

THE Servant of India

Editor: V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI.

VOL. II, No. 1.]

POONA—THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1919.

[ANNUAL SUBSN. : RS. 4

CONTENTS.		PAGE.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	1
ARTICLES :—		
In Collision with the People	3
Perpetuities	3
SPECIAL ARTICLES :—		
The Rowlatt Committee's Report.—II. The Proposed Legislation. By N. M. Samarth	4
The Strike and Its Lessons. By N. M. Joshi	6
The Industries Commission's Report.—VII. By L. S.	7
A LETTER FROM LONDON	9
SELECTION :—		
An English Paper's Charges and Mr. Devadhar's Reply	10

For convenience sake we begin our second year with the beginning of this month, and accordingly we number this issue No. 1 of Vol. II.

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

THE question of the disposal of conquered territories is going to prove one of the most difficult problems to be solved by the Peace Conference. The idea of the League of Nations has been welcomed in the abstract, but immediately the question of the application of its principles arose, each of the various Powers began to put forward its own claims to the territories conquered from the enemy. Indeed, it is a sorry spectacle, this scramble among the Powers, great and small, for the territorial crumbs in all parts of the world. It almost appears as if, with all the tall talk of high and noble ideals of President Wilson, European nations have not yet forgotten their land grabbing instincts.

LAST Saturday, Mr. Jinnah explained, at a public meeting in Bombay, the grounds upon which he felt constrained to oppose the resolution for full provincial autonomy adopted by the Delhi Congress. His grounds were two: first, the Montagu-Chelmsford scheme was based on the principle of diarchy, and the demand for the grant of full responsible government in all the provinces at once, which struck at the very root of that principle, would amount to a rejection of the whole scheme, —but the country's interest lay not in a rejection but in an acceptance of the framework of the official scheme. Second, by accepting the principle of diarchy in the provinces, they would be enabled to ask for the introduction of the same

principle into the Government of India as well. If, however, they resisted diarchy in provincial Governments, they would have to give up all hope of modification in the central Government, the reason for it being that, since the Congress had accepted the principle of gradual progress towards responsible government, they could not, except by overthrowing that principle, demand provincial autonomy and responsible government in the Government of India at the same time. In other words, Mr. Jinnah holds, with Mrs. Besant, that "to gain the shadow" (of provincial autonomy) "the Congress majority has surrendered the substance" (of the popularisation of the central Government). Pandit Malaviya, too, expressed his preference, at the above meeting, for the resolution of the Bombay Congress.

THE Delhi resolution, it is thus clear, does not commend itself to the thinking men in the country, and the thought is evidently exercising the minds of many as to how to get over the embarrassing situation created by it. The difficulties have been immensely enhanced by the mandate with which the Congress has bound the delegates who will proceed to England to plead India's cause in its name. That the Congress has charged them with such a mandate does not admit of a shadow of doubt. For the question was definitely raised in the Congress by Mr. Gokaran Nath Misra in the form of an amendment, and was decided in favour of those who held that no discretion whatever should be left to the deputation to depart from the Congress resolutions in any degree. Mr. C. R. Das opposed Mr. Misra's amendment on the ground that, in case any discretion was left, a delegate might, if he so chose, give up the claim for provincial autonomy, and the majority in the Congress, falling in with this reasoning, rejected the amendment by an overwhelming majority. It cannot reasonably be maintained, in the face of what happened in the Congress, that the resolution of full provincial autonomy did not tie down the hands of the deputation. It is for this very reason that the Congress has issued a mandate, and a very narrow mandate at that, that several prominent Congressmen felt themselves unable to join the Congress deputation and to organise an independent deputation of their own.

It is no doubt highly desirable that the split caused among the public workers by this question

should be healed, and in view of the situation in England and India, which is far from favourable, it has become essential that we should unitedly concentrate only on the most important demands instead of wasting our energy on demands which are obviously impossible, if the present official scheme is at all to form the basis of discussion. But the best way to bring about unity is not to put upon the Congress resolution a construction which it cannot possibly bear. We find it maintained, however, that the Congress has left to the deputation full scope for negotiation. This view is no doubt urged by those who speak with a voice of recognised authority on Congress matters, but it has also to be noted that their personal opinion is against the Delhi resolution. And we are not at all sure that this view will be generally accepted in the country. Mr. Jinnah pleaded at the Bombay meeting for full liberty being given to the deputation and their being made plenipotentiaries clothed with an authority to conduct negotiations with British statesmen. If this were done, he said, the best part of their trouble would be over. While we have no doubt that it would be so, we do not approve of this method of avoiding the trouble; for it would mean in practice nothing else than a jettisoning of the Delhi resolution altogether, and if this is to be done in the name of the Congress, we cannot but think that the Congress must sanction this proceeding in express terms. This make-believe, by means of which you seek to circumvent the resolution, adopted by the Congress after full deliberation both in the subjects committee and open Congress, must be sternly condemned.

It is the fashion in Nationalist circles to ridicule the policy which the Moderate party has thought it expedient to adopt, in view of the totality of circumstances, viz., to accord a general support to the principles of the Montagu-Chelmsford scheme and then to press for important amendments in it, as necessary to make it fully satisfactory. It is said that it is very bad strategy to commend, first, the scheme in a general way, for it inevitably tends to weaken the force of the demand for amendments if you betray any anxiety for the scheme as it stands or if you show that you can contemplate the possibility of the refusal of some of your demands. We would ask those who are now showing a feverish anxiety that the Congress deputation must not be tied to any specific resolutions, but must be left free to negotiate with the authorities, what the effect of this is likely to be on British statesmen. Will it exactly impress the latter with a conviction that Indian politicians will have nothing short of what they are demanding? What, again, will be the effect of some of the leaders maintaining, in advance of the final decision, that the reforms, however short they may fall of our expectation, must be accepted, and that, growing stronger in their strength, we must carry on our agitation for further reform?

Will it convince the authorities in England that we shall not yield one jot of our demands?

EVERYWHERE there are abundant signs that there is a strong reaction in the public mind from the extremism of Delhi, and perhaps the most typical of all is the fact that many distinguished lawyers of Madras have felt it necessary to review the political situation in reference to the recent Congress resolution on the reform scheme. It would appear that they have been holding informal meetings to consider if it would not be advisable in the interests of the country to take such action as would help to put the reform scheme beyond danger, and the alarm which these proceedings have caused in the breast of the editor of the *Hindu* shows that there is much strength behind this movement. The predominant feeling is that there is yet a chance that the scheme will be whittled down and the best way to counteract the forces of opposition is, while making a determined demand for necessary amendments, to accord general support to it. We only trust that the enraged disapprobation of the *Hindu* will not check this return to good sense among the discriminating public of Madras.

