

# THE Servant of India

Editor : V. VENKATA SUBBAIYA.

Office : KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. VI No. 53.]

POONA—THURSDAY, JANUARY 31, 1924.

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

## HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT.

### THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary.	...	...	J. Ramsay MacDonald.
Lord Privy Seal and Leader of H. C.	...	...	J. R. Clynes.
Lord President of the Council.	...	...	Parmoor.
Lord High Chancellor.	...	...	Haldane.
Chancellor of the Exchequer.	...	...	Philip Snowden.
Secretary of State for Home Affairs.	...	...	Arthur Henderson.
"    "    Colonies.	...	...	J. H. Thomas.
"    "    War.	...	...	Stephen Walsh.
"    "    India.	...	...	Sir Sydney Olivier.
"    "    Scotland.	...	...	W. M. Adamson.
First Lord of the Admiralty.	...	...	Chelmsford.
President, Board of Trade.	...	...	Sydney Webb.
"    Board of Education.	...	...	C. P. Trevelyan.
Minister of Health.	...	...	John Wheatley.
"    Agriculture and Industries.	...	...	Noel Buxton.
"    Labour.	...	...	Thomas Shaw.
Attorney General.	...	...	Patrick Hastings.

### NOT IN THE CABINET.

Secretary of State for Air.	...	...	Gen. C. B. Thomson.
Minister of Pensions.	...	...	F. Roberts.
Minister of Transport.	...	...	H. Gosling.
Postmaster General.	...	...	V. Hartshorn.
Asst. P. G.	...	...	
Chancellor, Duchy of Lancaster.	...	...	Josiah Wedgwood.
First Comm. of Works.	...	...	F. W. Jowett.
Solicitor General.	...	...	R. R. Slessor.
Paymaster General.	...	...	
Civil Lord of Admiralty.	...	...	Frank Hodges.
Treasury : Junior Lords.	...	...	
Financial Secretary...	...	...	William Graham.
Parliamentary Secretary and	...	...	Ben Spoor.
Chief Whip.	...	...	
Under-Secretary, Air Ministry.	...	...	William Leach
Colonial Office.	...	...	Sydney Arnold.
Foreign Affairs.	...	...	Arthur Ponsonby.
Home Dept.	...	...	Khys John Davies.
India Office.	...	...	Robert Richards.
War Office.	...	...	Major C. R. Attlee.
Ministry of Health.	...	...	Jas. Stewart.
Assistant Under-Secretary, Min. of Labour.	...	...	Sir Louis Kershaw
Parl. Secretary, Board of Admiralty.	...	...	C. G. Ammon.
Min. of Agr.	...	...	W. R. Smith.
Board of Education.	...	...	Morgan Jones.
Overseas Trade.	...	...	H. M. Lunn.
Min. of Health.	...	...	Arthur Greenwood.
Min. of Labour.	...	...	Margaret Bondfield.
Min. of Transport.	...	...	
Min. of Pensions.	...	...	J. W. Muir.
Board of Trade.	...	...	A. V. Alexander.
Min. of Mines.	...	...	E. Shinwell.
Financial Secretary, War Office.	...	...	J. J. Lawson.
Lord Advocate of Scotland.	...	...	
Solicitor General of Scotland.	...	...	

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT ... ..	621
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ... ..	622
ARTICLES:—	
The New Leadership. ... ..	624
That Dear Ally. ... ..	626
A Claim for Constitutional Reform. ... ..	627
The Indian Economic Conference. By Prof. R. P. Patvardhan, I. E. S. ... ..	628
Constitutional Convention: A travesty. By A. S. Venkataraman, B. A., L. T. ... ..	629
MISCELLANEOUS:—	
The Third Pan-African Congress. ... ..	631
CORRESPONDENCE:—	
The Akali Movement. By Ram Lal. ... ..	631

## TOPICS OF THE WEEK

Lenin. THE death of Vladimir Ilyich Ulianov, who is best known to the world under his pen name "Lenin", removes from the world to-day one of the outstanding figures in contemporary history and one of the great names of all history. Lenin's magnetic personality and hold over his people is only comparable to that of Mahatma Gandhi's over our own people. Painted as an inhuman monster by Western propaganda, Lenin's was really a most winsome nature. Single minded to the border (but not beyond it!) of fanaticism, he was great enough not to be afraid of moderation and it is well known that the whole re-orientation of Russia's "New Economic Policy" was due entirely to his boldness in espousing it, brushing aside as he did all question of Communist "prestige". Kalinin and Kamenyeff are Lenin's most likely successors: principally because they are pledged to a continuation and even broadening of this "N. E. P." Indeed, as we write, we have before us the official Soviet "Russian Information and Review" of the 5th which gives a most important resolution of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party in the direction of further concessions to capitalism, a resolution, which, as this paper says, "is widely interpreted as containing decisions of extreme importance." We entirely agree; and that they mean a further "strategic retreat", we as convinced opponents of Communism, can but applaud. It is all the more fitting that at this time, when a whole nation mourns him who cried a halt to Communist intransigence, we too should pay our tribute to this far-visioned and great son of Russia.

THE latest official news from Calcutta about the recrudescence of Revolutionary Violence in Bengal mentions that there are at present detained in safe custody two persons admittedly agents of Bolsheviks in Moscow. May we suggest in this connection that it would be a distinct advantage, if the following quotation from a speech made by Mr. Lloyd George in the House of Commons on May 15th of last year was borne in mind?

"This propaganda in the East," said Mr. George "is not altogether Bolshevik. Any one who has followed the History of the matter knows that up to 1904 Russia was sending large sums out of her Secret Service in order to propagandize the East against British interests. It was thoroughly well known. It was done in Persia Afghanistan, Baluchistan, Waziristan, and in India. It was well known that there were large sums of money being spent by the old Russian régime in order to create anti-British sentiment in all these countries. What happened? In 1904 you had the Reval meeting. A new understanding was established with Russia. From that moment the propaganda ceased. Is there not a lesson in that, that the essential preliminary to the cessation of propaganda in the East against British interests is to re-establish some sort of understanding? We talk about revolutionist and Tsarist government. The Russian is the thing that matters and there are really no fundamental differences. When you come to meet these people, the differences are not fundamental between your Tsarist and your Bolshevik—I am not talking now about doctrines—the moment they get on to foreign policy."

