

THE Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE

Office : KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. VI, No. 37.]

POONA—THURSDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1923.

{ INLAND SUBNS. Rs. 6
FOREIGN SUBNS. 8.10

CONTENTS.

TOPICS OF THE WEEK	433
ARTICLES :—			
On Being Beaten to Death	435
Who Exploits the Natives ?	436
Malabar Land Tenure.—X. Conclusion. By P. Kodanda Rao, M. A.	437
Protective Tariff : Some Fallacies.—II. By Prof. Prafullachandra Basu	438
REVIEW :—			
Einstein and Commonsense. By H. C. E. Zacharias Ph. D.	440
CORRESPONDENCE :—			
Rendition of Berar. By G. K. Nabiullah	443
MISCELLANEA :—			
The Berar Liberal Conference	443

TOPICS OF THE WEEK

So far little has happened at the Imperial Conferences. Imperial conferences now in session in London to assuage public feeling in India, but much to acerbate it. The loyalty effusions of the Maharaja of Alwar, who was selected in preference to Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru to respond to the Premier's opening speech, sound exceptionally hollow and will probably be assessed even in England at a heavy discount. They will, we hope, therefore do little harm. But his speech, on another occasion, on India's attitude to the Indian Exhibition is a regular slap in the face of Indians. Meeting after meeting is passing resolutions in this country—in which all shades of opinion are represented—urging the non-participation of India in the "White Empire Exhibition," and here is a so-called India's representative who is aglow with enthusiasm for this very Exhibition. Whether he approves of the policy of the Exhibition boycott or not, is it not the duty of anyone who professes to speak on behalf of India to warn Imperial statesmen that the general feeling in India is utterly hostile to the Exhibition and that there is a real danger of its being boycotted unless white domination is demonstrably renounced in imperial enterprises? Any harm likely to be caused by His Highness of Alwar will probably be neutralised by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, but there is none to counteract the very serious mischief of Mr. Innes' utterances. The Empire authorities are evidently plumping for Empire preference. But India is not at all in what the Bishop of Kampala calls in a recent article on Kenya "the Empire temper." She will

not prefer Empire goods because they are made in the Empire. Economically imperial preference is recognised to be a ruinous policy; psychologically it is impossible. India is in a mood now to boycott Empire goods just because they are to her a symbol of the White Empire. But not a word of this was breathed by Mr. Innes at the Conference. Well, if he slurs over it now we shall have occasion to bring it home to him when he faces the Legislative Assembly early next year!

* * *

FOLLOWING the lead of Madras and Bombay, Poona will hold a public meeting to-day, representative of all sections of public opinion, to protest against the Kenya decision and to recommend measures calculated to obtain redress. Here, as in the two places mentioned above, the two fragments of the Congress and the Liberals are participating in the demonstration, but in some respects Poona has gone one better, for it has not only secured the co-operation between these three political parties, but it has enlisted the support of all other parties and interests as well. All the many groups of the non-Brahmans, from the most progressive to the most reactionary, have, we believe, been roped in, and Depressed Classes, Mahomedans, Parsees, Indian Christians, Europeans, men and women—all have joined in sending a requisition to the civic head of the town to convene a meeting for the purpose of adopting resolutions similar to those passed at the Town Hall meeting in Bombay. The active support of European missionaries and others, such as the Rev. A. Robertson, Rev. J. C. Winslow of the Christ Seva Sangh, Mr. Garland Craig, Mr. Zacharias and Miss L. B. Fuller, whom the Poona public is fortunate enough to secure, either as speakers or as signatories to the requisition, has in our opinion great value as showing that the idea of the White Empire which is writ large on every page of the White Paper on Kenya is repudiated by enlightened public opinion amongst the Whites themselves, and it will be well if an attempt is made at every demonstration to be held in future to have as many Europeans and other Whites in as possible. The remarkable unanimity displayed on this occasion in a city rent by mutual dissensions shows conclusively that on the question of Kenya there is complete unity and that even the most backward among the politically-minded are at one with the most forward, and that even those who have no direct concern with politics feel impell-

ed by their sense of humanity to denounce the decision on moral grounds.

* * *

Anarchism Again? WE are told that there has been a recrudescence of revolutionary conspiracy, for some time past in Bengal and in order to meet it the Bengal Government has resorted to Regulation III of 1818, under which it has detained eight persons in custody without trial. The cases of these persons are going to be submitted to the scrutiny of two High Court Judges, and their continued detention will depend, we suppose, on the Government obtaining an endorsement of its decision, but the Government professes its inability to put "the incontestable proof" it holds of a real danger of anarchist crimes breaking out to the test of cross-examination and judicial decision. It is admittedly difficult for unofficial opinion to judge accurately of the extent of the spread of revolutionary doctrines and the gravity of the danger caused thereby to public security: but we cannot on that account trust implicitly the official versions that may be put forward for public consumption, as we know only too well by past experience. A man so universally respected as Babu Krishna Kumar Mitra was deported under this old-world Regulation, which is now invoked against these eight people, and a Rowlatt Act was put permanently on the statute book, abridging the procedure of trial in many ways, on the plea that only such an Act stood between India and a sea of blood which would inevitably result if anarchism was not restrained in this particular way. The cry of "Wolf" has been raised so often in the past that it is no wonder that the earliest attempt of the Bengal Government to satisfy public opinion meets with ill-success.

* * *

Defying Repressive Laws Committee. THE official *communiqué* recently issued indeed shows that the Government is anxious to conciliate public opinion. It recognises "the undoubted objections to detention in safe custody without trial," but maintains that the only possible alternatives to this objectionable course are open to far greater objection, involving as they do "the gravest risk to the lives of officers and members of the public"; and adds that the Regulation has been pressed into service merely because it is "the lesser of two evils". It says that the action taken against these persons is not based upon their "old revolutionary history," but upon "distinct information of (their) present participation in revolutionary conspiracy." Such an assurance given in a way best calculated to disarm criticism would ordinarily quieten public misgiving, but the Government, by putting about stories of sedition and anarchy which have proved unfounded, has so damaged its own credit for truthfulness that there is little inclination in the public mind now to give it the benefit of a doubt. Again, the Regulation of 1818, which Government

has now summoned to its aid, was excepted from the general condemnation which the Repressive Laws Committee pronounced on most restrictive laws and from their recommendation for abolition, only for two specific purposes, viz. "The protection of the frontiers and the fulfilment of the responsibilities of the Government of India in relation to Indian States." If it were not for these reasons the Regulation in question would also have gone the way of other repressive laws. There is thus no warrant in the Report of this Committee, which the Government accepted, for the application of this Regulation to the present case—a point well brought out by Mr. J. Choudhury in his letter to the Press.

