

# THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE,

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. VI, No. 49.]

POONA—THURSDAY, JANUARY 4, 1923.

{ INLAND SUBNS. Rs. 6.  
FOREIGN " " a. 10.

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	573
ARTICLES :—	
Nagpur and Gaya ...	575
Self-Determination ...	576
Compulsory Education Act.—II ...	578
THE WORLD OUTSIDE ...	579
REVIEWS :—	
The Korean Struggle. By V. V. S. ...	580
Philosophy of the Gita. By V. M. J. ...	582
MISCELLANEA :—	
National Liberal Federation's Resolutions ...	583

## TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

Working Committee.

THE formation of a Working Committee is, we trust, only a first step in the better organization of the Liberal party on which the President of the Nagpur Federation rightly laid so much stress in his inaugural speech. The All-India Council has in practice proved too large a body to convoke as often as questions arise which challenge an answer from the party. Past experience has been that the meetings of the Council are not as frequent and the attendance at them is not as large as one might wish. And the result is that the Liberal party has too often remained without an authoritative expression of its opinion even on crucial questions. It is most undesirable that this state of things should be allowed to last any longer. If a large Council is unworkable as an executive organ of the party, a smaller body must be constituted, which, without superseding the Council, will pronounce, in the name of the party, on questions which will crop up in the course of the year and will take other necessary steps for efficient and prompt discharge of business. The Council will of course be there with its overruling power: if on any matter the Working Committee should decide wrongly, the Council, and in the last resort the Federation, will have the power to set it right. But ordinarily one may expect the Working Committee accurately to voice the feeling obtaining in the party. It is to be hoped that, by means of this new arrangement, the Liberal party will make its voice heard on all important questions in a manner not open to question.

Responsibility for National Defence.

THE resolution on further reforms adopted by the Liberal Federation last year and reaffirmed this year

amounts to all intents and purposes to a grant of self-government *minus* the control of the army. This proposition is open to an obvious objection, namely, that it has become an established rule in British politics that where responsible government is given to a colony the responsibility of its military defence should also be cast on it. Where, therefore, a colony is unable to undertake its own defence against all perils, internal and external, it is impossible (it will be urged) to concede self-government to it. Mr. Sastri answered this objection in his presidential speech at Nagpur, by referring to a resolution adopted by the House of Commons on March 4, 1862, from which the doctrine that "self-defence and self-government go together" took its origin. This resolution was really intended to save the British exchequer from the incidence of a heavy financial burden, which is out of question in India, and was accepted by the Government with many limitations. It was agreed to by the then Under-Secretary for the Colonies in the spirit of the following observation:

While contending that it was not the policy or the duty of this country to abandon the colonies entirely to their own means of defence, he did admit that it was quite possible to go too far, in considering the wishes of the colonists, to forget the interest of the British tax-payer and even the true interests of the colonists themselves.

While, therefore, this doctrine is true enough in a general way, in the special circumstances of India her military backwardness, which is solely due to England's neglect, ought not to be made a bar to a constitutional advance. As Mr. Sastri says, "there is no inherent necessity" (at any rate in India) "for the transfer of civil power to wait on, or be measured by, the transfer of military power."

\* \* \*

Gandhian Programme Thrown to the Winds.

THAT, in face of the innumerable differences in the pro-Council party—the no-change section of non-cooperators should obtain a thumping majority at Gaya was a foregone conclusion. The boycott resolution might perhaps have been reaffirmed even if those who favoured Council entry were united, instead of being hopelessly divided, on the question of the purpose to which the Councils were to be applied, but at any rate they would have formed a strong minority with which the majority would have had to reckon. As it is, this party has rendered itself ineffective in offering opposition. No doubt Mr. C. R. Das has put himself at the head of a party who, despite the Congress decision, will

contest the Council elections, but it remains to be seen what the strength of the faction is. In any case the party's policy cannot be, like oil and vinegar, composite, consisting partly of co-operation and partly of non-co-operation, but will have to be definite and uniform. Both in confirming the boycott of Councils and rejecting the boycott of British goods, the strongest weapon in the armoury of non-co-operators was that that was the course approved by Mr. Gandhi. But this spirit of Gandhi-ism was thrown to the winds by the most devoted followers of Mr. Gandhi in calling upon the country to make direct preparations for civil disobedience. Those who remember in what a paroxysm of mental agony Mr. Gandhi was placed by his acceptance of, or rather acquiescence in, the Delhi resolutions of February last, which contradicted the Bardoli resolutions in some particulars, can easily imagine what his feelings would be on hearing of the Congress decision in this matter. NO doubt even the Bardoli resolutions were put forward by Mr. Gandhi as a preparation for civil disobedience, but every one knows that the constructive programme outlined therein has not the remotest connexion with civil disobedience. It is an open secret that Mr. Gandhi was in favour of an indefinite suspension of the aggressive part of non-co-operation, including civil disobedience, and it is inconceivable that he would have permitted this grave new departure at Gaya if he were in a position to participate in the Congress proceedings.

\* \* \*

At the Chariot-  
Wheels of the Ghazi.

NOW, whatever has happened recently to justify such a complete overthrow of Mr. Gandhi's policy?

Have any new national wrongs been inflicted? On the contrary, as Mr. Das showed in his opening speech, the old triple wrong, which led to the inauguration of non-co-operation, is in the course of being undone, requiring a restatement of the Congress demand in regard to it. The demand in regard to the Punjab is, by efflux of time, working itself out; the Khilafat demand has lost its point, though small thanks for it to the non-co-operation movement; swaraj is not impossible of achievement by constitutional means. Why, then, this decision to resort to the anarchical method of civil disobedience? Merely because, it is quite obvious, at Lausanne, where already there have been many ups and downs, negotiations have for the moment taken an unfavourable turn for Angora. The scene at Lausanne is constantly shifting. The sky there wore a very black aspect some time ago, but a more propitious weather was not long in coming thereafter. If again there is an undesirable change in the political atmosphere just now, is the Congress to determine its programme for the whole year merely by the position which Turkey happens to occupy at one point in a long course of negotiations, peculiarly prone to sudden vicissitudes? Are the fortunes of India to be committed to Khilafatists to shape them just as they

please, under the influence of the feeling evoked by the position of Turkish affairs at the moment when these Khilafatists meet in conference? It is apparent that no leader of any repute had thought of civil disobedience or any intensive preparation for civil obedience even a week before Gaya. It was forced on the Congress by the hot-heads of the Khilafat Conference. This may be a mark of lasting Hindu-Mahomedan unity. But critics less charitably disposed will but recognize in this episode the vision of a Congress being tied to the chariot-wheels of a foreign conqueror.

\* \* \*  
ON 1st December Sir Edwin Stockton asked the Under-Secretary of State for India whether His Majesty

The Dictation of the India Office. is offering any advice, and, if so, of what nature, to the Government of India with regard to India's future fiscal policy. Now anyone in charge of the India Office who was not altogether oblivious of the Joint Select Committee's recommendation that on matters where there was a concurrence between the legislature and the executive government, the India Office has no power of interference would have referred to this recommendation and disclaimed any such power as the questioner had obviously in mind. On matters of tariff the legislature and the executive have generally been in concord in the past, the opposition having come in most cases from the Home Government. It was therefore quite necessary, in order not to mislead the member who put the question, to say that for all practical purposes the Secretary of State has been divested of the power of giving "advice." Lord Winterton, however, is very far indeed from saying this. He said instead that "the Government of India will in the ordinary course address the Secretary of State when they have fully considered the report." Though literally correct, this will produce a wrong impression of the scope of the Imperial Government's power of interference. So far as Indians are concerned, it matters little to them at whichever end interference is exercised—whether the Secretary of State influences the India Government before the latter submit their views to the legislature or overrules them after they do so. It is interference all the same and clearly contrary to the spirit of the Joint Select Committee's recommendation.