THE freight on the carriage of rice from Rangoon to Bombay has been recently lowered from Rs. 40 to Rs. 30. Though the reduction from the previous rate is considerable, still the reduced rate is believed to be much higher than the circumstances warrant. In view of the criticism which is continually being made all over the country, it is surprising that the authorities concerned should hold their peace, and should not offer any explanation of the high rates. In this connection, we are glad to note that the Bombay Corporation has passed a resolution requesting the Government to more authorities to reduce the freight to a minimum figure not exceeding the figure actually paid to the shipping companies. We trust the Government will accede to this modest request.

MR. G. K. DEVADHAR, says *India* of January 3, is spending some useful days in studying the work of the co-operative organisations in this country. He has been in Manchester examining the activities of the Co-operative Wholesale Society, the Co-operative Union, and the C. W. S. Bank, as well as the Society's Tobacco Factory. He has also watched the working of the Co-operative Union's Jam Factory and Brewery at Middleton Junction, their Biscuit and Sweet Factory at Crumpsall, the C. W. S. Printing Works at Longsight, and Soap Works at Irlam. He was to go to York on the 27th, to visit one of the biggest stores belonging to the C. W. S., and to study the welfare work of the Rowntree concern. Mr. Devadhar, who spoke for the Home Rule for India League, at Manchester, was to speak on "Co-operation in India" at the Indian holiday conference at Ilkley.

IN COLLISION WITH THE PEOPLE.

AT a moment of crisis in Irish history Sheil asked: "Do you wish to rule Ireland by putting yourselves in contact or in collision with the people?" The people of this country will be impelled to address a similar question to the rulers at this time, and what with the dilatory process of another inquiry into the reform scheme through a Select Committee of both Houses of Parliament, on the one hand, and what with the indecent hurry in which permanent legislation of a restrictive character is being pushed through, on the other, the Indians at any rate will strongly suspect that the rulers have adopted the latter alternative. Nor will this be far removed from the truth, so far as the civilian bureaucrats are concerned, if the signs of the day are to be believed. When the Defence of India Act will probably remain in operation for a year more and can be further called into exercise for another six months by the issue of an ordinance; when thus ample provision of extraordinary powers is made so as to satisfy even the most exacting demands of the officials, it is difficult to understand why the authorities should take coercion in hand in advance of the conciliatory measures, unless they hope by this means to turn down reforms. It is true that when the joint report on reforms was drawn up, the Secretary of State and the Viceroy had all the facts about anarchy before them; and the Rowlatt report should really make no difference whatever to the scheme of reforms. But the official perhaps counts, and counts rightly, that the sedition report will create an amount of prejudice against Indian politicians generally, and sees in this his best chance of obstruction. In the name of killing sedition, he would kill reforms. On no other hypothesis is this insensate folly of saddling the country with coercive legislation on the eve of reforms even intelligible. Why cannot the officials allow reforms to be put through and wait till they exert a pacificatory influence upon the public mind, except on the supposition that they have wearied of their attempt to govern the country by putting themselves in contact with the people and would now try the other method of putting themselves athwart the public opinion in a defiant manner? That method has succeeded nowhere, and will fail here disastrously.

All Indians view with concern the recent outbreak of seditious crime in certain parts of the country and will support Government in all reasonable efforts to check it. But we cannot persuade ourselves that to offer an overdose of repression when the people are eagerly awaiting the reforms is the proper remedy for the disease, and therefore consider it our duty to offer it as keen a resistance as we can. The recent discharge of so many young men who were interned in Bengal shows that there has been a remarkable improvement in the situation, and that there has certainly been no accession to the ranks of revolutionaries. Will not the reforms, if generous and adequate,

still further improve the position and render any organised movement on the part of anarchists impossible? To produce a feeling of general contentment throughout the country is the best method of fighting sedition, and we cannot understand why Government should turn aside from that path to put on to the statute book permanent enactments of a most drastic nature and all too comprehensive in their scope. The result of it will only be that the difficulties in the way of carrying through the reforms will be enhanced, and that even if the reforms get through in their integrity, their reception will be prejudiced and practical working rendered difficult. They will in any case fail to satisfy public opinion, and the whole policy will be marked by failure. If, on the other hand, when liberal reforms are carried into operation and given a chance to stamp out anarchy, should they prove unsuccessful and a special legislation be thought necessary, the proposals will have more justification then and will receive greater public support. Such proposals can in any case pass the legislature, if the Government so wills, for even in the new regime inaugurated by the reforms, the Government will not be without power to force through repressive legislation in the teeth of popular opposition. They will therefore be well advised to accept the suggestion for postponement and withdraw these most obnoxious measures. If they should persist with them, they will create such a feeling of suspicion and discontent all over country that all the attempts made so far to conciliate the people will go for nothing and the subsequent attempts will be seriously prejudiced. The higher authorities must beware and prevent this conspiracy (for so it will be understood) on the part of the civilians to bring the reforms to nought.

PERPETUITIES.

THE late Herbert Spencer, the most renowned champion of philosophic evolution, or development hypothesis as he called it, used to carry his principles into matters of everyday life; and in spite of occasional eccentricities he generally acted consistently with what he believed to be the interests of human society in evolution. From this point of view he used to insist on the great danger of stereotyping current institutions or even what may, for the moment, be regarded as considerable improvements in current institutions. For what may be a desirable institution or innovation now may ere long become a great obstacle, and require later on a great effort to get rid of it. Thus he was a great advocate of science and its development and left sums of money to many scientific societies in his will; but being alive to the great danger of creating vested interests in future, he directed that all his money should be spent in a few years and not be permanently invested; for, thought he, all such institutions should continue to be living and not merely live on their past if they are to be any good at all. We believe

that there is on our statute book a law against perpetuities, that no claim should be allowed to come into existence which will live till eternity. Occasionally the legislature passes acts in defiance of this wholesome principle; but there can be no question of the soundness of this instinct against perpetuities.

In our country we are daily witnessing the evil effects of such perpetuities. Mr. Patel's bill is a fight against them in one aspect. The authors of the Shastras were to all appearance laying down laws in olden days which presumably were improvements on the then existing state of things. But their injunctions now prove to be irksome, not suited to the existing circumstances of society, and are doing harm which must detract to some extent from the benefits they may have formerly led to. It may be noted that it is under British rule that the Shastras have assumed this immobile character; formerly there used to be evolved various versions of them though they often required considerable mis-handling of the original texts. The British stereotyped our Shastras, or what the venal old pundits in the days of the East India Company often gave out to be Shastras for a consideration from the clients that appeared in the courts. No change could be made in them; the machinery for the purpose had disappeared with the disappearance of the Hindu rulers. Otherwise it is certain that law itself would have sanctioned changes in our manners and customs in consonance with the progress of the world in all directions during the last hundred and fifty years.

The evils of the influence of what are called revealed or inspired books are seen in all countries. On account of a sentence in the Bible the English people fought for ages against such an inoffensive bill as the Deceased Wife's Sister's Bill. A passage in the Koran is held to enjoin the purdah and another is held to sanction the institution of polygamy, though the original Prophet's leave to take to oneself four wives only was a great improvement on the then existing promiscuity in Arabia. Of course many of these injunctions in the sacred scriptures are got over when the selfish motives of the priests are inconsistent with them. Swift in his "Tale of a Tub" tells us in his own inimitable satirical style how Peter, Martin and John got over the express orders in the will of their father when they came in conflict with their inclinations. But when the interests or the self-love of a class are involved in keeping up the original absurd laws, then the fight has to be terrible indeed, requiring a great waste of national energy.