* * *

Preference for Backward Classes. CLOSE upon its order to admit untouchables to public schools, wells, dharmashalas, offices, etc., the Bombay Government has now issued another order in pursuance of a resolution passed at the last session of the Legislative Council, to reserve 50 per cent. of the situations of clerks that may fall vacant for non-Brahmans in the Presidency proper and 50 per cent. for Mahomedans in Sind. We are not in possession of statistics to judge of the adequacy or otherwise of the recruitment of this proportion of non-Brahmans or Mahomedans in subordinate public service. But we heartily endorse the principle underlying this step, the principle, namely, of giving preference to backward classes among candidates possessing requisite qualifications for certain posts. Till the present inequalities between class and class are obliterated by the diffusion of education among backward elements of the community, we cannot afford to give full play to the principle of open competition. In order to prevent the establishment of a close oligarchy of Brahmins, this principle has to be tempered in practice by a preference for backward classes. We feel no little pride that both these reforms of far-reaching consequence issued in this Presidency from resolutions moved by Liberal members in the Legislative Council, and we hope that other Provinces will soon follow suit and in the same way recognise the claims of backward and depressed classes. It is only in this way that the barriers between different classes can be thrown down.

* * *

Subsidence of the Agitation. THE Western India National Liberal Association has done well to support the public demand for affording an opportunity to the Government of India to consider proposals regarding rules governing immigration into Kenya, but it betrays an ignorance of the issues involved in this question when it goes on to add that "regulations of such a character alone will contribute to a complete subsidence of the prevailing agitation." The Kenya agitation will not subside even if satisfactory immigration regulations are made; there are many more questions, and of greater practical import, which have to be satisfactorily solved before the agitation will stop. The immigration of Indians is not after all an immediately practical issue, for in fact at present more Indians are coming out of Kenya than are going in. But we have to fight all we can for equal status, and until it is granted in full (subject of course to the overriding claims of the natives) there is no prospect of the agitation coming to an end.

ON BEING BEATEN TO DEATH.

ON the 1st of this month *Reuter* informed the world *à propos* of the Separatist demonstrations at Düsseldorf, that "the most horrible incident was the fate of two policemen who were disarmed by the French troops and fell into the hands of the Separatists who beat them to death with lead pipes." This incident may well be taken as illustrative of the whole history of Franco-German relations since the Armistice five years ago. "Disarm First" was then the watchword. Unless the German army immediately went east of the Rhine and immediately gave up all ammunition, rolling stock, &c. west of the Rhine, no Armistice would be granted. Germany gave in: much to the regret of Foch, who had looked forward to a complete annihilation of the German army. After the Armistice came the Versailles Peace Congress. Again Germany was told, unless she allowed herself to be completely disarmed, there would be no Peace; until every fortress was razed, every armament works transformed, all aeronautics given up, all materials of war still on hand delivered up, the blockade would be continued. Germany gave in and signed the dictate. Reluctantly the blockade was lifted—only to be succeeded by the "Reparations". These sums were, as will be remembered, not fixed at Versailles, lest by some chance Germany after all might be found able to pay them. They were left indefinite, so as to be adjustable from time to time to Germany's capacity to pay. Defenceless, Germany assented to every fresh demand. The moment she hesitated, the thumbscrews were given just another turn. Sanctions, Retorsions, threats of further undefined frightfulness always succeeded to reduce her to obedience. Still the Reich lingered on. Still the 60 million Germans existed and multiplied.

Hence the occupation of the Ruhr nine months ago. As a reply the whole of Germany engaged in non-co-operation on a gigantic scale. Her punishment was terrible. In the occupied districts life became a nightmare—courts-martial, shooting, whipping, imprisonment, expulsion, every conceivable humiliation was tried to break the spirit of the population. Outside, the financial burden of keeping the Ruhr industries idle, reduced the rest of the country to ruin. Meanwhile M. Poincaré, Sunday after Sunday, would repeat: "First Germany must disarm, first Germany must stop the passive resistance." At last the day came, when to continue the unequal struggle, had become an impossibility. Dr. Cuno's government retired, his successor proclaimed the cessation of the passive resistance. M. Poincaré took no notice, except to say, that he wanted reparations, not merely, cessation of non-co-operation. For, whatever indignation the French Government may have indulged in in public over the German non-co-operation: in private of course nothing suited them quite so well, as that Germany should commit industrial and financial suicide. 'Disarm First'

is the constant demand; then, the moment Germany gives up weapon after weapon, she is left a prey of the forces, which French policy has created. It is always the same story—the French army always depriving the German police of their arms: not to do the police work itself, but to give the assassins every chance of beating Germany to death.

Somehow or other, the French method is rather apt to revolt outsiders, particularly Englishmen, who still have ideals of "playing the game." But what is to be done to stop it? Mr. George tried blandishments, Mr. Law neutrality, Mr. Baldwin displeasure—but every time the result was the same, viz. nil. Many people thought that Mr. Baldwin's note to France two months ago was the first act in a drama, which would end by France being put into a place commensurate with her size and Germany given a sanctuary wherein to recover from the French bully's blows. This facile optimism ought not to survive Mr. Baldwin's opening speech at the Imperial Conference nor what the *British Official Wireless* on the 5th described as Lord Curzon's "informative review of British Diplomacy during the last two years"—in the course of which the Foreign Secretary frankly admitted to the Overseas Premiers that "our capacity of useful intervention was manifestly exhausted with the British note of Aug. 11."

Instead of all the futile jabber about entente or no entente, it is really labour time that the public should consider the realities of the position. The first of these surely is that Germany has no hope whatsoever. Whatever demand she may agree to, it will not alleviate her position. If Mr. Stresemann offers 51% of all shares in German industrial undertakings, M. Poincaré retorts that he has already got a lien on them under the Versailles treaty. If in answer to Mr. Poincaré's charge of wilful inflation, the German Finance Minister offers to stabilize the mark by a gold loan, M. Poincaré refuses to forego his right to seize the proceeds in payment of reparation. If German labour offered to work 18 hours a day instead of 8, France would accept it: but in return she would not by one iota abate her future claims nor release by the fraction of an inch her present stranglehold. If Western Germany from Westphalia to Hesse was turned into an 'autonomous' French Protectorate; if Bavaria proclaimed her independence under King Rupprecht and Saxony and Thuringia under a Soviet: France would accept the events, but why should she give up anything by way of return? It seems all so monstrously unfair: but we ask the reader, to look at it for once with the eyes of M. Poincaré. Candidly, is it conceivable that Germany could propitiate France by anything, by anything at all?

For secondly, France no longer wants reparations. She is very prosperous, has no unemployed, enjoys very light taxation and, moreover, is a self-contained Empire. The Reparation claim she will maintain, to put against her foreign debts to England and America. But, no longer expecting

trains full of gold to roll over the frontier from Germany nor having any use for goods made in Germany, she really does not want to be paid. Reparations are a weapon, whereby to beat Germany to death—*voilà tout*. And it is quite understandable that France really must go on with her lead-pipe treatment: she has gone too far, to turn back. If Germany was only given half a chance, now, in 10 years, in 100 years—there would be an inevitable reversal of the process. As it is, the diminishing 38 millions of France are still confronting the increasing 64 millions of Germany: no political fragmentation of the latter country can compensate for that fact. Hence what can France do, but so arrange things, that the 64 million Germans should gradually be killed off—by civil war, by malnutrition, by starvation? As long as Patriotism remains the ruling idea of the nations, what other or more sacred duty can France have, than to get Germany beaten to death?