\* \* \*  
Malabar Train  
Tragedy.

THE last of the episodes of the gruesome Waggon Tragedy in Malabar is over. Happily Sergeant Andrews and the five Police constables who were after all merely underlings in the affair, have been discharged by the Magistrate. But the ends of justice have not been properly met. The Magistrate rightly held that Sergeant Andrews "had not sufficient reason to take any steps to rescue the prisoners from the desperate situation in which they had been unfortunately placed by a mistake for which he was not responsible". It is inexplicable how the Government of India, while merely regretting the mistake

and letting off its author or the person responsible for it scot free, should have recommended the prosecution of Sergeant Andrews and the constables. The evidence recorded during the trial showed that there was no neglect of duty on the part of the accused as the process of asphyxiation made it impossible for the alleged loud and unusual clamour of the prisoners to be heard by them. The Government have come out badly from this entire business. It will be long before the tragedy is forgotten.

\* \* \*

AT Gaya, as at Ahmedabad, a proposal was made to declare complete independence of England as the goal of India's political ambition, but it was eventually rejected by the Congress. Mr. C. Rajagopalachar, who is supposed among leading Congressmen best to represent Mr. Gandhi's philosophy in its pristine purity, opposed the resolution, but on grounds entirely different from those advanced by Mr. Gandhi last year. He is reported to have observed that "Indians must have absolute separation and independence," but "that position has not yet been reached." This is really an argument, not against but for the proposition. If India cannot fully work out her destiny except in "absolute separation and independence", surely India's ultimate ideal must be independence. That "that position has not yet been reached" may be a good reason for not making it part of the practical programme before the Congress, but it has no validity against making it the goal of the Congress activities. Mr. Gandhi opposed a similar resolution last year at Ahmedabad, because he felt that fullest self-realisation was possible for India within the ambit of the British Commonwealth, if she was made a co-equal partner with the other Dominions. He realised, as few others do, that to be a self-governing constituent of the Empire was to combine all the advantages of *de facto* independence and a federation of free nations, and that, besides, the status of a Dominion placed the country in a position of declaring independence whenever it thought it advantageous to do so. Recently (*a. i.* on November 30th) in the House of Lords Lord Loreburn objected to the Irish Free State Constitution Bill on the ground that two Ministers of the Free State had declared that they were free at any moment in the future to repudiate the Treaty if they considered it wise to do so. In defending the Bill against this objection Lord Birkenhead (of all people!) recalled an observation of Mr. Bonar Law not so long ago that "any one of the self-governing Dominions was at liberty at any moment to resign from the Imperial connexion," and explained the practical aspect on this matter (apart from the constitutional aspect on which there may be a difference of opinion) thus: "It was extremely unlikely, if the predominant view in any of the self-governing Dominions was that that they no longer desired to form part of the British Empire, that any responsible British Government would resort to arms to conquer them. That is the true position." If the Dominions now continue to remain under the British flag, it is merely because their self-interest impels them to do so.

## NAGPUR AND GAYA.

NOW that the Gaya and Nagpur congresses have come to an end, now that all speeches have been made, all resolutions passed and all participants returned to their homes: out of the mass of conflicting details that threaten to overwhelm, one is looking for emerging results and for the discernible underlying principles which would help one to assess the value of these results.

The first thing which cannot but strike one's imagination is a comparison between this year and last. At Ahmedabad in 1921 the mental atmosphere was one of exultation: for had the non-co-operation policy of Mr. Gandhi not given his party such power and prestige, that the rest of India was suing for the privilege of a round-table conference with his party, that he himself could address an ultimatum to the Indian Government? The initiative, and with it all the tactical advantage of aggression, was with the N.-C.-O. party. The Liberal party, on the other hand, meeting at Allahabad at the same time, could but be dominated by the feeling of apprehension at the way things were drifting. The failure of the visit of the Prince of Wales, the policy of repression entered upon by Government, the utter unpopularity of their own cause, the portent of Malabar, Malegaon and Bombay: all combined to justify a distinct feeling of despondency.

But if such was the case only one short year ago, how tremendous the change, which has come upon the two scenes to-day! Indeed the tables have been completely turned, and where there was despondency last year, there was great enthusiasm this year; and where last year there had been much enthusiasm, there reigned this year from all accounts despondency. The at Ahmedabad much despised Liberal policy of Council entry was at Gaya warmly espoused by quite a third of this Congress of Non-co-operators and so far from that party feeling in the ascendant and as if sweeping the board, their one cry was—"Even if we do split only let us keep up the appearance of unity!"

At Nagpur on the contrary the Liberal delegates felt as men who at a long last had been publicly justified in their course of action. The first triennium of the legislature was drawing to a close; the Councils were no longer a novel experiment, but had become a tried weapon; the Liberals who had accepted the Reforms as a basis on which to work out India's future, now could look back upon the first spell of Indian parliamentary life, not only pointing to solid achievements but preparing for the future as realists, dealing with facts, and not merely as windy theorizers and as purely negative critics, after the manner of their rivals.

Indeed, comparing Nagpur and Gaya, that strikes one as the fundamental difference, that in the one case commonsense was devising plans for meeting actualities, whilst in the other make-believe was pretending their non-existence. When

dissensions have never been so prominent before, all that Gaya could think of was to pretend that there was unity. When, if any man has exploded the Khilafat, it is Kemal Pasha--Gaya pretends that he was the "Saviour of the Khilafat." When everybody is aware that the "constructive programme" will draw not a single new adherent, Gaya goes on pretending that it will bring *Swaraj*.

Nagpur, on the other hand, dispensed with all flights of fancy and dealt with the facts, as it found them. The Reforms had proved neither all-good nor all-bad: so how to improve them was the practical task that was being attacked. Where Gaya talked wildly of Civil Disobedience, Nagpur pressed for Indianisation of the Army. Where Gaya was content to envelop itself in a smoke-screen of mere verbiage, Nagpur's discussion cleared the air for common action on commonly agreed, definite points. Where Nagpur concentrated on concrete proposals, such as Dr. Gour's Civil Marriage Bill, or reported on concrete achievements, such as Dr. Paranjpye's Compulsory Education Act, Gaya glozed over the utter failure of its own Untouchability and "National" Schools campaigns.

And if once the Congress devotees give up the childish game of "Let's pretehd" and like men look facts straight in the face: what future is there before them? Passive Resistance, as dreamt of by the Mahatma of the Non-Violence creed, has been tried and found wanting. Violence, in the present state of India, is such manifest madness, that none can advise it. Parliamentary action has just been turned down. What then is left?