The same state of things is seen in the political sphere when we are considering the question of Native States in India. A hundred years ago, it was decidedly in the interests of British rule, and probably also in the interests of the people of India generally, that the small, ill-governed, and eternally fighting states of India should come under the suzerainty of a single powerful power. It may be regarded as a historical misfortune that this

power happened then to be foreign, though many regard this contact with a virile civilisation as the making of India. This suzerainty could then be established duly by entering into treaties with these states and guaranteeing them certain rights and privileges. But these treaties have now assumed in the eyes of the descendants of the original princes an air of inspiration; they have become a kind of perpetuity. They always come in the way of any improvement. When any new policy is proposed to them, they are always prepared to say, "This is not in the bond." One may be allowed to speculate as to how many of these Highnesses would have survived to this day to put forward this claim in the absence of the suzerain power. Thrones in ancient days were very unstable as they have become again in Europe. It is hardly possible that the present popular wave in Europe would not have touched our Native States. The subjects of the states would have clamoured for a recognition of their rights, and they would have had their way. But now the princes feel quite secure. Have they not got their treaties? As a result there is no political life at all in the Native States. The most ardent advocate of Home Rule would be most violently against migration to a Native State. The real problem of the Native States is how to get over the treaties when they conflict with the interests of their subjects. The questions discussed at the Chiefs' Conference leave us comparatively cold as they entirely neglect the people most concerned. The questions of the rights of the chiefs and their salutes or precedence are in our opinion of a very secondary importance. A renowned statesman in Europe gave at the utmost a life of a dozen years to the most solemn treaty between two countries, for in that period circumstances alter and the solid foundation for the treaty cracks. Is it not high time that the treaties with the chiefs should be revised after over a hundred years? It would indeed redound to their credit if the chiefs themselves come forward to submit to such readjustment. Perhaps their autocratic and irresponsible power may have to suffer some diminution. But if they consent to that diminution so as to give it to their subjects in the modern democratic spirit, the real power and influence of the Native States will increase incalculably. It is in this direction we wish to see a solution of the problem of the Native States which are nowadays working as a brake on our national progress.

THE ROWLATT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

II.

THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION.

IN the article on the Rowlatt Committee's Report, which I contributed to this journal on the 1st of August last, I pointed out that the Committee made its Report to the Government of India on the 15th April last, whereas the Report of the Secretary of State and the Viceroy on Indian Constitu-

Constitutional Reforms was dated "Simla, April 22, 1918," and that it was clear from para. 21 of the latter Report that the authors thereof had accepted *in toto* the conclusions embodied in the former Report on the first of its two terms of reference, namely, as to the "nature and extent" of the "criminal conspiracies" connected with the "revolutionary movement in India" and the manner in which they had been successfully encountered. "Both agree," I wrote, "in making it clear that the 'revolutionary movement' is confined to a small class and to certain localities only and that, far from casting any aspersion on the loyalty of the people as a whole, the fact is that the movement has been 'successfully encountered with the support of Indian loyalty,'" and I added that the quotation I had given from the Montagu-Chelmsford Report left no room for doubt that the Secretary of State and the Viceroy had not only gone through the Rowlatt Committee's Report before they wrote theirs, but had accepted the conclusions arrived at by the latter as to the "efficacy of the Defence of India Act" in crushing "the revolutionary movement."

No honest critic, who studies the Rowlatt Committee's Report with an unbiassed mind, will deny the existence of the "revolutionary movement" confined, as the authors of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report say, to "very small sections of the population." But it does not necessarily follow from it that the remedy for the future must be provided in advance at the present juncture by the sort of legislation which the Government of India have now brought forward. For one thing, it cannot be taken for granted that the constitutional reforms proposed to be inaugurated will not effect a gratifying change in the mental attitude and outlook of the "small class" of young men involved in the "revolutionary movement." There is good reason to believe that if legislative effect is given to the Montagu-Chelmsford Reform Scheme *without delay and without its being whittled down*, the political atmosphere in the country will, in all human probability, be such as to make "revolutionary crime" a thing of the past. Can it be asserted that the small number of young men hitherto involved in a revolutionary conspiracy will continue their activity in spite of a new order of things leading them and their countrymen, for the first time in the annals of their chequered history, to the promised land of "responsible government?" The Government of India may honestly think so. But responsible Indian opinion may equally honestly think otherwise. Indeed, the Secretary of State and the Viceroy themselves *do* contemplate such a welcome change in the attitude of these young men, when they make the following observations in para. 150 of their Report:—

"There exists a small revolutionary party deluded by hatred of British rule and desire for the elimination of the Englishman into the belief that the path to independence or constitutional liberty lies through anarchical crime. Now, it may be that such persons will see for themselves the wisdom of abandoning methods which are as futile as

criminal; though if they do not the powers of the law are or can be made sufficient for the maintenance of order." (The italics in this quotation are mine.)

That is exactly the view which thoughtful Indians take of the situation. They think that the persons constituting the "small revolutionary party" may be expected, in the changed circumstances of their country, to give up their past methods and to turn over a new leaf. Supposing the detenus are released and they persist in their ways, the powers of the law at present *are* sufficient to cope with their activity. When these powers cease to be effective, they may be made sufficient, if necessary, to meet the renewed exigencies of the situation. No doubt the present powers of the law include the extra-judicial weapons which have been forged during the war and have proved efficacious in suppressing anarchical crime for the moment. These weapons will be available to the Government until six months after the end of the war. The war has not yet ended. And it is a moot point in law when the war may be said to end. The signing of the treaties may not necessarily mean the end of the war. It means perhaps merely a paper transaction. Until the terms of the treaties begin actually to be given effect to by the enemy countries, the war may not be said to have come to an end. However, apart from this doubtful point, it is clear that the Defence of India Act will be in operation for at least something like nine months still. Meanwhile, the path of statesmanship and political wisdom lies in expediting the passage of the Parliamentary legislation embodying the Montagu-Chelmsford Reform Scheme, and not in proceeding with the Bills which the Government of India have thought fit to introduce at the present moment with a view to give effect to the recommendations of the Rowlatt Committee, ignoring the fact that those recommendations were made *before* the date of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report and consequently without regard to the improved situation which the reform proposals may legitimately be expected to produce, when once they are put into operation. The Rowlatt Committee, besides, was precluded by its terms of reference from even considering the question as to whether, and, if so, how far any constitutional reforms would afford the requisite remedy. Its business seemed to be purely legal and academic so far as the second term of its reference went, based as it was, merely on the question whether it was clear "that the measures taken against the revolutionary movement under the Defence of India Act had so broken it that the possibility of the conspiracies being revived could be safely disregarded."

