

THE Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. VI, No. 10.]

POONA—THURSDAY, APRIL 5, 1923.

{ INLAND SUBNS. RS.6.
FOREIGN SUBNS. s.10.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	109
ARTICLES :—	
The Viceroy's Apologia	111
Race Feeling in America. By Garland Craig	112
A LETTER FROM LONDON	115
REVIEW :—	
India's Military Policy. By V. V. S.	116
MISCELLANEA :—	
Mr. Sastri's Speech on Indians in Kenya	116
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
Performances of Trained Animals. By Miss K. M. Ridge	119

TOPICS OF THE WEEK

Retrenchment in Bombay. THE Bombay Retrenchment Committee—who, though appointed in July 1921, signed their report only on 28th February last, and whose dilatoriness has been the subject of public comment—have recommended a total specific reduction of 87¼ lakhs in the expenditure of the Bombay Government, besides suggesting ways of securing other economies, the result of which could not be calculated in exact figures. The main cuts suggested are :

Police	27-49 lakhs
Revenue	15-64 „
Public works	14-52 „
Excise	8-69 „
General Administration	6-21 „

Education which is one of the largest spending departments, has of course received careful scrutiny, but the reduction proposed is less than one lakh and such as will not in any way affect the progress or efficiency of education. We are not so sanguine as to expect the Bombay Government to accept the recommendations of this Committee to the same extent and with the same readiness as the Central Government accepted the recommendations of the Inchcape Committee, for the very simple but important reason that the current year's Bombay budget is a normal surplus one. But as any saving that could be effected is wanted for the development of nation-building departments, we hope the non-official members of the Legislative Council will resolutely enforce the economies suggested by the Committee, provided they approve of them. But it is a matter of very great regret that the report was not submitted a few weeks earlier, in which case its recommendations could have been given effect to in the current budget.

Provincialization of the All-India Services.

THE Committee have gone beyond their terms of reference and made suggestions regarding the Public Services and the Secretariat for which they have been strongly criticised by some of our contemporaries. The *Times of India*, for instance, has poured utter ridicule on the suggestion that the Secretariat should be transferred to Poona. Despite our contemporary's lofty contempt, we think the recommendation is very sound and sensible and the Government may do worse than accept it. The *Indian Social Reformer* has taken strong objection to the Committee's suggestion that recruitment to the Imperial Services should hereafter be confined to Europeans. It infers, quite wrongly in our opinion, that if this recommendation were given effect to, no Indian could be employed in the Posts and Telegraph and other Imperial departments. The *Reformer* has obviously confounded Imperial Services with Imperial departments. The main point of the Committee is that the salaries of the Imperial Services have been fixed so as to attract suitable Europeans and are unnecessarily high for Indians. When there were few Indians in these Services and when recruitment was made only in England, there was reason in the contention that Indians and Europeans should get equal pay. But now conditions have changed to such an extent that there is no justification whatever, in the Committee's opinion, for Indians to claim the same pay as Europeans. Hence their suggestion that Imperial Services should be confined to Europeans. We have, however, an objection to urge against this proposal, though we approve of the grades and salaries suggested by the Committee for Indians. So long as the Imperial and Provincial are two distinct services, the former will enjoy a higher status, and if confined to Europeans, no Indian would be in a position to fill certain posts, for example, the Principalship of the Agricultural College or the Directorship of Agriculture, which posts the Committee recommend should be filled by Imperial Service men. A better way, in our opinion, would be to fix salaries for all posts on an Indian scale and to give to Europeans overseas and other allowances that will attract and keep them in Indian service. If, however, there must be two distinct services, then there should be no reservation of any posts for either of them. For going beyond their terms of reference and taking a broad view of retrenchment, we think the Committee ought rather to be thanked than criticised.

Age of Consent.

WE congratulate Mrs. Cousins on the promptitude with which she and the Indian Women's Association, of which she is Secretary, have moved in protest against the hold-up of the Traffic in Women and Children's Act, recently passed by the Central Legislature. A very effective letter was sent on behalf of the Association in question to the Home Member of each Provincial Government and has since been given wide and sympathetic publicity in the press. It has been left to the *Times of India* (of yesterday), to strike a discordant note and ridicule the letter in question as "silly", "inaccurate" and "misleading". It so happens, however, that our contemporary happens to be inaccurate itself and Mrs. Cousins right; except for one irrelevant slip—the letter speaking of the matter having been deferred for further expression of opinion by the public and the Provincial "Councils", instead of "Governments". But (1) the ground for delay, as stated by the Central Government at Delhi over and over again, was the discrepancy between cognate sections of the Penal Code—as stated by Mrs. Cousins. (2) The "Commencement Clause" does make the will of the Legislature inoperative; for the Legislature did express its will to raise the age of consent from 16 to 18 and only agreed to the insertion of the Commencement Clause in order to save the Bill; for, unless the Legislature had agreed to that insertion, the Government threatened to drop the Bill altogether. Hence Mrs. Cousins once more is absolutely correct.

(3) The crowning inaccuracy of the *Times of India* however consists in stating that "the one point before the public is whether the age of consent should be raised from 16 to 18". The age of consent has been raised already by the Act in question, and previous to that the public had already expressed themselves favourably in that sense. What is now before the public is the question, whether the age of 18 should be substituted for 16 in all other Sections of the Penal Code as well. Our patronizing contemporary therefore is altogether wrong and bases its whole argument on that "which is not." It is indeed significant of the changed times that so necessary a social reform should now be opposed, not by Indian, but by European, opinion in India: though we will not insult the bulk of our European fellow-citizens by believing that the leading article in question, any more than Sir Malcolm Hailey, accurately represents their feelings in the matter. As for the Indian general public it must be up and doing along the lines the Indian Women's Association has shown. Since the Provincial Governments are going to be consulted, the public must bring pressure to bear on them. Moreover, as we said in our leading article of March 8th (which we are glad to see has been extensively quoted and approvingly commented upon by the *Modern Review* of April), now is the time to organize a series of public meetings and we only hope that the Women's Association will follow up their first line of attack by a sustained effort throughout the country.

ON the motion of Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru two important questions were discussed recently in the Legislative Council of the United Provinces—the collective responsibility of Ministers and joint consultation between the popular and non-popu-

lar wings of Provincial Governments. Although on both these matters the injunctions of the Joint Select Committee are unambiguous, it is an open secret that in certain Provinces they are set at naught by the Governors. This is notoriously the case in Bombay, but the attempt to draw the attention of the Council to this grave departure from the practice laid down by Parliament was invariably foiled by the President by a too strict interpretation of the rules of business. Pandit Kunzru, however, cleverly got out of the difficulty by moving for the reduction, by a taken vote of a budget grant. Of course it was thrown out by the Council, but anyway he managed to have his say. It would appear that in the United Provinces the recommendations of the Joint Committee were scrupulously carried out in the beginning, but subsequently the Governor gave reasonable cause for complaint. Pandit Kunzru therefore demanded that the rules made by the Governor regarding the transaction of business in his Executive Council and with his Ministers be published for general information. The Finance Member declined to do so on the ground that Parliament having given full discretion to the Governor in the matter, the question of publication or non-publication rests entirely with him, adding:—

"It is not even a matter on which the Government can make any recommendation, since it is no part of the functions of the Governor in Council or the Government on the transferred side to make recommendations to His Excellency the Governor. He exercises his discretion in such manner as he thinks fit. He may consult members of the Government regarding this or any other matter, but he is not bound to consult the members of the Government. That is entirely a matter for his discretion."

