

THE Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.—Office : Servants of India Society's Home, Poona (D. G.).

VOL. XI, No. 8.

POONA—THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1928.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	89
GOKHALE ANNIVERSARY :—	
My Political Guru. By Dr. H. C. E. Zacharias, Ph.D.	91
Sir Jamsetjee Jejeebhoy's Address	92
ARTICLES :—	
The Country's Verdict	94
Sir Sankaran Nair on the Commission	96
Excise in Bombay During 1926-27	97
Within or Without—I. By Raghunath Row	98
OUR SOUTH AFRICAN LETTER	99
OUR PARLIAMENTARY LETTER	100
OUR BENGAL LETTER	101
REVIEWS :—	
Near Eastern Politics. By Prof. T. G. P. Spear, M.A.	102
Capital and Labour. By Ernest Kirk	103
SHORT NOTICES	104
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
Marriage Age in South Africa	104

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

THE thirteenth anniversary of Mr. Gokhale's death fell on Sunday last and the occasion was availed of in Poona for commencing the construction of the new building intended for the Arya Bhushan and Dnyan Prakash Presses owned and managed by the Servants of India Society. These have so far been located in rented buildings in the city and were, as our readers will remember, burnt down in May 1926. The fire was a crushing blow and would indeed have wiped the Servants of India Society out of existence, had it not been for the financial succour so liberally given by its friends and sympathisers. To them the Society will always remain profoundly grateful. Speaking at Sunday's function Mr. Devadhar, President of the Society, gave expression to this feeling of gratitude to the Society's benefactors among whom it was a privilege to count the Wadia Charities, for, in Mr. Devadhar's words, to be regarded by them as worthy of their support was indeed to most a guarantee of efficiency as well as unselfishness. The Charities headed the subscription list started soon after the fire in aid of the Society by promising a generous contribution of Rs. 30,000 payable in six yearly instalments; and contributions came pouring in from friends and sympathisers who included all classes of society from prince to peasant. The employees of the presses too wanted to do their bit by offering to forego their hard earned bonus, but their offer was for obvious reasons thankfully declined. The incident however serves to show what strong ties bind them to their employers, the Society. As announced by Mr. Devadhar, the Society has received promises of support amounting to Rs. 2,40,000 nearly a quarter of which is still unrealised. In view of the fact that the work of construction of the

new press building is taken in hand and will be pushed on with vigour, the need for funds is urgent and those who have yet to pay up should do so soon. Sir Jamsetjee Jejeebhoy has added one more to his many services to the Society by specially coming down to Poona to lay the foundation stone and speaking in such appreciative terms about the Society and its work, as will be seen from his speech printed elsewhere in this issue. His appeal to all to render help even where opinions did not wholly agree was the most generous tribute that has ever been paid or can be paid to the Society.

* * *

THE Simon debate in the Assembly will always remain associated with the tragic death of Mr. Harchandrai Vishandas who literally laid down his life in the discharge of his duty. Mr. Harchandrai, much against his doctor's advice, went to Delhi in order to vote in favour of Lala Lajpat Rai's resolution proclaiming a boycott of the Commission, but collapsed before the time of voting. He will be remembered as a broad-minded Hindu, of whom there are not, alas, too many in Sind. When the national political consciousness was much less strong than at the present time, Mr. Harchandrai did his best at considerable sacrifice to rouse the people of Sind to a sense of their duty. He worthily represented Sind in the Bombay Legislative Council under the Morley-Minto Reforms and in the Legislative Assembly ever since its birth. When the National Congress met at Karachi in 1913, Mr. Harchandrai as Chairman of the Reception Committee left nothing undone to ensure its success. His death leaves his province and the country immensely poorer.

* * *

LORD OXFORD'S death removes from the arena of English politics one of the greatest statesmen and Parliamentarians of the last century. In 1886 he was elected member of Parliament for East Fife and retained the seat till 1918. After the defeat of the Conservative Government in 1892 he was picked up by Mr. Gladstone as a great asset to the Liberal Party and made Home Member in the new Liberal Ministry. As an ardent free trader he organised the Liberal party to give battle to Mr. Joseph Chamberlain in his tariff-reform crusade and thenceforward practically made himself indispensable to the Liberal Party. In 1908 he became Premier and the Cabinet that he selected was one of the most powerful Cabinets of this century, with a wealth of talents rarely matched in the annals of Cabinet-formation. The rejection of the Budget by the Lords engaged him in one of the toughest fights against the upholders of hereditary rights of the Upper House and as a result the Lords were shorn of their historic privilege of vetoing. His freedom from personal ambition and his steadfast pursuit of