It is a pitiful spectacle indeed to behold. And what makes it most pitiful of all, is to find the whole once so great Congress nowadays reduced to a mere appendage of the Jamiat al Ulema and the Khilafat Conference, who call the tune, whereupon the Congress members obediently set to dancing. Nothing indeed can be more melancholy than this supreme pretence of "Hindu-Moslem Unity", which would hand over the whole of India to some religious fanatics who look for their inspiration, if not for their instructions, outside of India and who have no hesitation to advocate the reduction of India to chaos, if only thereby they can somewhat improve the bargain which Angora is driving at Lausanne. Mr. Das had a good deal to say on an Asiatic Federation, which he contrasted as a natural development with the unnatural position of India within the British Commonwealth. But the waiting of the Gaya Congress on the decision of a conclave of Ulemas indicates sufficiently the position to which India would be reduced in this much lauded "Asiatic Federation" of which Turkey would be the head.

India may still suffer interference from Whitehall: but does anybody really believe that for India to depend on the parliamentary exigencies at Angora would be an improvement? India to-day may not yet have arrived at the status of perfect equality which is now the mark of a British

Dominion: but it is well on the way there. The way is clear to a position of virtual independence under the British Crown, as enjoyed to-day by Canada, by South Africa, by Ireland; to orderly progress along that way were bent the energy and intelligence of the Liberals assembled at Nagpur. And if Mr. Das and his Gaya Congress can pretend that they would prefer to become the satrapy of a Turkish Sultan, we are sorry for them, but, may the Gaya irresponsibles talk ever so wildly, we have less fear than ever that they will be able permanently to convert the whole of the seven crores of Indian Moslems, let alone the twenty-four crores of Hindus, to their own grotesque ideals.

### SELF-DETERMINATION.

THE National Congress having once again turned its back upon the constitutional method, it behoves those who believe in its efficacy to pursue it with the greater determination and by their energy to make up, so far as it lies in them to do so, for the loss of momentum resulting from the non-participation of a very large section of politicians in their efforts. It is time the Constitutionalists formed a definite plan by which they would set to work to obtain a further advance in constitutional reforms. In May last Mr. Sastri outlined very briefly a programme of work which seemed to him to promise the best chance of success. Since then Dr. Besant has put forward another scheme, which, if a little more elaborate than Mr. Sastri's, has nearly the same essential features. In pursuance of it, she has summoned a Conference in Delhi towards the end of this month, at which will be sketched an outline of a scheme of reforms on which the electorates will be educated in the coming months, and a mandate sought from them at the elections. After having won the elections on this programme, it will thereafter be the duty of the legislatures, according to Mrs. Besant's plan, to form a Convention from amongst themselves to formulate a more detailed scheme of *Swaraj*, which on their behalf and on behalf of the electorates will be submitted to the British Parliament as India's demand. We hope that all the leading members of the Liberal party and all the other parties who believe in using constitutional means to obtain further reforms will attend the conference promoted by Mrs. Besant. If any object to the precise plan to be put forward tentatively before the conference or have a better plan to suggest, they are all the more welcome to this gathering. For the conference is not intended merely for the purpose of registering the consent of those who take part in it to a line of action already determined upon, but for the purpose of discussing and modifying it in whatever particulars modification may appear to be necessary. It is obvious that at such a gathering, the critics have even a more useful function to perform than the regular followers of Mrs. Besant, and we trust

that the challenge which the Congress has made to the Constitutionalists by adopting a resolution on civil disobedience will evoke a warm response in the hearts of both to attend the conference.

The leading idea of this scheme is of course the application, in a limited sense, of the principle of self-determination to India's political future, and it is an idea which we are sure will approve itself to the judgment of all students of history. Superficial observers are apt to ridicule the idea of forming a new Constitution and to dismiss the ensuing conference and the projected Convention as only another set of Abbés Sièyes, perpetually engaged in a futile task. "The difficulty is not in framing a Constitution," they say, "but in getting it passed." Precisely. And the vital part of the Delhi Conference scheme consists not in formulating a constitution, but of obtaining a mandate from the electorate. To obtain a mandate perhaps even a bare list of the heads of reforms will be sufficient. The critics who indulge in the shallow criticism referred to above little realise in what deep respect the British people hold a demand made by members of the legislatures and backed by the electorates. No one suggests of course that, without a strong agitation among the masses, which alone will bring a conviction to the British Parliament that the demand is supported by the voters, anything is possible, but the plan is based upon the lesson which stands out in British history that if the accredited representatives of the people put forward a demand seconded by the electors at large, it has a very fair chance of being favourably considered. In this sense the principle of self-determination was recognised and given effect to long before it was so named and given a larger application by President Wilson. To illustrate this point, which lies at the base of the Delhi conference, we give below a few quotations from the utterances of English statesmen of all schools of thought during the debates in Parliament on the Irish Free State Constitution Bill. The extracts are long and contain the same sentiment, but they are quoted at length to prove that all parties in England are agreed on the principle of self-determination.

Mr. Winston Churchill said in the House of Commons on June 15, 1922:—

"The procedure in regard to every Dominion constitution is that it is formulated by the Dominion concerned and that it comes up for subsequent ratification and approval by the Imperial Parliament."

Mr. Bonar Law, the Prime Minister, said on the 27th November last:—

"It must be remembered, of course, that the drafting of the Constitution by the Irish Free State was, I think, implied in the Treaty, and as a matter of fact, the constitutions of Canada, Australia and of South Africa were all drafted in those Dominions, so that there is nothing in that to cause any exception."

This remark of the Premier was corroborated and somewhat amplified by Sir John Simon in a memorable speech, in which he said:—

He pointed out, and I think it is one of the encouraging features of the situation, that this Constitution is a Constitution which has been drafted in Ireland by Irishmen for Ireland. In that respect it differs from the great Gladstonian scheme, from the Act of 1914, and from the Act of 1920. The procedure that has been followed is, however, by no means a novel or a revolutionary procedure. As the Prime Minister pointed out, the Constitutions under which different parts of our Empire are now working are in a very large measure Constitutions which have been settled on the soil where they were to operate, by the people who were to live under them. The Dominion of Canada, which, in Section 2 of the constituent Act, is specially referred to, lives, it is true, under a Constitution which is contained in an Imperial Act; but that Imperial Act did nothing more than embody in legislative form the great collection of Resolutions which had been arrived at in Quebec as a result of long debate and ultimate agreement between the Canadians themselves. The Constitution of Australia is not to be found in any enacting Section of any British Act of Parliament at all. The Constitution of Australia is scheduled to a Statute of 1900, in exactly the same way in which it is proposed that this Irish Constitution should be scheduled to the present Bill. Perhaps the most remarkable case of all is the most recent, for the Constitution of the Union of South Africa was at length arrived at as the result of discussion in South Africa itself, and it was carried through this House, with in the recollection of a good many hon. Members, in the year 1909, without the alteration of a single sentence.

I believe it would be true to say that Constitutions which promote prosperity and loyalty, and which have been found to be lasting Constitutions for subordinate States in our Empire, have, almost without exception, either actually or virtually, been formed by those who were to live under them themselves. I think that that circumstance may well be set against some of the gloomy records and forebodings of the hon. and gallant Gentleman, for at any rate there is a real element of hope and confidence here, in that this Constitution is not a Constitution which the British Parliament formulates and offers to confer upon Ireland: it is a Constitution which Irishmen themselves have drawn up, and which they now apply to the Imperial Parliament to ratify.

