

THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE

Office: BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. VIII, No. 42. }

POONA—THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1925.

INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN SUBSN. 10 s.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	491
ARTICLES :—	
Peace, Justice and England	493
“A New Opium Policy for India”. By P. Kodanda Rao	1
Private Enterprise and Private Property. By Dr. H. C. E. Zacharias	495
REVIEW :—	
The Hero as Journalist. Professor R. Sadasiva Aiyar	497
MISCELLANEOUS :—	
An Indian Sandhurst.—Deccan Sabha's Memorandum	499

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

Obstruction or Co-operation ?

THE dispute between the pro-change and no-change sections in the Swaraj party shows no sign of being composed in the near future. In fact it is daily gathering volume and intensity. We regard this phenomenon with unfeigned delight for the simple reason that now at last there is a chance of the Swarajist policy being exactly defined. We have long felt that if only non-co-operation or obstruction were consistently practised on a large enough scale by a section of public opinion, the country would soon be fed up with it and would demand a change of policy. But the trouble has been that these policies have not been put into effect; that co-operation has often been followed under the guise of non-co-operation and obstruction, with the result that the public is much too indulgent to this kind of non-co-operation. Messrs. Kelkar and Jayakar have, however, now made it necessary for Pandit Motilal Nehru either to adopt the title of responsive co-operation as he has already adopted that policy or else to enforce obstruction, if he persists in calling the Swarajist policy by that name. It is for Pandit Nehru to make the choice. He may leave aside his prestige and frankly declare himself to be a convert to co-operation. If he does so, he will by that single act abolish all factitious differences between Liberals and Independents on the one hand and the Swarajists on the other. Unity will then reign supreme, and the object of the numerous Unity Conferences held in the past will be achieved in a trice. If, however, he gives greater weight to party pique than to national solidarity, he will not only maintain the present cleavages but he will in addition see his own party rent in twain from end to end. However it will not do then merely to do lip service to obstruction: he must then follow this policy, consistently and continuously and uniformly, to the exclusion of all other poli-

cies. He must go back on all the jack-o'-lantern changes which he has caused to be made in the rules governing the conduct of members. Indeed, it will not be enough to undo those changes; he will have to stiffen the original rules and make it an immutable condition of membership that no Swarajist can on any account actively support or passively acquiesce in any measure emanating from Government, or accept any post, whether honorary or salaried, elective or appointive. The policy of obstruction, if honestly pursued, has no terrors for us; it will soon teach those who follow it a lesson at the hands of the electorate. What we dread most, as likely to deceive the electors, is co-operation sailing under false colours. Messrs. Kelkar and Jayakar have made the continuance of this deception no longer possible. They deserve great credit for the service they have done to the public life of this country.

* * *

Even those who are advocating a change in the Swaraj party's policy from obstruction to responsive co-operation—are often seen to argue that the immediate acceptance of Ministerships is out of the question. The reason for it, according to them, is their plighted word to the electors. They pledged themselves to non-acceptance of office and could not therefore assume responsibility for any portfolio in provincial governments without laying themselves open to a charge of breach of confidence. We appreciate the full force of this reasoning, but we would point out that it proves either too much or too little. At the last general election the Swarajists did not lay any clear-cut programme before the electorate. Their policy, as they propounded it to the voters, was so vague that they need not regard themselves as bound to any particular policy. If, however, they should choose so to consider themselves, they must admit that they were committed as well to obstruction as to non-acceptance of office, which is only one aspect of obstruction. But, on their own showing, they have changed obstruction into responsive co-operation, all but in name, and in doing so they have already been guilty of breach of promise to the electorate. For instance, the Swaraj party had definitely committed itself, in provinces, where its members were in an absolute majority on legislative bodies, to reject all demands for budgetary grants. The party obtained a majority only in the Central Provinces and therefore it should have been easy enough to act up to their promises to the electorate. But did the Swarajists do so? Did they not, on the contrary, pick and choose, passing demands for nation-building departments and throwing out those for others? It must not therefore be assumed, as even Messrs. Kelkar and Jayakar seem to do, that by accepting Ministers' office the Swaraj party will commit an offence from which it has kept itself free so far. If the Swaraj party never gave as much as a thought to the electorate when by their very rules they changed their policy from uniform obstruction to responsive co-operation, why

Changing Programmes.

should they now boggle at the acceptance of Ministerships, which is only putting a crown on the policy they are already pursuing? Messrs. Kelkar and Jayakar must realise that they are on the horns of a dilemma: if they regard non-acceptance of office as a mandate from the electorate which they are pledged to carry out, they must regard obstructionism also as a mandate. Otherwise acceptance of Ministerships is just as open to them as the adoption of responsive co-operation.

* * *

PANDIT MOTILAL NEHRU is hitting out, right and left, against Messrs.

Whose breach of the understanding?

Kelkar and Jayakar in his campaign in Berars, which will only help to widen the gulf between the two factions. Messrs. Kelkar and Jayakar resigned their seats on the Executive Council of the Swaraj party and opened a crusade against the Pandit on the ground that the latter had violated the understanding between them. It would seem, however, that if the facts be as they are narrated by the Pandit, there was no breach of understanding on the Pandit's part, but clearly on that of Messrs. Kelkar and Jayakar. For, according to the version of Pandit Motilal, the understanding was frankly unilateral, the responsive co-operationists undertaking not "to express publicly or advocate or carry on any public propaganda against the principles or programme of the party" and not to "criticise or attack on the platform or through the Press the action of the Executive or of the Leader of the Party," but the Executive or the Leader of the party being at perfect liberty to criticise or attack responsive co-operationists, or carry on a propaganda against the latter's policy. All that the Executive Council agreed to do in return for Messrs. Kelkar and Jayakar entering into such a one-sided compact is that the Executive graciously waived its right to take disciplinary action against them, for which the Executive thought they had let themselves in. It is hard to believe that such astute politicians as Messrs. Kelkar and Jayakar would have been parties to this kind of understanding, but it is most amazing that Mr. Jayakar, who has attempted an explanation, makes an ostentatious disavowal of his desire to challenge the accuracy of the Pandit's statement. Perhaps Messrs. Kelkar and Jayakar merely took this occasion to open their campaign, though "the breach of understanding" was not precisely the reason that compelled them to do so.

* * *

LALA LAJPAT RAI'S entry into the Legislative Assembly is an event of the best augury for the future of constitutionalism in this country. The advantage the country will derive therefrom is not to be measured merely by the replacement of the most silent member of the Assembly by a hero of a hundred platforms, one who has played a conspicuous part in leading the movements of social, religious, educational and political reform in the Punjab. In the existing conditions the advent of Lala Lajpat Rai will be of particular value in countering the policy of obstructionism, should Pandit Motilal Nehru be tempted to pursue it again in the Assembly. Messrs. Jinnah and Malaviya and Bipin Pal have no doubt succeeded in holding the policy of consistent and continuous obstruction in check so much so that, on no less testimony than that of Messrs. Jayakar and Kelkar, the policy has completely disappeared from the Assembly. But the public have occasionally felt a doubt whether a stronger policy, one of more outspoken opposition would not be more conducive to the good of the country.