national good laid the foundations of the ultimate victory in the Great War. In response to the public opinion as expressed in the Press he consented to a Coalition Cabinet in 1915 and patiently suffered the calumnies of the press as well as the vapourings of some of his misguided colleagues in the serene confidence that he was doing his duty, thus proving the "sombrely virile" character which Mr. W. T. Stead attributed to him. On being presented with a demand that an inner Cabinet acting as a War Council should be formed—but without the Prime Minister—he refused to be bullied into submission and resigned in 1917, having been Premier for nine years in succession. After 1920 he gave himself up to literary pursuits. In 1925 he was made an Earl.

Lord Oxford's loyalty to Liberalism has been remarkable; he has never wavered in his adherence to the creed and has resisted the drift into socialism which many of his followers have regarded as inevitable. But apart from this, his intellectual aloofness and his freedom from passion and prejudice have been the keynotes of his eloquence. He rarely indulged in subterfuges, never took a mean advantage of any weakness in the position of his opponents and relied mainly on strict truthfulness. His oratory had not the quality of being impassioned and imaginative, like that of Gladstone, but was of the cold and critical type. He did his utmost to reconstruct the Liberal party and if the party to-day is still amorphous and looks like moribund the fault cannot be laid at his door. His freedom from jealousy and vanity made him one of the most agreeable men to consort with. Lord Oxford's death has removed from British politics a powerful force working against sudden upheavals and has created a void in the Liberal party which it would take a long time to fill up.

On Monday last Sir C. V. Mehta presented the Bombay Budget for 1928-29. The year 1926-27 was characterized by suspensions and remissions of land-revenue on account of an exceptionally bad season and a fall of Excise revenue, the major part of which is attributable to lower consumption of liquor. A still greater fall is recorded in the revenue from Stamps, the actuals being shorter by Rs. 18 lakhs than the estimates. The most creditable feature of the year was that the decrease in revenue was counterbalanced by a decrease in expenditure of Rs. 51 lakhs. Discussing the revised estimates for 1927-28 and the Budget estimates for the next year, the Finance Member referred to the unprecedented calamity of the floods which is responsible for a serious draft on the Famine Fund and the general balances to the amount of nearly Rs. 173 lakhs. The revised figure for Excise revenue is Rs. 386 lakhs against the budget estimate of Rs. 400 lakhs, which from the point of view of Prohibition is good news. The depression in trade and commerce is responsible for a fall of Rs. 13 lakhs in the revised estimates of the Stamps revenue. The question of the exchange of Stamps in lieu of a share in the income-tax was discussed by the Finance Members' Conference but no decision has been arrived at. The debt position is as unsatisfactory as it was last year; the Sukkur Barrage accounts for Rs. 9 crores, the Development Department is responsible for a debt of Rs. 13 crores, Irrigation Works show Rs. 244 lakhs and Civil Works, Public Health etc. record a total debt of Rs. 4.7 lakhs. A welcome announcement by the Finance Member is about the reduction of Bombay's contribution to the Famine Insurance Fund from 53.6 lakhs to Rs. 10 lakhs which lifts a weight off the shoulders of this province. The expenditure on the Back Bay Reclamation during the year has been Rs. 32.3 lakhs.

The Budget proposes to pay for the next year a sum of Rs. 5.5 lakhs out of general revenues to the Industrial Housing Scheme to cover the losses. The revised figure for expenditure on the Sukkur Barrage during the current year is Rs. 206 lakhs. The Finance Member says he is happy to mention that it has been found possible to provide Rs. 5 lakhs more under education; he ought rather to have been unhappy over being brought to such a perilous pass. The Finance Member hopes that the remnant of the provincial contribution of Rs. 37 lakhs will be wiped out this year, so that the soreness due to the Meston Award will have been completely removed. The attempt of the Finance Member however to throw the whole blame for the starvation of nation-building departments on the Meston Award cannot but provoke criticism. With a deficit of Rs. 62 lakhs, we can hardly bless the revised estimates for the current year. In spite of Sir. C. V. Mehta's assurance we do not believe that the possibilities of the retrenchment in the various departments have been exhausted.