It is significant that the Ministers did not vote on the motion.

FROM the statement made by the Hon'ble Pandit Jagat Narain in the United Provinces Council, it would appear that in eight municipalities compulsory education has been introduced with effect from the beginning of this year and in five others it will be introduced within a few months. The Education Department is in correspondence with twenty-two more municipalities regarding the details of their schemes, and it is expected that several of them will go in for compulsion. This result is no doubt due to the Minister's offer to meet two-thirds of the extra cost involved out of the provincial exchequer, but even so the programme framed in 1918 of doubling the number of boys in five years has not been fully carried out. And the total additional amount provided in the budget for meeting additional educational expenditure is, after all, not very great—only Rs. 50,000. It is not contemplated just yet to introduce compulsion in schools under the district boards, and the Minister thinks that it will take another two or three years for either Government or the district boards to be in a position to finance schemes for compulsion.

THE Second sitting of the Bombay Provincial Liberal Conference will be held at Satara in May. A Reception Committee with Mr. R. R. Kale, M. L. C., as Chairman and Messrs. N. G. Joshi and V. N. Deshpande as Secretaries has already been formed. The names of Sir Ibrahim Rahimatulla, Kt., and Mr. Parshotamdas Thakordas, C. I. E., have been suggested for the Presidentship. The fees of the membership of the Reception Committee are Rs. 10 and those of delegates Rs. 3.

THE VICEROY'S APOLOGIA.

THE statement issued by the Viceroy in which he seeks to justify the certification of the Finance Bill merely reiterates the arguments employed by the spokesmen of Government in the Legislature. With Sir B. Blackett and Mr. Innes, Lord Reading also makes light of the popular objection that the doubling of the salt tax will lay too heavy a burden on the poor people, while he holds that the alternative taxes proposed by the people's representatives would have pressed too hardly on trade and industry. This latter opinion is based on the fact that in recent years taxes specially affecting the mercantile classes have been greatly enhanced. But have the poorer classes escaped from the burden of additional taxation while industry had to pay a heavier toll? Professor Horne of Patna College calculates in the *Statesman* that before the war the poorer classes of the community were laid under contribution to the tune of 10 crores. But, between the years 1916 and 1922, this tax-burden falling on the lowest strata of society was actually doubled, having to pay 20 crores into the exchequer. Was industry called upon to pay anything like this cent. per cent. increase? And yet the poorer classes are to be made now to contribute, by way of the increased salt tax, an amount which will increase their burden by little short of another 50 per cent., and industry is to go scot-free. If it be said that though the percentages of increase in taxes paid by the very poor appear large, the actual amounts paid by them are trifling, it must also be remembered that these classes habitually live on the margin of subsistence and have no surplus wealth, out of which they can make these increased contributions. But Lord Reading says that not only they can make these contributions, but they are actually making them since 1st March—without there being any pother about it. Surely Lord Reading knows that people can be made to pay more than their just due or more than they are able to pay if we but put the screw on them, without their discontent actually taking an ugly shape. And what would have happened if a surcharge were levied on customs?

But anyhow only last year the Finance Member had proposed to raise the duty on cotton goods by 4 per cent. and the excise duty by a corresponding amount. Therefore, on Government's own showing, this additional burden at least industry could equitably be asked to shoulder and is in a position to shoulder. Why did Government not revive this proposal this year, asks Professor Horne? It was calculated that this duty would yield 3½ crores, which is about the deficit to be met, and the burden of this tax would have been shared to some extent by the well-to-do classes. If it be said that Government could not entertain the proposal this year in view of the Fiscal Commission's Report, which emphatically disapproves of any such idea, Professor Horne replies that thereby Government would at least have deprived the popular re-

presentatives of the claim to champion the oppressed masses. The only possible explanation of Government refusing to consider this and other alternative proposals of taxation is that they are unable to do anything calculated to offend the moneyed classes, while they do not mind what an uproar is created by the poorer classes.

As to leaving the deficit uncovered rather than enhance the salt duty, the Viceroy explains that Government felt it incumbent upon them to balance the budget "when the circumstances no longer permitted a hope that the deficit was purely temporary or was one which would yield to a determined effort at retrenchment." If no further retrenchments are possible and no alternative source of revenue is available, is it not somewhat misleading to emphasise, as Government members did in the Legislature and Lord Reading does in his apologia, that the enhanced rate of the salt tax will be in force only for a year and that next year the matter will again be submitted for consideration to the Legislature? It is no doubt true that the Finance Act limits the duration of the salt tax provision to a year, but what hope is there for the restoration of the salt tax to its original rate in the future, especially when the enhancement is intended to enable Government to abolish provincial contributions? If provincial contributions are to be eliminated by resorting to the device of doubling the salt tax, what relief will this measure bring to the Ministers? If anyhow the poor classes are to be mulcted, cannot the Provincial Governments do it themselves, say, by raising the land tax? It is only if the Central Government cuts down its expenses and develops its revenue in the right way, i. e. without increasing the tax-burden on the masses, that the cessation of the contributions levied on the Provinces will be of any practical help to the Ministers in building up their departments.

The Viceroy, in his explanatory statement also touches, though lightly, on the constitutional aspect of the question. He professes to take a strict view of the provision in the Government of India Act empowering him to use his special powers. Interpreted strictly, the provision can be invoked only in grave emergencies. But where the question at issue was at most between alternative sources of revenue, the exercise of the Viceroy's power was certainly uncalled for and unwarranted. This use can be justified only on the ground that what the Viceroy calls special powers could be brought into operation in normal circumstances. Even supposing that all the logic was on the side of Government and none on the side of popular representatives, the Viceroy ought to have deferred to the vote of the Assembly. Whatever the legal interpretation of the provision may be, this is the only course which is open to a wise statesman. For a too frequent exercise of the reserved powers vested in the Viceroy for the purpose of resolving deadlocks between the Executive and the Legislature will only cause more dead-

locks and a breakdown of the constitution, or the removal of the reserved powers altogether. If the Viceroy will not forbear to use them in any but the gravest crises, we have no doubt that the Legislature will not be backward in doing its clear duty of making use of its statutory powers. And we may say here that if we believe in the utility of the reforms, our belief is due, not so much to an over-easy assumption of unfailing forbearance in the head of the executive as to the confidence that every departure from this wise attitude will itself hasten the day when the remains of autocratic powers will be swept away and full self-government attained. In the meanwhile we hope that the suggestion made by Sir Montagu Webb will be adopted and acted upon, and that a petition to Parliament will be drafted and signed by all those who voted against the salt tax protesting against the Viceroy's action.

RACE FEELING IN AMERICA.

NOT infrequently one sees in the Indian Press statements regarding matters in America that reveal an interpretation entirely contrary to what the facts warrant. Prohibition is a case in point, usually in the Anglo-Indian Press.