Viscount Cave, the present Lord Chancellor, speaking in the House of Lords on November 30 last year, said:—

"I will just point out this: That this Constitution has been framed in Ireland. That is in accordance with all the precedents under which the Constitutions of our Dominions have been framed. The Constitution of Canada was framed in Canada. The Constitutions of Australia and New Zealand were framed in those Dominions, and that of South Africa was framed in South Africa. In every case the first initial framing of the instrument has been left to those most intimately interested, namely, the inhabitants of the Dominion concerned. That precedent has been followed here, and for that reason we find provisions which, I agree, are unfamiliar to us in this country (as, for instance, the fundamental laws safeguarding the elementary rights of citizenship)."

## COMPULSORY EDUCATION ACT.—II.

THE next most serious objection taken by non-official members of the legislature was to the financial provisions of the Act. The amount of the grant-in-aid to be given by Government to local bodies was determined till now by rules. The present Act for the first time makes a statutory provision in regard to the matter. This, however, can hardly be accounted a substantial improvement, for though rules are subject to modifica-

tion by the executive without reference to the legislature, in point of fact those relating to educational grants have never before been capriciously altered by executive councillors in charge of education to the disadvantage of local bodies. Much less is there any room for this apprehension when the department is administered by a Minister under the control of the legislature. But a change was nevertheless made and it was greatly appreciated by the Council. They objected, however, to what they regarded as an inadequate contribution which the Government had agreed to make to the expenses of primary education. To municipalities Government used to contribute half the cost, but in the case of local boards they made up the whole balance after the local boards had allotted one-third of their one-anna local fund cess to primary education; that is Government paid nearly 88 per cent. of the total cost, only the remaining 12 per cent. being paid by local boards. By the provisions of the present Act Government hold themselves responsible for at least half the cost of the primary education managed by bigger municipalities and two-thirds of the new money expended on primary education by local boards and the smaller municipalities to be merged into district local boards for the purposes of this Act, in addition to what they were contributing before the Act came into force. The effect of this will be that the larger municipalities will continue to get the subvention they used to get before; the smaller municipalities the management of whose primary education will be made over to district local boards will get an increased subvention—one-half of the present and two-thirds of the additional cost; but local boards will receive an appreciably reduced subvention—88 per cent. of the present and 66 per cent. of the additional expenses.

This is regarded by many non-official members as unsatisfactory, and point is given to their discontent by the fact that the recommendation of the Select Committee on the Bill to contribute three-fourths instead of two-thirds to district local boards was rejected by Government. But their dissatisfaction is not confined to the provision in regard to district local boards, though it is keenest on that point. They feel that the Government's contribution to municipalities also is very meagre. It is the general impression, which could not but be voiced in the Council, that the Patel Act failed mainly, if not wholly, because municipalities have not the means of introducing compulsion. It is not a pleasant confession to make, but no one who has given thought to the matter can deny that inadequate means were not the sole cause of the failure of the Act. But however that may be, the adoption of the shift system will enable many municipalities to introduce compulsion without putting an unduly heavy strain upon their resources. Even so, these municipalities are unwilling to apply compulsion under the enabling Act of 1918. But Government having now taken

power to compel them to do so, there is no reason why the present Act should not succeed where the old Act had failed. It is only to be hoped that Government, without being over-sensitive in exercising their power in case of municipalities which can raise money enough to finance schemes of compulsory education, will make an increased subvention to those other municipalities which are not equally favourably situated. In any case, if municipalities having a population of less than 50,000 are merged into local boards, all but half a dozen municipalities will be entitled to receive grants at the increased rate, and it is expected that they will thereby be placed in sufficient funds. For this reason the Select Committee did not press for a grant larger than the one provided for in the Bill. (Mr. G. B. Trivedi mentions in the *Indian Social Reformer* that the Select Committee recommended a two-thirds grant to municipalities, but he is obviously in error in doing so.)

But the case of local boards appeared to the Select Committee to stand on a different footing. Their resources are so very slender that to curtail the present scale of their grants might well have seemed to the Committee as good as putting it out of their power to adopt compulsion. That is so, but by a simultaneous amendment of the Local Boards Act district local boards have been given fresh sources of income. Their available resources being increased, there should be no objection to throwing a larger burden on them. An increase in the local fund cess is only one of the additional sources assigned to them, but this one source alone will give them all the new money that, under the scheme of this Act, local boards will have to produce to make education universal in areas under their jurisdiction. If local boards put on another anna of local fund cess and devoted the proceeds of it to primary education, they would be enabled to contribute all that is expected of them. The Compulsory Education Committee, who also recommended that district local boards should contribute one-third of the cost, compute that the additional burden that the boards will have to bear at the completion of the scheme is 20 lakhs. This can be raised by the boards by doubling their local fund cess. Nobody contends that it is unjust to impose this levy upon district local boards. All that is contended is that, instead of district boards, Government themselves should levy this cess. If the present Act were a permissive one, merely conferring upon the district boards the option of introducing compulsion and utilising this levy to that end, the objection would be perfectly valid. But it is not a permissive Act, and it is immaterial to the people whether Government impose the cess or district local boards do so, either at their own initiative or under pressure of Government—provided that the cess is levied and the proceeds are applied to the extension of education. It should be mentioned that if district local boards do not, or are not required to, introduce compulsion, but carry on their work of educational expansion on a

voluntary basis, Government have decided to continue grants-in-aid to them at the present rate, which, as said above, amount to 88 per cent. of the total cost. It would thus be seen that on this point also non-official criticisms were not altogether happily chosen.

**THE WORLD OUTSIDE.**

WHEN, a fortnight ago, we were reflecting in this column on the gigantic backslide of the once so impetuous Communist enthusiasts of Moscow, we were illustrating our comments by the proposal of a State Lottery on the part of the Soviet authorities—which fact, by the way, we had not taken from the *Morning Post* or such like purveyors of home-made Bolshevik canards, but from the official organ of the "Russian Trade Delegation" in London. In its latest issue to hand (Dec. 2nd) this Review provides some further melancholy facts on the lapse from erstwhile idealism in the shape of an article from the pen of Lunacharski, the Commissary for Education, who had dreamed of universalizing education, when he picked up the department's reins of his bourgeois predecessors. Alas, what are the cold figures? Let this table speak for itself:

	Schools.	Teachers.	Scholars.
1911	22,322	32,969	13,51,099
1920	30,000	70,000	27,50,000
1922	23,805	48,166	16,36,257

And the worst is not said yet: for the last figures refer to April 1922, since when "there has been a further decrease in the number of schools and teachers." Why? Because since April the Government has transferred all but half the salaries of teachers to local bodies and from Jan. 1st 1923 is going to shift the *whole* cost from its own shoulders to those of the municipalities and village communes—when it is safe to predict that there will be a further and still more startling drop in education. And this in Soviet Russia, which was going to make education the first charge on the State! We surely were not far wrong when we said a couple of weeks ago that the Soviet Government was fast qualifying as the most reactionary government in the world. How are the Mighty fallen!