Pan-Africa and India. WE are reprinting to-day on another page from the *Crisis* of this month a résumé of the Third Pan-African Congress and would draw particular attention to the fact that amongst the chief speakers figures none other than our present Secretary of State for India: and the most significant point about it really is, that his name is one that one would naturally expect to find there and anywhere, indeed, where an attack against Colour Prejudice is being led. Sir Sydney is apparently one of those fortunate people born immune against colourphobia and it seems to us that this in itself is his best title to the new responsibilities with which he has now been entrusted. For what we Indians primarily want, surely, is not so much somebody who agrees with us, as somebody who can be trusted to agree or disagree with us irrespective of all preconceptions as to racial superiority and inferiority. And if any body has any further doubt on Sir Sydney Olivier's trustworthiness in this respect, we would ask him to refer back to our issue of November 8th, in which we gave a full abstract of his article on "Colour Prejudice" in the October number of the *Contemporary Review*, and add that the whole of his career, in the Colonial Office service, as out of it, has been but a practical application of the principles enunciated by him. In which latter respect, he would seem the exact opposite to General Smuts who is so fond of enunciating principles in Europe, whilst his actions in Africa do nothing but refute them: a point which the same Pan-African Congress, mentioned above, has not been slow to drive home.

THE Swarajists, who claim to be as true non-co-operators as the non-changers and to differ from the latter only in their willingness to employ another instrument, namely, the legislative councils, for achieving the same end—profess to be utterly indifferent to British opinion and to see no difference between a Conservative and a Labour government. This is a mere affectation, for situated

as India now is, no one can afford to disregard British public opinion or fail to distinguish friends from foes. If the Swarajists were really indifferent to the course of political events in England, an accredited organ of their views like the *Hindu* would not have taken the trouble to ask for and obtain a message for India from Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, after it was known that he would be Prime Minister in a day or two. Nor would the Swarajists have been so loud in expressing their disappointment at the message. But are they really disappointed? Did they expect the message, if one was to be given, to be different in substance from what they have now got? Did they expect him to say, "Go on with your programme of wrecking the councils and bringing the administration to a stand-still. The Labour Party will support you"? If they did so, they deserved to be disappointed. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald gave them, indeed, very earnest and sound advice, when he said:

"We have seen in our own generation all sorts of revolutionary movements which seemed to be successful and which have broken contact with the past, but in the end, after much physical suffering and creation of evil tempers and vicious spirit, had to return to pick up the contacts they had broken and apply the very principles they had rejected."

pointing the path of constitutionalism, he invited all Indians "to come near to us rather than stand apart from us, to get at our reason and goodwill;"—through that path, the Swarajists will do well to consider, how best to respond to this appeal.

MR. A. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR,

Attitude Changed? M. L. A., editor of the *Swadesamitran*

and leader of the Swarajists in the Tamil districts, has published a reply to this message, in which he has attempted to show that Mr. MacDonald's opposition to 'policies designed to bring Government to a stand-still' is inconsistent with the principles he stood for during the war and until his re-entry into Parliament in 1922, as well as with the opinions he had formerly expressed regarding India. What has brought about this change of attitude in Mr. MacDonald, according to Mr. Aiyangar, is the prospect of office and the necessity for keeping on the right side of the Liberal Party in England. To prove that his attitude towards India has undergone a change, Mr. Aiyangar refers to a message given by him in November 1919 through Mr. Aiyangar to the Amritsar Congress regarding the Government of India Act which was then being enacted. Mr. MacDonald's advice to the Congress was:

"To lay down the fuller and juster programme for the nation and let every one concerned know that we consider ourselves bound to none of the provisions to which we have taken exception and go on using our influence to get what we want."

This passage does not at all bear out Mr. Aiyangar's contention. There is nothing in it to support 'policies designed to bring Government to a stand-still'. In November 1919 there was no non-co-operation, no council-boycott, nor council-wrecking, and by a fuller and juster programme Mr. MacDonald could not have meant the programme of non-co-operation. Mr. Aiyangar refers to another letter, of December 1922, in which Mr. MacDonald said that:

"He had been closely following all the movements in India during the past few years with care and sympathy, but that whether he agreed or disagreed with some of them, he had always considered them as the sincere efforts of Indians to secure their freedom and happiness and that there was no change in his interest and concern in Indian affairs."

Mr. Aiyangar has apparently no respect for the intelligence of his readers. Otherwise he would not have expected them to infer from these pass-

ages a change of attitude towards India in Mr. Ramsay MacDonald.

Another Borsad? A serious situation threatens to develop in Tanjore district unless the authorities meet it with great tact. The mirasidars or landholders, an influential and fairly numerous class, are organizing a "no tax" campaign, in which big and small, Hindus and Muhammadans, Brahmans and non-Brahmans have joined. The campaign is a protest against the enhancement of land revenue, at 25 and 18 3/4 per cent. on first and second class lands respectively, due to resettlement. Whether one approves of direct action in this case or not—and one's approval depends very much on the circumstances of each case and the consequences to be anticipated—it must be conceded that the mirasidars have a strong case. In December last their representative in the local legislature moved a resolution to the effect that the collection of enhanced revenue be suspended for one year at least from January 1924, till the principles of land revenue settlements are embodied in legislation. Some time earlier a similar resolution had been passed by the council with reference to another district, viz, Bellary. The Government however, opposed this resolution and it was defeated by a narrow majority. The mirasidars then wanted to wait in deputation on the Governor, but the opportunity was denied them. They then held a conference, at which they protested against the attitude of Government and resolved to launch on a 'no tax' campaign if a sufficient number of mirasidars should favour it. A committee is touring the district to ascertain this and very soon the conference will meet again to consider its report. From what is appearing in the daily papers, it is perfectly clear that the campaign will be started. The Government's contention is that Bellary and Tanjore are economically very different and therefore there would be no justification for suspending the enhanced rate in the case of Tanjore. On the economic ground we believe the Government is right. The real objection, however, is not economic but constitutional. It is that the principles of assessment should be decided by the legislature and not by the executive. This position has been accepted by the Government, and its spokesman has promised to introduce a Bill very soon, probably in April next. Why then should the Government not yield gracefully, but antagonise an influential section of the population? A loss of Rs 12 lakhs, it is said. It is not a great loss compared with the results of a no tax campaign. Let the Madras Government benefit by the example set by Bombay in the matter of Borsad.

Mr. S. G. Vaze. BY last mail we heard from Mr.

Vaze who by that time had been a fortnight in Kenya. He had had an interview with the Governor, who went over the whole White Paper with him. Whilst Sir R. Coryndon's latent hostility was unmistakable, Mr. E. Denham, the Colonial Secretary, was as sympathetic, helpful and understanding, as those who had the pleasure of knowing him as Director of Education in Ceylon, expected him to be. Mr. Vaze was about to leave Nairobi to attend the Indian Congress at Mombasa and at this time now is probably spending a couple of weeks in Uganda. His further plans include Tanganyika in February and a return to Bombay on March 10th.