Now, however, when Lala Lajpat Rai refuses to follow Pandit Nehru into the Opposition lobby, the public will feel sure that it is an occasion when even the most courageous and unselfish patriot can with a clear conscience support Government. There will thus be provided a touchstone so to speak, by which members' actions may be judged, and we are sure the constitutionalists will feel it a great relief to have some one in the Assembly whose purity of motive is beyond cavil and who will yet set his face against opposition merely for opposition's sake. Again, the Labour Party in the Assembly, which is none too strong, will derive much accession of strength from Lala Lajpat Rai. It is now common knowledge that Pandit Motilal Nehru has used his best efforts to weaken this Party by seducing some of its prominent members to support the capitalist cause which he espouses. To this party Lala Lajpat Rai will be a tower of strength. We congratulate the Assembly on this addition.

* * *

WE find that the Indian Sandhurst Unnecessary Secrecy Committee has aroused more than ordinary interest in the public, who have sent in quite a large number of memoranda on the question which forms the subject of inquiry. The Committee, it would appear, has a variety of witnesses in view, British Indian subjects, subjects of native States, princes, army officers, college and University authorities, and so forth, and has addressed different questionnaires to the different classes of witnesses. So far so good, but we cannot understand why these questionnaires should be treated as confidential, as we understand they are. For instance, why should the questions which Indian States' rulers or subjects are requested to answer be kept secret from public bodies in British India? It is possible that the replies which the former may submit may contain something which is meant for the information of the Committee alone, but is there any reason why the questions cannot be made public property? British Indian subjects may indeed happen to be *au fait* with the problems which the Committee has made the close preserve of the Indian princes, and an Indian State subject may be quite at home in questions intended for British India. The supply of these questionnaires to those for whom they were not intended by the Committee has, we are told, actually been refused, and we should be glad of an explanation from the authorities as to why this unnecessary secrecy has been observed. We should have expected the leader of the Swarajist party, who finds a place on the Committee, to have at least secured this much, that the Committee will throw open its inquiry to all and sundry, but even in this he has failed. Another matter in connexion with the Committee which requires justification is the proposal to send a part of the Committee overseas. It appears to us a sheer waste of money for any members of the Committee to undertake a visit to Sandhurst, Duntroon, Kingston, West Point, and so forth. All the information the Committee may need in regard to Military Colleges in foreign countries can be obtained by post, if it is not already in the possession of the Army Department. The partiality which the present members of the Legislative Assembly, some of whom at least are wedded to obstruction, show for this proposed joy-ride of the Indian Sandhurst Committee seems to us altogether inexplicable, particularly when we remember that the first Assembly, none of whom belonged to the obstructionist persuasion, threw out the demand for a grant for the expense of the Lytton Committee which was engaged on the very useful task of inquiring into the needs and grievances of Indian students abroad.

* * *

PEACE, JUSTICE AND ENGLAND.

FURTHER details, both from Locarno and from Geneva, are now available: but none of them make us revise the first impression which the Sixth Assembly and the Locarno Pact gave us and to which we gave expression in our issue of October 22nd. Every writer is agreed that Mr. Chamberlain did not carry any conviction at Geneva nor even made a favourable impression. The MacDonald—Herriot *Protocol* of the Fifth Assembly still held the field and the Sixth Assembly merely acquiesced in postponing its reconsideration until the holding of the Seventh Assembly, because it understood that further discussion now might prejudice the success of the negotiations at Locarno which were then looming ahead. Obviously the *Pact*, if to be reconsidered, would best be reconsidered, when Germany was a member of the League, if for that propitious event there was any chance at all. So the Assembly held its hand and said nothing—but it thought a lot.

And its thoughts clearly were, that the leadership of the League has passed entirely to France—from England. We have already pointed out this fact, but it is so momentous a one that we cannot refer to it too often. The French Premier came to Geneva, the English Premier sulkily stayed in a near-by watering place. The French delegation was brilliant and included all shades of progressive opinion: the British contained nobody of note, except Mr. Chamberlain, and they too of a strictly one party complexion. France proposed a big Economic Conference, modelled on the famous Financial Conference of Brussels in 1921: England turned it down. France supported Dr. Nansen's scheme for settling Armenian refugees in their own country, though a Soviet Republic: England turned it down. "All along the line", says Mr. H. W. Wilson in this month's *Contemporary*, "the British felt it necessary to make serious criticisms, mostly in deprecation of any extension of the League's activities, which contrasted pointedly with the progressive line regularly adopted at every point by the French."

But, it will be said, after all, the British were right: they have pulled off Locarno. Yes—but why? Because it suited the French. Now we do not wish to be unkind, but really it is no use beating about the bush either: there are two main reasons, and two only, which have prompted France not merely to accept, but to welcome, Locarno—and these two reasons are called respectively "Morocco" and "Syria." Of the magnitude of the Moroccan effort most people, even in this country, are now aware: that the revolt in Syria calls for an even greater effort, is not yet public property. Yet so it is: and what makes Syria far, far worse for France than Morocco, is the fact that Syria is held under a mandate. With Abd el Karim, after all, France can compromise; she can save her face by saying that she always meant to recognize the independence of the Riff and that dear Abd el Karim merely misunderstood her. France can withdraw

from the Riff: she cannot withdraw from Syria, unless she admits to the League that she is incapable of upholding the League's mandate there and that the League had better appoint a stronger and more competent mandatory. Is it conceivable that France at any time could say any such thing—not in the dim *couloirs* of chancelleries, but in the fierce international light that beats down upon every Genevan scene? But if France has to enter into this vast struggle in Syria, she certainly cannot afford to keep her rear uncovered at her very doors, on the Rhine. More even than funds, she needs for her Syrian commitments a genuine *entente* with Germany. This Locarno has given her and it would be foolish to belittle the achievement. But truth really compels one to emphasize, above the paeans sung to Mr. Chamberlain, that the merit of the *Pact* is due in the first instance to Mr. Stresemann and in the second to Mr. Briand: Mr. Chamberlain was the officiating priest who blessed the new union, but it is the contracting parties at a marriage, after all, who are the principal persons on that occasion, not the priest.

As for the *Pact* itself, it is right enough, as far as it goes. But what about the things that ought to go with it? Cologne is to be evacuated on the 1st prox.: well and good—but what about the other parts of occupied Germany? Is this occupation to continue until 1935 as per the letter of the Versailles Treaty and if so, why—if the "Locarno Spirit" of equality of nations in Central Europe is a reality? What about those shameful and absurd limitations of the German aviation industry? Junker dominates the aerial traffic of all Europe already, though he is not allowed to have his factories within the *Reich*. Worst of all, what about Austria's union with Germany? Mussolini at the close of Locarno brusquely told an interviewer on that point: "Never." Very well—but it is futile to think of a contented Germany, as long as that *never* runs. The accession of the Austrian Catholic peasant population to the *Reich* will alone provide the necessary antidote to Prussian junkerdom; a *Reich* of all Germans alone will permanently make them forget their pre-war state of glory under the Hohenzollerns. With an artificially cribbed and cabined and mutilated Germany, there never will be peace in Europe, because there will lack the basic ingredient of any true peace—justice. And it is this which brings one back to the present British attitude: for a peace based on justice after all implies also compulsory League jurisdiction. But against this Britain sets her face like a flint. Not only with Switzerland, but even with Sweden, she has quite lately refused to enter into a compulsory arbitration treaty (such as France has concluded): and all, just because she insists that, in the last instance, the British Navy is to be used, not as justice, but as England herself, dictates. It is well, if Locarno should have exorcised the demon of French militarism: but alas, no beginning even has yet been made to cast out the devil of British navalism.

"A NEW OPIUM POLICY FOR INDIA."