BY asking for the abolition of capital punishment, the Ceylon Legislative Council has brought itself into line with current progressive thought on the subject of penal reform. This form of punishment is a relic of less civilised times and does not really act as a deterrent. For if a murder is committed under the influence of some strong passion or on the impulse of the moment, it is clear that the murderer cannot be held back by any consideration of the penalty prescribed for the deed. And if on the other hand it is committed in cold blood and after careful preparation, it is done in full knowledge of what is to follow and as such the extreme penalty of the law ceases to hold out any terrors for the murderer. The hollowness of the argument that if capital punishment is abolished, it would result in a larger number of murders is proved by the experience of countries which have for some time been doing without it and find that the abolition of capital punishment, instead of increasing murders, has led to a reduction in their number. Then, capital punishment has also the great demerit of being irrevocable with the result that the chances of the innocent person being sometimes hanged in place of the guilty are not quite nonexistent. So far as Ceylon is concerned, there is the additional complication of the country being largely reared on the Buddhist tradition of *ahimsa* which prevents some jurymen from returning a verdict of guilty in a murder case. Besides the execution of the sentence has generally a demoralising effect upon prison authorities, and cases are on record in which prison officials have committed suicides in order to escape the responsibility of carrying out what to them was a dreadful duty. All these considerations were set forth in the course of his remarks in the Ceylon Legislative Council by the mover in support of his motion. Those however who wish to study the question at greater length may do well to refer to Mr. E. Calvert Roy's admirable book "Capital Punishment in the Twentieth Century", which seems to have largely inspired the debate in question. In this book a convincing case has been ably made out for the abolition of this form of punishment with the aid of a wealth of statistics relating to countries where capital punishment has been abolished. In Mr. Roy's opinion, the immediate alternative to Capital Punishment is the substitution of a long term of imprisonment; not as an ideal substitute but as the next step in a general process of penal reform.

MY POLITICAL GURU.

I CONFESS that it is never quite without an uneasy feeling that I take part in any celebration of anniversaries of distinguished Indians—for the simple reason that it seems to me that what we want in India is not more, but rather less hero-worship, or—to put it more colloquially and generally—less concern about personalities and rather more, very much more, about principles.

The exception which proves the rule is February 19th—the anniversary of GOPAL KRISHNA GOKHALE'S death in 1915: and it is the exception, which gives me no misgivings whatever, just because GOKHALE is the outstanding example in contemporary Indian history of a man who would always place principles first and everything else a long way after. The *locus classicus* of his life of course is the incident during the Great Plague at Poona in 1897, when he publicly retracted allegations against the Indian Government of the day voiced by him on what he had considered reliable authority, but afterwards discovered by him to have been incorrect. Not only was this action of his not appreciated at the time, but on the contrary it was deemed to have been at its best quixotic, and at its worst treasonable, but in any case altogether unpatriotic. GOKHALE at that great testing time of his life placed truth above the mere exigencies of the hour and in so doing he has given an example of devotion to the supremacy of ethical values in public life, which has rarely been equalled and never excelled in the India of our own days.

Of course people said then and they say it still to-day, that morality and practical politics are mutually exclusive and that, what in politics is needed for success above all things, is utter unscrupulousness and an iron resolve to use all means, fair or foul, to achieve the end that one has proposed to oneself. The fallacy of that view is in fact patent: yet only too many cannot see it, notwithstanding the almost daily exemplification of the adage that "Honesty is the best Policy." In business, in big business particularly, the sanding of sugar simply does not pay: for the sake of gaining fraudulently a penny today, all chance of gaining a pound tomorrow is forfeited. And good business is not merely based on the credit, the reputation, one enjoys amongst one's customers (is "a satisfied customer not the best advertisement"?): it is even more generally based on the recognition that even in business life transactions must never be one-sided, but must always endeavour to reconcile the mutual interests of both parties. Modern Big Business certainly has done with the pettifogging little devices of the proverbial *bania* and if it would be absurd to hold it up as a school of sanctity, the fact remains that business has recognized at least that honesty is the best policy, however faltering the steps may be by which individuals follow it.