### THE NEW LEADERSHIP.

The long suspense, lasting for a month and a half since the British elections, is over and Mr. MacDonald is at last occupying his rightful position as His Majesty's Prime Minister. The bourgeois world, which, up to the last moment of the fateful vote in the Commons on the 21st, had been indulging in most variegated but almost uniformly violent prognostications as to the risks and perils of "allowing" Labour to rule, has with a perfectly surprising change of tone given its universal benediction to Mr. MacDonald, once the inevitable had happened. Even the Rothermere organs, which had tried to make people's hair stand on end with pictures of Red Ruin and Bolshevism at Whitehall, meekly welcome Mr. MacDonald as quite a safe man; Mr. Leaf, Chairman of one of the "Big Five" in the banking world, voices "a definite feeling of confidence and hope"; consols go up a point; the "Daily Chronicle" ridicules the "panicky talk of the past month"; and the "Morning Post" pays the new Cabinet the grudging compliment of being "more for show than for wear". Indian papers of all shades have been equally ready to welcome the new Premier. The *Times of India's* leader of the 26th is a warm advocacy of Labour's fitness to rule; the *Bombay Chronicle* of the 25th is quite happy because Mr. MacDonald expressed "sentiments with which no Muslim is inclined to quarrel"; and the *Voice of India* though it does "not expect much from him", manages to expect him to "restore some of the dignity Britain has lost, some of the conventions of honour and fair dealing, some of the ideals of a true commonwealth of free nations." Most amazing of all, even the Communists do not hail Mr. MacDonald's debut with the shouts of "Traitor!" which we for one had expected: on the contrary, the *Labour Monthly* of January actually says that "the first need for all of us at the present moment, whatever our differences, whatever our criticisms and distrusts, is to unite in support of a Workers' Government", and even admits that "a Labour Government in a minority cannot be expected to show easy successful action or immediate results straight away."

If such unanimity of approval surprises, the surprise is somewhat diminished, if one looks into the composition of the new Cabinet. For whose opinions are not represented there? We find on it distinguished Conservatives like Lords Parmoor and Chelmsford; a great Liberal like Lord Haldane; the Union of Democratic Control is represented by men like C. P. Trevelyan and Noel Buxton; the Fabians by Sydney Webb and Sydney Olivier; the L. L. P. by J. R. MacDonald himself and by Philip Snowden; the extreme Left by John Wheatley. The law is there (Patrick Hastings), mining (Stephen Walsh and Wm. Adamson) and for other Trade Unions we have J. R. Clynes, Arthur Henderson, J. H. Thomas and Thomas Shaw. Going outside the Cabinet, we get four university professors (W. Graham, R. Richards, O. R. Attlee and A. Green-

wood); two Army men (Gen. C. B. Thomson and Colonel J. Wedgwood); a Christian Socialist (R. R. Slessor); a conscientious objector (Morgan Jones); a Jew (E. Shinwell) and a woman (Margaret Bondfield); a Co-operator (A. V. Alexander); a capitalist manufacturer (U. M. Leach) and two tradesmen (B. Spoor and Jas. Stewart). The L. L. P. has a further representative in J. W. Jowett, the U. D. C. in Arthur Ponsonby, and Liberalism in Sydney Arnold; whilst Trade Unions claim the rest (F. Roberts, H. Gosling, V. Hartshorn, Frank Hodges, R. J. Davies, C. S. Ammon, W. R. Smith, W. Lunn and J. G. Lawson). There is no doubt about it, that the new British Government is definitely "Labour": but no less can there be any doubt about it, that it does not mean to rule as a tyranny of class or opinion.

To people who will not distinguish between Communists (who are convinced aristocrats, just as Fascists are) and Socialists (who are convinced democrats) this discovery has naturally come as quite a surprise: though it need not have done so, if only they had ever troubled to read what Socialists themselves have been saying all along—certainly since the Labour Party (in 1917) came out as a *National Party*, no longer intended to represent the interests of one class, but of all workers, whether by hand or brain. Indeed, whatever Mr. MacDonald may achieve for the cause of socialism, he certainly is bound to accomplish a vast amount—and that immediately—for that of democracy. As is notorious, the idea of parliamentarism, i. e. democracy, is at a heavy discount throughout the world to-day. But if one probes into the contempt into which "Government by Talk" has fallen, one finds that the real cause for it is the system, which places one party in absolute command during the life time of a parliament, so that discussion is reduced to a mere *epiphenomenon*, of the same influence on events, as perspiration is on the speed of a pedestrian. The reduction of alleged representatives of the people to the status of performing animals, rushing, obedient to the crack of the party whip, now into this, now into that lobby, cannot but render contemptible people who submit to such degradation. Yet for nearly a generation, such has been the case and party tyranny has been growing worse and worse during and after the years of the War. In fact Mussolini's parliamentary "reform" in Italy (according to which any party which gains the majority of votes in the country is entitled to 2/3rds of the seats in parliament) is not so much a caricature, as a logical expression of this principle of Cabinet autocracy which sees in members of parliament nothing but automatic voting machines.

Fortunately for democracy, the last British elections have created a situation, and in Mr. MacDonald found a leader, who is capable of turning, what to most people still seems a deadlock, into the most fruitful opportunity for delivering democracy from the creeping paralysis with which it is stricken the world over. In the *New Leader* (*nomen est*

omen 1) of January 4th Mr. MacDonald contributes an article "In Parliament Tomorrow", which we venture to think will become classic. In contrast to the *quidnuncs* who in the press and outside ring the changes on sums of addition and subtraction, Mr. MacDonald asks to "let us take elementary arithmetic for granted". Instead of running his head against the brickwall of a three-party stalemate, he leaps over it by proposing to "rule in the House of Commons more by administrative success than by a party force, whilst the legislation that will be carried will have to be more in accordance than it now too often is with public desires outside and the course of debates inside." In other words, Mr. MacDonald definitely renounces all idea of Cabinet autocracy and reliance on the automatic working of the party machine. On the contrary, he consciously aims (and says so in so many words) at the loosening of party bonds: and the composition of his Cabinet most certainly is not only proof of his earnestness and of his consummate skill in this direction, but also a pledge of continued success. Being a great leader, being serenely confident of the rightness of his aims, he is quite content to govern by an appeal to the free judgment of the members of the legislature, by an educational propaganda in the country, by the inspiration of the great ideals themselves for which he and his friends stand. "Candid thinking and free voting", as Mr. Brailsford puts it, will thus once more make Parliament "the great and free instrument of government" which it was, before the machine age reduced it to its own standards of soulless automatism. As a natural consequence, Mr. Macdonald does not intend to turn every division into a vote of confidence. Whilst holding generally to party principles and conceptions of policy, members will be expected to use their own judgment and vote accordingly, irrespective of party allegiance. As a consequence, the Government will be ready to submit to such amendments to its own proposals, as express the reasoned will of the House and of the country, without feeling obliged to resign merely because an adverse vote on some secondary matter has been carried. The Government will resign, when the House of Commons in so many words calls upon them to resign, just as Mr. Baldwin was called upon to resign these few days ago: but it will not resign a moment earlier. As a further consequence, the new Government will undoubtedly set up Parliamentary Committees, which will be composed of men of all the three parties, to advise and even control administration: a method which will ensure that general policies will be adopted and specific steps taken, not in compliance with party shibboleths, but with reason. The private member will come into his own again and measures will once more be scrutinized on their merits.