MR. C. F. ANDREWS in his "New Opium Policy for India" (see the SERVANT OF INDIA of the 3rd September) observes with reference to the consumption in India that "there are very serious black spots in different places but that the main portion of the agricultural districts does not suffer from any serious opium addiction." It is gratifying to have an assurance from Mr. Andrews that the situation is not quite so alarming as some of his previous statements on the subject might lead the average reader to believe regarding the extent of the evil or of the share of the Government in promoting it.

Mr. Andrews agrees with—of all people—Sir John Campbell that "a Dangerous Drugs Act for the whole of agricultural India would scarcely be practicable in the present circumstances." He goes further and says that "outside these areas (black spots) there need be no Dangerous Drugs Act at all." He would confine such an Act to the "black spots" only. He also advocates that there should be "a gradual reduction of the opium offered for sale in all areas where excess is shown above the Opium Conference index figure of 6 seers per ten thousand, until it comes below that actual figure." Let us examine these proposals in some detail.

In the League of Nations India was stranded in a position of very unenviable isolation by her inability to agree that the use of opium for other than "medical and scientific" purposes in India was illegitimate. This reservation drew on Sir John Campbell some of the fiercest criticism from opium reformers, and among them from Mr. Andrews himself. Surprisingly enough his present proposals do not render the reservation superfluous; for in areas not affected by the Dangerous Drugs Act, it is his intention to permit opium consumption without medical prescription. In fact he rejects the League's definition of *legitimate* and adopts that of the Government of India—the quantitative and statistical. The Government too wish to restrict consumption to "legitimate needs" and they think consumption to be legitimate as long as it does not exceed 1,20,000 lbs. per annum for the whole of British India. Mr. Andrews is also driven to accept the same principle irrespective of how and by whom the opium is consumed, provided a certain rate of consumption is not exceeded, to wit, the index figure of the League of Nations. His proposals will not put India right with the League.

The "black spots" enumerated by Mr. Andrews, in which he advocates a Dangerous Drugs Act, consist of "municipal areas of large cities" and, to a much larger extent, of rural areas, whole districts and provinces. The municipal areas possess qualified medical practitioners, druggists and dispensaries, but the rural areas have but few such facilities. Mr. Andrews does not say how the Act is to be worked in such areas, particularly if only allopathic doctors and druggists are to be considered qualified to administer opium. It seems impracticable to make the

rate of consumption the criterion for enforcing a Dangerous Drugs Act. It would perhaps be better to adopt the suggestion which this writer ventured to throw out in his paper on "Opium consumption in India" read before the South Indian Social Workers' Conference in Coimbatore in January last; and that is that "opium shops should be closed in all areas where free dispensaries under allopathic doctors exist." Here the criterion for the application of the Act is the existence of a dispensary and not the rate of opium consumption. Even if the latter falls below the index figure of the League, there is no reason why a person should be allowed access to opium when a qualified medical practitioner is available in the neighbourhood, say, within five miles. The area subject to the Dangerous Drugs Act should be co-extensive with the area in which medical facilities exist for its effective operation. In areas without such facilities consumption should be checked by rationing it down gradually.

Mr. Andrews does not say here if he proposes to include the v aids and hakims as competent to administer opium under the Drugs Act. If they are excluded, it will be a great grievance to the indigenous medical practitioners who are now-a-days very sensitive and command the sympathy of the Indian politician. There will be a first rate agitation. If they are included in some places, viz. the black spots, there is no reason why they should be excluded in other areas. In fact all of them might be included. And that would incidentally enable India to declare that the use of opium without medical prescription is illegitimate and bring her into line with the other nations in the League. And that is no small advantage.

Even this alternative is not without serious defects. The opium reformer cannot repose as much confidence in the indigenous practitioner as in the allopathic one regarding the use of opium. There is, however, something to be said for the view that to-day the indigenous medical man is treating medical cases of the most serious kind, involving greater risk than the administering of opium. To-day he is administering opium too.

If it is not proposed to prohibit him from treating all kinds of medical cases, he can be allowed to administer opium also. From a larger point of view the country's interests will not be served by ignoring the indigenous v aids and hakims but by taking them in hand, organising them and improving their knowledge and practice. From the point of view of opium also, it is easier any day to educate the comparatively fewer, more educated and intelligent v aids and hakims than the general mass of opium consumers about the proper use of opium. One method of such education is to enclose every packet of opium in a wrapper which has printed on it the opinions of the leading allopathic, ayurvedic and unani medical practitioners on the use and abuse of opium. In spite of its initial difficulty and inefficiency, it is more advisable to enact a Dangerous Drugs Act for the whole of India, and registering v aids and hakims also as competent to prescribe

opium, rather than have the scope of the Act confined only to the "black spots." Only it has to be remembered that strenuous efforts have to be made to educate the vaidas and hakims as to the proper use of opium before any good results can be expected.

There might be some difficulty in isolating the "black spots" for the purposes of the Drugs Act, as implied in Mr. Andrews' proposals. If the Act is applied to a municipal area, shops may be opened just outside the municipal limits. It will be necessary to prohibit opium shops within an area of, say, five miles from the municipal limits. Distance may act as a deterrent to some extent. The larger the area that comes under the operation of the Act the more efficient will it be; for it is only the border villages that can evade the Act.

The policy of the gradual rationing down of opium to the index figure of the League is admirable. It must be remembered, however, that the League's figure takes into account only the strict medical—as practised by allopaths—and scientific use of opium, and makes no allowance for mere addicts. It will be necessary to register the confirmed addicts and estimate separately their requirements. It will be necessary and advisable to consult the leading vaidas and hakims as to the requirements of their profession before rationing down is adopted. There can be no doubt that a good number of the inferior class of medical practitioners will profiteer by the monopoly, and it would be no easy matter to fix the ration for each registered practitioner. The evil can only be minimised by graduating the reduction of opium in such a way that it shall not outstrip the drop in the demand from medical practitioners consequent on their education in the proper use of opium. And that will be a rather slow process.

It will be noticed that no policy is without serious defects. And each of them can and will be defeated to some extent by smuggling. Even with the present policy of the Government of India Mr. Andrews finds that "Rajputana opium has been one of the greatest curses even in a country so far distant as Upper Assam," and apprehends that "the smuggling that is taking place must be enormous." All of which only proves that it is not entirely the fault of the Government of India that all the radical projects of opium reformers are not practicable and efficient in the immediate future. Mr. Andrews' new policy, though neither radical nor free from defects, is certainly an improvement on the present situation. If the criticisms and suggestions contained in this paper could be of any the slightest use to Mr. Andrews in revising his proposals, the writer will be more than amply rewarded.

P. KODANDA RAO.

LIBERALISM, SOCIALISM, AND CATHOLICISM.

VI. PRIVATE ENTERPRISE AND PRIVATE PROPERTY.

IN the last two sections of this series the wage system has been considered, both in itself and in its re-

lationship to other labour systems: but the underlying question, with which it is bound up, has so far not yet been treated—viz. whether the corollary principles of private enterprise and private property on their part are morally admissible. Now production of goods, as we have already seen, depends on a combination of natural resources, human labour and capital: but this combination does not take place spontaneously, it needs a man with certain qualities of leadership to effect it, and this person is the *entrepreneur* through whose intervention alone the prospective enterprise is called into existence. This person therefore fulfils a function, which so far from being evil, is good and even necessary; and indeed the type of a Merchant Adventurer, who charters a ship to sail unknown seas and barter the produce of his own against those of foreign lands, or that of a captain of industry who, realizing the value of an invention, stakes his own fortune on it and wins a bigger one not only for himself but for his friends also whom he has persuaded to associate themselves with him in this venture: such types, I say, do not lack attractiveness and, if higher forms of human endeavour are conceivable, it yet does not follow that this form is illegitimate. On the contrary, the enterprise required to call a productive organisation into existence is needed again and again to carry it on, to keep all the component parts together, to steer the enterprise through difficulties, to make decisions and ever fresh ventures on the strength of one's judgment.