But now comes our dependable friend and worthy counsellor, the SERVANT OF INDIA (in the issue of the 15th March), and makes editorial comment under the headings, "The Filibusters", and "Killed for their Complexion" and makes deductions regarding the racial question as exemplified in the failure of the Dyer anti-lynching Bill that lovers of truth and international understanding do not like to leave unchallenged.

Now, no decently minded American defends lynching. It is gross, cruel, barbarous, and is certainly a challenge to organized society and modern civilization. My purpose is, therefore, not to make a case for lynching, but to rid the readers of the SERVANT OF INDIA of the totally misleading impression gathered from the following statements.

It was stated that, "the Republicans... are fully imbued with fierce race pride common to all white Americans". As a humble citizen of that country I personally disclaim, so far as I am able to know my own mind and heart, the possession of this "fierce race pride". I know scores of my personal friends and acquaintances in whom it is likewise absent; and from my observation of public men and leaders of thought generally I venture to assert that a very fair proportion of them are likewise to be exonerated of this charge. Such statements do violence to the character of literally thousands of "White Americans" whose devotion to the service of the Negro is absolutely unchallenged, and to unnumbered noble-minded editors, educators, and other leaders, both in the North and in the South, who are working hand in hand with Negro leaders for the uplift of that race. Personally, I make my *namaskar* to those of every

race who have attained to higher intellectual, moral, and spiritual planes than myself. I enjoy fellowship with my equals, and seek to serve those less privileged.

There is another statement: "Lynching... at least in the dozen Southern States of the Union is part of ordinary life". The following facts will show the magnitude of this over-statement.

The population of the fifteen States usually called *Southern* is 30,475,000. The writer of the paragraph states therein that there were sixty lynchings in one year. If the figures are correct, as they doubtless are, it would make one lynching annually to every 507,916 persons. Nor are these sixty by any means all Negroes. In these fifteen States there are approximately 1500 counties. This would make one lynching in a county once in twenty-five years. In the counties there are more than 15,000 cities, towns and villages. That would be one to a town in every 250 years. Never within my knowledge has a lynching occurred twice in the same locality in the same generation. Public sentiment, even local public sentiment, is against it, and not for it, as is supposed. These fifteen States comprise an area of 883,868 square miles. This is greater than the total area of the Bombay Presidency, Bengal, Madras, Punjab, Central Provinces, United Provinces, the Nizam's Dominions, and all of Burma. If all the lynchings were in these Southern States (which they were not), it would bring the total average to one in every 14,731 square miles. This serves to show how far removed from actual fact is it that they are "part of ordinary life". It is no more accurate than to say that in the late war Englishmen were generally pro-German, or that slavery is still common among Hindus.

Further, mention is made of "the utter degradation to which the white race has reached in the Southern States of America". Such deductions are not more charitable than to charge the residents of Bombay, Madras and Chauri Chaura with murderous intent and abetting of the crimes of mobs.

The estimate is made that, "if American public opinion had been sufficiently strong on the point, such a thing as 'filibustering' of the Dyer Bill would have been impossible", and, "but that a modest bill, which only intended to end the setting at naught of all law and order, like the Dyer Bill, should have been so easily got rid of shows just how far the effects of that sort of racial poison extends".

I make bold to say that public opinion on lynching was not reflected in the killing of the Dyer Bill. The American Press is almost solidly against lynching. The influential journals of the South, with a very few exceptions, are against it. Informed public opinion everywhere is against it. If the Dyer Bill could have possibly been so framed as to put the test solely on the broad moral issue involved, no Government could have stood

that would not put it through, and no legislature returned that would not endorse it.

"States' Rights" was the rock on which the Dyer Bill broke, and the one on which most remedial Federal legislation breaks. Whether rightly or wrongly, the police power in the Federal Union is reserved to the several States. All such regulatory legislation invades this right, and men of high moral ideals and integrity, men who utterly oppose lynching and all other lawlessness, would fight most stubbornly to prevent the invasion of that right. Many other American statesmen hold that this position is archaic in the light of the growing solidarity of the Nation, resulting from modern communications and a highly developed inter-State commerce. But these have not yet won the day, and the old order prevails, and no internal police power whatever is exercised by the Federal Government.

In many other phases of national interest there has of late been a gradual encroachment by the Federal Government on matters formerly reserved to the States, and this tendency is stubbornly fought on every issue. The Democratic Party has championed the idea of "States' Rights" more persistently than the Republican Party, but neither of them dare yet to take much liberty with the doctrine.

It was never possible to get Federal legislation on the Prohibition question till public sentiment became so overwhelmingly strong to enforce the doubtful expedient of writing a regulatory measure into the fundamental Constitution. Attempts to regulate Child Labour have met repeated defeats on the same issue, and the interests of childhood are not held in high esteem in America. Proposals are now before Congress to amend the Constitution to enable the Federal Government to regulate Child Labour. The so-called "White Slave Traffic", about which public opinion rises to fever heat, cannot have Federal regulation till the operations of the procurers become inter-State and thus come under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power. Many beneficent measures affecting such questions as workmen's compensation, educational reform, etc., must wait the will of State bodies.

Our friends in India may be assured that the Dyer Bill was allowed to be defeated by a public opinion that is unalterably opposed to lynching, but differing as to the right and effective manner of preventing it.

II.

It is inevitable that recent world conditions should bring out in sharp relief the question of RACE. The consciousness of power engendered by the great war; renewed aspirations stimulated by the phrase, "Self-determination"; the recasting of frontiers, and the resettlement of peoples of all racial strains, have all served to make this one question loom unduly large in our minds.

The growing importance of the British Dominions and the Crown Colonies which impel them to insist on a recognition of status equal to their

relative value in the Commonwealth, and India's aspirations have alike served to sharpen this question to the point of acuteness. The more recent emergence of the burning question of Islamic nationalities has added its quota of interest. America, which has one of the most critical race problems, is brought in for purposes of comparison, and very soon we are involved in acrimonious discussion which produces much heat and no light.

Apropos of these considerations and a recent communication in the SERVANT OF INDIA, I should like to submit the thesis that in these and all other so-called "racial problems" the racial factor is never the primary but always a minor cause of difficulties.

Racial prejudice there is in plenty, but it is largely a cultivated and artificial thing. Racial differences there unquestionably are, but they tend to disappear very rapidly when the more fundamental issues draw men together. Two men of the same cultural outlook though of different race find more in common than two of the same race with widely divergent culture. Likewise a group of men of several racial types will develop an *esprit de corps* in an enterprise that results to their common economic advantage that is altogether impossible for men with clashing economic interests, though of racial homogeneity.

My observation leads me to the conclusion that economic ascendancy is generally the primary motive underlying most of our racial antagonisms. Once a given group of people attain economic ascendancy, they are confronted with the problem of keeping it. They find it impossible to maintain against opposition the economic *status quo* on any logical or reasonable grounds, and racial or other considerations are introduced to give social sanction to a system that would otherwise fall. Then this system must be politically entrenched, for social sanction and political power are the two means by which mankind generally enforces its will on the opposition.