Thirdly, as a further and last consequence, it must be realized that England cannot stop this process by any diplomatic action. M. Poincaré will say "Noted" and proceed. England could declare war, certainly; but M. Poincaré knows only too well that the British people would refuse to carry out such a policy. He has also taken good care to see that, militarily, England should be at the absolute mercy of France—as there is to-day no doubt she is. No: England is impotent, to hinder France beating Germany to death. Only one way out there is: that is, for England herself to renounce the ideal of Patriotism; to call on all nations of the world to form with her a new Society of Nations, each and every one of them renouncing their own national sovereignty and transferring it to the nascent Federal World State. With England showing the way, such a new, supra-national authority, would be a possibility. With its coming into being, and thus alone, an alternative would have been found to either France, beating Germany, or Germany France, to death.

Utopian? Perhaps. But one thing at least is quite certain: that, if the cold-blooded murder of Germany is by the public conscience of Europe permitted to take place, it is not Germany alone that will ultimately be wiped out of the book of the living, but the whole of Europe and the whole of all this precious Western "civilization" as well. And who would regret it?

WHO EXPLOITS THE NATIVES?

THE clear enunciation by His Majesty's Government of the principle that in the government of Kenya the native African population shall receive primary consideration is, speaking abstractedly, a great gain to humanity. But it is equally certain that, so long as the European settlers continue to enjoy their present position, the administration will seek first not the welfare of the indigenous inhabitants, but the material advantage of the dominant section of planters among the white

immigrants. At any rate the Imperial Government's declaration of the trusteeship principle has not created consternation among the planting community, for the latter has no reason to doubt that even a so-called trustee administration will do nothing to overthrow or impair white domination. At the meeting of the Convention of Associations (or the White Parliament) held on 10th September at Nairobi the Chairman expressed himself unable to understand why imperial statesmen should have made so much pother about native interests. He could not imagine how any conflict could conceivably arise between the interests of the natives and those of the whites. The interests of the two communities were interdependent and complementary, and therefore to say, as the White Paper says, that the interests of natives in relation to white settlement were paramount was, according to the Chairman, a contradiction in terms. Having studied for the last twenty years the interests of the original inhabitants exclusively, the Chairman naturally felt much chagrined at the suggestion of the White Paper that the native's welfare was the peculiar concern of the official. The fact of course was that the white settlers were far more competent to safeguard the interests of the African population than the agents of the Imperial Government, and therefore, the Chairman wound up by saying, all that was required in order to do the maximum of practical good to the natives was that self-government should be conferred upon Kenya, that is, upon the handful of European settlers there.

That the Chairman of the White Parliament speaks in this fashion will occasion little surprise in India, but what will come as a surprise is that the Governor, who attended the sitting of this Parliament, echoed these sentiments instead of uttering a solemn warning that the Europeans must henceforward put a stern limit to their grab. Sir R. Coryndon indeed went out of his way to assure the convention that "to imperil the position of European settlers was not in the mind of the Secretary of State and he could detect no such indication at all in the wording or the spirit of the document. He could quite honestly advise them to banish any such fears from their minds." With such a Governor in the position of the Imperial Government's agent to discharge the trust committed to him, it is easy to understand the feeling of triumph which the European settlers entertain about the decision. They may well claim that they have won all along the line and the principle laid down by the Imperial Government as to the preponderance of native interests will make no practical difference to the continued exploitation of Kenya in the sole interest of 2,000 white planters. If Sir Robert has thus made plain how he will implement the declaration in the White Paper about the priority of native interests, he has not left us in doubt as to the manner in which future immigration into Kenya will be controlled. He says: "In the course of time, as

natives progress intellectually, they will no doubt take the place which Africans hold in other parts of British Tropical Africa in mechanical and subordinate clerical work and in small trade, and it must be the aim of the British administration to further that development by all possible means. With that object the Colonial Government must weight, so far as may be practicable, the effect on native interests of the admission to the Colony of would-be immigrants of any race." That is to say, Sir Robert Coryndon will not raise his little finger to counteract the attempts of Europeans to reduce African natives to wage-slavery, but he will at once restrict and perhaps prohibit the immigration of Indians who enter the colony now as artisans, clerks, stationmasters, telegraphists and small traders.

If Indians come in the way of native development, we shall be the first to advocate their exclusion. We shall fight as hard as we can for equality of status as between Indians and Europeans, which has been solemnly promised to us, but we shall equally with all our force discountenance any encroachment that the Indian settlers will make on native rights, which must be held sacred. Kenya Indians do not wish to exploit the natives, and if they do they will receive no support from India. But is it necessary only to train the natives to fill the positions now occupied by Indians; is it not equally necessary, nay, necessary in the first instance, to restore to the natives their rights over land, to give them security of tenure, to abolish every form of forced labour, to make labour contracts civil instruments, breaches of which are civilly punishable, to repeal the Registration Ordinance and to reduce the crushing taxation which compels natives to labour on Europeans' farms? Which is more urgent—to rescue them from semi-slavery or to educate them to be stationmasters or telegraphists? Let them be trained by all means to do these things themselves; but is it desirable that, when Africans have displaced Indians, Europeans shall still enjoy the fruits of land expropriation, invade native reserves, keep the wages artificially low, impose such high taxes that natives have no alternative but to work on the plantations of the whites, make it a criminal offence, cognisable by the police, for natives to leave employment, and to compel them to wear "a pass" round their neck all the time, and, to crown all, to recoup the employer for prosecuting "deserters" out of the money wrung from the natives? We do not think that the natives themselves will consider it a benefit to be able to oust Indians, while Europeans overlie the Colony and steal, in the picturesque phrase of Major Grogan, both their land and their limbs. If it is thought that the native African is so peculiarly constituted that he will not object to white domination, while he cannot tolerate the development of the country in minor matters at the hands of Indians, let us put the matter to the proof by submitting this question to their

judgment. Indian settlers have no objection to apply the principle of self-determination to this question, if Europeans are agreeable. But the Imperial Government by enunciating the principle of the supremacy of native interests, and thus imposing restrictions upon Indians, has only provided the Europeans with "a smoke-screen," as Mr. Andrews puts it, "in order to veil the far more deadly attack (of the Europeans) upon the rights of the natives." Indeed, one feels that the fury of the European settlers against the Indians is due in a large measure to the very fact that Indians to some little extent prevent the exploitation of the natives by Europeans.

MALABAR LAND TENURES.

X.—CONCLUSION.

THE main proposals for tenancy reform advocated in this series, which is being concluded to-day, have been set forth in the last four articles and it would be unnecessary to elaborate them in greater detail or discuss consequential changes. It would, however, be useful to recapitulate the main proposals.

(1) The right of permanent occupancy shall be the invariable incident of all leases, except that

(2) the superior holder shall have the right to resume the land for bona fide cultivation by himself, for extending his own buildings or for exploiting minerals.