That being so, it is scarcely fair to the Rowlatt Committee as well as to the public at large that the proposed legislation should be put forward at this moment and attempted to be justified on the ground that it is based on the recommendations of that Committee,—recommendations, again, which were guarded in tone and circumscribed by out-

standing considerations of expediency and competency, which do not seem to have weighed sufficiently with the Government of India, but which, nevertheless, deserve to be borne in mind. "We may say at once," say the members of the Rowlatt Committee in their unanimous Report, "that *we do not expect very much from punitive measures*. The conviction of offenders will never check such a movement as that which grew up in Bengal unless all the leaders can be convicted at the outset. Further, the real difficulties have been the scarcity of evidence due to various causes and the want of reliance, whether justified or not, on such evidence as there has been. *The last difficulty is fundamental and cannot be remedied. No law can direct a court to be convinced when it is not.*" The italics are mine. They touch the merits of the *punitive* provisions embodied in the Bills which the Government of India have framed. Apart from this "fundamental" difficulty, the question, which is no less serious and by no means free from doubt, is as to whether, and if so, how far the proposed Bills are *intra vires* of the Government of India legislature. The last para. in the Report of the Rowlatt Committee deals with this aspect of the matter in these terms:—"In making suggestions for legislation we have not considered at all whether it could be argued that such legislation is in any respect beyond the competence of the Governor-General in Council. We have no authority to lay down the law on any such point, and any provisional assumption as the basis of our proposals would only cause embarrassment. We have proceeded, therefore, on the basis that any suggestions of ours which it may be decided to adopt will be given effect to by some legislature competent for the purpose."

This will serve to give an idea of the highly contentious character of the present Bills purely from a legal point of view. I ask whether it is right and proper that the Government of India should proceed with these Bills. No useful purpose will be served by doing so. The proposed legislation is neither necessary nor desirable nor expedient at the present juncture. On the other hand, it is positively calculated to make the forthcoming constitutional reforms fall flat on a deeply discontented people.

N. M. SAMARTH.

THE STRIKE AND ITS LESSONS.

THE general strike of the mill-operatives in Bombay, unexampled in the history of these movements in India, has happily come to an end. But a close observer of the economic conditions will not fail to see that it is not an isolated event confined to Bombay city or even India; but is a part of the general unrest which is now coming on to the surface and which has been caused by the economic pressure of the war, falling comparatively more heavily on the labouring classes. The wave of democratic ideas which is spreading over

the world is adding to the strength of the economic movement. The thinking minds of the country cannot therefore afford to be indifferent to the indications, and the lessons of the great strike in Bombay.

We must bear in mind that industrialism has come to stay in India. Its tide cannot be checked by the cry of 'back to the land' or by a wail over the destruction of home industries. Taking this central fact for granted, the State, the factory owners, and the educated Indian public ought to set about in right earnest to prevent the evils which, through indifference or ignorance of history, accompany the growth of industrialism. Slums and the practice of sweating, with the consequent deterioration of the health and the brain power of the labouring classes have inevitably crept in in all industrial countries on account of want of forethought.

Bombay, too, has not escaped these evils. About one hundred factories, a large number of which are cotton mills, now exist on this small island. The population has grown over a million, giving rise to overcrowding unheard of anywhere else in India. Not more than one or two out of a hundred ordinary workmen are literate. A working day of twelve hours does not leave any scope for recreation, amusement and instruction. There is no provision for old age pension, insurance against sickness or compensation for injuries. Liquor shops are provided in plenty. These conditions have degenerated the physique of the workman, deprived him of brain power and reduced his standard of life to the lowest degree. This state of things, highly dangerous to society and even to the industries, has been not only allowed to continue but even to grow by indifference and shortsightedness. The Government, which could have done much for improving the conditions of labourers by introducing salutary factory legislation by imparting education and by giving financial help for providing housing, means of transport and open spaces, have done practically nothing. The factory owners in Bombay, who in other matters are patriotic and liberal, do not seem to recognise that they owe a duty to their own workmen. The educated Indian public is still more apathetic. But fortunately—this word is used advisedly—owing to the strike the public has for once at least shaken off its usual apathy, and it is, therefore, necessary that the newly awakened interest should be directed into channels of practical utility and reform.

The first and the foremost lesson that every one will draw from the events connected with the strike is about the danger of allowing a vast population to remain not only in ignorance, but in a state in which the brain has no scope for work. The prolongation of the strike to weary lengths after the intervention of His Excellency the Governor and even after the announcement of the concessions by the mill-owners was only due to the want of thinking power among the workmen. Earnest efforts must, therefore, be promptly put

forth not only to diffuse education among younger generation but also among the elderly workmen. The Municipality ought to give up its narrow view of its duty, and, with the help of the Government and the mill-owners, ought to spread a net-work of night classes and lecture-halls. In England, the Workmens' Education Association is playing a worthy part in educating the workmen there, and educated Indians in Bombay ought to make good their claim that they desire to see an early dawn of democracy in India by making practical endeavours in this matter.

Another fact which has recently been vividly brought to public notice in the recent epidemics and in the strike, is the further danger to society of allowing a large section of the population to live a very low standard of life. The origin of the complaint about the low vitality and inefficiency of the Indian workmen and about their habits of irregularity and drunkenness are only due to their low standard of life. Every effort must be made to remove this evil, first, by reducing the hours of work and giving facilities to workmen for recreation and amusement, by the provision of decent houses for them, by enabling them to make provision against sickness, unemployment and accidents, and by the total prohibition of the sale of intoxicating drugs. The Government in England and the English factory-owners are showing commendable zeal in introducing large and bold programmes of welfare work for the benefit of the English workers. But in India neither the Government nor the factory-owners nor the educated Indian public have cared to show their recognition of the necessity of these measures. Let us hope that this lesson of the strike is not totally lost upon us all.

There is great need for organising labour for different objects, such as, firstly, in the co-operative movement, for enhancing the credit of the workmen, for the provision of stores, for insurance and for medical help, or secondly, in trade unions, for safeguarding their interests in a conflict with the factory-owners. Both Government and factory-owners can assist workmen in organising themselves in the co-operative movement. It is the educated classes, interested in seeing the early establishment of democracy in India, who can, and should, help the working classes in organising themselves in trade unions. Neither Government nor the factory-owners need take fright at the growth of trade unionism. One of the lessons of the recent strikes is that unorganised workmen are much more difficult to deal with than organised. But it must be clearly understood that organisations of workmen framed either for co-operation or for fighting, must, if they are to serve their object, be entirely managed by the workmen themselves. If they are unable to manage them to-day, an attempt must be made to teach them to do so as soon as possible.