A leader who proposes to lead so wisely and along such attractive paths of rediscovered common sense, fairness and goodwill, will, we venture

to think, not be displaced in a hurry. As far as one can see, the three party system has come to stay, and to stay for good. In this generation at least it seems doubtful—though the three parties then may not be the three parties to-day—whether the voters of Great Britain will ever again give to any one party the overwhelming majority which they remember only too well the Georges and Baldwins to have misused and squandered. After the shams and bluffs of Mr. George, after the comatose "tranquillity" of Mr. Law and after the pathetic ineptitude of Mr. Baldwin, it is indeed not saying much that Mr. Macdonald will prove by far the better man. With such a man the British nation is not going to dispense after a month or even after a few months. Mr. Macdonald suggests that, as each parliament has already a maximum duration (of six years), so also should it have a minimum duration, say, of three years: and we on our part are sanguine enough to prophecy that minimum duration for Mr. Macdonald's government itself. And those of our readers who are not of our way of thinking, we would merely ask to ponder the following quotation taken from the *New Statesman* of the 5th inst.: "If Labour is speedily displaced from office, the chickens of industrial unrest, hatched under its administration, will come to roost on the perches of those who evict it. And to the industrial unrest will be added the sense of political resentment to which the eviction of labour by a combination of the other parties will inevitably give rise."

No, contrary to all shallow judgment and superficial appearances, the Government which came into power on the 14th of January will be both strong and secure. And if that is so, the cause is above all things to seek in the fact that the men who have now assumed control are inspired by definite ideals and are not ashamed to own them. The Labour Party, as Sydney Olivier tellingly describes it in the *Nineteenth Century* of this month, is pervaded by religious fervour, pride of party and, above all, real comradeship. It is for this reason, that, poor and uninfluential, the party has been able to increase its representatives in Parliament from one forty years ago to 192 to-day; it is for this reason that it can always count on voluntary helpers of a devotion which no money can buy. The Labour Party is not a party of idealists in the sense of men who, abstracting from the world as it is, dwell in a Cloudcuckoo Land of their own. But still less are they a party of materialists, who consider that the world as it is, must remain as it is. They are men who know only too well that power and money to-day are masters, and men but their slaves: but they are also determined, that this inversion of the true order shall cease. Man, human personality first; interests of this or that "industry" this or that "country" after; a long way after. The present Government is composed of all sorts of men: but one thing all of them have in common, that none of them are "moneyed."

Originally Conservatives, Liberals or Labour, they are all agreed in making the human factor paramount, whether in politics or in economics. A soulless bureaucracy and plutocracy thinks only in terms of Prestige or of Profits: Mr. Macdonald and his friends will insist on thinking in terms of human happiness. This is the great revolution, a revolution of thought, in the business of government, which was ushered in a week ago; this the greatest of all victories, which democracy, the rule of the common people, has achieved for many a long day. Neither idealists nor materialists, the new leaders of the Empire have come forward as true Realists, basing themselves on the power of the common people, and ready to prove to them that their common humanity can be made the dominant factor in statesmanship. Having all the brains, they also have now the power, for translating their faith into fact: a power which with increasing confidence all people of goodwill—and not in Britain alone—will desire to see remaining in their hands.

For if such is the new leadership, who would not follow it?

#### THAT DEAR ALLY.

THE signing of the treaty of alliance between France and Czecho-Slovakia marks yet one more stage on the road towards European domination, so steadfastly pursued by France since 1918. A glance at the map will show that encircling Germany in the east there lie Poland and Czecho-Slovakia: both of them now avowedly pledged to act as France's vassals in all but name. Linked up with them are Yugoslavia and Rumania, who between them dispose of the following standing army:—

Czechoslovakia	150,000
Rumania	250,000
Poland	250,000
Yugoslavia	250,000,

a total of nine lakhs of men under arms. In the West, France disposes of a "peace" establishment (in December 1921) of 736 000, to whom the Belgian contingent of one lakh must be added. The whole of this formidable total, moreover, is one organic whole under unitary control: and not only so, but the armies themselves of the French client states, are officered by Frenchmen to quite an incredible degree. By way of example let us quote Poland where on Feb. 19, 1920 (according to an answer given in the Chamber of Deputies) the army contained no less than 9 French generals, 723 other officers and 2120 rank and file: a number, which in November 1921 was admittedly *doubled*! Again, in Czechoslovakia is situate the famous Skodra Works which used to supply the whole Hapsburg Empire with arms: this factory, needless to say, has now become a mere branch of the corresponding French Creusot-Schneider works. In this connection, it seems curious that a conspiracy of silence should have been maintained regarding

the origin of those arms, destined for Afghanistan, which are still being detained at Bombay. When a political crime is being committed in Bengal the headlines the very next day shout of "Soviet arms"; when, some time ago, a cargo of sword-sticks was being retailed in Calcutta, the press was full of "German swords": why then, one wonders, this delicacy about calling those arms lying in Bombay "French rifles" when the outburst at the time of the Afghan Minister at Paris had practically given away the show already? The maintenance of this fiction of the "Entente" is surely one of the most curious of Curzonian gadgets, when it is the most patent of facts that the bulk of all French exports to-day consists of war material, directed in the last instance against England. But why say even, in the last instance, when nobody has forgotten yet that it was Creusot-Schneider that armed Kemal Pasha's armies against the British forces then operating against them?