(3) If the land is resumed, compensation shall be payable for improvements made by the tenant.

(4) The tenant shall be free to make improvements.

(5) The superior holder shall have the right to make improvements with the sanction of a recognised agricultural expert, provided the tenant refuses to make them.

(6) Occupancy rights shall be heritable and transferable.

(7) The superior holder shall have the right of pre-emption in case of sale of tenant's rights.

(8) The tenant in actual possession of a holding shall be held responsible for Government assessment thereon and he shall be entitled to the benefit of remission of revenue.

(9) The rent payable on a holding shall be one-third of the net produce, exclusive of the extra rent payable to the superior holder for the improvements made by the latter.

(10) In view of the Government assessment also being one-third of the net produce, the rent shall be equal in amount to the Government assessment as fixed by the Settlement Officer at each settlement, which shall be once in fifteen years.

(11) The tenants shall have the right to have rents in kind commuted into money.

* Previous articles in this series appeared in the issues of June 21 and 28, July 5, August 2, 9 and 30, and September 6, 13, and 27.

(12) There shall be no partnership between a cultivating tenant and the superior holder.

(This provision is necessary to prevent a superior holder evading the obligation to lease out land with permanent rights of occupancy, by calling his tenant a partner on certain conditions.)

(13) The superior holder shall be entitled to increase in rent warranted by the improvements he has made.

(14) The Collector of the District shall have power to let in a tenant on the cultivable waste under private ownership.

(15) Before assigning lands for cultivation, they shall be constituted into consolidated and economic units, subdivision of which being prohibited.

(16) Where holdings of land now under cultivation have not been already sub-divided beyond the limits of economic holdings, such sub-division shall be prohibited, as also the further sub-division of the already economic holdings.

(17) Compensation, which shall be a definite multiple of the fair rent, shall be payable by the tenants to the landlords in instalments spread over a number of years.

(18) All leases shall be registered.

(19) Rents shall be the first charge on land, next only to Government assessment.

We may now briefly consider the proposals of Dewan Bahadur Krishnan Nair and Mr. Kotieth Krishan. The former's proposals are framed entirely in the interests of the kanamdars. It has already been shown in the second article of this series how the present-day kanamdars, as such, have no case for legislative protection. The proposals advocated by the present writer give ample protection to all such kanamdars as are cultivators also. They only exclude the non-cultivating kanamdars whose sole ambition seems to be to play the rackrenting landlords themselves. Certainly, the kanamdars cannot get a better advocate of their ancient claims than Mr. Logan. And yet it was Mr. Logan himself that strongly opposed the idea of offering any legislative protection to kanamdars whom he characterised as mere investors of money, who contributed nothing to the wealth of the country, who rackrented the actual cultivators and who, as compared even in 1872, had no right, either statutory or prescriptive, in the land (vide ch. VIII. of Mr. Logan's report as Special Commissioner on Malabar Land Tenures 1881-82).

Mr. Kotieth Krishnan's bill (*Young Men of India*, April, 1922) is highly commendable, inasmuch as it seeks to protect the actual cultivator, whether he is a kanamdar or verumpattamdar or a tenant of even inferior status. Mr. Krishnan, however, proposes to take existing rents as the basis for fair rents, which, to this writer seems unjustifiable, for reasons already explained. The proposals advocated in this series, the writer ventures to believe, mean merely a return to the ancient, well-known and most equitable system of

land tenures in Malabar, with certain slight changes. The essence of the proposals is that the actual cultivator should be left in undisturbed possession of the land he cultivates as long as he pays one-third of the net produce of the soil as rent to the landlord, exclusive of the assessment payable to the Government.

P. KODANDA RAO.

PROTECTIVE TARIFF: SOME FALLACIES.

2.—INDISCRIMINATE USE OF THE PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

A SECOND fallacy with regard to the protective tariff is that, in order to create an atmosphere of intense industrial activity, we should start with the imposition of the tariff on all sorts and varieties of articles.* There could be no better means of discrediting the tariff itself as a means of developing any industry whatsoever in India. There is no doubt that the imposition of the tariff means loss to the consumers. This loss is accepted for a time so that the industries concerned will develop and after that their cost of production will fall to the advantage of both the consumers and the producers. The consumers will then be paying the ordinary prices and the industry will be able to compete with similar foreign industries. Thus, for the policy of the protective tariff to be successful, it is necessary that the industries chosen for protection are such that they will develop within a reasonable period. Development of industries *per se* is not a desirable object to be pursued at any cost. We want that in order to benefit our own consumers and producers. As the consumers of the products of an industry are always greater in number than the producers, and as the producers in a manufacturing industry in India are and will be, for a long time to come, very much fewer in number than the consumers, the latter's interests cannot be indiscriminately sacrificed for those of the producers in the name of real good of the country. If the industries protected be properly chosen they will necessarily be those the products of which are widely consumed. Thus their high price will inflict a loss upon the general body of the consumers. This loss cannot be so lightly undertaken merely for the fad of developing our industries without any reference to the loss of the consumers, especially when the country is so poor. Otherwise the goal, viz., conferring a great benefit upon the country, will be sacrificed for the means, viz., developing industries. Economic self-sufficiency with regard to all the items of a country's consumption is not at all a desirable end, just as similar economic self-sufficiency of an individual is not at all desirable. Then all the benefits of the organised life of modern civilisation will have to be given up, and as a country or as individuals we shall all be reduced to Robinson Crusoes.

* Vide Oral Evidence before the Indian Fiscal Commission, 1921-22

Again, an indiscriminate use of the protective tariff will inevitably raise the general cost of living since so many articles will be affected. There is no doubt that the country will suffer very much. Probably no country in the world, not even the richest, and least of all India, can bear such a burden. Is it prudent to go in for such an abnormally heavy burden without first ascertaining whether the sacrifice will be compensated by the subsequent gain? Moreover, such a general rise in the prices of many articles can have either of two effects. Either the people will be reduced in number in accordance with the Malthusian theory of population, or they must reduce their standard of consumption and thereby lower their efficiency, which is none too high even as it stands to-day. In India, as we all know, the latter will happen as it has happened among the middle classes during the last decade or more. Is that condition desirable? Enthusiasts will no doubt say that at present we consume many unnecessary things which do not increase our efficiency and even some which diminish it, so that a redistribution of the items of consumption will prevent the falling off in the efficiency. But it is futile to chafe at such things inasmuch as such wastage must remain even in the best countries as long as man is what he is and is not converted into an automaton. Education helps to a certain extent, but it is not certain whether education helps much from this point of view, as will be evident from a comparison of the requirements of an educated with those of an uneducated man from the strict point of view of economic usefulness.