Lastly, we shall have failed to learn anything from the recent strike and the events connected with it, if both Government and the public do

not keep a watchful eye on the growth of industrialism in India and take all the necessary precautions to prevent the further growth of some of the evils which, on account of a heedless policy, have already appeared in cities like Bombay. The future establishment of factories must be controlled and regulated as to their location, so that a growth of congested and over-crowded cities like Bombay will be prevented. Facilities must be offered, if they are necessary, to spread factories over a wider area. A town-planning act must be enforced in all the areas where the establishment of factories will be allowed, the principle of the policy being "the ruralisation of towns and the urbanisation of villages." The policy will minimise many of the worst evils of industrialism, and the conflict between the claims of agriculture and industries will be reconciled.

N. M. JOSHI

THE INDUSTRIES COMMISSION'S REPORT.

VII.

THE Commissioners begin the chapter on "Government industrial policy in recent years" with the sentence, "The commercial instincts of the East India Company had from the earliest days in this country led it to make various attempts to improve those Indian industries from which its export trade was largely drawn, as, for example, by organising and financing the manufacture of cotton and silk piece-goods and silk yarn, although this policy met with opposition from vested interests in England, which were at one time sufficiently powerful to insist that it should be suspended, and that the Company should instead concentrate on the export from India of the raw materials necessary for manufacture in England." It would have been much better if the Commissioners had quoted chapter and verse to substantiate the statement contained in the first part of the above quoted sentence, for without the support of recognised historical authorities a mere assertion is not likely to remove the general impression that the East India Company's efforts were made not to foster Indian industries but to crush them out. That impression may perhaps be due to the later action of the East India Company taken under the pressure of manufacturers in England, to which reference has been made in the report. It was, therefore, necessary in fairness to the East India Company and in the interests of truth for the Commissioners to support their statement with well-known historical authorities. It is true that the elucidation of this matter did not come within the scope of their inquiry, and if they had kept altogether silent on the subject there would have been no ground for this criticism; but when they once took up the subject it was their duty to sift thoroughly all the historical evidence on this subject. If they had done so and discussed all the evidence at their sittings, the Hon'ble Panditji would not have perhaps found it necessary to write the first and the major portion of his minute.

The Commissioners go on to say that owing to the *laissez-faire* views prevailing in England, the spasmodic efforts that were being made here to help the indigenous industries became less and less frequent, and "the first attempt at a general policy of industrial development took only two forms—a very imperfect provision of technical and industrial education and the collection and dissemination of commercial and industrial information." One does not want to dot the i's or cross the t's when the Commissioners themselves call the provision of technical instruction as "very imperfect." They may well have said that greater stress was laid in the first years of the inauguration of the commercial intelligence department to the collection of commercial information that was likely to prove useful to the exporters of raw material. Even now the publications of this department, which under its present head are more or less adapted to the country's requirements, are not issued in a popular form and are not likely to prove of much assistance to the ordinary industrialist. Reference is made in the Report to the Indian and Colonial Exhibition, held in London in 1886, and to the institution of series of monographs on Indian industries by various provincial Governments, and to the work of the Geological Survey in connection with the economic use of minerals. For one reason or other the industrial monographs did not prove very useful to persons intending to start these industries, and the Commissioners might very well have given their reasons for the monographs failing to fulfil the objects for which they were written. The results of the Geological Survey are proving useful in the establishment of metallurgical industries, and great credit is due to the president of the Commission for having done much as the head of the Geological Survey to help the starting of these industries. These efforts were, however, as the Report acknowledges, due more to the initiative of a few far-sighted officials than to "any considered and general policy on the part of the Government," and consequently cannot form the basis of any continuous useful work.

The remaining portions of the chapter are devoted to describing briefly the attempts made in the various provinces in the cause of the industrial development. The place of honour is rightly given to the United Provinces, which under the guidance of Sir John Hewett took up the work of industrial development in right earnest. Probably his having occupied the post of the member for the commerce and industries department in the Government of India gave him opportunities of studying the industrial needs of the country and as soon as he was given charge of a province he called a Conference at Naini Tal to consider the question of the industrial development of the province placed in his charge. As a result of the recommendations of the Conference, loans or grants were given to several concerns, but owing to proper precautions not being taken, when placing orders for machinery, nor to any provision being made for in-

spection by Government experts, the factories that received financial assistance did not flourish for some years. The one pioneer mill started by Government did not also prove a successful venture. These two instances showed that while the Government of Sir John Hewett was honestly anxious to foster the growth of industries, it had neither the assistance of experts nor the advice of sound business men in carrying out its industrial policy, and that practically no progress in the direction of industrial development is seen as a result of the Government policy. The Madras Presidency was the second to take up this question, but the results of that Government's policy were not very successful. At least that has been the opinion, not of nonofficials, but high officials of sister presidencies. As the officer appointed by that Government for the purpose of looking after the manufacture of aluminium vessels, etc., was a member of the present Commission, he seems to have satisfied his colleagues that the absence of tangible results was due to Lord Morley's despatch of the 26th July, 1910, and to the opposition of the local European merchants. I know nothing of the latter cause; perhaps it is correct. But on reading Lord Crewe's minute of 12th March, 1912, it appears that the criticism of Lord Morley's despatch is not fair. May it be that the officer, who tried to develop the industries of Madras and failed, saw a splendid opportunity, as a member of the Commission, to have a hit at a minister whom he held to be responsible for his own failure, and whom very few officials love and admire sufficiently to stand up in his defence? This reference seems to be due to the spite of one gentleman, and it would have been better if the Commissioners had carefully considered the other side of the question before attributing failure to Lord Morley's despatch. I think that the policy laid down by that statesman that "State funds might be expended upon familiarising the people with such improvements in the methods of production as modern science and the practice of European companies could suggest," but that any semblance of commercial ventures should be avoided, seems to be a sound one for the time when it was laid down.

After mentioning the recent attempts made in Bombay and the Central Provinces for helping industries by the creation of the post of Director of Industries, the Report refers to the industrial surveys in Bengal, the Punjab, the United Provinces and the Central Provinces which, being conducted by officers without technical knowledge of any industry, were "useful only for administrative purposes as reviews of the existing industrial position" and consequently "nothing definite seems to have resulted from any of them except the report." A reference is also made to the expert examination of industries in the Bombay Presidency. The report says in conclusion that little has been advanced by these spasmodic efforts of various Governments, that the experience gained of these efforts has been of a negative character, and then

goes on to add in trenchant terms: "Much valuable time has been lost, during which substantial advances might have been registered, and the outbreak of war, which should have proved an opportunity to reap the fruits of progress, has served mainly to reveal and accentuate startling deficiencies."

L. S.

A LETTER FROM LONDON.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

LONDON, DECEMBER 31.

THE COALITION VICTORY.