All these "exports" of course are costly: where then does the money come from to pay for them? Assuredly not from bankrupt states like Poland &c. No, France obligingly lends the amount required to these countries, and in turn pays her armament firms by money borrowed on her part from her small *rentiers*, who in turn are promised that ultimately "Germany will pay all". Thus there are at the present moment due the following sums, practically all for war material (of course manufactured in France!):

by Belgium	...	3772 million francs
Czechoslovakia		542
Poland	...	1328
Rumania	...	1254
Yugoslavia	...	1747
		<hr/> 8643

Is then France so rolling in money, that she can afford all this *largesse*? The following figures tell their own tale, representing as they do the annual *deficits* incurred:

in 1919	...	42600 million francs
1920	...	38300
1921	...	30500
1922	...	30800
1923	...	35200
		<hr/> 177400

The steady drop of the franc in the markets of the world is at last attracting attention, not only in our news columns, but in France itself. The following table will show the fluctuations during the last four years:

	Francs to the £		Francs to the \$	
1920	from 40.33	to 57.45	from 10.75	to 17.40
1921	" 45.46	" 61.59	" 11.31	" 17.18
1922	" 47.—	" 71.81	" 12.71	" 16.06
1923	" 62.38	" 85.93	" 13.55	" 19.80

These figures are unmistakable signs of the growing loss of confidence in a country which year in, year out, fails to meet its debts and puts off its creditors by the products of the printing press. The only surprise is, not, that the franc has depreciated so much, but that it has not depreciated more. Since the £ itself of course has depreciated (against a pre-war parity of \$ 4'86 to the £, to-day's quotation is \$ 4'22), the true index must be sought in the dollar exchange. Clearly, the hopes of France, to squeeze enough money out of Germany to meet her deficits, have hitherto broken the drop: but now that the whole pitiful failure of the Ruhr adventure stands revealed, that retarding factor has been removed, with the result that to-day the \$ is worth already 22'50 francs. As a French wag bitterly commented on M. Poincaré's promise that the occupation of the Ruhr would henceforth become "invisible": "Like the Reparations, one supposes!"

The French people, thrifty and inclined to meanness, as peasantry the world over is, have hitherto been only too ready to point their blind eye to the unspeakable infamies perpetrated by France in the occupied German territories (infamies which just now are once more glaringly exemplified in the Separatist terror fostered and kept alive by General de Metz's orders in the Palatinate): in the fond belief that anyhow these "measures" would ultimately produce the hard cash. Now the bubble is bursting; the franc is inexorably falling, the cost of living in France is inexorably rising; a tardy 20% increase in taxation has in addition had at last to be resorted to—and worst of all for M. Poincaré *et Cie.*, the general elections of April are drawing ominously near. So once more, the mills of God, certainly grinding very, very slowly, may yet turn out to be grinding exceedingly fine: at all events, the time seems to be propitious for some plain speaking on the part of the new British Foreign Secretary, and for a consequent international re-orientation. And if anybody can effect this still, Mr. MacDonald certainly should be able—and willing—to do it. Good luck to him.

#### A CLAIM FOR CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM

THE Kathiawar Hitawardhak Sabha has addressed a representation to the Governor-General urging the claims of certain portions of Kathiawar which are under British administration to constitutional reforms. It is a well reasoned document which we hope will receive the earnest attention of His Excellency. The peninsula of Kathiawar has an area of 23,445 square miles of which 1,265 sq. m. belong to Baroda and 1,298 sq. m. are incorporated in Ahmedabad district, leaving 20,882 sq. m. to form the Political Agency of Kathiawar. No fewer than 193 separate states are found in this area, but only about a dozen of them are of any importance on account of area, population or revenue. The vast majority of them are ridiculously small—about a

third of the whole number consisting of single villages or portions of villages—and would not under any sensible arrangement have been dignified with the status of a 'state'. As it is manifestly absurd to expect the owners of all these little patches of soil to discharge the functions of a government, the more important of them, 82 in number, have been graded, since 1863, in seven classes and given powers of administration in a diminishing degree, only the first two classes having plenary powers, the remaining 111 being combined in *thana* circles and deprived of all powers of administration. These *thana* circles and four Civil Stations, comprising in all an area of more than 5,000 sq. miles, are under the direct jurisdiction of the Agency. It is for this area, which has so long been under British administration and which in future also is bound to be under British administration, that the Hitawardhak Sabha most legitimately claims constitutional reforms. It rightly urges:

"In view of the fact that the administration of all this territory has to be discharged by the British Government and that the people forming its population have their welfare entirely in the hands of the British Government as much as that of the people in British India, Your Excellency has to consider whether the present out-of-date methods of Government are to be continued or that they are to be replaced by a system of Government, less autocratic, more constitutional and susceptible to popular opinion."

The Kathiawar Agency is not a backward area like the Agency tracts of Madras or Chota Nagpur. In education and general enlightenment the people are as advanced as those in British India. The Sabha therefore urges that a constitution and system of administration similar to that prevailing in British Indian provinces should be established in Kathiawar also; that is to say, it asks for a legislative council with a majority of elected non-official members, enjoying the powers of interpellation, moving resolutions and voting on the budget, a judiciary which is entirely independent of the executive, an executive which is controlled by law and deprived of arbitrary and autocratic powers, and municipalities and local boards with non-official majorities and elected presidents. The legislative authority at present is the Governor of Bombay and laws are promulgated as directed by him. "No preliminary stage has been considered necessary, which may serve as a guarantee that the law enacted has been maturely deliberated upon, still less has there any opportunity been given to the public or any representatives of the public for discussion or for the expression of any opinion for suggesting any alternative to the proposal." It is certainly an anachronism that all legislative power should be vested in an individual, however exalted he may be. The entire civil and criminal jurisdiction is vested in executive officers who have had no previous judicial training either on the bench or at the bar, and the higher officers are most often military officers. It is surely too late to let the system continue. The unbounded powers of the executive are thus set forth by the Sabha:

" The officers entrusted with executive powers may seize hold of any person and confine him to a prison without a written warrant to the jailor, without informing the imprisoned person of the accusation against him and without any opportunity for defence. They may have any person living within the agency areas forcibly 'externed' beyond those limits and prevented from entering them again, without giving any warning or taking any steps which may justify their action in the eyes of impartial observers. There is no independent judiciary that may be appealed to as guardians of liberty and the safeguards of the reign of law; no representative assembly where ministers of state or other executive officers may be questioned on matters of public interest or methods of administration or particular instances of the exercise of executive authority. "

As to local self-government there is no trace of it yet in the Agency, the only two municipalities that exist being managed by officials assisted by some nominated members only.

There is now an excellent opportunity for inaugurating these reforms, in as much as the Kathiawar, Cutch and Palanpur Agencies, which have till now been under the Governor of Bombay, are shortly to be brought under the jurisdiction of the Governor General himself. Conditions in Palanpur Agency are more or less similar to those in Kathiawar, and though for obvious reasons the Hitawardhak Sabha has confined itself to urging the claims of Kathiawar, there is no reason why the two agencies should not be amalgamated and placed under one legislative and administrative authority. Though these areas have been administered by the British as much as British Indian provinces, by a legal fiction which ought not to have come into existence, they are treated as foreign territory, given the name of Agencies and consigned to unprogressive and autocratic rule. In essential respects they are not unlike Berar, which enjoys an advanced form of Government. In fact, if Berar could well form part of the C. P. administration, there is no reason why the *thanas* of Kathiawar and Palanpur Agencies should not form part of Bombay Presidency. That would undoubtedly be the best course from every point of view and neither the people of the Agencies nor those of Gujarat are likely to be opposed to it. But if for some reason or other that course be not practicable, then the amalgamation of the Agencies under one authority, and endowing them with the form of government urged by the Hitawardhak Sabha, should commend itself to the Government of India as a minimum, the reasonableness and logic of which surely are unanswerable.