And if that holds good of business, how much more is it true in politics that honesty is the best policy? In Mr. Lloyd George we have a contemporary statesman whose very name, has become iden-

tified with opportunism. Anything to gain a temporary success, seemed his motto during long years of war; and so he progressed from temporary success to temporary success, until he seemed almost the arbiter of the world. But once, as the cynic might say, he was found out, what fall, what collapse! Was there ever a greater contrast than between the Lloyd George of ten years ago and of today—unless it be his protagonist, the Kaiser? Honesty surely is the best policy even in politics: certainly in a democratic age, when power is given to the people at large and—what the people at large want, is not so much a brilliant man, or a successful man, but a man they can trust; and it is not fortuitously that the principal English statesman after Mr. George has been "Honest Baldwin." Not of course that all English voters today are agreed that this political honesty of Mr. Baldwin's is real: the fact remains that it is honesty of purpose which a leader in modern democracy must be believed to possess, if he would gain the support of his people. Mr. George was idolized at one time when he voiced loudly democratic ideals; he was execrated and thrown aside like a broken pot, when the people found they could not trust him; whilst Mr. Gladstone was the Grand Old Man of English political life the whole of his time up to his death, and has remained such in the grateful memory of his country ever since—just because the people knew that they could trust him, to place his (and their) ideals above any sordid expediences of the moment.

Not of course, as if one wished to plead for a doctrinaire mentality, such as displayed for so many years by a De Valera in Ireland: that barren obstinacy of a man who, entitled as he may be to the whole loaf, refuses the half and prefers to starve himself to death rather than cut half the loaf, in order to be able to fight for the rest of his loaf. This often is called "compromise" and in that sense of course compromise is of the essence of political life; but what is its blight is the compromising of the principles of truth and justice for the sake of momentary advantage. A sense of the realities is most needful in political life: which means, in the beautiful phrasing of Mr. MacDonald, not only that one must fix one's gaze upon the ideal, but that to reach it, one must realise that a journey thither has to be undertaken. Realism demands that each day's journey be in accordance with one's resources, but not that its direction be changed, in accordance with the allurements of the moment.

GOKHALE certainly, no less than Gladstone, possessed that sense of the realities of politics; they were not idle visionaries and wish-fanciers given to chase chimeras. But reality is not synonymous with squalor: it includes it, but the really great leader will want to remove it, not to immerse himself in it. And again, an appeal to the sordid interests of man can by the nature of the case be only of passing success. Appeals to fill pockets, to wreak vengeance, to destroy, are appeals for action, which cannot be an end in itself, which cannot

produce anything great, let alone permanent. Such indeed is human nature that it will respond—gladly or sluggishly—to an appeal for Truth, for Justice, for Sacrifice. Greed, lust, anger are negative in their application: they never enable men to co-operate together nor can they ever evoke that loyalty and readiness for sacrifice, without which no mass-action can ever endure. When the Allied statesmen wanted to get the last ounce out of their people, they told them, not that there were rich cities to loot or fair damsels to win, that there was prospect of sating one's revenge and wallowing in the enemy's gore: but that liberty and justice, honour amongst nations and civilization itself were at stake. I am not in the least here concerned, whether these appeals were in accordance with the historical facts of the case: the point is, that mass-action on that scale was and is not possible, without an appeal to the highest principles. Cynicism and egotism are no incentive whatever for people to follow a leader; certainly they are not the kind of motive for which people will enthuse, let alone make a sacrifice. No, the cynics who sneer that in practical politics there is no room for high principles, are patently wrong. In political life no constructive working together, no driving power, is possible without an appeal and devotion to high principles. And that such appeal be not mere hypocritical cant, our old axiom "Honesty is the best Policy" again guarantees: that leader only can be certain of permanent following who is recognized as worthy of the people's trust, inasmuch as he practises in his own life, what he preaches.

Out of all such tests GOPAL KRISHNA GOKHALE'S name arises unseared and with but added lustre. He lived, as he preached; he could make the highest appeal, because he himself tried to conform to it. He wished to attract his followers, not to himself but to his principles. To give them a permanent expression, he founded his Servants of India Society, which should survive him, when he no longer could espouse them. He sank himself in his cause. That is what I think is the supreme lesson GOKHALE has for India today and for all time: not to place personalities or expediency above the eternal principles of Truth and Justice; to rally round political programmes based on Righteousness and not to follow blindly this man or that, who only too likely may be a demagogue whose real goal is his own, not the common weal; and finally, that, as one must sink one's own individuality for the good of a greater whole, so also need we all in India today to stress, not our rights, but our duties, in order to transcend our own little communal advantages for the sake of the nation, the great Indian Commonwealth of the future, in the building of which none has had a more lasting or more honourable share, than GOKHALE.