TO-DAY a historic year expires. What will the New Year bring to India? It is very difficult to say, for the fortune of the ballot box does not seem to be a very promising one. This has been the most remarkable of all General Elections. To begin with, the electorate was doubled by the Electoral Act of this year. For the first time, some six millions of women were enfranchised, and no-one knew which way they would vote. Then, too, owing to war-conditions, and the special circumstances of a national army, it became necessary to enfranchise the soldiers, who, after all, were but exercising their functions of free citizenship upon the field of battle. No-one could say which way the soldiers would vote. But this was not all the difficulty. Owing to the speed at which it was thought fit to push forward the elections, a very large body of troops were unable to receive any election literature at all, whilst, in many other cases, the candidates were unknown or their programmes did not essentially differ. The Coalition was, as its name suggests, a conglomerate of the different parties, and unless a man is specifically labelled, the average Britisher does not know exactly how to cast his vote. In this election, there were Unionist Coalitionists, non-Coalition Unionists, Liberal Coalitionists, and Liberal non-Coalitionists, and Labour candidates, some of whom stood as Coalitionists whilst most did not. In addition there were a few Independent candidates. All the elements of a muddle existed; and yet, in so far as the voting proves anything at all, it proves certain things very emphatically. The first is that nearly half of the electorate was too confused or unable to vote, or else declined to express any opinion at all, until more normal times had arrived and they knew better where they were. The majority of the electorate plumped for Mr. Lloyd George in overwhelming numbers. He stood, in their eyes, for driving power such as had led to victory. He stood for a victorious peace. He stood for the average man's ideal of the immediate and not too distant future. The women voted for him in bulk. The soldiers, in so far as they voted at all, voted for him almost *en masse*. The candidates that fought under the Coalition banner, whether Unionist, Liberal, or Labour, came through almost unscathed, and with colours flying. They secured huge majorities, in most cases. The Liberals entered the contest divided. A minority of them stood

as Coalitionists. Nearly all of them succeeded. The majority of the party followers of Mr. Asquith, were tragically defeated. The ex-Prime Minister himself lost the seat that he had held continuously for over thirty years, and whose name had been specially retained out of compliment to him when the Franchise Act was passed a few months ago. With him have disappeared from the House of Commons his principal supporters and lieutenants. The House will know no more Mr. McKenna or Mr. Runciman, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Mr. Montagu's cousin) or Mr. Gulland, Sir John Simon or Mr. Charles Roberts. It was once said that the Unionist members for Scotland could easily travel in one first class compartment. It has just been remarked that all the Asquith Liberals could easily drive to the House of Commons in a penny 'bus. Their total numbers are 26, and they do not include a single man of front-rank eminence. The Unionists have simply romped home. Not only do they predominate largely in the Coalition, but their numbers outside it are nearly double those of the Asquith Liberals.

DEFEAT OF INDIA'S FRIENDS.

The Labour party will, at least for the present, be the largest non-Government party in the House. They have succeeded, and yet they have failed. They had hoped to get a minimum of 80 seats, with a possible 120. As it is, including the Government Labour members and the single Socialist, the party has raised its representation from 42 in the last Parliament to 70 in the new one. They also polled about 2½ millions out of the 9 million odd votes cast. But they not only failed to secure their minimum membership. Many of the best known of the Labour leaders were hopelessly defeated. Mr. Arthur Henderson himself, the Secretary of the Parliamentary Labour Party, was among the defeated, as were such stalwarts as Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, Mr. Philip Snowden, Mr. F. W. Jowett, and Mr. W. C. Anderson. They were all rejected because of their pacifist views expressed during the war. Practically every pacifist candidate was swept out of political existence, and the ban extended to those who were deemed to be even remotely tinged with the evil thing as well as those who were regarded as indifferently disposed towards the energetic prosecution of the war. It happens that many of those who have been defeated are among the strong supporters of Indian reform. Unfortunately, the average man regards them as being either unpatriotic or else as cranks, and it is only proper to note that their identification with any cause would not have helped it. Strangely enough, the only woman candidate to secure election was the Countess Markievicz, who represents a Dublin constituency in the Sinn Fein interest. As it happens, she is unlikely to be seen in Parliament, for, as at present advised, Sinn Fein has decided to abstain from attendance at St. Stephen's. Whether, in the light of events not very far ahead, the party will continue to absent itself remains to be seen. In all probability, it will reconsider its posi-

tion, and we may yet see a woman in Parliament. If Sinn Fein decides to attend, it will possibly dispute the occupancy of the Opposition front benches with the Labour party. Among other friends of India who disappear from the House of Commons are Mr. H. E. A. Cotton, whose services could have been so valuable in the near future, Mr. J. M. Robertson, Mr. Dillon, Sir Edward Parrott, Mr. Chancellor, and Prof. Lees-Smith. Sir Herbert Roberts did not stand again, but he may soon be heard of otherwise. Among those friends of India who sought election and failed to secure it were Mrs. Despard, Col. Meyler, Mr. George Lansbury, Mr. Sidney Webb, Capt. Sidney Ransom, Miss Alison Garland, Mr. John Scurr, Major Graham Pole, and Dr. G. B. Clark. Mr. T. J. Bennett, of the "Times of India" was elected, and both Mr. Joynson-Hicks, the spokesman for the Indo-British Association, and Sir J. D. Rees, its opponent, were re-elected. Col. Wedgwood and Mr. Mac Callum Scott are also back again, whilst Mr. Montagu was returned with almost a two to one majority over his Labour opponent for the constituency of Cambridgeshire.

PROSPECTS OF INDIAN REFORMS.

From the point of view of India, the prospect is not too encouraging. The Coalition numbers 484, giving it a majority over all other parties of 262, with one result still to come, but which will almost certainly give another vote for the Coalition, counting two in a division. The Government party consists of 338 Unionists, 136 (probably 137) Liberals, and 10 Labour. The Opposition, or rather the non-Coalition parties, consist of 73 Sinn Feiners, 59 Labourites, 26 Liberals, 9 Independents, and 7 Irish Nationalists. It will be seen that the Unionists combined have an absolute majority of the whole House. I need hardly suggest to your readers what this may mean. It will be very difficult for the Prime Minister not to construct his Cabinet with materials preponderantly Unionist in character. The Liberal element in the Cabinet will not be very large. Labour's power will be very much curtailed by reason of the party's small representation in Parliament, though its influence will be greater than its numbers indicate. Nevertheless, the utmost that it can do is to help to save the Reforms from destruction at the hands of their enemies, who are increasing in number and in influence. As a party, Labour is well-meaning towards Indian national aspirations, but it is very ignorant in all matters of administrative detail. In all probability, it will not, especially under the leadership of the more conservative type of Trade Unionists that at present forms its major part, proceed very far in advance of such legislation as may be introduced by the Government upon receipt of the reports of the Committees now sitting in India. At this stage it is very difficult to analyse the situation, but it is not very promising. Only the greatest union on your side, the most determined decision to limit demands to the minimum deemed necessary to make

the Reforms effective, and the sending here of your best equipped leaders, having a free hand, who are acquainted with the peculiarities of the British psychology, and who will not fritter away their energies at the fringe of the situation, but will direct them towards the conversion and conviction of the few men that, for the time being, at least, really count here, will help. There is a very real danger not merely that improvements in the Reforms may not be secured, but that the proposals themselves may be rejected and their great purpose frustrated. It is a matter for the most earnest consideration on the part of the advisers and leaders of the Indian national movement whether they will use all legitimate means to ensure that nothing on your side should occur to jeopardise still further the prospects of constitutional reform in India for many years to come.