## THE INDIAN ECONOMIC CONFERENCE.

### I.

THE Seventh Indian Economic Conference held in Bombay last week, was a distinct success. A large number of economists from different parts of India were present: though Calcutta was, I believe, unrepresented, and one missed some prominent economists like Professors Kale, Coyajee, Jevons, Radhakamal Mukherjee and Mr. Manohar Lal. The Secretaries of the Conference were fortunate in

getting a man of the ability and experience of Sir M. Visvesvaraya to preside. About twenty papers covering a wide variety of subjects,—a few making valuable contributions to the study of the problems they dealt with—were discussed. Nor was the social side forgotten: the members were given abundant opportunities to get to know one another, and to have informal talks and discussions. A few spots on the sun there were: the printed papers should have been in the hands of members at least a week before the meeting of the Conference, so that they could have been "taken as read" with greater justice, and the discussion would have been more thorough and thoughtful. In the second place, some of us felt that the atmosphere of the meetings in Bombay was not as calm and judicial as the occasion demanded, and as one found, for example, the session in Lahore. Perhaps in future all demonstrations on the part of the public should be forbidden, as it is forbidden at any inquiries of a Royal Commission; for truly the problems of economics need to be discussed in as impartial and dispassionate a spirit as those before any Royal Commission.

The Economic Conference, it is well-known, does not pass any resolutions; and Sir M. Visvesvaraya suggested in his concluding remarks that it should do so. The wisdom of such a step, however, is open to question. In economics, much more than in politics, opinions have to be *weighed* as well as, or perhaps more than, *counted*; and, moreover, the Economic Conference will have enough to do in stimulating and educating economic opinion in the country.

The Presidential address was a vigorous plea for the economic regeneration of India to be brought about by means of a new economic structure. Elected Boards of Industries are to be established in every province to work under the control of a Minister of Development, who is to be advised by a Development Committee of the local Legislative Council. There are to be popular Development Committees in every district, city and village. The Central Board is to have its subordinate and expert staff in the districts to assist and to work in collaboration with the local committees. The business of these local committees is to promote agriculture and industries, to look to the spread of education, including vocational education, and to maintain the statistics of their localities. There is to be an initial economic survey of the province, and on the basis of this, progress is to be watched by yearly and periodical stock-taking. Such is to be the new economic structure; but over and above this there are special ways in which the State can help. The manufacture of railway materials can be helped by the Government placing orders for these materials within the country; that of locomotives, machinery and motor cars by suitable subsidies and freight concessions, and guaranteed dividends; the steel industry by adequate protection. Further, the present system of currency must be replaced



by a gold standard; and technical and commercial education must be pushed forward. Finance is a difficulty; but Sir Visvesvaraya would suggest a loan. "We spent Rs. 150 crores or more on the great war. We might as well add to that debt a little more to fight ignorance and poverty." "If these measures are adopted, there is every prospect that we may be able to double production from agriculture, and quadruple that from industries, in less than fifteen years," and "the material progress of the country will proceed at a pace which will astonish the world."

The enthusiasm of the Presidential address is catching, but a critic may perhaps say that it makes too light of the financial difficulty—it may not be only 'a little more' that will be necessary to finance the big projects suggested—and that it places too much reliance on mere economic 'structure.' It is curious to read side by side with this Dr. Mann's lament at the recent Board of Agriculture meeting at Bangalore that "with Indian cultivators there is too often a hiatus between demonstration and practice." One feels that here as in many other things the truth lies somewhere in the middle.

R. P. PATWARDHAN.

### CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTIONS— A TRAVESTY.

THE formation of the new ministry in Madras raises matters of constitutional importance, having no parallel with the present conditions in any self-governing country and having no support in the past in any country where responsible government has become 'a fait accompli.'

The Governor in a communique announced that it be established as a convention that the ministers resign before the formation of the new council. There is more than meets the eye here. Constitutional conventions as followed in ordered constitutionally progressive countries demand that the old ministers, unless defeated in the elections, should face the new council and take its verdict, but here in Madras—and in other provinces as well—a different convention has been adopted. The convention, which in England has been very largely a result of accident and absence of design, has here been dictated by the Governor. In effect, the resignation of the ministry owes its origin to the convention, whose sponsor has been the Governor. The 'Justice' party has not been returned on any party cry or programme but it has happened—as it will always happen—that most of the M. L. C's are Non-Brahmins and the 'Justice' party has claimed them all in its fold—an ipse dixit based on the ground that Non-Brahmins ipso facto belong to the Justice party, taking for granted that it is a party. Recently however the claim has been proved to be utterly hollow by the formation of a Non-Brahmin opposition. The fact that the ministers did not resign during the last three

years when they were defeated on any important measure and that after the General Election they resigned as a result of the press communique, goes to illustrate another convention being established (notwithstanding any section in the Government of India Act or any instructions laid down in the Joint Committee Report) viz, that ministers depend in reality, besides formally, on the Governor for "getting into" and "getting on with" their office. It comes to this that the ministers hold their office during the pleasure of the Governor, while the Executive Councillors sometimes are even in a worse plight in as much as they have to serve two masters, the Governor and the ministers, as can be illustrated by the case of the late Sir K. S. Aiyangar anent the introduction of the Irrigation Bill, who resigned as he did not care to continue in office on sufferance.

In this connection the position of the English Prime Minister may be considered. In the words of Alston: "The English Prime Minister serves two masters. If the House to which he owes his elevation turns against him, he can destroy it and appeal for support to the nation (or even possibly hold office for a time, relying on the support of the sovereign till smoother times come round—though this is scarcely conceivable, unless the country passes again through some great crisis such as that at the end of the 18th century); while on the other hand, he may continue to act as if quite indifferent to the general feeling of the nation, provided only the Majority is for him". It will be thus seen that the two constitutional masters whom the English Prime Minister has to serve, may even be defied by the Indian ministers.