It really seems therefore wilful blindness to deny a place, a quite legitimate place, to private enterprise. Public enterprise—i. e. enterprise for public service—no doubt is an even higher activity than private enterprise, the enterprise caused by hope of private gain: but this fact does not negate the legitimacy itself of private enterprise, nor of private gain, for the matter of that. For "profit" is the reward of enterprise as such: labour gets its wage, management its salary, capital its interest—and the *entrepreneur* the profits, if there be any, or else he has to stand the loss. For like all venturing, to be enterprising entails the taking of risks; it is therefore a precarious way of gaining a livelihood, and while on the one hand it will appeal to the gambling instinct in man, it yet demands a considerable fund of admirable qualities too, such as pluck, foresight, organisatory talent: and therefore quite deserves to be rewarded. Besides, it must not be forgotten that even in this form of human activity the consent of others is needed: for unless he can get people to trust his judgment, he will not get together the capital, and perhaps not even the labour, necessary for his enterprise. Mr. Penty indeed goes so far as to say (III, 143) that "if private management were entirely to disappear I cannot help feeling that initiative would disappear with it."

The fact is, as Fr. Coulet (II, 136) clearly puts it, that "since labour, after the fall, has assumed the character of a penalty, man does not resign

himself to it ordinarily, especially when the toil is hard and prolonged, unless driven to it by necessity or self-interest. Take away from him the hope of being able to appropriate, to keep and to transmit to his children the fruit of his labour, and at once you will take away from him also the desire to work." So far Liberalism was in the right, when it stressed the legitimacy of private enterprise, of profits and of the self-interest on which both so largely depend. But Catholicism is unable to look complacently on the clash of rival egoisms resulting from such self-interest, once the latter is left without restraints, to take care of itself. Competition the Church does not condemn; on the contrary she recognizes in it a powerful means for prodding sluggards to greater exertion, for sharpening their wits and eliciting enterprise and initiative in general. But she nowhere ceases to proclaim that avarice and covetousness are two of the seven deadly sins, though sloth is to be sure one too. Competition therefore must never degenerate from a form of emulation, of wanting to excel, to a form of warfare, of wanting to injure or destroy a competitor. The whole of that commercial ideology of "capturing markets", of "squeezing out" rivals, of creating demands by tricks of a scientific "salesmanship", of making "corners", all of which Socialism so scathingly has held up to the only too deserved opprobrium of our age—all of this falls under the equally uncompromising condemnation of the Church. Indeed there is so little left of the Victorian Liberalism, which expected this universal competition to bring about an economic millennium, that the danger today is perhaps rather that of overlooking the legitimacy of competition in itself. As Bernard Shaw once said, the trouble about private enterprise is that it has ceased to be either private or enterprising: free competition indeed having led to the gradual disappearance of all competition. If the self-interest of A demands that he should sell cheaper than B so as to get all the customers, a very small dose of "enlightenment" suffices to make A and B see that their self-interest really demands that they should combine so as to fleece their customers all the more unrestrainedly. And so we are reaching today a stage when Combines and Trusts and *Cartels* and *Interessen-Gemeinschaften* (lit. communities of interests) are eliminating all competition: the amalgamated producers decide at what price their produce is to be marketed and the middleman is reduced to the rôle of an employee.

But if competition is eliminated, why maintain private profits? Whatever may be said for the advantages of private enterprise and free competition—once the State e. g. parcels out its different provinces amongst different railway companies, as France has done and India too: what advantage is there in such a railway monopoly in private hands over one in the hands of the public, i. e. the nation? In this respect Marx was quite in the right when he said that trustification would lead to nationalization. Once there is no more enterprise left, it is indeed difficult to see why it should go on being rewarded: on the

contrary, it seems almost immoral to do so. Catholicism therefore welcomes nationalization where it has become inevitable. In all countries, Posts and Telegraphs are already so nationalized, in a good many countries railways too are. In England the coal mines seem on the verge of having to be nationalized—not because anybody is enamoured of the prospect, but because there seems no alternative. Similarly electric power stations may soon become a national concern and there is no reason, why the list should close there. But what Catholicism says is that it does not follow that therefore all means of production should be nationalized, as Marx pretends is the case; nor that it is in any way desirable that all private enterprise should thus be made impossible. On the contrary, whilst on the one hand private enterprise, where it has—like a good teacher—made itself superfluous, ought to be succeeded by a form of industrial activity, which has no further need of an *entrepreneur*, which form may be that of a government or municipal department or of a guild or of a public corporation created *ad hoc*: so on the other hand there seems an urgent need to maintain the system of private enterprise, in order to make possible the initiative necessary for launching out on new undertakings, the functioning of which is so notoriously made difficult by any bureaucracy. But what people do not seem to realize is that there is as much bureaucracy inside a big railway company, let us say, as there is in a department of national railways and that "enterprise" is not a necessary concomitant of private ownership. "No one who has ever worked inside a large commercial organization," says Mr. Penty (III, 147), "will deny that success goes to the bolder, to the man who studies the game rather than the work: and for these evils nationalisation is no remedy." Still, in public concerns there does obtain a public scrutiny which is altogether lacking in private ones; and mistakes and negligences are not apt to be allowed a quiet funeral in Profit and Loss Accounts or in bankruptcy courts.

Nationalization therefore is in such cases the preferable alternative; and *a fortiori* State ownership and State management of industries, if not of all industry, are perfectly legitimate. The teaching of the Church, unlike Liberalism, neither abhors the State nor does she allow private enterprise to be turned into a fetish, an end in itself. Against Socialism however the Catholic insists that private property, as well as private enterprise, are perfectly legitimate. The one indeed follows from the other and *mutatis mutandis* private property derives its defence from the same reasoning that we have seen to apply to private enterprise. But if anything, the safeguarding of private property is perhaps even more necessary and fundamental than that of private enterprise: for very little reflection will show that the abolition of private property in every form would concentrate such colossal power in the hands of the collectivist authority, as to reduce the self-determinatory possibilities of the individual to a vanishing point. For, as Fr. Fallon says, "every activity, even of a spiritual order, expresses itself in the use

or consumption of material goods" (I, 148), all of which *ex hypothesi* would be vested in the Socialist State.

The Church therefore from the first has strenuously opposed Socialism on this point and the antagonism of the two rival systems of thought have nowhere perhaps clashed so fiercely and uncompromisingly. The "nationalization of women" of course is a grotesque caricature of Socialism: yet what makes that illustration so popular is that it expresses, more tellingly than any other could, man's abhorrence of an omnipotent and ubiquitous authority meddling in the most private affairs of the individual. But if Catholicism objects *in toto* to "the Servile State," it yet defines private property (in terms of Roman jurisprudence) as "the right to use, enjoy and dispose of things to the exclusion of others, within the limits of the law." (I, 171). Whilst therefore it is inflexible in maintaining the justice of the right whereby "others may be excluded," it yet restrains that right of the individual by admitting that "the others" may exact legal limitations of it. Property therefore is not merely a concomitant of function, as modern Socialists are fond of imagining: yet it is true to say that even private property is but a means to a human end; that it therefore must never be turned into an end in itself and that it does not imply an absolute right, sacrosanct and inviolable, as the Liberal adage, that a man may do what he lists with his own, pretends. As the old Roman law already acknowledged, a starving person for instance taking food belonging to another person to preserve himself from dying does not commit theft*: and it is curious that such a humane and sensible interpretation of the rights of property never obtained in English law—with the result that until a little over a hundred years ago a starving child could be and was sent to the gallows for having taken a loaf out of a baker's shop to still its hunger. The latter is the mentality of Liberalism which still pretends that the rights of property rank before all others; that the heavens may fall in, but that even an iota must not be abated from these "rights".