WHILST in Russia Bolshevism is thus seen to be retracing its steps from the Left, signs are not wanting that elsewhere the Bourgeoisie is swinging away from the Right. Certainly the lesson of the War seems to have really sunk in, at least as far as the people are concerned, however jingoistically and nationalistically their rulers may still strut about. By way of illustration we would adduce an excellent article, "Glorious War", in the November issue of *Blackfriars*, and would do so particularly because the authoress, Elizabeth Christie, tells of post-war psychology in Serbia—and, as is only too notori-

ous, Serbs have hitherto, in company with the rest of the Balkan people, always looked upon war as a normal state of life, and on peace merely as an interlude between one war and another. Mrs. Christie anyhow has come to see that the effects of war are evil—wholly evil; not materially evil, but morally, spiritually evil. She depicts the mentality engendered by the German-Austrian occupation of Serbia; when the "Slay and spare not!" of the combatants was succeeded by the "Lie and hesitate not!" of the non-combatants. She describes how all the invader's words and acts were distorted, misinterpreted, vilified—and how not to do so was to acknowledge oneself unpatriotic; how patriotism suddenly elevated to the rank of virtues such vices as hatred, lying, theft, idleness, envy; how a Serb woman was boycotted for directing an Austrian soldier fainting in the street to the hospital where he could obtain succour; how "we goaded one another to ferocity and vied with one another in callousness". "The saddest part of it all," our authoress continues, "was that children were praised for lying if it was a question of baffling the enemy. What will be the effect of this perversion of youth?" And just note this perfect little psychological picture:

"Compelled by the spirit of war to belittle good and magnify evil, we deplored the appointment of Count Salis-Suevis, a humane, deeply religious man, as Governor-General of Serbia. He was fair-minded and also well-disposed towards the population, and it was feared that his popularity might pave the way to an understanding fatal to the national cause."

*Development in Serbia.*

WHO can but assent to the concluding sentence of Mrs. Christie's article: "War, whatever virtues it incidentally evokes, remains a curse to all who have experienced its results at close quarters." And the great hope of the world to-day lies just in this fact, that so many millions have experienced war at close quarters, that the prevalent popular feeling at every turn in foreign politics has become: "War? Anything but that." It is this feeling which stopped a great Near East conflagration the other day; it is this feeling which checks the Churchills, the Poincaré's, the Mussolinis all over the world. And that even Serbia should begin to be thus permeated, is welcome news indeed. The article in *Blackfriars* in fact does not stand alone; on the contrary, there seems quite an agitation on, that "Pasic must go"—and seeing that M. Pasic, the Yugoslav Premier, is an old Serb die, hard of the Poincaré type, one devoutly hopes that as "Lloyd George must go"—and did go, so also this "Pasic must go" and will go. Indeed this will probably be the price of getting the deputies from Croatia (the formerly Hungarian province of Serb race) to give up their boycott of Councils—we mean of the Skupchina, as the Belgrade Parliament is called. The Croatian bloc under M. Radic represents all that is progressive in Yugoslavia, whilst the old Serbs of Serbia proper are an un-

mitigated crowd of backwoodsmen who are running the whole newly "liberated" provinces as if they were so much conquered territory—for the sole benefit of their own backward country. The danger is—though M. Radic may come to terms with the opposition leaders at Belgrade and form with them a coalition, and though king Alexander may well ask M. Radic to form a government in place of that of M. Pasic—that the king's elder brother may then place himself at the head of the Serb diehards and plunge the country into a civil war. Prince George, in fact, is quite ready for it: but are the masses of the Serb people ready too? One doubts that; and if peace is preserved in Yugoslavia, it will indeed not be thanks to its rulers, but thanks to the fact that the people "have experienced the results of war at close quarters."

*Indians de los Pueblos.*

HOW many people in this country, one wonders, have ever heard of the "Bureau of Indian Affairs"? Not to mystify our readers, let us hasten to explain that the United States have maintained this department (since 1830) for the protection of the so-called "Red Indians" of North America, the rightful owners of that continent, who, step by step have been driven by the European invaders from their wide prairies, until, overwhelmed by a superior civilization, nothing today is left of these wild nations, but miserable remnants dragging on an ignoble existence in special "Indian Reservations." Outside America little is known of these Red Indians, beyond what is gathered from story books: small wonder therefore that hardly anybody has heard of the so-called "Pueblos" (from the Spanish "pueblo" = village)—a type of Amerindian still found on the tablelands of Arizona and New Mexico, and differing totally from their *quondam* north-eastern neighbours who shared the plains with the bison. The Pueblans are sedentary, agricultural, mild-mannered and highly artistic; closely allied to the great Aztec civilization which once flourished in Mexico. But whilst in Mexico the descendants of the Aztecs form 80 p.c. (half of whom are of pure, and the other half of mixed descent) of the population of sixteen millions and are gradually winning back their ascendancy, their kinsmen, the Pueblos in the U. S. A., are reduced to a beggarly eight thousand souls all told, who have survived in their little corner of an archaic world in a civilization of their own and that of no mean an order. For these Pueblo Indians are "artists in music, in ceremonial dances, in poetry, in pottery, in weaving, in silver-work; and in the art of pure design alone their continuing and developing achievement is superb, comparable to the early Greek and Etruscan art and far surpassing the most ambitious achievements of [white] American artists in this direction—as the American artists themselves are the first to acknowledge."

*Protecting the Indian.*

OUR quotation is from an article by a gifted American woman writer, A. C. Henderson, who has lived for

the past six years at Santa Fé (New Mexico), and the *New Republic* (of Nov. 29th 1922), commenting on it, likewise testifies to the "inexpressibly lovely and precious art" of this race and to their culture as built up on "an economic system of extraordinary interest." Well, to cut a long story short: this little remnant of a people it is now proposed to wipe out. Why? Because the greed of the White Americans is not satisfied with the three million square miles of United States territory, but must needs covet the land belonging to these few dozen Indian villages. We should add that these ancestral holdings of the Pueblos were not set up by the United States, but that these rights were acknowledged and taken over by them from the Spaniards—the first white "colonizers" of that country: yet these "scraps of paper" are now going to be torn up and the land handed over to the white settlers, who already are starving out the Pueblos by misappropriating the irrigation water, without which land throughout New Mexico is utterly useless. Thousands of trespasses on Pueblo land have been persisted in for more than fifteen years: the U. S. Government might have stopped them at the time, might have heeded the Pueblos' constant protests to the Bureau of Indian affairs. But not only was nothing done to arrest the wanton and devastating aggression of the white settlers, but today we find a bill (the Bursum Bill) being promoted in the U. S. Senate (which it has passed already!), which Bill legalizes the transfer of Indian patented lands to non-Indian claimants. And these claims of course will be adjudicated in the local courts of the State of New Mexico, of whom a Special U. S. Attorney for the Indians (Mr. R. Twitchell) said: "Our local courts have yet to show, in my judgment, where an Indian has ever received a square deal." Thus are American Indians protected in their own country; and yet there are American citizens who do not blush to talk about the "British" economic exploitation which has destroyed the native population in India." (*Young India* of Dec. 14th). Mr. Mayor Hylan and his friends "who believe that fundamental justice and not power of might should prevail in a civilised world" (*ibid.* Dec. 7th): might really ponder the Bursum bill and the fate of their own American Indians, before they—so very kindly and disinterestedly—start worrying about the Indians in this sub-continent of our own.