H. C. E. ZACHARIAS.

GOKHALE ANNIVERSARY.

SIR JAMSETJEE JEJEEBHAY'S ADDRESS.

In laying the Foundation Stone on February 19th, the 19th anniversary of the death of Mr. Gokhale, of the building intended for the Servants of India Society's Arya Bhushan and Dnyan Prakash Presses in Poona, Sir Jamsetjee Jejeebhoy, Bart., K. C. S. I., addressed a meeting in Poona as follows:—

ON this day, sacred to the memory of Gokhale, we are met here, in the precincts of institutions reared by him, with a view to taking the first steps to reconstruct the printing presses of the Servants of India Society which were struck down by a disastrous fire in May 1926. It is well known that these presses afforded substantial material support to the Society, which we are all proud to regard as the most precious legacy of Gokhale to his dearly beloved motherland. On an occasion like this we naturally prefer to dwell in our minds on the Society as the common instrument of us all for the nation's uplift rather than as the embodiment of a certain section of political opinion or a certain school of social thought. It is of course not possible in these days of sharply differentiated views, alike on social, economic, industrial and political questions, for any public worker to render effective aid in their solution except by ranging himself on one side or another. For this reason I am quite prepared to believe that to some of you even these national workers in the Servants of India Society may have appeared sometimes as identified with sectional, though never sectarian or communal, movements. This to a certain extent is inevitable, but I may with confidence claim this much on their behalf, that they have scrupulously avoided being drawn into party entanglements to the utmost possible limit; that their political and other commitments are of a very wide character, the principles to which they have pledged themselves having won acceptance from an overwhelmingly large mass of thinking Indians; and that even where their inmost convictions were deeply engaged, they have acted, not in a spirit of narrow partisanship, but in that of broad tolerance, remembering always that, if for the moment they seemed to have placed themselves at the service of causes which received only a partial support of the people, they regarded themselves as the servants of the whole of India, pledged to promote every effort tending to advance the national cause. This cosmopolitan detachment from all clannish movements or sectional interests, which alas! is such a rare phenomenon in these days of communal antagonisms and party strife, has had a wonderful reaction on public opinion which, irrespective of political or communal differences, held it as its sacred duty, when a year and three-quarters ago the Society's printing presses were reduced to ashes, to set the Society, thus crippled, once again on its legs, free to give its unselfish labour in the country's interest as before without much financial anxiety. The response of the country to the Society's appeal for help has been most encouraging, considering the fact that it was a time of severe trade depression when the need for it arose, and that no more than a mere handful of members of the Society could, on account of their preoccupations, be released for the work of collection. But no feature of this generous response could be more gratifying either to the Society itself or to its sympathisers, among whom I count it a privilege to reckon myself, than that help came readily, and in many cases spontaneously and in ample measure, from persons of all races and creeds, holding every variety of opinion on the questions of the day and in every station of life and exercising every kind of profession. I am sure you will join with me in congratulating

the Society on such a signal mark of public approval for its catholicity of outlook; but I would on this occasion—and I have no doubt the Society will join with me there—express my sincere rejoicing that the public showed such a commendable broad-mindedness in appreciating in a very solid manner the services rendered by the organization in general, though perhaps in minor particulars a member or two of the Society, or perhaps even the whole Society, might have run counter to their own cherished views. A wide-spread organization like the Society, carrying on activities in different spheres of public life, must naturally alienate the sympathies of a great many men, if a division of opinion alone were enough to cause alienation. It would thus be a most precarious life indeed for a body like this, depending as it does solely upon public charity, if everyone whom it had the misfortune to displease on one point or another felt justified to withhold his financial and moral support from it. It must then either disband itself, which God forbid! or, what is far worse, and what I am sure shall never happen, compromise with its honour by swallowing its own convictions and trying to be everything to everybody. And what I have most admired in the Society is its utter truthfulness and absolute incorruptibility, when the temptation to sacrifice principle in order to obtain popular support is so strong. My immediate purpose, however, is not to sing the praises of the Society for its sincerity of conviction, but rather to sing the praises of the charitable-minded public who have made it possible for the Society to retain such perfect liberty of action, making it independent even of their own likes and dislikes. This seems to me to be the most encouraging fact, full of promise for the future, in what would otherwise be a very gloomy outlook indeed. And I am not sure that the fire which broke out in the Arya Bhushan Press on May 25, 1926, was not designed, in God's own dispensation, for the purpose of reassuring the Society that, however divergent its policy might at times be from that favoured by the public at large, the people recognise in them the true servants of the country, whom it is their bounden duty as well as proud privilege to keep above want.