In America in certain parts of Virginia, West Virginia, North and South Carolina, Kentucky and Tennessee there are mountain residents of the purest Anglo-Saxon strain. They have been there for generations, unaffected by the great currents of popular thought and progress that have touched the rest of the country. Their inaccessibility has till now kept them self-contained and racially pure. Unfortunately they are ignorant and illiterate. Recently they have begun coming out and drifting into the industrial centres of the South Atlantic States. These people, because of their ignorance, are exploited every whit as much as the Negroes or foreign immigrants. The social cleavage between them and other Americans, of even less pure blood, is just as sharp as between the whites and the coloured peoples. They are called "Mountain Whites" and "Poor White Trash", and are looked down upon by the Negroes themselves. Yet from these people came the best all-round soldier the nation produced in the late war. But

their being *white* does not give them immunity from exploitation, oppression, and social ostracism.

The same applies to the Scandinavian and the white Russian who go to American shores. Their ignorance, not their colour, is the opportunity of the exploiter of whatever race.

In past periods of history coloured races have had white slaves and the submerged of white stock, and as far as we are able to determine, the same relative positions were held as between the high and the low, though the colour was reversed.

On the other hand, the American Indian, though coloured, has been generally respected by the "pale face". First, because he was a fighter, and second, because he never allowed himself to become economically dependent on the white man. Likewise in India, the depressed classes continue to be depressed because the organisation of society serves to keep them economically dependent. *Dependence, poverty and ignorance* are the three arcs of the vicious circle that girdle the oppressed of every land.

As noted above, *social sanctions* of the popular and superficial sort, reflect this condition very quickly and very directly. In America the vulgar epithets are applied: "Mountain whites" (Anglo-Saxon), "Bohunks" (Austrian and other Slavic peoples), "Polaks" (Poles), "Micks" (Irish), "Greasers" (Mexican), "Dagos" (Italian). All these are regarded as inferior till they achieve economic independence, and then, to the politician at least, they become "Worthy citizens of the Great Republic", "Noble descendants of an ancient race" and the tendency is for them gradually to assume social equality and political identity with their neighbours. There is significance in the fact that an American who has Red Indian blood in his veins boasts of it, and it enhances rather than detracts from his social position.

It is my firm belief that the Asiatic exclusion laws in America have no actual basis in race prejudice. Indian, Chinese and Japanese labourers are excluded for economic reasons, but the students and educated classes from all these countries are given the freest entré into the best families and social circles of the whole nation. To any one who knows American social sentiment this is absolute and positive proof that the idea of race inferiority is non-existent.

It is perfectly true that politicians and propagandists who seek to buttress the economic position of the American labourer and thereby to get his vote, do use the pretence of race inferiority of foreign competitors, and this opens America, rather fairly we must admit, to the charge of generally cherishing this "fierce race pride". Fundamentally there is far less of it than is generally supposed.

But if the labouring classes of Great Britain, even, were to begin a great invasion of America, to an extent calculated to upset the economic equilibrium, the immigration laws would be hurriedly revised to exclude them. On the other hand, if it were economically profitable to large and in-

fluent groups of people to admit Japanese labour, the race question, as such, would never show its head. I quite admit that this is not less sordid and selfish than race prejudice. But it is the fact, nevertheless, and neither India nor America is the peculiar possessor of this tendency.

I was maintaining this thesis with some vigour in correspondence with a friend who had been touring in the East. He stated my point most admirably in these words:

"The trouble arises not so much from differences of race as from the sense of individual manhood and self-respect which refuses to accept racial superiority as a ground for injustice."

Later he replied in this vein:

"I have thought over the fundamental issue a good deal as one does who is obliged to speak more or less on the subject. At first I was strongly of the opinion that racial antagonism was pretty nearly the rock-bottom reason, but you do not have a very great difference in race in Korea, in China, or in Russia, and yet you have similar conditions to those in India in each of those countries—Korea under Japanese leadership, China under Manchu leadership, and Russia under Russian leadership."

Racial segregation of the spontaneous sort, often lends an unwarranted emphasis to racial differences. But it is the tendency of people everywhere to gravitate to the group with which they have most in common. The rich protect themselves against those of their own race by "restricted residence areas", or by increasing property values to the point that naturally excludes the poor. A labouring man likes to live near another labourer because he "speaks his language" and because his little house is not dwarfed in comparison with his neighbour's. The size of one's house, the appearance of the surroundings, the wearing of "over-alls" (the garb of the working men in the West) and carrying the dinner pail, have more significance many times than the simple question of complexion. But the Negro, just beginning to extricate himself from economic submergence, must needs accept this burden as well, and he has never had time to analyse it, but imagines it still to be solely a question of race.

The sheer force of the interrelationships of the nations in this century will compel us to face these issues honestly and fairly. There is a call to all men of good-will to seek to understand the facts and to undertake to properly interpret those facts to the unthinking who are led so woefully astray by whatever interest first plays upon their emotions. Certainly our task is to encourage the world over that which my friend characterised as "the sense of individual manhood and self-respect which refuses to accept racial superiority as a ground for injustice".

By half quoting Kipling we misquote him. He pointed out what, I am sure, he held as the popular fallacy, that "The East is East and the West is West," etc., to enable him to point to what he held as the real truth, that

"There is neither East nor West,
Border nor Breed nor Birth,
When two good men stand face to face,
Though they come from the ends of the
earth".

GARLAND CRAIG.

A LETTER FROM LONDON.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

LONDON, MARCH 15.

KENYA DEPUTATION.

THE news has reached here that, in view of the acuteness of the situation in Kenya, the Indian Legislature has nominated Mr. Sastri, Mr. Kamat, and Mr. Jambadas Dwarkadas to be a deputation to come to this country, in order to support the claims of India to a settlement of the Kenya controversy on the lines of the Imperial Conference resolution during the negotiations that will be opened here upon the arrival in May of the Governor of Kenya and the delegations representing the white and the Indian settlers. Doubtless other prominent Indians who will be here at that time will associate themselves with a deputation that the Indians Overseas Association is organizing, and which, it is hoped, will be led by its new President, Lord Hardinge, and include such influential names as those of Lords Chelmsford, Meston, and Islington, as well as Mr. Montagu and Mr. Charles Roberts.

The Ceylon delegation now here is not at all satisfied with the published proposals of the Colonial Office to extend constitutional reforms in the Island. They contend that the spirit of the proposals is narrow and illiberal, that too much emphasis is placed upon communal divisions, which never have been so clear cut in Ceylon as in India, and that there is no advance proposed in the matter of responsibility. They will certainly press for improvements in these respects.

CLAIMS OF THE DOMINIONS.

It would seem that the fact that Canada has signed a Treaty with the United States on behalf of the King, apparently upon the advice of the Canadian Prime Minister, and not that of the British Prime Minister, has somewhat altered previous legal conceptions as to the status of a Dominion and the structure of the British Commonwealth. The *Times* points to the claim of the Dominions to dissent from the terms of a Treaty made with another country by the British Government, and adds that the question may become acute also if and when the Mother Country is obliged to dissent from the terms of a Treaty contracted by a Dominion. It is quite clear that there will have to be, in the near future, a constitutional Conference to discuss these points, and that there must be continuous consultation between Britain and the Dominions on all matters of foreign policy.

LECTURES ON INDIA.