When the general body of consumers is in so reduced circumstances, their demand for consumption articles must fall. This will result in a decrease in the production of the latter. Apart from its effects upon the efficiency or general well-being of the community at large, such a situation is not likely to foster the growth of industries nor indeed an atmosphere for that desirable consummation. Even those industries which normally have a chance of success will be put at a disadvantage. Those which have little chance will of course go down quickly. This, combined with a condition of general distress among the consumers and a widespread failure of the tariff to develop all the industries of the country by means of the indiscriminate tariff, is sure to discredit the tariff itself as a means of developing any Indian industries. Even without this situation the case for the protective tariff is not very strong. An indiscriminate policy like the one advocated will only smash what position it has now. Also looking to precedents in other countries which are protectionists, we do not anywhere find any such policy being pursued. In Japan, Germany, the United States of America etc., the possibilities of the development of an industry are first explored. In most cases the industry is actually started and when it is seen that competition with foreign products has be-

come severe and dangerous for that industry at home, then only is the tariff allowed.

It may be argued that the position of the consumers will not be worse than what it was before if there be a rise in prices as a result of the indiscriminate use of the tariff inasmuch as they will be benefited as producers. This is only partially true, but specious to a large extent. If the rate of the tariff be higher than what is just necessary to develop the industry at the present cost of production, that is, if it be higher than what is necessary to protect it from foreign competition, then it will be extravagant and therefore inflict a greater loss on the country than what is necessary to develop the industry, and this will be at the cost of the consumers and for the benefit of the few owners of the industry. If the rate be as it should be, just sufficient to develop the industry, the income of the producers cannot rise very much. The income specially of the general body of the producers, that is, the working classes in the manufacturing industries cannot rise in this way. If it does, it means an increase in the cost of production, which means the necessity of an enhanced tariff to protect the industry with this additional cost of production. Thus we shall be in a vicious circle. The imposition of a tariff, just sufficient for the industries to develop, raises prices; this raises wages; this raises the cost of production; and this makes the old just-sufficient tariff insufficient now. Raise the tariff now and the circle re-starts. Therefore the circle must be broken somewhere, and it is naturally broken at the weakest point. The weak labourers are not granted an increase in their wages commensurate with the increase in the cost of living (this is so for a short period only), nor are the suppliers of raw materials given increased prices commensurate with the increase in their cost of living. Thus there must be economic degeneration at some not very desirable points.

The above case is argued on the hypothesis that all the consumers of the country are also producers in the protected industries. But this cannot really be so, even in an industrial country. There are many industries in all countries which have little to do with foreign trade and therefore with the tariff and its results, although there is some indirect effect. They will derive little benefit out of the tariff. For India another important point is relevant in this connection. Agriculture is not usually included in our discussions regarding the tariff except when we think of an export duty on agricultural raw materials*. This is so because agriculture is not a manufacturing industry, and the present rage is for the latter only. Seventy-two per cent. of the population are directly engaged in agriculture in India, and more are dependent on its profits. Some others pursue other small industries which will be hit if there be, as is attempted by the indiscriminate protectionists, a very rapid development of all the manufacturing

* Vide section (6) *infra*.

industries. These people, and their number is in crores, will fall back, as they have gradually done, during the last half a century, upon agriculture; some of course will be diverted to the factories. § Therefore the importance of agriculture in the national economy of India is very great both as an occupation and as the only effective reserve to fall back upon. With an indiscriminate use of the tariff, the effect on the agriculturists will be that they will have to pay higher prices for all the articles which they will buy. But if they charge higher prices for their products, then we fall at once into the vicious circle. The cost of production of the industries rises with a rise in the price of the agricultural products whether used as raw materials or as foodstuffs for the factory workers; this necessitates a rise in the just-sufficient tariff; if the tariff be raised, the circle re-starts. So, the agriculturists must not raise the price of their products although the prices which they will have to pay for their purchases will rise. Indeed the suggestion in many quarters is that agricultural raw materials should be cheapened by imposing export duties on them in order to develop the manufacturing industries in India. But what becomes of more than three-fourths of the population who must pay higher prices for their purchases and get lower prices for their own products? And does the country gain when such a huge number suffer? If so, of whom does "the country" consist?

It will be apparent that the above objections to the indiscriminate tariff apply to any protective tariff. But in the latter case the harmful effects are reduced by the number of articles affected which must be a few, and by the expectation that the high price in each case will be paid for by the success of the industry within a reasonable period, while in the former case none of these redeeming features appears.

PRAFULLACHANDRA BASU.

REVIEW.

EINSTEIN AND COMMONSENSE.

NYS, D.: LA NOTION D'ESPACE. Brussels. 1922. 9½ x 6½. pp. 446. (R. Sand.) Fcs. 30.

A SOLAR eclipse in May 1919 was made an occasion for testing certain theories about the light-æther—a rather abstruse subject in advanced physics, which naturally would not interest one man in a million. But instead of one, it was millions of people, who, at least according to the papers, were said to be, not merely interested, but fairly carried off their feet, because photos taken of the eclipse had shown that a stellar ray passing close to the sun was deflected by O"83, before reaching the terrene observer—a deflection, predicted by and in accordance with the new theory, advanced by one whose name until then had been utterly unknown: Albert Einstein.

§ Census of India Report, 1911.

The physical theory itself nobody of course understood. Yet—or perhaps because of it?—no superlative seemed sufficient to express the popular enthusiasm that an incomprehensible theory had incomprehensibly been "proved." "This much all understood", says for instance Mr. A. Moszkowski¹ "that from the quiet study of a scholar an illuminating gospel for explaining the universe had been irradiated." A new Copernicus, a greater than Newton, was said to be walking amongst us; one who had finally overthrown all our antiquated conceptions of the stellar universe, the laws of physics and of thought itself. No claim was too extravagant, not to be made; the drawing rooms of two hemispheres hummed to tea-talk on odd bits of the electron theory or of fourdimensional 'continua'; journals of every kind fell over each other to explain to their readers the elusive theory, secure in the knowledge that none could contradict their "explanations" and that intellectual snobbery would prevent admission that they had not at least got hold of some slight glimpse of what on the face of it was altogether above the crowd. At the height of the stunt, it was even forgotten that Einstein was a German; multitudes in London and even in Paris flocked to listen with rapt attention to lectures given by a "boche" whom even the yellow press dubbed "our illustrious guest."

Alas for the impermanence of such lionizing! "Society" or "the World" (choose your own expression!) in another season was convulsed by psycho-analysis and repeated, as the latest password to "the last word," that every day in every way it was getting better, the "luminous gossamer" of Berlin being quite eclipsed by the faith-curer of Nancy. And when in yet another season Tutankhamen had been launched by our wonderful Harmsworthian adepts on its career of supreme importance and exclusive topic of conversation, who was there left who would prove himself so altogether old-fashioned, as to mention still somebody quite as *vieux jeu* as Einstein? Yet this seems the very moment, when serious people might with advantage consider this curious "Relativity Theory," undisturbed by foolish society cackling and newspaper sensationalism. Hence we doubly welcome the publication of Prof. Nys's book—written, as it is, not with a view to any fashionable theories, but in the natural sequence of events as the fourth (and last) volume, completing the "Natural Philosophy" of the well-known cosmologist of Louvain University.