A case in point is supplied by the debate on the "noconfidence" motion by Mr. C. R. Reddy. In defence of the ministry, the Hon. Mr. (now Sir) A. P. Patro is reported to have said that the ministers are individually responsible. It is not known whether he was alive to the full significance of his statement. Either the ministers are responsible or not. If they are responsible, their responsibility is individual or collective. If according to the Hon. Mr. Patro, they are individually responsible, the resultant product is American departmentalism, not the English cabinet government. There is no necessity then that the ministers should belong to the same party. The fact that they are or profess to be of the same party, cuts the ground underneath the argument emphasising individual responsibility, and affords overwhelming evidence in support of the contention that the ministers are collectively responsible. If they are collectively responsible they must resign in a body and accept office as a body. What has now happened is that the ministry having resigned as a body, a truncated body with the repudiation of one arm has accepted office with the substitution of a new arm. In England even as early as 1765, the principle of cabinet solidarity had gained ground. Referring to Rockingham's first ministry

Lord Chesterfield writes, ( vide Government of England by Hearn, pp. 212-13 ) " I do not remember in my times to have seen so much at once as an entire new Board of Treasury and two new Secretaries of State cum multis aliis." Again Lord Morley in his life of Walpole observes: " As a general rule, every important piece of departmental policy is taken to commit the entire cabinet, and its members stand or fall together. The Chancellor of the Exchequer may be driven from office by a bad dispatch from the Foreign office, and an excellent Home Secretary may suffer for the blunders of a stupid Minister of War. The cabinet is a unit—a unit as regards the sovereign and a unit as regards the legislature. Its views are laid before the sovereign and before Parliament, as if they were the views of one man. It gives its advice as a single whole, both in the royal closet and in the hereditary or representative chamber. The first mark of the cabinet, as that institution is understood, is *\*united and indivisible* ( not individual ) responsibility." This famous passage from the pen of the Late Viscount Morley, is supported by the more authoritative utterance of his chief, Mr. Gladstone. He said, " As the Queen deals with the cabinet, just so the cabinet deals with the Queen. The sovereign is to know no more of any differing views of differing ministers, than they are to know of any collateral representation of the monarchical office; they are an unity before the sovereign and the sovereign is an unity before them; while each minister is an adviser of the Crown, the cabinet is an unity and none of its members can advise as an individual without, or in opposition, actual or presumed, to his colleague." It would be absurd to speak of collective responsibility in this sense as applied to the Madras ministers.

The next question that arises is " To whom are the ministers responsible ? " This ground has been partly traversed. In theory they are responsible to the council and through it to the electorate. In practice they are responsible to the Governor. The first would imply the resignation of the ministry, if it gets defeated on any important governmental measure. Some members of the Madras council are of opinion that for the ministers' sins of omission and commission, the party is responsible. That is altogether the negation of ministerial responsibility, a *sine qua non* of responsible government worth the name. When important governmental measures are defeated the ministry does not resign. The question of responsibility to the electorate too has been brushed aside by the ministers. The Religious Endowments Bill has been carried through in the teeth of the opposition of the electorate, and in view of the large measure of protest and the volume of public opinion against it, assent has been withheld and the Bill has been referred back to the new council for reconsideration. The

\*The italics are mine.

members of the Justice party might have defined their attitude towards a question of the kind and might have canvassed with an election cry defining their views in relation to a question of the kind. In practice the Governor's dictating a convention and dictating the choice of ministers ( whereas in England the choice of ministers is limited ) serve only to strengthen the belief that the ministers, in practice, are responsible to the Governor; but then, what is the dividing line between the reserved half and the transferred half?

On the other hand, if the ministers are really responsible to the legislature why should the nominated element in the council be allowed to vote on an important measure like the " no confidence " motion moved by Mr. C. R. Reddy in the local council on the 27th November, when properly speaking the question must have been decided by the elected element purely? This is perhaps another convention, by which the reserved half, according to the leader of the House, Sir Charles Todhunter, endeavours to develop what is admittedly a transitional and imperfect form of government? Why should the Chief Minister have had recourse to an exceptionable procedure such as sending a whip ordering members to vote against the " no confidence " motion? Another convention perhaps is the voting of the ministers also against the " no confidence " motion. This may *pari passu* be applied to elections of presidents in local boards and municipalities. When there are two or more candidates who contest the presidency, why not allow them to vote for themselves? On its very face, this is ridiculous. Similarly when ministers are indicted, they can not be allowed to vote. The neutral attitude of Sir. K. V. Reddy ex-minister, was legitimate, constitutional and therefore commendable.

The inevitable inference is that the English conventions, which have been very largely the result of accident and absence of design are distorted and introduced into India and that it is feared, the ultimate result will be that so called Responsible Government, even on a limited scale as it has been given, will be neither responsible, nor ordered Government and the so-called reforms a farce.

This fear is confirmed when we contrast the powers of an Indian minister with those of an English minister. We can allow the minister to speak for himself. ( Vide the Rt. Hon'ble Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri's Presidential Address Dec. 1922 ) " I am Minister of Development *minus* Forests and you all know that development depends a good deal on forests. I am Minister of Industries without Factories which is a reserved subject and industries without factories are unimaginable. I am Minister of Agriculture *minus* Irrigation ..... I am also Minister of Industries without Electricity which is also a reserved subject." Referring to the English Premier, Mr. Low says: " Backed by a stable and substantial majority in Parliament, his power is greater than that of the German Emperor or the American President, for he can alter the laws, he can impose taxation and repeal it and he can direct all the forces of the state. The one condition is that he must keep his majority, the outward and concrete expression of the fact that the nation is not willing to revoke the plenary commission with which it has clothed him".

A. S. VENKATARAMAN.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

## THE THIRD PAN-AFRICAN CONGRESS

The following resolutions were passed :

The executive Committee of the Third Pan-African Congress, meeting in London and Lisbon in November, 1923, regards the following matters as those which seem to them to embody the legitimate and immediate needs of the peoples of African descent.

1. A voice in their own government.
2. The right of access to the land and its resources.
3. Trial by Juries of their peers under established forms of law.
4. Free elementary education for all; broad training in modern industrial technique; and higher training of selected talent.
5. The development of Africa for the benefit of Africans and not merely for the profit of Europeans.
6. The abolition of the slave trade and of the liquor traffic.
7. World disarmament and the abolition of war; but failing this and as long as white folk bear arms against black folk the right of blacks to bear arms in their own defence.
8. The organization of commerce and industry so as to make the main objects of capital and labour the welfare of the many, rather than the enriching of the few.

These seem to us the eight general and irreducible needs of our people.

Specially and in particular we ask for the civilized British subjects in WEST AFRICA and in the WEST INDIES the institution of home rule and responsible government, without discrimination as to race and color.

We ask for such areas as NORTHERN NIGERIA, UGANDA and BASUTOLAND, a development of native law, industry and education with the specific object of training them in home rule and economic independence, and for eventual participation in the general Government of the land.

We ask for FRENCH AFRICA the extension of the citizenship rights of voting and of representation in Parliament from Senegal and the West Indies to other parts of the colonies as rapidly as the present comprehensive plans of education can be realized.

We demand for KENYA, RHODESIA and the UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA the restoration of rights to the land to the natives, a recognition of their right to a voice in their own Government and the abolition of the pretension of a white minority to dominate a black majority, and even to prevent their appeal to the civilized world.