The India Society continues its interesting series of public lectures on subjects relating to various aspects of Indian culture and its influence upon the cultures of other countries. Last week-end the Japanese Ambassador presided at a meeting, of the Society, when Mr. H. F. E. Visser, the President of the Association of Friends of Asiatic Art at the Hague, lectured on "Indian Influence on Far Eastern Art." Mr. Visser said that some current opinions about the

relations of Indian and Chinese art were not well based. The subject raised a number of difficult and intricate problems; and in his opinion seekers after solutions of these problems could not be too scrupulously accurate in their observations and deductions. The two magnificent poles of the art of Asia were India and China. Before there could have been any contact between them, each of those arts had produced works of extraordinary beauty and masterly style. If there were any question of the one having inspired the other, then the honour lay with India. She had enriched Far Eastern Buddhist art with some of the highest attributes that it possessed. Some supreme Buddhist works in Far Eastern countries were the result of a fusion of Indian and Far Eastern art, and there was nothing finer in the art of Asia. The lecture, which was warmly received, was a fit pendant to that delivered not long since on the influence of Indian art in Indo-China, delivered by a French expert.

RESTRICTION OF OPIUM.

A writer in the *Westminster Gazette* draws a harrowing picture of the reversion of China, during the present period of anarchy and chaos, to the growth of opium, in spite of its illegality. He says that whilst the situation in China is going from bad to worse, public opinion is stiffening in the United States which has for long constituted itself the moral guardian of China and a joint resolution just presented in the House of Representatives forms a strong indictment of the Government of India. This resolution severely criticises the alteration, made at the instance of India's representatives in the League of Nations opium resolutions regarding the restriction of the cultivation of the opium poppy, of the words "medical and scientific" to "legitimate." It points out that whilst the world's medical needs in respect of opium would be about 75 tons, approximately 1500 tons are annually produced in India, Turkey, and Persia, and that the use of the word "legitimate" permits the continuance of sale of enormous quantities of opium which cannot possibly be required for medical or scientific purposes. The resolution therefore calls for the only effective means of controlling the drug menace by strictly limiting production "to the quantity required for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes, thus eradicating the the source or root of the present conditions." It is also requested that the President of the United States should urge upon the Governments of Great Britain, Persia and Turkey, the immediate necessity of limiting the production of the poppy and the production of opium and its derivatives exclusively to the amount required for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes. Is it not strange that, after so many years of Empire, we should be bracketed with Turkey and Persia on a great moral issue?

FRENCH COLONIAL POLICY.

M. Poincaré, the French Prime Minister, in a letter to M. Candace, Deputy for the Colony of

Guadeloupe, states that the French Government had preferred not to employ coloured troops for the occupation of the Ruhr, "not because it wishes to refute the abominable calumnies, but because it considered it wiser at this moment to provide no pretext for a propaganda which has, unfortunately, reached friendly nations." M. Poincaré obviously refers to Great Britain and the United States, who alone among the nations have strong colour susceptibilities. M. Candace had asked M. Poincaré to state the reason for the withdrawal from the Ruhr of a division of French soldiers "which contained about two hundred Creoles" from Guadeloupe and Martinique. The French Premier adds: "France has always considered her colonies as an integral part of the indivisible Fatherland, and dares not distinguish between the various races which live under her flag. In several of her old possessions she has even given to the native population the prerogative of French nationality, notably in the case of the Antilles, and I need not tell you that in the eyes of the Government of the Republic there are not two categories or classes of citizens. We have too great a consciousness of human dignity to set up such an artificial and unjust distinction." I believe that it was M. Poincaré who not long ago remarked that there was no phrase with which to explain in the French language the words "the colour problem." That this is not the case everywhere is elementary knowledge.

REVIEW.

INDIA'S MILITARY POLICY.

THE DEFENCE OF INDIA. By "ARTHUR VINCENT." Oxford University Press. Rs. 2.

THIS is the second booklet in the series "India of To-day" published under the general editorship of Dr. L. F. Rushbrook-Williams and a volume which ought to be read by everyone interested in the public affairs of India. The most important problem concerning the well-being of India is explained in it briefly and clearly, so as to suit the general reader. After dealing with the maritime defence and the north-east frontier, the writer has rightly devoted the bulk of his little book to the difficulties of the north-west frontier—the importance of the different passes, climatic conditions of the frontier, the nature of the tribes, the influence of Afghanistan and the Russian menace. He discusses briefly the pros and cons of the so-called "forward" and "backward" schools of the frontier policy and, himself belonging to the former, strongly advocates the establishment of large cantonments in the uplands close to the Durand Line or the Afghan border. Though this would entail large initial outlay such as India cannot afford in her present financial condition, he believes that it is the only way to control the supply of arms to the tribes from outside and of converting them in course of time to a

peaceful population. Another great advantage resulting from this policy, according to the writer, would be the improved health of the troops, who at present are stationed in the belt of the greatest heat, exposed every year during the hot months to heat-stroke, fevers, dysentery and other troubles. It is a policy requiring careful examination not only at the hands of the military and the executive as hitherto, but of the Legislature also, and for some years to come at any rate is not within the range of practical politics.

The frontier policy, however, is very much a question of finance. Infinitely more important is the problem of making India, within the shortest possible time, capable of defending herself against foreign attack by sea or land, and of rendering her a bulwark to the Empire in time of danger instead of a cause of anxiety. British statesmanship has at last come to see that the only way of attaining this object is to man the different branches of the Indian Army with well-trained Indian officers. But the policy followed by Government is so cautious that, as our writer thinks, it will take more than three generations for the object to be achieved. No wonder, if to Indianise but eight units no less than 22 to 23 years are required! This, however, is an absurd length of time and special steps should be taken to shorten it. The greatest obstacle to be overcome in this connection is the caste feeling in the military, both among officers and ranks. This feeling has been promoted to such an extent that few European officers can tolerate the idea of having Indian colleagues. One suspects that the real reason for completely Indianising a few units—segregating them in other words—instead of distributing Indian officers among all units, is this caste prejudice of the European officer. The ranks also, for keeping up their military pride, have been encouraged to look with contempt upon the educated non-martial castes. To a certain extent the good account which 'non-martial' recruits gave of themselves during the war has shaken the foundations of this caste feeling, but it still remains the greatest evil to be contended against in the Indian Army. If India should be able to defend herself within a reasonable period of time, the pace of Indianisation should be very much quickened and the caste basis altogether abandoned.

V. V. S.

MISCELLANEA.

INDIANS IN KENYA.

MR. SASTRI'S SPEECH IN COUNCIL OF STATE.

THE following is the text of Mr. Sastri's speech on the resolution which he moved in the Council of State on March 5 on the rights and status of Indians in Kenya, which ran in these words:

That this Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that he be pleased to convey by telegraphic message to His Majesty's Government the view of this Council that no settlement regarding the political

rights and status of Indian settlers in the Crown Colony of Kenya would satisfy the people of India unless Indians in Kenya are granted full and equal rights of citizenship with European settlers.

And this Council records its indignant protest at the reported threats of violence on the part of the latter and fully trusts that His Majesty's Government will take effective steps to prevent any such outbreak and to afford the Indians resident in Kenya the necessary protection.

And this Council records its emphatic conviction that no restrictions on new immigration from India will be acceptable to public opinion here.