### THE KOREAN STRUGGLE.

THE CASE OF KOREA. BY HENRY CHUNG. With Foreword by Hon. Selden P. Spencer. (George Allen & Unwin, London.)

It is often claimed that India is the first country to offer non-violent resistance on a national scale to a powerful foreign government and that she has set an example to the rest of the world of pitting soul force against brute force. As a matter of fact that credit would seem to belong more properly to another Asiatic country, Korea, which under much



more difficult conditions has been struggling against Japan. A foreign government is nowhere a philanthropic institution; but there is no comparison between the liberal British administration of India and the ruthless military rule of Japan in Korea. Similarly, in adherence to non-violence and heroism in suffering—men, women and children in Korea have borne indescribable horrors—the Koreans have proved immensely superior to Indians. And if, in spite of it all, the Korean movement has not succeeded any more than the Indian movement it is because there is a limit to the achievement of human nature in the mass. Saintliness is rare enough in individuals; it is utterly impossible for a whole nation in this mundane world. Whatever it be, the story of Korea's struggle against Japanese rule is full of interest and instruction to the people of India.

Korea is a narrow and mountainous peninsula, its length from north to south being nearly 700 miles and its average width about 130 miles. Its area is about 84,000 sq. miles and its population about 17 millions. Its geographical position is its greatest misfortune in this age of imperialism. It is situated between Siberia, China and Japan. It lost its independence in the clash of the imperial, including commercial, ambitions of Russia and Japan. It gave no provocation to either country beyond the provocation of the sheep to the tiger. The designs of the Western powers in the Far East convinced Japan that the possession of Korea was essential to her own national existence and she was powerful enough to take it. An American writer has very well put the case for Japan.

"Glance at the map and you will see that the peninsula of Korea is a pistol pointed straight at the heart of Japan. As long as that weapon remained, unloaded, on the table Japan felt tolerably secure. But when she saw an unfriendly hand moving stealthily to grasp it, she was forced to take decisive action in order to insure her own safety, for with nations, as with individuals, self-preservation is the first law of nature."

In 1895 Japan waged war against China, and defeated her, because the latter sent troops to Korea which was theoretically under the suzerainty of the Celestial Empire. Again in 1904 Japan waged a very costly war with Russia because the latter acquired access to a Korean port. The inevitable result of that war was that Korea became a protectorate of Japan. In 1907 Japan forced the "Emperor" of Korea to abdicate the throne in favour of an imbecile son, for having secretly sent envoys to the Hague Conference to plead the cause of Korea against Japan before the western nations. These events only increased the traditional hatred of the Koreans towards the Japanese. Political assassinations were resorted to, Marquis Ito, the foremost statesman of Japan, being one of the victimised. Shortly after this, in April 1910, Korea was formally annexed to Japan.

Now began an iron military rule, the object of which was the forcible denationalisation of the Koreans. All Korean newspapers, periodicals and associations were suppressed. No meetings, even for religious purposes, of more than five persons could take place without the permission of the Japanese officials. The Korean language was banished from all offices, law courts and even schools. The teaching of Korean history was prohibited. Nay, all books relating to Korean history and biographies of illustrious Koreans were collected from libraries, schools and private houses after a systematic search and turned. The writer of a pamphlet, "The Truth

about Korea," could say in 1910: "It is today a crime to own a Korean history. I have talked to Koreans who have been beaten and sentenced to imprisonment of from fifteen to thirty days for committing the crime of reading about their own country." All schools, including those managed by foreign missionaries, were required to have at least three Japanese teachers each and their salaries were required by Government to be double those of Korean teachers. All teachers were required to wear swords in the class-rooms. The kind of religious liberty vouchsafed for the Koreans may be understood from the following incidents. A Christian preacher was arrested for referring to the Kingdom of Heaven. In letting him go with a warning, the Japanese magistrate told him that the only kingdom with which the Koreans should be concerned was the kingdom of Japan. Another preacher was charged with treason for preaching to boys against smoking cigarettes, because the manufacture of cigarettes was a Government monopoly! Koreans were not allowed to seek education in foreign countries. They could go to Japan, but every obstacle was placed in their way of specialising in such subjects as law, constitutional government, history or economics. "The Japanese have always held that England, by encouraging a purely academic education for the higher class Hindu in India, was breeding discontent and agitation, and they had no intention of trying a similar experiment in Korea".

Though Korea was annexed to Japan, she was given no representation in the Japanese Parliament. Most of the civil and military appointments were held by the Japanese. To rule a population of 17 millions Japan sent 17,000 bureaucrats against the 1,200 that Britain has been sending to India. The most flagrant racial discrimination was practised in every sphere. The Japanese officials got 40 p. c. more pay than Koreans of the same grade and a colonial allowance in addition. Japanese coolies were given 50 p. c. higher wages than Korean coolies for doing the same work. "The Japanese coolie kicks or punches the Korean who dares to stand his way". The law applying to the Japanese did not apply to the Koreans. Flogging was reserved for the special benefit of the latter. The police were invested with extraordinary powers. They could arrest without warrant, enter any house and search it whenever they thought it necessary, women's apartments included, could imprison, torture, punish and discharge arrested persons with perfect impunity. They possessed judicial powers of "summary judgment" in cases of minor offences. In 1916 they disposed of over 56,000 cases involving about 82,000 persons, of whom only 30 were adjudged innocent, 952 pardoned and the rest—84,000—sentenced to various punishments. Among the chief defects of the system of justice introduced by Japan in Korea are mentioned: arrest without due process of law, presumption of the guilt of any person arrested; no right of counsel until after the first hearing, secret investigations and tortures by the police, the bias of the judges who are required to familiarise themselves with the records of a case before trying it, the power of the judges to give absolute and final decision as to the admission of any evidence that may be offered. In the economic sphere every discrimination was shown in favour of the Japanese. Koreans were deprived of the Crown, municipal and temple lands which they were enjoying, and these lands were given away to Japanese immigrants. Trade and other concessions were all given to the Japanese. A Japanese steward

was forced on every rich Korean, and he could not spend his money without the knowledge and sanction of his steward. If he did, his property might be confiscated on the presumption that he was spending the money to plot against Government. The net result of the Japanese rule in Korea was that within ten years of the annexation nearly a million and a half Koreans emigrated to Manchuria and Siberia, vowing eternal hatred of Japan. These are militant and wage a continual guerilla warfare against the Japanese.

Believing that the war had made the world safe for democracy and that their plea for self-determination would be heeded by the nations of the world, urged, above all, by the passion for self-government, 33 prominent representative Koreans signed a declaration of independence and published it simultaneously all over the country on March 1st, 1919, the day of the funeral of their ex-Emperor. The demonstrations were planned and carried out with much skill and secrecy, the Japanese spies and police being quite taken aback. It was a nation-wide demonstration in which young and old, men and women, rich and poor, all alike took part. People were to meet peacefully, read the declaration of independence (printed copies of which were secretly distributed by school girls), shout *Monsei*, meaning "Long Live Korea," march in a peaceful procession with flags and disperse. Instructions were issued that no violence of any kind was to be tolerated, no rowdiness, terrorism or destruction of property. Under no circumstances were the Japanese police to be resisted. The demonstrators were to allow themselves to be beaten, imprisoned and even killed without complaint. At Seoul, the capital, after the declaration was read, one of the signatories went to the telephone, called up the chief of police and informed him of what had happened and their readiness to go to prison. The instructions were everywhere observed to the letter. The people were unarmed and the demonstrations on the whole quite peaceful. But the Japanese militarists chose their own way of dealing with the movement.