SELECTION.

A DANGER IN INDIA.

We print below the leading article that appeared in the "Yorkshire Herald" of December 27, 1918, on the Rowlatt Committee's Report and the reply thereto, given by Mr. Devadhar in the form of a letter to that paper.

ONE of the most grave and complex problems that our statesmen will have to deal with in the coming year is the future system of government of India. The Montagu-Chelmsford report proposing certain constitutional changes in the direction of greater self-government has now been before the public for some time, and it cannot be said to be growing in popularity. Some time ago we cited the opinion of an educated Indian to the effect that the principal result would be the placing of the peasantry entirely in the hands of a certain section of the educated classes who would simply exploit the ryots for their own aggrandisement. That view has been endorsed by many who are entitled to speak with authority on the subject, and their objections have been reinforced by a report from a Committee over which Mr. Justice Rowlatt presided which has established the existence of an extensive conspiracy for the overthrow of British rule. The result is that others who, not being aware of the real situation, were inclined to view the proposals for "reform" in a favourable spirit, are wisely reserving their judgment till they are better acquainted with all the facts.

It is a somewhat curious circumstance that, though the report of the Rowlatt Committee on Sedition is dated April 15, 1918, and was therefore in the hands of the Government of India seven days before the Montagu-Chelmsford report upon constitutional changes, which is dated April 22, the former report, which throws a most sinister light upon the demands of some leading Indian politicians, was not published in India till later than the latter and even yet is not generally known in the United Kingdom. To remedy this, however, there has now been published by the Indo-British Association a pamphlet giving an epitome of the Rowlatt report with foreword and notes disclosing a position of affairs which does not hold out much hope that India can be safely entrusted with any such system of self-government as that suggested. One or two illuminating points are brought out in the pamphlet. For example, during many months the Bengali press, we are told, resounded with the "wrongs" of "innocent youths" interned without trial, and represented by Mrs. Besant and other fanatics as "ruthless oppression," but an impartial and searching inquiry conducted by Mr. Justice Beachcroft and

Sir N. G. Chandavarkar (ex-Judge of the Bombay High Court) revealed that out of 806 persons interned by the Bengal Government all except six were deeply implicated in some form of revolutionary enterprise. Facts like these, as has been observed by the "Madras Mail," will enable the ordinary Englishman to obtain a juster view of the Indian situation and lead thoughtful people to weigh against the amiable theories of Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford the stern realities of the case.

The broad facts to be gathered from the Rowlett report are briefly (1) the very wide extent and ramifications of the conspiracy against British rule and the elaborate arrangements for corrupting boys and young students, (2) the assistance given by Germany, (3) the inference that much remains undiscovered and that very large numbers of persons must now be infected with the revolutionary poison, and (4) the numerical weakness of the police force for which the constant objections of elected Indian members of the Legislative Council to any strengthening are chiefly responsible. The grave disclosures are ridiculed by such factionist papers as the "Indian Patriot," the "Hindu" and the "Kesari," as well as by some prominent agitators, and these are the people who would be placed in a position of authority and power under the new scheme of "reform." That no great catastrophe took place during the last few years is attributed not to the absence of desire to wreck the British Government but to the stupidity of German agents who were at the bottom of all the mischief. Deplorable results were also averted by the loyalty of the non-Brahmin and non-political classes in India and to the brilliant services of the much maligned but faithful and efficient Indian police. The conclusion of the Indo-British Association is surely in the circumstances well justified that to weigh the scales in favour of the shibboleths of British Radical politicians and to weaken British authority now, as would be the effect of the proposed changes, is tantamount to inciting a grave political disaster.

MR. DEVADHAR'S REPLY.

TO THE EDITOR, 'THE YORKSHIRE HERALD,' YORK.

SIR,—Your article entitled 'A Danger in India,' appearing in your issue of Dec. 27, is calculated to cause great pain and some degree of consternation to Indians, who, like myself, have been accustomed to look to the British Press for fair-play. You have quoted from a pamphlet issued by the Indo-British Association, purporting to summarise the Rowlett Commission's report on unrest in India. The Association's publication is unfortunately of a one-sided character and especially designed to prejudice the case for what Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford have described as the politically-minded sections of the Indian people. It is evidently also to be used as a weapon with which to attempt to destroy the Montagu-Chelmsford proposals for Constitutional Reform in India. You somewhat lightly speak of 'the amiable theories of Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford,' but you appear to have omitted to notice that the general principles laid down by these two eminent and responsible statesmen in their Report have been accepted not only by their colleagues, who participated in the mission, but by the Government of India and the India Council, the great majority of whose members are Englishmen of very wide experience of Indian administration, covering a long period of years. You declare that 'deplorable results (to the stability of the British Government in India) were . . . averted by the loyalty of the non-Brahman and non-political classes in India.' Though I myself belong to neither, I have nothing but the highest admiration for these classes. But your remarks imply that those deplorable results might not have been averted because of the disloyalty of the Brahman and political classes in India. As a member of both of these classes, I must emphatically and indignantly protest against any such implication, nor will you find any warrant for such an innuendo in the Rowlett Commission's report itself, in spite of the mali-

cious abstract of the Indo-British Association. Had it not been for the strong and loyal support of the Government by the politically-minded classes in India throughout the crisis with which the Empire had been faced, the history of events in my country would have been very different from what it has been. Undoubtedly the best judges on this point are the Secretary of State for India and the Viceroy, and my countrymen are prepared to accept their judgment in the matter as against that of the Indo-British Association. I observe that you quote Sir N. G. Chandavarkar (himself a Brahman and a member of the politically-minded classes) in support of the thesis formulated by the Association. May I be permitted to quote the following remarks by him in a speech delivered at the Moderates' Conference, held recently in Bombay?

The last point on which he wished to speak was one on which he could not speak with the freedom which he would have liked to have allowed himself. He thought, however, he ought to speak on that point because he claimed to speak with the voice of authority on the subject. He referred to the revolutionary crime in Bengal and to the Rowlett Committee's report. He had recently had opportunities of studying the psychology of the revolutionary movement in Bengal from the inside. When he undertook that task, he hesitated, because he knew it was an odious task, but he took it up because he had spent several years of his life, not merely in the legal profession, but had also taken part in public, social, religious and political life of the country, and wanted to know what the psychology of the revolutionary movement was. He said if the Rowlett Committee's report and the facts of the revolutionary crime in Bengal were to be used against the Reform Scheme, no one, who had studied the literature of that movement as he had done, would come to the conclusion that repressive laws should come first and reforms afterwards. On some future occasion, he might write on the subject, as without doing so he would not be discharging his duty to the British Government. For the information of the Conference, however, and for the information of the British Parliament, before whom the Rowlett Committee's report would go for discussion, he wished to place some facts, which, he hoped, would be utilised and made known to every member of Parliament. When they spoke of the revolutionary movement in Bengal, they spoke of the 'Bhadralog' dacoities. The people concerned in the movement were respectable, high-class and educated men. The Parliamentary Committee's reports of 1813 contained documents in which the then Governor-General of India informed the Directors of the East India Company that these 'Bhadralog' dacoities were very much rampant throughout the province of Bengal, that the Government had enacted laws of the most rigorous character to put down the movement. But the more rigorous the laws, the more numerous the dacoities became. Afterwards Government tried saner measures and these had the desired effect. Sir Narayan next related how on subsequent occasions, similar enactments of repressive measures were followed by dacoities and revolutionary crimes and instanced the passing of the Ilbert Bill in 1883 and the partition of Bengal in Lord Curzon's regime. Sir Narayan said he wished to bring home to the conscience, to the minds and to the bosoms of the British public and the members of Parliament, the fact that from his knowledge of the revolutionary crime in Bengal, his conviction was that the only effective way of preventing revolutionary crime was the introduction of liberal measures of administration.