"In speaking on this Resolution it is my great desire to avoid all rhetoric or attempt to excite feelings. I will confine myself merely to a statement of view because I believe that the facts in themselves are such that they carry their own conclusion. In the first place, I think in the course of public discussion upon this subject, there has been some mistake of an important character which, if I may, I would try to put right. Those who have advocated the Indian case have grounded themselves more or less expressly upon the Resolution which in the year 1921 the Imperial Conference of Prime Ministers adopted on the subject. I venture to think, having been a party to that Resolution, that it is somewhat of a serious mistake. That Resolution, Sir, was the result of a case that the Government of India put forward. I am in a position to say, and the public are in a position to judge from the memorandum of the Government of India published at the time, that our case did not concern any of the Crown Colonies. It was concerned solely with the self-governing Dominions of the Empire, and the case was also argued, as I have a right to state, solely on the ground that it concerned itself with the self-governing Dominions of the Empire. The case for the Crown Colonies rests on equity and does not derive in the least from that Resolution. We have got pledges of equity dating far back in the history of India. We have got it asserted again and again on high and solemn authority and it did not require the Resolution of the Imperial Conference of the year 1921 for the first time to give vitality to our claim for equity of treatment in the Crown Colonies. I make this repudiation at this early stage of my speech because I am particularly anxious that nobody here should carry the impression that the implication of that Resolution applies to Kenya Colony. That Resolution cites in the very beginning the right of every community in the Empire to exclude elements of the Empire's population which it does not care to assimilate. We have given that right to the self-governing Dominions and to India. We have not given that right, and if the people of India have a voice in the matter, they will not allow the right to be given, to the Crown Colonies. The whole claim of the self-governing Dominions in the matter is based upon the fact that, whatever the equities, whatever the rights and wrongs of the case, a people who can govern themselves, have a right in the last resort to say who shall compose the population. No Crown Colony, neither Ceylon, nor Fiji, nor Mauritius, nor Kenya, has yet acquired the right to say who shall form the population. If it is to be determined entirely by the Colonial Office, the Colonial Office, being a part of the British Cabinet, cannot settle the matter without amicable arrangements with the India Office; and the Colonial Office and the India Office, agreeing together, will determine these matters and not the people of Kenya. I am very anxious to make this repudiation also for the reason that, when this is once granted, the expression "the people of Kenya," "the community resident in Kenya" has, by a sort of verbal jugglery which I cannot understand, been applied solely to the white population of Kenya as if they were the only community who had a right to determine who shall go to Kenya and who shall not.

Having made that point perfectly clear, so far as I can, let me now proceed to say that our claim to equality is, even as regards Kenya, rather academic and theoretical to-day. We assert the right to equality but we are quite content—and

I wish more general recognition were given to that circumstance than has been given to it before—in the achievement of equality to proceed by stages. For what are the demands of our people in Kenya and what are the demands that the Government of India and the Secretary of State for India have so long supported? In the first place, we do not ask for universal suffrage as the European community there enjoy to-day. We do not ask that the Legislative Council of Kenya, such as it is, should be composed of elements giving to the Indians proportionate representation, either considering the number of the population or considering the amount of taxation that they have to pay towards the general support of the Colony. We are content that we should be less than a half in the Legislature, and so far as the Executive Government is concerned, no more than a bare admission of the Indian element has been conceded. If I may be permitted to say so, nothing more has yet arisen in the shape of a definite demand of our people. It is then, Sir, considered on the merits of the question, a partial, a very partial fulfilment of the rights of equality that is being asked for. As to the franchise, we have expressly agreed that such a qualification should be fixed as will enfranchise only 10 per cent. of the resident Indians. Now, upon what ground is even this modest demand for a partial fulfilment of equality, where the full assertion of equality would have been eminently justified, resisted? Sir, I think it is best in answering the question to go to the root of the matter at once and without hesitation. The root of the matter I had personal opportunity of understanding. Last year, there were in London certain representatives of the white Kenya community, come to press their views on the authorities, and I was privileged to be present at a private discussion in which their claims were put forward. I may at once state that their claims were clear and were firm. East Africa, Sir, and the Colony of Kenya with which we are particularly concerned, is unfortunately dominated by the spirit of South Africa. It is that spirit that reigns there. The spirit of South Africa to those who have understood it is to be summed up in two expressions. The first is "no admission of equality for Indians"; the second is "the expulsion of Indians if possible." There is no mistake about that. I heard these things myself, and the residents who came there told us that it was their desire as early as possible to get into the Union of South Africa as an African Empire, so that Kenya is now to be prepared in its treatment of the Indian element to enter the future African Confederation. That means clearly that Indians are to be expelled and such as happen to be residents are to be denied in so many words that there would be anything like equality accorded to them. Why, Sir, it was my painful business that day to listen continually to statements of this kind: "We will not allow this equality which is an academic theory, which is the folly of the Colonial Office; we cannot have it here. Let people come out there and see for themselves." And, in order to enforce this point of view, all things that we have seen usually on such occasions are being enacted.

Sir, it is quite extraordinary that the facts of history are even being denied to support this claim. History is falsified and even the facts that the Indian was on the soil before the white settlers appeared, that he has done a good deal to make the Kenya Colony what it is are being denied. And on the occasion that I have referred to I further heard it said that if the Indian has done something as any human being would have done if he were resident in a place, that thing could have been done for the Kenya Colony if the African native was educated for the purpose, and that it was not necessary, that it was not desirable, that the Indians should be allowed to base their claim on the mere fact that they were there, and that they did something to build up the railway or to carry on the trade. If that was done, it was a mistake and it should be modified at the earliest possible opportunity. The Colonial Office as was spoken of in terms of the utmost disrespect and contempt and everybody can see now in the papers that my unfortunate friend Major the Right Honourable Ormsby-Gore has come in for a good deal of abuse at the hands of the African press for the simple reason that he stands up for the dignity, for the righteousness and for the

good name of the British Empire.

With regard to the natives of Africa, Sir, as I have said to the Council already, I will try not to raise feeling. The natives of Africa are, as everybody knows, not quite civilised. They are advancing by leaps and bounds. Great efforts are necessary to pull them up along the line of evolution. But will history answer the question in the affirmative, that when the European exploiter, the European colonist, has gone abroad and come into contact with semi-savage tribes, the contact has been beneficial to the latter invariably? Could it be claimed to the credit of the European nations that they have been careful, that they have been solicitous, to observe scrupulously the rights and serve the needs of a semi-barbarous population? Assuming, however, that here and there such a statement could be made with an approximation to the truth, we are in a position to say from information that comes over that the European settlers in East Africa can by no means claim to come under this humane description. Well, Sir, innumerable instances could be quoted to show that their treatment of the East African native is by no means marked by a consideration of common humanity. I will only read one or two extracts to show the spirit in which the thing is done.

The Hon'ble Mr. B. N. Sarma: May I suggest, Sir, that we are dealing now with the question of Indians in East Africa, and having regard to the state of feeling it might be desirable not to dwell too long upon the question of British *versus* natives of East Africa?

The Hon'ble the Chairman: The Honourable Member has not yet done so. His extract, when he reads it, will show us what he means. I will allow the Honourable Member to proceed.