I have dwelt upon this aspect of the matter at such length, for I do not mind confessing to you that, while trying to look into the future of this Society, as I often do both in my individual capacity and as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the N. N. Wadia Charities, I for my part was at times overwhelmed by fear lest, on account of its championing the cause of the under-dog in all social and political struggles, it should so offend the influential and wealthy classes as to put its own future in peril. It sides with the people in their attempt to extort political power from the bureaucracy; it takes up the cause of the masses in their fight to win social position from the higher classes; it is on the side of the employees when these have to obtain decent conditions of life from the employers. It is true that in every case it espouses the cause of the oppressed only in so far as it deems it just and without doing any injustice to others. But the fact remains that in every case it puts itself wrong with the very people who can give it monetary assistance and puts itself right with just those who are at present, and who for a long time to come will remain, unable to replace by their own effort this assistance if it should be withdrawn. In thus reflecting on the future of the Society, I was often dismayed by what appeared to me to be the irony of the situation in which the Society was placed, of having to live on the charity of those whose interests are not furthered, but may possibly be retarded, by the work it does on behalf of the lower classes, if one may at all use such expressions as 'upper' and 'lower'

classes. The Society thus lives, so to say, on the sufferance of the former; but I am glad to say that the calamity which overtook the Society has in a most unexpected manner shown us the only way out of this inescapable dilemma. If the donors will only remember that part of the Society's work which commends itself to their reasoned support, and if, in regard to the other part which arouses their opposition, they remember the spirit of selfless devotion in which the work is undertaken, the Society's future is assured. For one item of work done by the Society, which perhaps fails to meet with the approbation of some there are sure to be at least ten others which excite their sense of grateful appreciation, and for this reason the Society can claim a mite from everyone who is willing to help forward a cause which on the whole makes and ought to make a strong appeal to his patriotism. I understand that when all the promises of help made last year are realised, the Society will be in a position to place its printing presses and other allied activities on their old footing, but the need for funds for the maintenance of members from day to day still remains, and I would take this opportunity of calling the attention of the public to the fact that the Society has no endowments to depend upon, but lives, so to speak, from hand to mouth on the collection it succeeds in making in the midst of its work. It is, therefore, the duty of all who can spare anything for charity from their personal needs to help the Society with contributions, be they ever so small, though of course they would make them as big as they can.

The building, in which the Society's presses will be housed, will be the centre from which will issue forth important organs of public opinion and other literature, social and political, embodying the actual experience gained by members as well as the results of their research. Great as is the value of the work done thus far in this direction, very much greater must be its value in future, when the "education of our masters" is the most imperative duty lying on those who would make the incipient democracy the success we all desire it to be. That indeed is the foundation of our future Swaraj and I trust the Society will have an invaluable contribution to make to this vital but rather neglected work. I can really think of no other organisation which by its traditions and training is better equipped for it than this Society which possesses, in spite of its limited resources, one of the best stocked libraries I know of in this country, and which subjects its members to a rigorous training for an adequate period before allowing them to play their rôle in public affairs. The necessity of this preliminary equipment is, I am afraid, not quite so well appreciated now as it was not very long ago; and I am, therefore, the more glad to find that the Society still maintains unbroken the traditions handed down to it by its founder. I am sure that if in the immediate past political agitation, which of course has its uses, counted for more than political instruction, which lies after all at the root of our political advance, we are fast approaching a time when knowledge will again be in request everywhere. In fact the need is at the present moment being sorely felt, when we are engaged in hammering out a constitution for our country. I would here recall to your mind the unique part played by Gokhale, to whose memory I would myself pay, and invite you to pay, our tribute of reverence and affection, in the Morley-Minto reforms, which, though at this distance of time they appear almost diminutive to our eyes, constituted at the time, when viewed in right perspective, a most notable advance on the things that went before. It is now an open secret that the reforms originated on the official