But then the Catholic Church has never exalted private property and possessions into the place which Protestant contempt for the vow of poverty had insensibly prepared for it during the course of the centuries. Calvin hesitatingly initiated the ever since growing prejudice, not only against the vow of poverty, but against poverty in general, but in the end the Victorian age really came to look upon poverty as a crime and punished it in its infamous "Poor Laws." Against this Catholicism has always maintained with S. Thomas Aquinas that "Those who wish to live virtuously need to avoid abundance of riches and beggary inasfar as these are occasions of sin" (Summa, III, 40, 3, ad 1), as also in his Proverbs Solomon (30, 8) prays: "Give me not riches

* "It is not theft, properly speaking, to take secretly and use another's property in a case of extreme need: because that which a man takes for the support of his life becomes his own property by reason of that need". (2a 2ae, 67, ad 2).

nor penury, but appoint me what is needful and sufficient"; but that "this precept of the Divine law: 'There shall be no poor or beggar among you' does not forbid anyone to beg, but it forbids the rich to be so stingy that some are compelled by necessity to beg" (2ae 2ae 187, 5 ad 3): for as he says, "A man may feed and clothe himself in conformity with others, not only by possessing riches, but also, by receiving the necessaries of life from those who are rich." (III, 40, 3 ad 2.)

Property has got rights, to be sure—but it has got plenty of duties too; nor are they of a nature to be capable of being transferred to a "Charity Organization Society". From the same Catholic principle spring the sumptuary laws, which set to luxury, ostentatiousness and waste a *ne plus ultra*: laws, the obsolescence of which probably has done more to foster the modern bitterness of class antagonism than anything else. These duties of property, mentioned by me, are those of consumption: if I have not spoken of those of production, it is because I have already in previous sections written at length about the legitimacy of the State regulating and supervising the treatment of Labour by Capital; as a consequence of which Catholicism, though defending the legitimacy of private enterprise, which Socialism denies, with Socialism and against Liberalism defends by State interference in private enterprise the curtailment of ownership rights when exercised in such a way as to render the freedom of the wage contract nugatory or to make it impossible for the wage-earner to lead—whether in his workshop, his family or his country—a fully human and truly Christian life.

But justly limited as the rights of property may be, the right itself must not be whittled away, whether the right of private property be that of turning it to profit, or that of passing it on to heirs or even that of lending it out against interest. This last point I shall proceed to treat in a separate section; the present one I would conclude by saying that both as regards private enterprise and private property the liberty of the individual must neither be excluded in the fancied interest of that of the community (Socialism); nor may that of the community be in that of the individual (Liberalism): the truth rather lying in the putting both individualism and collectivism into their proper places and balancing them one against the other in the harmonious whole of a Catholic *Weltanschauung*.

H. C. E. ZACHARIAS.

REVIEWS.

THE HERO AS JOURNALIST.

H. W. M.: A SELECTION FROM THE WRITINGS OF H. W. MASSINGHAM. By H. J. MASSINGHAM. (Jonathan Cape, Ltd., London.) 1925. 9 x 6. pp. 368. 12s. 6d.

THE average newspaper, not to speak of the crime-soaked yellow press, flourishes by delivering brawling judgments on all things all day long, echoes the

catchwords of the hour, and speaks in a medley of voices, which seldom emanate from steadily humane principles. For a newspaper must live, and to live it must please, and it can only please, says Lord Morley in a sentence as sad as profoundly true, by being very cheerful towards prejudices, very chilly towards theories, and loftily disdainful to the men of principle. Far from being a Temple of Justice, journalism is often a Cave of All the Winds. But from among the ruck of ephemeral literature, like luminous peaks rise a few that live not by exploiting sensation, by catching the eye and tickling the ear of the public but by essaying to reveal underlying truths, by endeavouring to minimize human misery. The editor of any such paper or journal deserves in himself to be called the Fourth Estate of the Realm. Easily the greatest of such journalists in recent years passed away last year in the person of H. W. Massingham, whom the volume under review commemorates by a symposium of tributes by veteran writers and publicists (like G. B. S., Brailsford, H. W. Nevinson, and H. M. Tomlinson)—tributes prefacing an anthology of H. W. M.'s articles covering the most diverse topics bespeaking his amazing versatility. Commencing journalism in his teens, in the early 'eighties, Massingham spanned in his journalistic career well-nigh half a century—a sky inlaid with patinés of bright gold.

Fired with a burning passion for humanity, he found scope for his ardour for humane causes in the newspaper. In those asphyxiating 'eighties when Labour had not even glimpsed the Promised Land, when at the helm of the *Star*, Massingham advocated the restoration of the English country side through the extension of small holdings and the creation of Parish Councils; the taxation of land values; the opening of Parliament to manual workers through adult suffrage and the payment of members and returning officers' expenses; the realization of democracy by means of progressive education and the leisure which a legal Eight Hours Day would secure; furtherance of municipal enterprise; the taxation of idlers by graduated income-tax and death-duties; and old age pensions. Later, as editor of the *Daily Chronicle* he heartened and steadied the new-born Trade Unions, backed and inspirited the miners in their grim, victorious struggle through the summer and autumn of 1893, and pressed on factory and mining legislation, exposed the conditions in dangerous trades and the living-in system that obtained then in shops, and crushed Liberal opposition when Mr. Joseph Chamberlain launched his Workmen's Compensation Act. From first to last the lodestar by which he steered his bark was the ideal of a humane democracy, inasmuch the Massingham of 1918 was in essence the full-blown flower and fruit of the Massingham of the *Star*. He began with sympathy for the sweated worker and horror at the bestiality of slums; and he ended—the conviction that Capitalistic direction smothers the personality of the worker gaining strength—by formally abandoning the Liberal ranks and joining the Labour Party in 1923. The programme he advocated at the elections of 1918 was therefore the consummation of schemes he had espoused earlier—schemes then necessarily rudimentary. In *International Politics*, he upheld universal disarmament, with no conscription, open diplomacy, and a standing Council of Nations, interpreting an international Labour Code and acting as permanent custodian of peace. In *Home Politics*, the national control of the land and its supporting industries of mines, transport, and electrical power—the last change rendering feasible a six-hour work-

ing day. "A great educational programme to follow on the nationalization of leisure." This would in turn bring about an equality of opportunity; which would in its turn result in toning up the calibre and character of Labour and open to it the direction of Capital; so would the status and reward of Labour rise. In *Finance* he declared for the Capital Levy. The ideal that inspired the 'platform' was the eventual accomplishment of equality, the self-respect and welfare of the poor man, the making for a broader citizenship—all together constituting the bedrock of the democratic State.

With steady and true penetration Massingham perceived the respective weakness of the two parties, the Liberal and the Labour. The former, he called a "manufacturers' party", blind to the flaming scandals of industrialism, reconciled to the cruel anti-national treatment of the miners, and conservative in its thinking. "If the Liberal party decides for the Capital system without modification," M. wrote in the *Nation*, "the workman and the idealists at least will have little more to say to it." In a noble tribute to Morley marked by delicate criticism of honest John's limitations, Massingham deprecates in passing his deficiency of social outlook, recording sadly how on the occasion "when he was moved to consider the condition of England his gaze was a little vague and pre-occupied"; and a little further on, asks challengingly: "Was it not the business of the humanitarian thinker to open the road from Manchester Liberalism to the Social Liberalism of the 'nineties"? Massingham was no less poignantly alive to the defects of the Labour Party—its pre-occupation with the statesmanship of wage-fixing, its tendency to class-selfishness, and its intellectual nonage.