"The Notion of Space" is a philosophical work. Its business is not, to deal with physics, but with metaphysics: and its author sticks to that business of his. That is, where it straightaway differs from Einstein and particularly from all the mob of expositors, interpreters and exegetes, that have followed in poor Einstein's wake. For all of

¹ Einstein the Searcher. London, 1921. (p. 13.)

them without a single exception, do not stick to their business, which is physics and mathematics, but go on expatiating on questions which are purely philosophical.

For Einstein's two principles (the "restricted" and the "general") of relativity deal (1) with the question how to express in a mathematical formula all possible relative movements, so that each observational point of view may seem but a special applied case of that formula; and (2) with an attempt at explaining gravitation as a form of acceleration and at expressing it in geometrical terms. This last endeavour leads Einstein to identify "space" with "the gravitational æther" and to reduce the world to "two causally connected, yet conceptually distinct realities, viz. gravitational æther and electromagnetic field or—as one might also call it—Space and Matter."² This "space" therefore is considered as if it were a substance; and since nothing corporeally existing corresponds to it, it is promptly called "non-Euclidian" space, an expression which by the popularizers is translated as "curved"—as if Euclidian geometry excluded the curvilinear! But what is all this "non-Euclidian geometry"? Euclid, as will perhaps be remembered, starts with certain postulates, i. e. unproven or unprovable axioms, on which he builds up the whole of geometry by logical deduction: the sixth postulate for instance affirms that two straight lines cannot enclose a space, &c., &c. Now, obvious as the actual fact expressed by these postulates seems to be, mathematicians have not been wanting to speculate, what kind of conclusions would follow, if any of these postulates were omitted. Thus Riemann omitted the sixth and worked out a non-Euclidian geometry on that basis; Lobachewski similarly proceeded by leaving out the fifth. The mathematical ingenuity displayed in these "metageometries" is necessarily great: but the real point is whether any of these metageometries is compatible with the corporeal world, as actually existing, or whether they are pure mathematic fiction. Few people seem to remember that number and magnitude are two altogether different things. "Minus five oranges" for instance is a number; and therefore exists in the realm of mathematics; but it lacks magnitude and therefore reality. (5-10) oranges is quite legitimate algebraically; but when someone told you to think of a world of oranges, which gradually becomes attenuated, until suddenly a point is reached when (like Alice through the Looking-glass) you step out of a world of oranges, as we know them, into a mysterious world of negative oranges: you would know that the man was talking arrant nonsense. Yet most of the Einstein-mania is due just to this cunning trick of stimulating the imagination to clothe mathematical formulæ with reality. Mathematical formulæ are very useful as a means

² Albert Einstein: *Æther und Relativitätstheorie*. Berlin. 1920. p. 14.

and as a method of thought: but let nobody be fooled into believing that to every mathematical expression there must correspond an actual, or even a possible, magnitude. The symbol: ∞ (infinite) is ideally very useful, but does it follow that an "infinite" inkpot is possible? Or 2.25 inkpots—though the average number of inkpots owned by half a dozen people may come to that? Hence also these non-Euclidian geometries are "algebraic hypotheses which may have exact results, as have the negative quantities, but which have no value as an expression of reality" as Fouillée puts it³; they are an "imaginary world of symbols" incompatible with the properties of extended bodies. Similarly Nys (p. 321) calls the relativity theory "a purely mathematical concept, an abstract synthesis of elements logically linked together by the artifices of calculation." Aloys Mueller has recently⁴ shown, how impossible it is, to turn physics into geometry and *vice versa*; and H. Henning⁵ that Einsteinian physics are basing their speculations on "the voluptuous sophistry of the subtlest of psychological illusions;" so that K. Vogtherr⁶ sees in the whole of this Einsteinianism a serious danger to sane thought and commonsense and, rather aptly, compares it with "Cubism" in art, "that decadent taste, which believes that it should make crooked and lopsided, what is straight and symmetric."

The fact is that, as Hoenigswald⁷ pointed out long ago, "these novel conceptions of space and time represent an inadmissible mixture of subjective and objective and a grievous confusion of the domains of science and philosophy respectively." The whole phenomenon is the natural result of that contempt for philosophy and the overrating of the "exact sciences," so typical of the Victorian era; a contempt which of necessity leads to the superstitious credulity of our day, when the most grotesque nonsense is avidly believed, provided only it is put forward by a man of science. But every hypothesis, every process of induction is, first and last, subject not to the laws of electricity or astrophysics, but of thought, i. e. of philosophy. Scientists, *qua* scientists, can describe that which is apprehendable by the senses, and can therefrom conclude sequences of events: but the moment they get into questions of "being," "cause," "truth," etc. they philosophize. We have no quarrel with them on that account: but we do quarrel, because they so hopelessly bungle whenever they attack philosophical problems; as indeed is only natural, seeing that they spurn all philosophy as such, and are consequently innocent of the most elementary philo-

³ *La pensée et les écoles anti-intellectualistes*. Paris. 1911.

⁴ *Der Gegenstand der Mathematik und die Relativitätstheorie*. Braunschweig. 1923.

⁵ *Relativitätslehre und experimentelle Psychologie*. Leipzig. 1923.

⁶ *Wohin fñhrt die Relativitätstheorie?* Leipzig. 1923.

⁷ *Grundlagen der Mathematik*. Heidelberg. 1912.

sophical training. We are not going to retaliate by spurning science. Einstein's mathematics may be as useful and exact, as his physics and astronomical theories. We leave it to mathematicians and to physicists to decide that. But when we have him and his neophytes tell us that "the remarkable feature about Einstein's theory is that, starting from a purely experimental basis, it compels us to accept the supersensual as a fact"⁸ or that this theory has "introduced a revolution into the foundations of scientific thought by destroying the objectivity of time and space"⁹, we must politely but firmly insist that these are philosophical assertions which can therefore only be proved or disproved by philosophical methods.

With all due respect for instance to the Secretary of the Royal Society (Mr. J. H. Jeans), the "objectivity of time and space" is a purely philosophical theory, which has been held by nobody but Newton, Locke, Clarke and Spinoza. Its opposite theory of the subjectivity of time and space has been upheld by Kant, Leibniz, Berkeley, Hume, Hegel, Bergson and Spencer: so that to speak of Einstein's recent exploit in this connection, is, to say the least, a trifle lacking in proportion. In fact, Nys in the volume before us devotes 211 pages out of a total of 432 to an analysis of the various theories of space, which at one time or another have—erroneously, as he shows—been held; whilst the second half of the book establishes the true nature and properties of space, according to Aristotle and that school of philosophical Realism, which from his time to ours has but worked out and consolidated the implicits of human common-sense. When we of this school speak of "space", we are careful to distinguish between the ideal space of geometry, which is thought of as an indeterminate, three-dimensional, homogeneous and isotropical continuum, and the concrete space of reality which is a relation of distance. Being a relation, distance therefore derives its objective value from the terms, which it relates, which must be concrete bodies (p. 217). Thus two oranges on my table may be said to be at a distance from each other, when they do not touch each other; and this distance can be "measured", i. e. we can say that, not until 10 more oranges have been placed in line between these two, would the whole dozen oranges touch each other. In other words the distance between the two original oranges is a possible series of spatial positions, where neither one orange nor the other is to be met—not a sort of mysterious entity stretched out between two fixed points (p. 35), as imagination is so fond of misleading us. Distance is most emphatically not a sort of padding, which keeps things apart and without which they would coalesce: as regards the distance between my two oranges, it is utterly