In conclusion, and while apologising for the length of this letter, may I remind you of the generous and emphatic protest, made not long ago here in London against these unfair and inspired diatribes against the Brahmans and the politically-minded classes of India by no less a person than the Right Hon. Sir S. P. Sinha, K. C. (a non-Brahman), speaking on behalf of himself and the Maharaja of Patiala? Your readers are doubtless aware that Sir S. P. Sinha is a member of the Imperial War Cabinet and one of the Indian delegates to the Peace Conference?—Yours truly.

36, Drayton Gardens,
London, S. W. 10,
Jan. 5, 1919.

G. K. DEVADHAR.

INDIA'S WAR FINANCE.

AND POST-WAR PROBLEMS.

By Prof. V. G. Kale, M. A.

The book lucidly reviews the administration of Indian finance during war time and clearly brings out the great services rendered and sacrifices made by this country for the successful prosecution of the war to a victorious issue. It describes the effects of the war upon Indian finance, currency, exchange, trade and banking and points out in what directions urgent reforms are called for in view of the requirements of the country's progress in the era of reconstruction and rapid development. Every student of public questions and of Indian Economics ought to buy a copy. Cloth bound Rs. 2.

Copies may be had of leading booksellers and the Aryabhushan Press, Poona, and Bombay Vaibhav Press, Bombay.

Now is the opportunity for Novel Readers
A NEW NOVEL "MYSTERIES OF PARIS"

BY
EUGENE SUE

The Great French Novelist. Neat get-up. Good paper. Complete in 1 volume Price Re. 1-0-0 and for other Novels (bold type Editions) Catalogues free on application.
The Superior Watch Co. Post Box No. 167, MADRAS.

JUST A WORD

or two to remind you to send your order To-Day for our famous
COSSI SILK SUIT PIECES
Worth the price, and a piece guaranteed for one suit complete.
Price Rs. 8 per piece.
Order from:—GOOD LUCK COMPANY, BENARES CITY.

To Lovers of Religion.

Esoteric Hinduism, in English, with an Introduction by Mrs. Annie Besant, in two parts. Popular Hinduism and Philosophic Hinduism ... 2-8-0
Portraits of Indian Classics ... 0-8-0
Dasaratha or the Fatal Promise ... 0-8-0
Kumuda, a drama ... 0-8-0

Apply to:—L. V. RAMACHANDRA IYER,
Publisher, MADRAS.

Sovereign Ringworm Ointment

Will give miraculous cure in 24 hours for Chronic Ringworms, Dhobies' Itches and other skin diseases. Guaranteed. If not curable, money will be given back. Price per phial As. 12.

SOVEREIGN & Co.,
B. O. Box 127, Madras.

ARYAN CINEMA,

Opposite Reay Market, Poona City.

2nd Instalment

Of a Stupendous Railway Serial-

Girl & Game

On Thursday 6th & Friday 7th.

Pathe's Mysterious Serial

House of Hate

8th Instalment

From Sat. 8th to Tues. 11th.

Take the Offensive AGAINST CATARRH.

Many people are inclined to neglect this disease in its early stages—don't commit such an error! Catarrh gives rise to many diseases such as—Loss of Sight, Deafness, Hay Fever, Asthma, Bronchitis, Sore Throat, Influenza etc. To effectively cure any Catarrhal disease you MUST remove the Catarrh and that is what most remedies fail to do. The Actina treatment gets right to the root of the trouble and its powerful vapour courses through even the minutest nerves and blood-vessels in direct contact with the affected membranes removing the congestion, and restoring healthy circulation. Invest Rs. 25-8 (plus postage etc.) in an Actina and save specialists' fees. Valuable Booklet entitled "Prof. Wilson's Treatise on Disease" containing particulars of our Conditional Trial Offer and testimonials post free from Rai B. S. Bhandari, M. A., Batala, (India).

1 **ACTINA NATURAL
TREATMENT.**

New Books.

Guttala Re. 1.
The divine minstrel of Benares. A poem by F. G. and L. M. Pearce. Based on a version of the Sinhalese "Guttala Kavya."

Short Stories Rs. 2
Social and Historical by Mrs. Ghosal (Srimati Swarna Kumari Devi) with nine illustrations and bound in cloth.

Ode to Truth As. 8.
By James H. Cousins.

G. A. Vaidya Raman & Co.
(Ex.) (S) Kondi Chetty St., Madras.

SHRI BHARAT DHARMA MAHAMANDAL.
THE ALL-INDIA
Hindu Socio-religious Association.
General President: H. H. the Maharaja Bahadur of Durbhanga.

Subscription for General Members each Rs. 2 a year. Members have the privileges of (a) the Mahamandal Benevolent Fund; (b) the Mahamandal Magazine (in English),—a High Class Monthly free; (c) all the Mahamandal *Shastri* Publications, on a discount of 12½ p. c. off. Prospectus and Specimen copy of the Magazine sent FREE. AGENTS wanted in all important towns. Commission handsome.

The General Secretary, Shri Bharat Dharma Mahamandal, BENARES CANTT.

THE EASTERN PHARMACEUTICAL WORKS.

1 ANTI-FEVER.

An excellent preparation which can be used with great success and safety as a Curative or Preventive of Influenza, Malaria, or any other Remittent Fevers.

Guaranteed to contain no quinine, or any poisonous agents, which in the hands of laymen may lead to harmful after-effects

2 HEMATIC COMPOUND.

An ideal bone and nerve tonic, an excellent blood regenerator and purifier. Invigorates and rapidly recoups lost health in convalescence from Influenza, Pneumonia, Typhoid and other tropical fevers. Guaranteed free from alcohol.

3. ANTI-INFLUENZA.

4. CHOLERA DROPS.

Sole Agents:—**Sane Bros.**
Madhav Agetey, Mohan Buildings,
BOMBAY 4.

Rates of Subscription.

(Including postage.)

Yearly	Rs. 4-0-0
Half yearly	Rs. 2-4-0
Quarterly	Rs. 1-4-0
Great Britain (Yearly)	7 shillings.
Single Copy	As. 0-2-0

Subscription payable strictly in advance.