In the BELGIAN CANGO we fail yet to see any decisive change from a regime of profit making and exploitation to an attempt to build modern civilization among human beings for their own good and the good of the world. We demand a system of state education, the recognition of native law, a voice in Government and the curbing of commercial exploitation in that great land.

For the independent nations of ABYSSINIA, HAITI and LIBERIA we ask not merely political integrity but their emancipation from the grip of economic monopoly and usury at the hands of the money-masters of the world.

For the Negroes of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA we ask the suppression of lynching and mob-law, the end of caste and the recognition of full citizenship despite race and color.

We demand the restoration of the EGYPTIAN SUDAN to an independent Egypt.

We demand for PORTUGUESE AFRICA release from the slave-trading industrial monopolies financed in England and France which to-day nullify the liberal Portuguese Code in Mozambique.

We urge in BRAZIL AND CENTRAL AMERICA that peoples of African descent be no longer satisfied with a solution of the Negro problem which involves their absorption into another race without allowing Negroes as such full recognition of their manhood and right to be.

We ask the LEAGUE OF NATIONS to appoint direct diplomatic representatives in the Mandated territories with duties to investigate and report conditions.

We ask the appointment of representatives of the NEGRO race on the Mandates Commission and in the International Labor Bureau.

In fine, we ask in all the world that black folk be treated as men. We can see no other road to Peace and Progress. What more paradoxical figure to-day fronts the world than the official head of a great South African State striving blindly to build Peace and Good Will in Europe by standing on the necks and hearts of millions of black Africans?

For the Third Pan-African Congress,

(Mrs.) Ida Gibbs Hunt,

Rayford Logan,

W. E. B. Du Bois.

Committee.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

## THE AKALI MOVEMENT : WHAT IS ITS OBJECTIVE?

THE EDITOR, SERVANT OF INDIA, POONA.

SIR,—Not long ago some of our Congress leaders were anxious to make it clear that the objective of the Akali movement in the Punjab was not to establish a Sikh Raj but to help in the establishment of Swarajya. Although this view of the case was totally in variance with the opinions openly expressed in the public utterances of the Akali leaders during the past two years, not a few Congressmen were disposed to accept the explanation in the fervent hope that the Akali leaders would see the error of their ways and endeavour to turn a new leaf. It is clear as the noonday sun that no one in India is in favour of the re-establishment of Sikh Raj in any part of India. In the Punjab which may be said to be the homeland of Sikhs the very notion of the re-establishment of the Sikh Raj is sufficient to alarm the Hindus and Muhammadans who constitute the majority of the population of the province.

I have ventured to write this letter after reading the speech made by Sardar Mangal Singh at the Akali Diwan held at Coconada on the 30th December, 23. The following extract from the speech in question speaks for itself:—

"The Government for the fifth time have again come out with their last weapon to sacrifice us finally, and in their frenzy and fanaticism they have declared us unlawful and heretics as (? though) we were condemned criminals and damned felons. What I tell you, therefore, is that this policy of repression will not succeed with the Sikhs. It has failed in the past and it is bound to fail this time and we are determined to see that it fails. Government do not seem to have studied the Sikh history to its advantage. They do not know that this is not only the first time that we have been declared unlawful. We were declared unlawful at the very birth. Remember we laid open our gates to the late Government and we now push on with our movement to establish a Raj of our own in the Punjab."

Now no one can say that Sardar Mangal Singh is an irresponsible person. On the other hand it is well known that he is one of the recognised Akali leaders in the province. The Diwan where he made the speech referred to above was held in connection with the Congress, and it is also well-known that Sardar Mangal Singh was put in charge of the Akali gatherings held in Coconada during the Christmas week, by the Shiromani Gurdwara Prabandhak Committee. What he says cannot, therefore, be lightly dismissed as the ravings of an irresponsible agitator. It is the opinion of good many Nationalists that there should be a clear understanding with the Akalis as to the objective of the Akali movement before the Congress renders any further assistance to the Akalis. My personal opinion — which I know is shared by good many Nationalists is that the Akalis aim at nothing but the establishment of Sikh supremacy in the Punjab. And this is an objective which every patriotic Hindu or Muhammadan is bound to oppose and condemn.

Lahore. 20-1-24.

RAM LAL.

## Thoughtful Books.

	Rs.	s.
1. <b>The Buddha And His Doctrine.</b> By G. T. Strauss. A popular and lucid account of Gautama's life, teaching and philosophy. ... .. 2	14	
2. <b>The Mysticism of Sound.</b> By Inayat Khan. ... .. 3	4	
3. <b>The Gospel of the Holy Twelve.</b> An original and complete Gospel. New Edition, with introduction and notes by E. Francis Udny, M. A. ... .. 2	7	
4. <b>St. Francis of Assisi.</b> By G. K. Chesterton. ... .. 2	1	
5. <b>Beauty in Religion.</b> By A. Maude Royden. ... .. 2	14	

**The Theosophical Publishing House,**  
**Adyar. Madras.**

INDIAN BOOK SHOP

George Town, Madras.

Revised and brought up-to-date.

## THE Indian Administration.

FIFTH EDITION

BY

Prof. V. G. KALE, M. A.

*Professor, Fergusson College, Poona,  
Member, Tariff Board.*

This, the Fifth Edition, is thoroughly revised and brought up-to-date. In preparing this Edition, the Author has rearranged and expanded his exposition of the constitutional and administrative changes, inaugurated by the Reforms Act of 1919. The developments in the Indian Government, have been dealt with chronologically and logically and an effort has been made to bring out prominently, the peculiarities of the new organisation and to give an insight into the working of the Central, Provincial and Local Administration. As the economic, social and political bearings of various administrative problems have been instructively dealt with in the book University students will find the present edition a very helpful guide in his studies. To the general reader, the present edition will be very useful, as it gives full information regarding the Government, he has to influence.

Price Rs. FOUR. (Postage Extra.)

Copies can be had of:—

(i) THE MANAGER, ARYABHUSHAN PRESS,  
POONA CITY.

(ii) ALL PRINCIPAL BOOK SELLERS  
of leading Cities and Towns in India.

**F**OR terms of Advertisement, please apply to the Manager, SERVANT OF INDIA, Kibe Wada, Bhudhwar Peth, POONA CITY.

## 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*—W. Burrige, M. A., M.B., B.Ch., L.M.S., S.A., and N. K. Siddhanta, 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—

M. B. REHMAN,

LUCKNOW UNIVERSITY,  
LUCKNOW.

*Business Manager,*  
Lucknow University Journal.

LUCKNOW: UPPER INDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, Ltd., 41, Aminabad Park.

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

## 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

## CUT ME OUT

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

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

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

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

## 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.