Parties and leaders were to him but the varying instruments for the realization of an increasing purpose, of an expanding creative design. In one sense he was an intransigent—in so far as he refused to make a fetish of his party when it closed its eyes to humane values or betrayed sacred principles; and then he was ready to trounce it summarily into sanity, if not to make its life burdensome to itself. Massingham never gave to party what was meant for mankind. In leaders he would bear and forbear much—feebleness and bungling—but never juggling with moral right. There was a great deal of the salutary spirit of compromise in him, for he was willing to mark time if he needs must, but never summoned ignoble patience to tolerate politicians, merely because they belonged to his own camp, when he saw them flouting in action the solemn scroll they swore by. A career in politics is ensured and purchased by the price every party-man is called on to pay for success, namely, readiness to denounce fiercely every leader and every measure of the other side. Men like Lord Courtney who stand four-square to all the winds that blow and keep their heads cool amidst the charivari of politics, would be rewarded with condign neglect—doomed to plough a lonely furrow. One of those who never divorced morals from politics, Massingham was never slow to pull down the idol he had thought all gold, but which later on bewrayed clay feet in the acid test of action. Shaw well says of him: "When some leader had gained his enthusiastic support by advocating the reform that all leaders advocate in Opposition, and proved no exception to the rule that no leader advocates them in office, Massingham would fall slaughterously on him, and set the financial backers of the paper demanding why Liberal leaders were being attacked in a Liberal paper and what party the editor thought he belonged to, anyhow." He gave short shrift to politicians who, crab-like, set their face and steps backward, or tampered

with the moral currency, or flirted with jingoistic Imperialism. When Gladstone's leadership came to an end, Massingham put his potent pen at once at the service of Lord Rosebery, remembering his creditable work as Chairman of the London County Council. But when that 'Flying Dutchman of politics' soon showed himself to be what he was—an Imperialist, irresponsible and whimsical at that—he marooned him. Warm and generous in his appreciation of the charm and genius of Mr. Lloyd George as M. was, his feelings towards him began to grow chill with the Marconi incident; and assumed keener acerbity when Mr. George took his cue, during the miners' dispute, from the Capitalist paymasters of his party, and showed himself in other ways as a questionable opportunist.

A man of sterling rectitude of principles, who 'personified politics' in the words of Brailsford, with Massingham politics was never the spring-board of personal ambitions. In 1889, when the nominal editor of the *Star* imposed his veto on his advocacy of the Eight Hour Day, M. resigned, appealed to the shareholders and directors and won the battle. Again in 1891, when he was away for a holiday and Prof. Stuart wrote a leading article criticising John Burns for interfering in a Scottish strike, Massingham resigned again, this time finally. The brilliant lustrum of the editorship of the *Chronicle* (1895-99) terminated with a similar resignation, this time over the Boer War, for Massingham refused to dope his conscience by consenting to soften his criticism of what he deemed to be an unrighteous war. In 1923 again, he resigned the editorship of the *Nation*. There was a spring of resilience in him, for every time he was worsted he emerged victorious and as a martyr he always rose from his ashes with ludicrous promptitude and success.

Massingham's political interests were but one ingredient in an opulent and high-strung personality of varied substance and many glancing lights. "Politics held it by no prescriptive right," writes his son, "but because action in the drama of life was essential to its nature." Yes, a miscellaneous personality with infinite variety in its composition! Passionately devoted to literature and the arts—a denizen of their higher and rarer altitudes accessible only to serene minds and finer natures—endowed with a keenly sensitive eye to beauty in nature and an ear subtly responsive to soul-uplifting nuances of melody, he was yet one of those who scorned to refine themselves away in a Lotus-land of cloistered beauty divorced from energizing action for the commonweal. As a student of literature Massingham was as much at home in Mussorgsky's *Godounov* and Gogol's *Dead Souls* as in Meredith and Hardy. Of rare incisiveness is the study of Shaw's *Back to Methuselah*; as critique it is one in a thousand. There are studies of Chesterton's *Black Magic*, the decadent French intellectual, Paul Claudel, of *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, of Olive Schreiner, Tolstoy, *The Master Builder*, Galsworthy and other men and books—some profound, some sketchy, but all suggestive. The *Causerie* on Shaw's *Caesar and Cleopatra* shows close knowledge of Mommsen. In the *Impressions of Venice* we come across casual, but pregnant hints on art, made with all the authority of Ruskin without his vagaries; for Massingham knew enough of Ruskin to have shed Ruskinism in respect of the stones of Venice.

Massingham's literary articles are too good to be blown about like sybilline leaves by the wind of time; and yet those that are included in this volume seem but a flosam. Strawn in these essays are gems, to be had, if not exactly for the picking, at any rate sufficient to reward the searcher.

Massingham flung the largesse of his soul with lordly profusion, the miraculous fecundity recalling to us Omar Khayyam's rose:

"Look to the blowing Rose about us—'Lo Laughing,' she says, 'into the world I blow,
At once the silken tassel of my Purse
Tear and its Treasure on the Garden throw".

Indeed a highly composite personality in which were blended, to borrow the words of Mr. Vaughan Nash, "paganism and austerity, mockery and seriousness, passionate ardour and a penetrating and unillusioned critical faculty, depths of generosity and tenderness and a strong infusion of corrosive scorn." We heartily recommend this book to the who do not refuse to see the vital bearing of callis on politics.

R. SADASIVA AIYAR.

MISCELLANEOUS.

AN INDIAN SANDHURST.

DECCAN SABHA'S MEMORANDUM.

The following Memorandum has been submitted by the Deccan Sabha, Poona, to the Indian Sandhurst Committee.

PRACTICABILITY.

THE present Committee was appointed in pursuance of a resolution passed in the Legislative Assembly on February 19, 1925. We see, however, that the terms of reference defining the scope of this Committee are in accord, not with the final shape in which the resolution was passed by the Assembly, but with the shape in which the Government of India desired the Assembly to pass it. Taking it for granted that it was both desirable and practicable to establish a Royal Military College on the lines of Sandhurst in India and believing that the Government of India had already committed itself to this opinion, the Assembly asked for the appointment of a Committee to consider what practical measures should be adopted for the establishment of such a College. The Government of India had, at an early stage in the debate on the resolution, made an attempt, in which eventually it failed, to persuade the Assembly to keep the feasibility of the creation of an Indian Sandhurst an open question. In drawing the terms of reference for the Committee, however, the Government of India has returned to the proposition which it put before the Assembly and which the Assembly rejected, viz. "whether it is desirable and practicable to establish a Military College in India to train Indians for the commissioned ranks of the Indian Army." But in the questionnaire issued, we find no question directly bearing on this particular term of reference. We do not make it a matter of complaint if the Committee too, like the Assembly, hold the Government of India to the support which its spokesmen undoubtedly gave in a public manner to the establishment of an Indian Sandhurst and concern themselves only with recommending the definite steps that require to be taken in setting about the task. But if the Committee do not take this view, the public will have a legitimate grievance in not being invited to tender evidence on the practicability of setting up in this country a well-equipped College capable of giving the highest military training to Indian cadets.