The Right Hon'ble V. S., Shrinivasa Sastri: Sir, I was only saying that as regards the East African native of the soil, it is not the Indian but the White settler from whom he has to be protected. It is that point which I was trying to labour, as it is being exploited in England that the introduction of the Indian and his maintenance in full rights of citizenship would be injurious to the development of the East African native. Our whole point is that in so far as that humane object is concerned, we are far more useful in East Africa than the White settlers. I will only read one extract, Sir. This is the quotation that I wish to read from a paper which was addressed to the Head of the Government in East Africa by the Indian residents:—

"Again a party consisting of members of the same school of thought, including amongst them a prominent member of the present Reform Party, assembled in front of the Nairobi Court House, and in the presence of the Magistrate and Police Officer and in the teeth of the remonstrances from the former and checking by the latter they publicly flogged certain innocent natives on the plea that it was useless to take them to court to be dealt with according to the law, etc., etc."

I only mention this to show that Indians could not have done such a thing; but the White settlers in Kenya seem to have a notion of ordered life in a community very different to ourselves. On another occasion it would appear that they did something which was most extraordinary. A number of Europeans, including some prominent members of the present Reform Party, marched up in an unlawful assembly to Government House, insulted Sir James Hasler, the then representative of His Majesty's Government, threw stones at Government House, shouted to Sir James to resign his office, and behaved themselves in such a rebellious manner simply because the then Governor disagreed with them in their views and policies of forced labour. I do not wish to contemplate what would happen if a number of people came to the Imperial Secretariat in Delhi and behaved in the manner. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief would have something to say to that.

Now it is a fact that the White settlers of Kenya have been, through the weakness of that Government, led to believe that they can deal shortly and summarily even with their Government, and when they threaten violence in case equality is forced upon them, they are not bluffing by any means. When

the Honourable Member in charge of this subject spoke in another place, he seemed to regard these assertions as mere threats which were never intended to be carried into effect. I thought at the time that he was much too optimistic, and I hope the news that has since come over has made him also change his opinion somewhat. Sir, I can only say that our people, whether in India or abroad, have shown such humility, such respect for order, such patience under the greatest provocation, and such forbearance and modesty in their demands for perfectly established rights, that what an American lady told me recently is perfectly true, that we Indians are about the only Christians left now, omitting the Chinese, on the face of the earth! Honourable Members will notice that there is a third clause in my Resolution. I wish to say a few words on that subject.

The third clause protests against restriction on Indian immigration which it is the intention, it would appear, of the Colonial Office, to enact for the first time. In the other place when this matter was discussed recently, this matter was not brought to the attention of the authorities in the same way. But immigration and the control of immigration in respect of Kenya Colony is so important that I ask your leave, Sir, and the leave of the Council while I keep them for a few minutes on this subject.

It has been admitted, and admitted on authority, that it is no longer questionable that India is an equal partner in the British Empire with Great Britain and with Dominions. It is a proposition with an enormous variety of implications. I do not believe that the Indian people will ever take advantage of that claim and draw out all the implications and insist on each one of them. But on this they will. We are three hundred millions in this country. If eighty millions of people must have an outlet and if they find enormous outlets, vast unoccupied spaces all over the world, and keep them all to themselves and coop up the three hundred millions within the limits of India and say to them: "You have no outlet, but you are equal partners in the Empire nevertheless"—that is a proposition to which it is very hard for us to assent. I can't understand, although I cannot approve, its being said that other parts of the Empire with vast unpeopled spaces were not conquered by Indians, were not settled by Indians. Perhaps it is a sort of answer; I will not pause to examine it; but the case of East Africa, the case of Kenya Colony is clean. There can be no gainsaying that it cannot be called a British colony and it cannot be allowed to become a British colony. If anything, it is a British Indian colony. Indians having somewhat prior rights, but because they are politically weak and cannot assert their rights in full, they are quite willing to share their rights equally with the British people. It ought to be considered a British Indian colony and we cannot therefore allow the Right Honourable Winston Churchill's assertion that Kenya must be kept a characteristically British colony. Moreover, look at the irony of the situation. Quite recently a sum of £10,000 has been taken from the public revenues of Kenya colony to which Indians contribute, I understand, somewhat over 50 percent., and set apart for the establishment of a Publicity Bureau in London with the object of attracting English settlers to that colony. At that very time and while public money to which Indians contribute is freely used for the purpose of attracting White settlers, it is proposed—what an irony of things—to enact restrictions as to Indian immigration which will have the effect of excluding Indians altogether from Kenya. It is impossible for a self-respecting people to submit to such barefaced violation of the fundamental equities of the case. We are afraid that under pressure it is quite possible that the Colonial Office may yield. Sir, speaking on this occasion I will, as I have done very frequently before, acknowledge on the part of the Indian public with the fullest appreciation and gratitude the way in which the Government of India and the Secretary of State for India have throughout championed our cause in this matter. We only beg them to keep the fight up a little while longer. If we lose in Kenya the result is we lose all along the line. The Dominions where I received such hospitality and such sympathetic hearing when

I presented our case, the Dominions will be perfectly justified, when a successor of mine goes round hereafter, in turning on him and saying, "What is the case in the Crown Colonies which are administered by the British Cabinet themselves? How can the British Cabinet solemnly pass a resolution and send you out to seek fulfilment thereof, while its spirit is being violated by the British Cabinet themselves?" Losing in Kenya, we lose therefore in the self-governing Dominions, we lose all round, and its moral reaction on the progress of India itself towards the status of a Dominion need not be described in detail. Sir, we cannot afford to lose there. There will be very few friends left in India to plead for the cause of the British Empire. You will wipe out the friends of Britain in India by any such settlement. Britain herself in the eyes of the world will be generally condemned as having fallen a victim to moral decay. For, after this war and the amount of brotherhood that has really come up amongst the nations after the League of Nations, and solemn pledges on the part of the British Empire that they are only a lesser League of Nations within the larger League of Nations, the world will be quite justified in passing upon the British Empire the judgment that it has become subject to moral decay, and moral decay cannot long precede material decay. I will say nothing more, Sir, but commend the Resolution to the acceptance of the Council.

CORRESPONDENCE.

PERFORMANCES BY TRAINED ANIMALS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—In the March 1 issue of the SERVANT OF INDIA appeared an advertisement inviting offers for the sale of "2 trained circus lions and other circus properties." Now a paper which inserts an advertisement is in no way responsible for the advertisement itself, but we are truly grieved to see a paper like the SERVANT OF INDIA (which we thought stood for justice, freedom and was out to fight oppression and exploitation in every form) condescending to insert such an advertisement at all. It is thereby becoming the means for the encouragement of trained animal performances.

Do you, Sir, realise what lies behind the words "trained circus lions?" Are you, in common with a great many people, under the delusion that such trained circus lions have become so by kindness, even if you are able to overlook the heartless cruelty of confining large beasts of prey, or other animals in small cages?

The whole question of trained animal performances has been thoroughly investigated by Jack London, the famous American author, who collected careful evidence for many years, afterwards writing "Michael Brother of Jerry" (Mills and Boon, Rupert St., London.) No one with any heart, after reading this book (some are unable to read it) could ever again sit through a trained animal performance. It reveals what lies behind 99 per cent. of all animal acts, "cold-blooded conscious, deliberate brutality or torment" of the most unspeakable kind. Here is one quotation: a theory held by a master trainer of an animal school:—"Take it from me, when an animal won't give way to pain it can't be broke. Pain is the only school teacher. You can't break animals with a feather duster, the thicker the skull the thicker the crowbar." "Heart-bonds between trainers and animals! The only heart-bond I know is a stout stick which goes iron on the end of it."