irrelevant, whether there are other oranges or inkpots or even a vacuum chamber between them; the relationship of distance between the two remains unaltered. But I know that this relationship can be altered: I could put my orange No. 1 in any position occupied by the additional ten oranges for instance. In that case I would "move" orange No. 1 on my table and if my table and the whole world, except that one orange, suddenly disappeared, it would still move. Hence the space occupied by its volume, which we call its "internal place" (*ubi*, where), is independent of any other bodies, although of course without any other bodies the motion of the orange could not be perceived or measured. And if all motion is not an illusion, the "internal place" also cannot be a chimaera but must be real; and if real, it must be due to a localising accident, which makes a body to be "here" or "there," just as a thermic accident would make it hot or cold, or an optical one pink or green. "Hot" and "pink" is real enough, though it cannot exist without a concrete substance to be hot or pink: just in the same way "here" and "there" is real enough, though it cannot actually exist, without a concrete substance to occupy that "internal place." To this "internal space" corresponds "internal time"; i. e. the succession of changes of a thing considered by itself (e. g. rice grain—paddy plant—straw)—with which we contrast "external time," which is the relation of such succession of changes with the successive changes of other things (e. g. the internal time of a rice plant is thus related to the external time of lunar or solar movements). In the same way we contrast the internal space occupied by a thing with its external space which is determined by other things, localised externally to it.

That, very briefly, is the kernel of the scholastic theory of space: and as will be seen, it supplies the only explanation which will neither turn "space" into some kind of matter nor into a purely subjective fancy—against either of which alternatives common sense revolts. Secondly, it distinguishes sharply between the *reality* of the "where," and the human capability of fixing it. And that is where all Relativity comes to grief. Even if, as according to some physical theory, velocity compressed the size of all bodies (and therefore also all measuring rods moving at that same velocity), it would only follow that on that body no shortening could be *measured*; it would emphatically not follow, as the Relativists try to hoodwink us, that there is no *real* difference between the size of the body at rest and in motion. To call any magnitude relative or absolute is once more to employ utterly inappropriate terms, to use no harsher expression. The size of my orange is not relative nor absolute: it just *is*. How successfully I can measure the indisputable reality of that orange, is an altogether different question, which we may well leave physicists and mathematicians to determine. But one cannot rise from a

⁸ L. Bolton: Introduction to the Theory of Relativity. London. 1921, p. 172.

⁹ J. H. Jeans: Relativity. (Encyclop. Brit. vol. 32). 1922.

study of all this recent flood of "Relativity" literature without feeling that physics and mathematics would probably gain much, if their exponents restricted themselves to such determinations, which alone are germane to their science: but that in any case, if to philosophize is their desire, they ought to be ready to find answers for their philosophical difficulties, not in this science nor that, but in philosophy. And in this case, it is devoutly to be wished that before anybody sets out again to Einsteinize, he might take the trouble of mastering some such technical philosophical treatise on the subject, as the solid, lucid and sane work of Prof. Nys, which one has such pleasure and confidence in recommending to all students interested in the subject.

H. C. E. ZACHARIAS.

CORRESPONDENCE.

RENDITION OF BERAR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—Your article on "the Right of the People" in your issue of the 16th August, sounds much like "the devil quoting scripture." You seem to be throwing dust in the eyes of your readers by confounding the issue. Though you take shelter under happy phrases like "self-determination" and "self-government", your dictum, "Berar cannot go back to the Nizam without the consent of the people" (referred to by your correspondent in the same issue) cannot hold much water. Your "chattel theory" is anything but convincing. Forsooth the people of Berar must be consulted, but why they should be consulted only on the question of "transfer" I fail to understand. If they have got to be consulted at all let them be consulted on what form of government they want and be given one accordingly. It will be insulting the injured innocence of Berar to give them the option of either a king crane or a king log. You will admit that John Bull is a veritable king crane, while the Nizam may be a king log.

You seem to be more perturbed over the question of the rendition of Berar to the Nizam than Berar itself. You seem to have forgotten the old adage "Good government is no substitute for self-government." The misrule of an autocratic countryman is much more preferable to the enlightened rule of a foreigner having regard to the fact that the former is in a certain measure self-government. After all "independence" is the supreme privilege of misgoverning yourself, if you so choose. You are coolly assuming that Berar is against such "transfer" while it is very difficult to gauge the real feeling of the masses at large. To suit your own convenience of argument you drift along from self-determination to partial consultation of the wishes of the people, exulting in the erroneous idea that the former is the same as the latter.

Political sovereignty no doubt belongs to the people at large and physical force is ultimately on the side of the people and not on the side of the ruler. When people are alive to this sense and realise their power they will assert themselves in spite of London or Hyderabad. Responsible government has got to be won and wrested from the ruling authority and has no value whatsoever if it is given as a boon. It is for the legal Sovereign to consider how far his sovereignty coincides with the political sovereignty of the people. If it does not, he acts at his peril. Here this question does not crop up because the political sense of the people is yet in the making and is not yet thoroughly alive.

Political sovereignty of the people being out of the question, it can be considered only with India as a whole and cannot be applied piecemeal to a few yards of territory. We have then the unique spectacle of legal sovereignty belonging to the Nizam and the administrative sovereignty to the British. India is a land of many wonders and here is one more surprise in

store. Just think for a moment, political sovereignty belonging to the people, legal sovereignty to the Nizam and administration to the British!

In justice you will admit that administration must revert to the legal sovereign, whoever he may be. The account between the political sovereign and the legal sovereign might be settled later on with the rest of India! Why bother about it just yet?

Throw a glance to the East and to the West. Look to China, Japan, Afganistan, Persia and Turkey; you will be convinced that it is easier to abolish native and indigenous despotism and autocracy than a foreign one.

Most of the Indian States are on the brink of industrial revolution. Ere long they will outstrip us on the path of progress. Political power always follows in the wake of economic independence. The fortunes of India and the countries surrounding her are so interdependent that the political status of the one must necessarily influence that of the other. This is truer in the case of British India and Feudatory India. They are part and parcel of the body politic and are so related that their destinies have got to be welded together.

The people of Berar need not be afraid on that score. They will not be forgotten by the rest of India. If we succeed in wooing this coy maiden of Freedom first, certainly we will be the last to withhold this blessing from our countrymen in native states. The Nizam will be the last person to stand in their way, knowing as we do the political sagacity of his illustrious house which has stood them in good stead for centuries. Then why raise this hue and cry over a minor question and a side-issue if it is fairly on a way to settlement?

G. K. NABIULLAH,
Vice-President, Y. M. M. A.

Bombay,
8th September.

[If the people of Berar are sure to prefer indigenous bad rule to foreign good rule why not put the matter to the test? That will solve all difficulties.—Ed.]