The military, the gendarmes, the police and even the civilians—all Japanese—fell on the crowds everywhere with guns, swords and whatever other weapons they had, killed, wounded, kicked, beat and dragged to prison young and old, boys and girls, men and women. In many villages houses and churches were burnt down and a large number of people massacred. Many thousands of people were arrested, subjected to the most horrible tortures and indignities and flogged. The most revolting cruelties were practised upon school girls and young women, an invariable practice being to strip them naked in the presence of men. The flogging was so severe that many people died of its effects. The official figures are killed 631, wounded and treated in Government hospitals 1409, flogged 10,592, total arrested about 39,000. The Korean figures are killed 7,625, injured 45,562, imprisoned 49,811, houses burnt 724 and churches burnt 59. The demonstrations were held, according to official statistics, in nearly 600 places, in 185 of which firearms were employed. When these atrocities came to be known in Japan there was no indignation or protest in the press. It was only when letters from missionaries appeared in the American press that Japan, who was then anxious to stand well in the estimation of the western world, recalled the head of the civil administration

and that of the military, the prototypes of O'Dwyer and General Dyer, and announced the inauguration of reforms and a conciliatory policy. These reforms seek to remove some of the worst forms of racial discrimination and other causes of irritation, but the bulk of the Koreans are dissatisfied, having fixed their minds on absolute independence. Reconciliation and even assimilation would become possible in due course of time, if the dominant military party, which is outside the control of the Ministry, did not so frequently ruin the attempts of liberal statesmen.

V. V. S.

### PHILOSOPHY OF THE GITA.

#### INTRODUCTION TO THE BHAGAWAD GITA.

By V. K. RAMANUJACHARYA. (The Theosophical Publishing House, Madras.) 1922.

DEWAN Bahadur V. K. RAMANUJACHARYA, President of the District Local Board, Tanjore, and formerly a member of the Madras Legislative Council, sends us a copy of his "Introduction to the Bhagwat Gita" for review. That an old man now verging on seventy years and immersed in public administrative affairs should write such a book reminds one of a very pregnant remark by a great writer to the effect that while many real or would-be 'philosophers' long to be 'kings' many small and great 'kings' in public affairs ever cast wistful glances at the contemplative life, which, they hope, would free them from the choked atmosphere, the dazzling limelight, the storms in tea-pots, the din and dust of controversy, the game of mud-throwing and the futilities of public life. That they seldom actually forsake such a life without a pang and without almost being forced to do so—witness your John Morleys, your Gladstones, your Tilaks and Aurobind Ghoses—is a phenomenon of much interest to the psychologist and philosopher. This much is clear that though the 'king' in them might more or less suppress the 'philosopher', the latter is never completely and irrevocably supplanted. The 'philosopher' in Dewan Bahadur Ramanujacharya, while owing allegiance to the 'king' in him, has for the last twenty years been having furtive conversations with the Gita and one of the results is the book under review.

The author is frankly a follower of Sri Ramanuja. He however admits his debt to Theosophy which enabled him to see that 'all wisdom was not confined to his school only'. Wherever he feels compelled to differ from Ramanuja, he has the courage openly to say so and thus the book offers us an interpretation of the Gita, according to Sri Ramanuja, modified however in the light of Theosophy. For instance, the author rightly recognises 'oneness of interest and purpose' in addition to 'oneness of nature' which alone Sri Ramanuja and his followers recognised. Again, Ramanuja and his followers could not look at the outcast in the Hindu society in the way in which the author does. God Sri Krishna, the author says, asks us in chapter IX of the Gita to prostrate ourselves before Him and in the tenth chapter He identifies Himself with all that exists, including even the *Sudras* or the outcasts. We are therefore expected by Him, infers the author, to prostrate ourselves even before the *Sudra*, recognising the divinity in.

The author gives up controversial argumentation and contents himself with an indication

of his opinions. The reviewer may be excused if he too fights shy of controversy. He cannot however help saying that setting forth the pros and cons of one's ideas and theories is a way of converting the openminded among those who do not hold identical views and that the author has deprived them of the pleasure of comparing the reasons which led him to adopt Ramanujiya interpretation with those which other learned commentators from Sankaracharya to Tilak advance in support of their own views. To those, however, who would like to read in simple and straightforward English what Sri Ramanujacharya thought and believed as regards the Gita, the book before us is very valuable and we can gladly recommend it to such students. In the earlier sections of the book an outline of the teachings of the Gita is given, which, coming as it does from the pen of a man who has thought long and deeply on the subject, must command respectful attention from all. In the later sections verses from the Gita—not all, but most of them—are literally translated. The footnotes appended to the translations, though few and short—perhaps because they are few and short—really help the student, to whom copiousness of notes often means losing the wood for the trees. Before concluding, we might refer to an inconsistency which struck us while reading the book. It refers to the interpretation of the word 'asat'. While on page 20 the author remarks that "the terms *sat* and *asat*, which respectively indicate matter in the gross condition and matter in the fine condition, cannot be applied to it (i. e. the *Atma*)" we find that on page 55, the line *नास्ततो विद्यते मावो नामावो विद्यते सतः* is translated thus: "the body does not endure, nor does the *Atma* cease to be." Here apparently there is some inconsistency which the author will no doubt clear up in the next edition. The reading of the book was a pleasure to the reviewer and he hopes it will be the same to many whose interest in the Gita has still retained its freshness.

V. M. J.

## MISCELLANEA.

### NATIONAL LIBERAL FEDERATION.

#### RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE FIFTH SESSION.

AMONG the resolutions passed by the fifth National Liberal Federation which met in Nagpur at Christmas were the following:—

##### SELF-GOVERNMENT.

This meeting of the All-India Liberals earnestly urges upon the Secretary of State for India and the British Parliament the necessity of accelerating the pace for the attainment of complete Self-Government and towards that end the taking of steps for the immediate introduction of full responsible government in the Provinces and responsibility in the Central Government in all departments, except the military, political and foreign.

##### INDIANISATION OF THE ARMY.

This meeting of the All-India Liberals regards with the gravest concern the delay in the inauguration of plans for the Indianisation of the Officers' ranks in the Indian Army, for the reduction of the British element and for the introduction of other improvements and economies recommended by the Military Requirements Committee of the Indian Legislative Assembly, regards it as a crucial test of the sincerity of the authorities regarding India's Dominion status, sees no way except through drastic retrenchment under this head of the country's regaining financial equilibrium, and calls upon the British Cabinet and the Army Council to restore by speedy

action the confidence of the people of India in the oft-repeated promises to grant full responsible government to India. This Federation also earnestly appeals to the people of India to take, in the meanwhile, fullest advantage of the Indian Territorial Force Act and to enrol themselves in large numbers in the Territorial Force. It also appeals to the Government to take all possible steps to promote and popularise enrolment in the Force.