The question on which the practicability turns for the most part is one of cardinal importance to India, for it is no other than the question of the number of Commissions the Army Council is prepared in the immediate future to advise His Majesty the King to confer upon Indians. It is admitted on all hands that if Indians will receive Commissions in

future only at the present rate, no Indian Sandhurst is at all possible. In fact unless this number can be raised very materially by the authorities concerned, it is altogether profitless to give serious consideration to the question of founding a Cadet College in India. No doubt the Army Secretary, Mr. E. Burdon, made himself responsible in the debate on the resolution on an Indian Sandhurst, to the extreme statement that even if all the officers required for India's needs were to receive their training in this country, it will still be uneconomical to set up a Sandhurst here. We do not profess to speak with expert knowledge on this point, but *prima facie* it seems very much like overshooting the mark to say that even a country of such enormous size as India, whose Army needs are greater than those of many others, judging from the proportion of India's total resources devoted to the Army, must always draw upon other countries for the supply of her officers, if she is not to spend her money wastefully. Several European countries are many times smaller than India, and yet they are not known to depend in such a vital matter as the training of their officers on foreign countries. British Dominions, which require a much smaller contingent of Army officers than India, do not send their cadets to Sandhurst, but prefer to give them training at their own institutions, which they would not do, if they had found it an uneconomical system. For instance, the Royal Military College, Duntroon, which Australia maintains, has an establishment of 150 cadets, from 30 to 35 staff cadets being admitted annually. The College of Canada has about the same strength, and there also, as in Australia, the College course lasts for four years. India, however, drafts some 70 officers annually from Sandhurst; she should, therefore, be much better able to maintain a College like Sandhurst for her own needs than a British Dominion. But it would be a good business proposition to start and run such a College in India only if an assurance was forthcoming from His Majesty's Government in advance, that a substantially larger number of commissions than the maximum now open to Indians would be made available in future. Unless there is a prospect of a more liberal policy being pursued by the War Office, the present Committee, which is named the Indian Sandhurst Committee, will find that it is hardly worth their while to discuss the most important matter referred to them, viz. the creation of an Indian Sandhurst.

DESIRABILITY.

As to the desirability of an Indian Sandhurst, it goes without saying that no country should be under the necessity to send its citizens to a foreign country for professional training, and, least of all for military training in its higher grades. The Army Secretary admitted, in the debate in the Legislative Assembly above referred to, the several disadvantages which attach to the present practice of sending Indian cadets to Sandhurst for training, viz. removal of the boy to unfamiliar surroundings at a very tender age, expense of the course, etc. but on the other hand he also mentioned certain disadvantages which, in his opinion, would flow from the creation of an Indian Sandhurst. Of these, the one to which he attached the greatest weight is that, if India trained her cadets in her own institutions controlled by her own authorities, the Army Council might decline to recommend Indians for King's Commissions, in which case Indian cadets would be eligible only for Dominion Commissions, and as these carried with them a less extensive authority than the King's Commissions, the home-trained officers would occupy a position of inferiority to that of officers trained at Sandhurst. We would, however, submit that there is not much substance in this argument for it is

not proposed, after the establishment of a Cadet College in India, to confer Commissions upon Indians without reference to the Army Council; and since the Army Council will retain in the last resort complete control over both kinds of Commissions there is no reason why they should refuse to give King's Commissions to cadets who, though trained in India, are adjudged to be fit to hold them. Through their control over Commissions, the Army Council will exercise control over the training and other important details in connection with the Sandhurst of India and it is up to them to have such arrangements made therein that the cadets that will be turned out by the College will be fully equal in military capacity and in other respects to the product of the British Sandhurst. If, still holding the final power in its own hands in military matters, His Majesty's Government freely allowed Indians to hold Dominion Commissions, but forbade them to hold King's Commissions, it would lay itself open to the charge that it is solicitous of the safety of British troops, but careless of that of Indian. His Majesty's Government might insist upon levelling up the course of instruction at the Indian Sandhurst, should it be found inferior, and also insist, if necessary, that Indians cadets, after receiving training in India, should be required to make a tour of duty in England or the British Colonies, or should be attached to British troops in England for a short period, say, six months, so as to ensure that Indian officers will be fully equal to their British confreres. The public in India will not object to it at all, for they are keen on a College which will produce officers of the best possible quality. But they will strongly object to the position of inferiority in which officers trained in India will be involved by being held ineligible for King's Commissions and therefore subject to certain disabilities. In this connexion, it may be mentioned that His Majesty's Government offers seven Commissions in the Imperial Army every year to those who pass out of the Kingston College, although it exercises no control over the internal arrangements of the College. We see therefore no reason why it should not grant King's Commissions to those who will graduate from the Indian Sandhurst, in the administration of which it will have a substantial, if indirect, voice. The Army Secretary argues, further, that even if Indians, who have received their whole training in India, are granted King's Commissions, they will be looked upon as inferior to the products of Sandhurst. This kind of inferiority, which will exist only in the imagination of British Officers, they will know how to treat, but they will not reconcile themselves to actual inferiority of official status.

RECRUITMENT FROM THE MIDDLE CLASSES.

Assuming that superior commissioned ranks will be made available to Indians in as large numbers as qualified Indians are forthcoming to occupy them, we can conceive of no valid objection to the establishment of an Indian Sandhurst. India will not grudge the expense that will be incurred; and in fact she will keep the expense for cadets at a low figure and institute scholarships on a liberal scale so as to bring advanced military education within the reach of the higher middle class. It is unthinkable that, from the large number of Indians who pass out of high schools and colleges every year, sufficient to man the Civil Service as well as the Army, cadets of the requisite quality will not become available in sufficient numbers to enable a Military College to be maintained in India if the recruiting-ground is not narrowly restricted. All the reasons suggested by the Committee, i. e. in questions 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, and 13, operate to a greater or less extent in check-

ing the supply of cadets; but the principal reason which, in our opinion, conduces to this result is the one suggested in question 10. We have no doubt that it is the belief of those whose function it is to select candidates for Sandhurst at present that young men of good birth and high social position, coming from families with military traditions and belonging to communities noted for martial spirit are alone fit for cadetships at Sandhurst. If the selection is made on this principle, we are afraid India will find it difficult for a long time to come to supply even the ten vacancies now allotted to her at the Sandhurst College. For the only military traditions left in India now, thanks to the military policy pursued by Great Britain, are the traditions of service in the Army in the capacity of rank and file. It is only those classes which contribute sepoy to the Indian Army that claim to be endowed with martial instincts. But these fighting classes are obviously much too poor to afford the expense and much too backward in education to possess the necessary standard of scholastic attainments for a course at Sandhurst. Again, whatever may be the particular merits of the aristocracy in other countries, in India the aristocratic classes like Rajas, Nawabs and the landed gentry are, by reason of ignorance and idleness characteristic of this class, as a rule unfitted, whether intellectually or physically, to exercise the skilled profession of officer or to undergo the rigours of a soldier's life. Cadets must therefore be sought out chiefly from the middle classes who are keen on receiving higher education. Military ability is not inherited, but acquired by training; and the lack of military traditions in candidates for cadetships should not be regarded as a disqualification. We do not desire that the middle classes should be given special privileges: all that we wish to say is that in the existing conditions the middle classes will naturally form the most promising supply-field for recruiting candidates for superior military training. And the final selection should be by *peienonte o tpiom*. We regard this as essential, for there is reason to believe that the political antecedents of the candidate's family and other things entirely unconnected with his fitness, moral, educational or physical, enter largely into the preliminary selection of candidates by the Deputy Commissioner, the Commissioner and the Governor, a practice which ought to be stopped. This can be done most effectually by making competitive tests the sole channel of admission to the Cadet College. We believe that by giving wider publicity to the prospects opened out by a military career, by enlisting the co-operation of school, college and university authorities in this respect, by keeping the expense at a minimum figure, by awarding scholarships on a generous scale, and by raising the minimum age limit of entrance to the College, a stimulus will be afforded to the recruitment of Indians; but we believe that the best means of encouraging such recruitment is to tap a source which has so far been in effect, if not in intention, utterly neglected, viz. the middle classes. Quite a long time will elapse in India before the door is opened to talents from all ranks. The very cost of the course, however much it may be brought down in future, will put it outside the means of the lower middle classes to aspire to a military career; but superior posts in the Army must at any rate be practically available to the upper reaches of the middle classes. Therefore, no extraneous considerations like descent from a high family, political associations, etc. should be allowed to influence the selection of candidates for entrance to the Military College.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