MISCELLANEA.

THE BERAR LIBERAL CONFERENCE.

THE Berar Liberal Conference which met at Akola at the end of last month passed the following resolutions relating to local matters:

RETROCESSION OF BERAR.

This Conference with dismay notes the occasional reports which appear in the newspapers about the retrocession of Berar to His Exalted Highness the Nizam and places on record its emphatic opinion that such retrocession is not desirable as not being conducive to their progress—political, social and economic.

LEGISLATION IN REGARD TO BERAR.

That this Conference brings to the notice of the Government the anomalous position in regard to the legislation applicable to Berar and urges upon the Government the necessity of giving the elected representatives of Berar in the Council an effective voice in the framing and amendment of Berar legislation and till such measure is taken no legislation should be notified for Berar without first obtaining the vote of the majority of Berar members of the Council.

PROVINCIAL RETRENCHMENT.

In view of the present financial stringency and recurring deficits in the provincial budget which are making nearly impossible any advance in any of the development departments, this Conference expresses its dissatisfaction at the meagre action which has been taken by the Government on the recommendations of the C. P. Retrenchment Committee and urges that those recommendations be given effect to as speedily as possible.

NAGPUR UNIVERSITY CORPS.

This Conference urges that immediate steps should be taken to organize a University Training Corps of the Territorial Force in connection with the Nagpur University.

JUST RECEIVED. JUST RECEIVED.
Useful Books For Sanskrit Students.

With Notes and Translations.

- | | Rs. | a. |
|--|-----|----|
| 1 The Mricchhakatika of Sudraka with the commentary of Prithvidhara. By Pandit Hirananda Mularaja Sarma Sastri M. A. and Kasinath Pandurang Parab. ... 2 | 4 | |
| 2 Uttararamacharita . A Sanskrit Drama by Bhavabhuti. Edited by Shrinivas Govind Bhanap. ... 1 | 12 | |
| 3 The Vikramorvasiyam of Kalidasa. Edited with a new Sanskrit Commentary, Various Readings, Introduction, A Literal Translation, Exhaustive Notes in English and Appendices, by M. R. Kale, B. A. ... 3 | 4 | |
| 4 Kumarasambhava of Kalidasa. (Complete) with the Commentary of Mallinatha. By M. R. Kale, B. A. ... 3 | 12 | |
| 5 Meghaduta of Kalidasa with the Commentary of Mallinatha. Edited with a literal English Translation, copious notes in English and with various Readings by Gopal Raghunath Naudargikar. 1 | 12 | |
| 6 English-Sanskrit Dictionary . with an Appendix containing Sanskrit equivalents for Latin, French, Greek phrases etc., commonly used in English by Vasudev Govind Apte, B. A. ... 3 | 0 | |
| 7 The Student's Hand-Book , of Progressive Exercises. Part II. By Vaman Shivram Apte. M. A. ... 0 | 14 | |

SANSKRIT BOOKS.

- | | |
|---|----|
| 1 Amarsar . An Abridgment of Amarakosha. Being a Sanskrit-English and English-Sanskrit Pocket Dictionary. By Mahadev Shivram Gole, M. A. ... 0 | 14 |
| 2 Kamakshistuti Satakam 0 | 5 |
| 3 Radhavinoda 0 | 2½ |
| 4 The Kathasaritsagara , of Somadevabhattacharya, Edited by Pandit Durgaprasad and Kasinath Pandurang Parab. ... 5 | 8 |
| 5 The Brahmasutra Shankara Bhashya with the Commentaries of Bhamati, Kalpataru and Parimala and with Index etc. Edited with Notes etc., by Pandit Nurani Anantha Krishna Sastri, and Vasudev Laxman Shastri Pansikar. ... 10 | 0 |

The Theosophical Publishing House,
 Adyar. Madras.
 INDIAN BOOK SHOP
 George Town, Madras.

A Wonderful Discovery.

No medical expert could say that there was ever a guaranteed cure for diabetes in the world. Our cure for diabetes is a Heavenly Blessing which never fails to cure it. Accordingly instead of quoting excellent references we are ready to offer it gratis to all Provincial Governments and the Chiefs for trial on the condition that the results thereof are duly published for public information. We undertake conditional treatment on satisfactory terms. It restores also lost vitality and removes general debility of either sex. A sample for trial at Rs. 3 will give complete satisfaction and remove bias against advertisements in general.

Apply with 2 as. postage for further particulars to:—
G. R. KHORANA, LYALLPUR

THE LUCKNOW UNIVERSITY JOURNAL.

A high class University Journal for the promotion of original research.

Four issues will be published during each academic year, viz., in September, December, February, and May.

Editor—C. J. Brown, M. A.—supported by a strong Consultative Board representative of all the Departments in the University.

Special Features.

The Journal will contain original contributions from members of the Lucknow University and will also publish Vernacular contributions in Hindi or Urdu of a suitable character. It will contain portraits and illustrations from time to time. It will also publish Reviews and Notices of all important Books and Reports coming out in the educational world. Another important feature of the Journal will be the publication of the latest news about University affairs and other interesting informations about educational matters.

Annual Subscription.

	Town.	Mofussil.	Foreign.
For Students of the University, Rs.	2 0	2 8	} 10s.
For all others ...	Rs. 4 0	4 8	

Matters for publication should be sent to the EDITOR. All business communications relating to subscriptions and advertisements should be sent to the Business Manager.

The Journal is an excellent medium for advertisement. For advertisement rates and other particulars apply to—

B. MUKHERJEE,
 Business Manager,
 Lucknow University Journal.
 LUCKNOW UNIVERSITY, }
 LUCKNOW, }
 LUCKNOW: UPPER INDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, Ltd., 4,
 Aminabad Park.

LONDON: P. S. KING & SONS, Orchard House, 2 & 4 Great Smith Street, Westminster, Lond., S. W.

READY FOR SALE.

Indian States Act, 1922.

(Protection of Princes Against Disaffection Act)
 Demi 8 vo., pp. 450, Paper cover

This pamphlet is published under the authority of the Daxini Sansthan Hitvardhak Sabha. It contains a full report of the debate in the Legislative Assembly at the time of the introduction of the Bill, in the Council of State at its passing and in the House of Commons on the motion of Col. Wedgwood, M. P. It contains all the published Government papers pertaining this question; the evidence given on this subject by witnesses before the Press Laws Committee; the petitions presented to Parliament on behalf of the Daxini Sansthan Hitvardhak Sabha, Kathiawar Hitvardhak Sabha and the Progressive Association of Bombay. The articles of Messrs. N. C. Kelkar, Mansukhala Metha and G. R. Abhyankar dealing with this question are fully reproduced. Press opinions from about 25 leading papers are given in a separate Appendix. In the introduction the Government case has been fully examined and the unsoundness of its arguments exposed. Price Rupees two. Postage Extra.

All those who are interested in Indian States should possess a copy.

Copies can be had from —

The Manager, Aryabhusan Press,
 Budhwar Peth, POONATAZI

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 **COUSIN 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.....