##### NON-INTERFERENCE BY THE S. OF S.

This meeting of the All-India Liberals attaches utmost importance to the principle laid down with emphasis by the Joint Select Committee of Parliament on the Government of India Bill of 1919 to the effect that where an executive government and its legislatures are in agreement on any matter there should be no interference by higher authority except when Imperial interests are involved. It regards it as an essential condition for the growth of the Indian constitution and preparation of the legislatures for ultimate responsibility of the whole government and it trusts, further, that, besides loyally observing the principle, the Secretary of State will give it full scope by releasing Governments in India from obligations to consult him previously in such matters, both by liberal interpretation of rules and regulations on the subject and by modifying these wherever necessary.

##### INDIANIZATION OF THE SERVICES.

(1) This meeting of the All-India Liberal Federation strongly opposes the proposal to appoint a commission of enquiry into the alleged financial and other grievances of the Imperial Services and to make further increases in their pay and allowances.

(2) In order to enable the Government of India and Local Governments to reduce expenditure on overhead charges of administration and reserved subjects, this Federation urges on the Secretary of State for India the necessity of authorising the Indian legislature and local legislatures to make laws regulating public services under clause (2), section 96 B of the Government of India Act and in the meantime stop all recruitment in England in all Imperial Services.

##### INDIANS OVERSEAS.

This meeting wishes to convey to the Imperial Cabinet of Great Britain its sense of concern at the undesirable effect produced on the minds of the people of India by reports that are received here from time to time of obstacles and difficulties in the way of the application to Crown Colony of Kenya of the principles embodied in the resolution of the Imperial Conference, 1921, and trusts that the Cabinet, which had influential representations at the Conference including the then Prime Minister and Colonial Secretary, will be able at an early date to carry out these principles in letter and in spirit.

This meeting condemns the anti-Indian policy pursued by the Government of the Union of South Africa and by the Provinces comprised in the Union, where the proportion of Indians is steadily deteriorating and, while fully acknowledging that the Government of India have fully identified themselves with Indians in their sentiments, this Conference, in the interests of Indians overseas generally, urges that the Government should continue to bring pressure to bear on the Union Government to accept the policy enunciated in the resolution of the Imperial Conference of 1921.

##### RETRENCHMENT.

This meeting of the All-India Liberals earnestly trusts that the Inchope Committee and various provincial retrenchment committees will recommend material reductions of expenditure and enable the Government of India and various local Governments to restore their financial equilibrium and thus avert the need for additional taxation.

##### PRINCES PROTECTION ACT.

This Federation is of opinion that the Indian States (Protection against Disaffection) Act passed by the Council of State on the Governor General's certificate is not in the interests of British India or subjects of Indian States and therefore Parliament should advise His Majesty to withhold his assent to it.

## PROGRESS OF THE MASSES.

While fully recognising the need for rapid political advance, this Federation emphasises the great necessity for pushing on the progress of masses in all directions, educational, social and economic, and for this purpose urges on the Government as also on the people the great desirability of adding to the institutions that aim at the advancement of the masses all along the line.

## UNTOUCHABILITY.

This meeting of the Federation is of opinion that untouchability is a great blot on the Hindu community and that therefore it is necessary to remove all disabilities to which untouchable classes are subjected.

## THE Servants of India Society PAMPHLETS.

1. **Self-Government for India under the British Flag—** 0-8-  
by the Rt. Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, President,  
Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. pp. 91.
2. **The Public Services in India—** 0-10-  
by Mr. Hirday Nath Kunzru, Senior Member  
Upper India Branch, Servants of India Society.  
Crown 16 mo. pp. 175.
3. **The Congress-League Scheme: An exposition—** 0-6-0  
by the Rt. Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri,  
President, Servants of India Society.  
Crown 16 mo. pp. 66.
4. **The Co-operative Movement—** 1-0-0  
by Mr. V. Venkatasubbaiya, Member, Servants of  
India Society and Mr. V. L. Metha, Manager,  
Bombay Central Co-operative Bank Ltd. Bombay.  
Crown 16 mo. pp. 191.
5. **The Medical Services in India—** 2-8-0  
by an I. M. S. Officer. Crown 16 mo. pp. 58.
6. **Trade Union Legislation—** 0-4-0  
by A Labour Advocate. Crown 16 mo. pp. 32.
7. **The Conscience Clause for Indians in Indian Education** 0-8-0  
**Codes (With a reply to certain Criticisms)—**  
by The Rt. Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, President,  
Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. pp. 67.
8. **Hindu Law in the New Era—** 0-10-0  
by K. K. Gokhale Esq., Sub-Judge, Jath State  
Crown 16 mo. pp. 80

These books can be had of:—

- 1 The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City.
- 2 The Bombay Vaibhav Press, Bombay, No. 4.

## 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.

## 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 SUN**  
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.....

## PUBLIC SPEAKING AND DEBATE.

Rs. A

- The Art of Extempore Speaking, or how to Attain Fluency of Speech.** By Harold Ford, M. A., LL. D., D. C. L. 12th Ed. Enlarged and revised ... .. 15
- The Chairman's Guide and Secretary's Companion,** with useful hints for the Conduct of business and social Gatherings of all kinds ... .. 3
- The Chairman's Manual,** being a guide to the Management of Meetings in General and of Meetings of local Authorities, with separate and complete treatment of the Meetings of Public Companies, By Gurdon Palin, of Gray's Inn, Bar-at-Law, and Earnest Martin, Fellow of the Chartered Institute of secretaries ... 4 13
- How to Conduct a Meeting, Standing Orders and Rules of Debate.** Parliamentary Practice explained and adapted for the use of local Governing Bodies, Labour Organisations, etc. By John Rigg 3

**Theosophical Publishing House.**

Adyar

Madras,

AND

INDIAN BOOK SHOP

55 Meadows Street.

Fort, BOMBAY.

### BEST REMEDY

Eminent Doctors of England, America, Africa nay of every part of the world, admire and strongly recommend to the sufferers, our infallible Cure for Gonorrhoea, Gout, Syphilis, Impotency and Granulation (eye diseases). If you want the surest cure for any, please apply with 2 annas postage for particulars to:—

G. R. KHORANA,  
LYALLPUR.

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

- |  | Rs. a. p. |
|--|-----------|
| 1. <b>Indian Economics—</b><br>(4th edition). Featherweight paper Demi.<br>8 vo. pp. 700. Cloth Bound. Revised & enlarged.           | 3-0-0     |
| 2. <b>Gokhale and Economic Reforms—</b><br>Crown 16 mo. pp. 250. Cloth Bound.  | 2-0-0     |
| 3. <b>Indian Administration—</b><br>(4th edition). With additional chapters on the<br>Reforms Act. Demi. 8 vo. pp. 528. Cloth Bound. | 3-0-0     |
| 4. <b>The Reforms Explained—</b><br>Demi. 8 vo. pp. 100.   | 1-0-0     |
| 5. <b>Indian Industrial and Economic Problems—</b><br>(2nd edition). Crown 16 mo. pp. 340.   | 1-0-0     |
| 6. <b>India's War Finance and Post-War Problems—</b><br>Crown 16 mo. pp. 164. Cloth Bound.   | 2-0-0     |
| 7. <b>Currency Reform in India—</b><br>Crown 16 mo. pp. 120.   | 1-0-0     |
| 8. <b>Dawn of Modern Finance in India—</b><br>Crown 16 mo. pp. 154.  | 2-0-0     |

These books can be had of:—

1. The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City.

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