In establishing a Military College at Dehra

Dun, which in reality is only a preparatory school with a bias for military training, the underlying idea is that a public school training is essential for one who is to develop later into an Army officer. We are for maintaining this institution and even for starting similar ones in other provinces; but we do not share the view which undoubtedly inspired the establishment of Dehra Dun, viz. that separate schools are needed for the training of the governing classes. We recognise that public schools have their own merits and would welcome the addition of a few schools of that type to our educational system as a measure of educational advance in general; but we do not admit that public schools like Dehra Dun are the only or an indispensable recruiting-ground for candidates to a Military College. Indeed it is not maintained by any one that public schools have any peculiar relation to Military Colleges. Those who contend that the future officers of the Army must pass through public schools also contend that the future ambassadors, consuls, judges, civil servants, professors, lawyers, etc. must pass through them. In fact public school education is in England supposed to be a necessary preparation for every profession. In India this idea has not been followed except in regard to the Army: our lawyers, our judges, our professors, our engineers, our doctors, our civil servants (i. e. Indian) have not been the recipients of public school education. But the idea survives in the department of the Army alone. It must be set aside in respect of the Army as in respect of other walks of life. Even in England, only 25,000 out of 6,000,000 children receive the benefit of public school education. If the example of England is followed in India in this respect, where education is already so restricted, to what a narrow class would professions and public service be confined! Our aim in India must on the contrary be to widen the channels of educational opportunity. We cannot therefore support any proposal for making public schools the only source of recruitment for cadetships, though we have no objection to providing such schools for the benefit of the wealthy classes on the clear understanding that the products of ordinary schools and colleges will be allowed freely to compete for entrance to the Cadet College. We lay particular emphasis on this point, for we find it on record (vide the Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. III, Part 1, p. 83) that it is the Government's intention to discontinue outside nominations for cadetships when Dehra Dun will be able to supply cadets who have completed the course of instruction there. If Dehra Dun is thus made the sole recruiting ground, a military career will be the close preserve of the aristocratic classes, to which we can never agree. Admission to the Military College must therefore continue to be granted to outsiders even after Dehra Dun becomes a full-fledged institution. The open competition, which we recommend, will put to the test the claim of the partisans of Dehra Dun that it produces the best candidates for admission to Sandhurst. In order to minimise the disadvantage from which boys of other institutions than Dehra Dun will suffer, the educational authorities should be asked to introduce drill and such-like subjects into their institutions and to push on with the U.T.C. scheme. On the other hand, the University authorities should be asked to give recognition to the school-leaving certificate of Dehra Dun and similar institutions that may come into existence in future as equivalent to the passing of the Intermediate Examination of their Universities. Otherwise, for those who will fail to obtain entrance to the Military College, Dehra Dun will become a blind alley.

Three Important Books.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| | Rs. A. |
| 1. Socialism and the Historic Function of Liberalism. By Harold Langshaw. With a preface by the Right Hon'ble Charles Trevelyan, M. P. "Gives a scientific justification for the process which seemed to be in full operation at the last General Election, of the precipitation of our people again into two instead of three political parties."—From the Preface. ... 4 14 | |
| 2. J. Ramsay MacDonald (1923-1925). By Iconoclast. Gives in a brief, critical survey of Mr. MacDonald's work as Premier and of the circumstances leading up to the election. ... 2 14 | |
| 3. What is spiritualism. By (Charles W. Hayward, M. D., C. M. (Edin.), D. P. H. (Camb.), M. R. C. S. (Eng). L. R. C. P. (Lond.), Barrister-At-Law. ... 0 13 | |

Useful And Interesting For All.

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Baha 'U' LLAH And The New Era. By J. E. Easlemon, M. B., Ch. B., F. B. E. A. A comprehensive outline of the history, and more especially of the teachings of the Bahai Movement founded in the latter part of the nineteenth century by the three great Persian teachers—the Bab, Baha'u'llah and 'Abdu'l-Baha. ... 6 15 | |
| 2. Buddhist Birth-Stories (Jataka Tales) The Commentarial introduction entitled <i>Midana-Katha</i> , the Story of the Lineage. Translated from Prof V. Fausboll's edition of the Pali text by T. W. Rhys Davids. New and revised edition by Mrs. Rhys Davids, D. Litt., M. A. ... 6 2 | |
| 3. My Life for Labour. By Robert Smillie, M. P. With a foreword by J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P. ... 2 1 | |
| 4. Heathen Essays. By Dr. James H. Cousins. Nine Essays. ... 1 0 | |
| 5. Two Little Savages. Being the adventures of two boys who lived as Indians and what they learned. With over three hundred drawings. Written and illustrated by Ernest Thompson Seton. ... 6 8 | |

(Postage Extra.)

The Theosophical Publishing House,
Adyar Madras

THE INDIAN BOOK SHOP
NEW INDIA OFFICE.

George Town, Madras.

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

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| | Rs. a. |
| 1. Indian Economics—
(4th edition). Featherweight paper Demi.
8 vo. pp. 700. Cloth Bound. Revised & enlarged. | 8-0-0 |
| 2. Gokhale and Economic Reforms—
Crown 16 mo. pp. 250. Cloth Bound. | 2-0-0 |
| 5. Indian Industrial and Economic Problems—
(2nd edition). Crown 16 mo. pp. 340. | 1-8-0 |
| 6. India's War Finance and Post-War Problems—
Crown 16 mo. pp. 164. Cloth Bound. | 2-0-0 |
| 7. Currency Reform in India—
Crown 16 mo. pp. 120. | 1-0-0 |

These books can be had of—

The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City.

HINDU LAW.

(3rd Edition)

BY

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

High Court Vakil, Bombay.

Price Rupees Ten, Postage Extra.

The Aryabhushan Press, 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. Burridge, 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,

Business Manager.

LUCKNOW UNIVERSITY, }
LUCKNOW, }

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.

KARNATAKA

AND

INDIAN REVIEW OF REVIEWS.

Published Monthly

An Independent Organ for the People of
Indian States

AND

A Register of the Progress of Indian Nationalism
Annual Subscription Rs. 4, (Post free.)

D. V. GUNDAPPA
Editor

BASAVANGUDI P. O.
Bangalore City (S. India).

THE KENYA PROBLEM.

A Selection from the Speeches and Writings of
The Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P. C.

A vigorous and lucid exposition of the
Indian point of view. Contains also
the full text of the Cabinet decision.

Pages 147. Price As. 12.

Apply to:

The Aryabhushan Press,

Budhwar Peth, POONA CITY.