am simply putting to you their case without arguing it one way or the other—they have pioneered it, they have developed it, and have erected certain economic standards and they say that they will not consider the possibility of depressing this standard. This applies not only to this country but to all other countries. They say that to England, they say that to every other European country, they say it to every Asiatic country. They have a high economical standard from the point of view of expense, and are not prepared to lower that standard of living. They do not discuss whether the one standard is superior to the other standard from racial point of view. The people in Australia do not want to repeat the slum conditions of other countries, nor will they have labour, either white or coloured, exploited in the interests of the few. They know Asia as a continent capable and desirous of sending abroad its hordes of half-starved workers to find a livelihood. Their only acquaintance with Asiatics is as cheap, illiterate laborers living poorly and squalidly. And they believe that these Asiatics are in need of emigrating their surplus populations and are casting envious eyes upon the country for which Australians have made such sacrifices. Now, I do not know how far it is true of Japan. I think it is largely probable. But I do not believe this about China and I am certain it is not true about India. You will have found in the course of practical life that it is not so much the realities that count as the prejudices and the superstitions. So long as people believe a thing, however wrong, however erroneous it may be, it is real to them and it has to be counted with as a reality. In Australia they have created economic standards which they describe as 'White Australia' and which apply just as much to a white people living at a lower level as they do to Asiatics. You will perhaps be able to understand the thing a little better when I remind you of the argument sometimes used in your own country that my own compatriots by their more expensive standards of life have unduly increased the cost of living for Indians and have set a bad example in regard to public and private expenditure. Certain members of a particular political party here have openly declared that they are unwilling to allow my compatriots to enter here or to remain here unless they are content to live at the Indian standard of life and expenditure. Now, I am not arguing one way or the other, but I am simply giving an Indian analogy. Nor is this the only difficulty. No country likes to take in unlimited numbers of aliens even though living at its own standards. Still more is this so where the immigrant population cannot be assimilated by intermarriage. Where the type of culture is different there will sooner or later arise a cultural conflict, and it cannot be expected that the older population will quietly accept such a prospect. In this country you realise how difficult it is to build up a stable nationality in view of caste divisions. As regards admitting considerable numbers of immigrants to any country, especially where intermarriage would be difficult, if not impossible, and certainly undesirable, the people of that country would not be prepared to open wide the door. But Indians are certainly entitled to say to Australia: "If we can convince you that we do not desire to emigrate our labour population, whom we need ourselves, if we can reassure you against what you would regard as an invasion and an attempt to reduce standards and alter the character of your culture, you ought, in return, to admit such of us as conform to your standards and to grant equality of citizenship to those of our compatriots who are already settled in Australia." That seems to me a way out and that I believe is what Mr. Sastri is aiming at. He does not want to tell the people of Australia that Indians want an open door for all immigrants because it is not true and it would not help if you are to win freedom for Indians in Australia. I think that what Mr. Sastri has suggested is not an unreasonable provisional settlement of a very difficult and complicated problem. I do not think that it is a final or a wholly satisfactory one, but these great problems in which questions of race, economics, and culture are involved are not easily solved. They are, however, susceptible of an equitable provisional solution.

We have to remember the weaknesses and defects of human nature and recognise those weaknesses and defects in any attempt to reach a solution. So far as the Association of which I am the Honorary Secretary, the Indian Overseas Association, is concerned, we are tirelessly engaged in an endeavour to solve these problems upon such lines as those I have already indicated. We endeavour to follow the line taken in South Africa by Mr. Gandhi and later on by Mr. Gokhale, and still later by the spokesmen of the Government of India. We have felt that that was the only way of approaching anything like a permanent settlement and final solution of this most difficult problem. In my opinion, it is the most difficult that the world has to face in the future; but I think that, its very difficulty should cause all who have a sense of responsibility not to do anything that is calculated to increase the tension unnecessarily, to increase friction unnecessarily, to increase racial hatred unnecessarily. I think that every effort should be made to avoid an approach to an open rupture. It may be that an open rupture cannot be avoided, but I would urge you to do everything possible to bring about peace rather than go half way to meet such a situation whose consequences are incalculable and cannot bear thinking of. I venture to suggest that a lead may be given to the country in the hope of reaching a permanent and final solution.—The Leader

EDWARD CARPENTER.

	Rs.	A.
From Adam's Peak To Elephanta. Sketches in Ceylon and India	7	7
Angels' Wings. Essays on Art and Its Relation to Life. Illustrated.	5	11
The Art Of Creation. Essays on the Self and its Powers.	5	4
Chants Of Labour. A Songbook of the People. With Frontispiece and Cover by Walter Crane. (paper)	2	3
Civilization; its Cause and Cure. Essays on Modern Science.	7	7
Days with Walt Whitman.	6	9
The Drama of Love and Death. A Study of Human Evolution and Transfiguration.	5	4
Edward Carpenter, Poet and Prophet. By E. Crosby. (wrapper)	0	2
Edward Carpenter, the Man and his Message. By Ton Swan.	4	6
Edward Carpenter. By Edward Lewis.	5	4
England's Ideal	5	1
The health of Nations.	3	1

Theosophical Publishing House,
Adyar. Madras

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.

CURRENCY REFORM IN INDIA

BY

Prof. V. G. KALE,

Price Re. One.

Please order your requirements at once from:—

THE ARYABHUSHAN PRESS,
POONA CITY.

THE Servants of India Society's PAMPHLETS.

1. **Self-Government for India under the British Flag—** 0-8-0
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—** 0-6-0
by the Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri. Crown 16
mo. pp. 66.
4. **The Co-operative Movement—** 1-0-0
by Mr. V. Venkatasubbaiya, Member, Servants of
India Society and Mr. V. L. Mehta, 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
Codes (With a reply to certain Criticisms)—** 0-8-0
by The Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri President
Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. size pp. 67.

1. **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.
 2. **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.
 3. **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.
 4. **A Gist of Gita-Rahasya—** 0-8-0
(2nd edition, reprint) by Mr. V. M. Joshi, M. A.
 5. **Writings and Speeches of the late Hon. R. B. G. V. Joshi.** 5-0-0
Demi 8 vo. pp. 1400. Cloth Bound.
 - 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.)

These books can be had of:—

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.

Medical Services in India

BY

AN I. M. S. OFFICER,

Price As. 8 Postage extra.

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