In accordance with the suggestions given in the preface of this book, the Jack London Club has been formed to combat the cruelties inherent to performances by trained animals in public, and there are now branches in America, France, England, India and Australia, all with a steadily increasing membership. To become a member one has to sign a pledge and carry it out, and there is no subscription. The pledge of the member of the Jack London Club runs as follows:—

1. I pledge myself never willingly to encourage the exhibition of trained animal turns by purchasing or occupy-

ing a seat at any entertainment in which such turns, or films of them, are included.

2. I pledge myself to leave my seat in any Theatre, Music Hall, Circus, Cinema, or other place of entertainment during the performance or portrayal of any trained animal turn, and subsequently to write to the management a letter of protest, explaining my reason for such action.

3. I pledge myself to use my influence, when opportunity offers, to induce friends and members of the public to join the Jack London Club.

Any of your readers in India desiring further information about the Jack London Club should write direct to the undersigned.

We feel sure that the insertion of the advertisement in question was an oversight, and shall be glad if you will help to counteract its effects by the publication of this letter.—Yours, etc.

K. M. RIDGE,

Secretary, Jack London Club, India
Vice-President,

Poona Society for the Protection of Animals,
3, Arsenal Road, Poona.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

From Macmillan Co., New York.

MUNRO, W. B. AND C. E. OZANNE: SOCIAL CIVICS. 1922. pp. 697. Rs. 6d.

From Longmans, Green & Co., London.

ROWNTRE, B. SEEBOHM: POVERTY, STUDY OF TOWN LIFE. 1922. pp. xx+496. 5s.

From Co-op. Wholesale Society, Manchester.

CO-OPERATIVE PRESS AGENCY: THE PEOPLE'S YEAR BOOK, 1923. pp. 336. 3s.

From H. M. Stationery Office, London.

CEYLON: CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO THE FURTHER REVISION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF CEYLON. 1923. Cmd. 1809. pp. 39. 9d.

From Supdt., Government Printing, Madras.

STRATHIE, D. N.: EXCISE AND TEMPERANCE IN MADRAS, A NOTE ON EXCISE POLICY. 1922. 142. Re. 1-6.

From S. Ganesan, Madras.

A. E.: THE NATIONAL BEING, SOME THOUGHTS ON AN IRISH POLITY. 1923. pp. 134. Re. 1.

From the Author.

HAJI, S. N.: THE DEFERRED REBATE SYSTEM. 1923. pp. 60.
VAKIL, C. N.: OUR FISCAL POLICY. 1923. pp. viii+157. Rs. 4.

WANTED a Lady Investigator for the Labour Office on Rs. 150 pay, plus Rs. 50 conveyance allowance. Her duties will be to collect family budgets and other information required for the Labour Office and to supervise other Lady Investigators. Apply by letter, stating qualifications to Labour Office, Secretariat, Bombay.

HINDU LAW IN THE NEW ERA

BY

K. K. GOKHALE,
Sub-Judge, Jath State.

Crown 16 mo. pp. 80. Paper cover.

Price Annas Ten. Postage Extra.

Can be had of—

The 'Aryabhusan Press,' Poona City.

Useful Books on Practical Subjects.

	Rs.	As.
Call to India, England, and Empire; or The Reconstruction of Indian Agriculture. By Khasherao Jadhava, M.R.A.C., F.C.S., M.R.A.S.E.	3	1
The Conflict Between Individualism and Collectivism in a Democracy. By Charles W. Eliot	2	8
Direct Action. By William Mellor	3	15
The Future of Exchange and the Indian Currency. By H. Stanley Jevons	13	2
Indian Currency and Finance. By John Maynard Keynes	6	9
Indian Railway Finance. By Dinshaw Edulji Wacha	0	4
The Land Question Solved. By Robert Murray. With Foreword By Robert Smillie	1	5
Modern Finance. By Emile Burns. An Explanation of the machinery of finance, national and international, showing how it has been affected by the War.	2	3
The Nationalisation Peril. By G. E. Raine	3	1
Near Future of the Imperial Finance. By Dinshaw Edulji Wacha	0	2
The Physiology of Credit and of Money. By Oswald St. Clair	4	6
The Progress and Decay of Societies. A study of the Rise and Fall of Nations in relation to social structure. By K. G. Babu Rao, M. A., B. L.	2	0
The Purse of India: A study of the Financial Policy of the Government of India. By M. Subraya Kamath	0	8
Roads to Freedom: Socialism, Anarchism, and Syndicalism. By Bertrand Russell	7	6
Scientific Distribution. By Charles Frederic Higham, M.P.	10	13
Sixty Years of Indian Finance. By K. T. Shah, B. A., B. Sc. (Econ. London)	15	6
A Society of States: or Sovereignty, Independence, and Equality in a League of Nations. By W. T. S. Stallybrass M. A. (Oxon.)	1	5
The Tariff Problem. By Sir William Ashley, M. A., Ph. D.	4	6
The Way Out: or The Road to the New World. By Wilfred Wellock	0	14

The Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar, Madras.

AND
INDIAN BOOK SHOP,
55 Meadows Street, Fort, BOMBAY.

CUT ME OUT

and mail me, with your name and address, to
Good Luck Co., Benares City.

I will bring you, per V. P. P., one **COSSI SILK SUIT** length for Rs. 12 only. These pieces are economical, hard wear and handsome ever made.

Test them any way you please—Why not give it a trial

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

The Book For You

—0—

IF you want a treatise noted for clearness and conciseness, a treatise that within a limited space will teach you the principles of clinical medicine better than most books of double the size and double the price, then buy

An Introduction to Clinical Medicine

BY

DR. A. J. NORONHA, M. D.

The book is illustrated most profusely with actual photographs from Indian experience. You have the very example, the actual typical clinical picture before your very eyes. Purchase the book to-day and it will bring it home to you that we are speaking the truth!!

To convince you still further we need only mention that the book is recommended to all the Civil Hospitals and Dispensaries all over the Bombay Presidency, Aden and the Persian Gulf by the Surgeon-General with the Government of Bombay. Besides it is spoken of in the highest terms by leading teachers of Medicine in India. *It is the book for the Student.*

The book for the Practitioner.

Price Rs. 12-8. Postage Extra.

For Copies Apply to:—

The Aryabhushan Press,

POONA CITY.

Come weeping!

Go laughing!!

VISHA-NASHINI.

(GUARANTEED.)



SURE & SAFE SCORPION TINGS

An Immediate CURE.

Highly Certified.

Complete cure in 2 seconds as if by magic.

As. 4 a Box.

Postage Extra As. 6 for 1 to 6 Boxes.

Mention this Paper while ordering,

Agents wanted everywhere.

S. C. ANRAJ JAIN,

55, BRIGADE ROAD,

BANGALORE.

HINDU LAW.

(3rd Edition.)

BY

J. R. GHARPURE, Esq., B. A., LL. B., (HONS.)

High Court Vakil, Bombay.

Price Rupees Ten, Postage Extra;

Copies can be had at:—

The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City