side to the sole initiative of the late Lord Morley, who was almost wholly indebted to Gokhale's constructive suggestions for the forward steps then taken. Those who know the inner story of this momentous epoch in our political annals know how close was the correspondence between the suggestions then put forward and the enactment that eventually issued from Parliament. We have here matter for the most sanguine expectations of being able to reap a rich harvest from the stores of knowledge laboriously accumulated. And what happened in 1907 was almost literally repeated twelve years later, when it fell to the successor of Gokhale in the headship of the Society to give body and form to the country's political aspirations in the shape of the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms. Here again the momentum for reforms was derived solely from the late Mr. Montagu, and the Rt. Hon'ble Srinivasa Sastri played then, it is common knowledge, the same rôle as was played by Gokhale in the earlier reforms. The existing constitution too appears to us extremely defective, and scarcely has anyone a good word to say about it; yet it is a universally acknowledged fact that it marked very great progress from the former constitution; and to this progress, it is no exaggeration to say, no one from among the non-officials contributed so much as Mr. Sastri. To me this one fact alone, that the successive heads of this organization could give a decisive turn to events in our favour whenever political reform was on the stocks, is sufficient proof of its pre-eminence among public bodies of its kind. Just at this moment counsel coming from the non-official quarters in the matter of a further revision of the constitution appears to be at a discount, but I feel no doubt that when the next favourable moment for another step in advance comes, this Society will again be ready with its advice, taking as before a lion's share in shaping our political destiny. If Mr. Sastri's achievements in this respect closely resemble his revered master's, no less remarkable is the resemblance between their achievements in South Africa. If Gokhale by his consummate skill brought the outstanding differences between Indians and South Africans to an amicable settlement in 1914, so did Mr. Sastri in 1926, again twelve years later. The change of feeling that, to all accounts, has come over the Union Government, which only a year before had pledged itself to the expulsion of Indians from South Africa (for no less was implied by their Segregation Bill) is marvellous, if not almost miraculous. Surely many things must have conspired to bring about this happy result; but I am confident that I can say with truth that Mr. Sastri again played a decisive part on the Indian side in this wonderful achievement. I make special mention of this because our experience so far is that as often as a crisis in the country's fortunes arises, the Society steps forward to turn it to the best possible account in the national interest, and a body which occupies such a position can be sure of a continuously and a growingly useful career in future. The present President of the Society, Mr. Devadhar, works in a different sphere, but there too his services to the country are as unique as those of his two predecessors and the time has certainly passed when social reform and the work of social amelioration are accounted a less integral factor in a nation's up-building than political reform and an improvement in the political status. It surely is a great tribute to the far-sightedness of the Society's founder that he gave in his scheme of the Society's activities as prominent a place to social as to political work, each being indeed a counterpart of the other in the all-rounded development of the country. And to you, who are daily witnessing here in Poona the manifold activities of the Seva Sadan, I need hardly

praise either its magnitude or its excellence. I will only add that you may go over the whole country and yet not find its equal, though this forms but part of Mr. Devadhar's activities. We may legitimately feel a sense of devout thankfulness for having in our midst an organization, of which the three successive heads have had such a magnificent record of substantial achievement, each in his own field of work, to their credit.

Of Mr. Gokhale, the thirteenth anniversary of whose death we celebrate to-day, I do not propose to say more. But I may permit myself to add just one word that is uppermost in my mind at the present moment. His supreme value as our leader and teacher is this, that he showed us by example that character is a necessary part of a politician's equipment. This in my view is the lesson that stands out from his life and this is a lesson that needs emphasising at this time. For him politics was not a bed of roses; he had to pass in his day through an ordeal of public criticism and vilification that has been the lot of few. But he lived it down, and has emerged from it a stainless patriot adored by everybody. Independence in your relations to Government is a quality very much admired, and justly admired, at present, but steadfastness in standing four-square against popular passions and prejudices requires in a popular leader greater courage, and this is just the quality that stands in greater need at a time when democracy is about to come into its own. If I may with the utmost humility give expression to my individual opinion in this matter, I notice latterly an appreciable decay in the standard of public life, which only enhances in my view the value of the work of the Servants of India Society, who are undeviatingly true to the spirit of the founder in this respect. They too have passed through much public obloquy. Popularity is now theirs, just as much as it is others', but they have also won something else which stands far higher—a reputation for honesty of purpose and unselfish devotion to the common motherland of us all. May God prosper them and their great work.

THE COUNTRY'S VERDICT.

THE expected has happened. The Indian Parliament has pronounced its verdict against associating in any degree or manner with the British Parliamentary Commission's investigations. If it is not yet the whole Parliament which has refused to have part or lot in this inquiry, it is at any rate by the popular Chamber of it, from which were to be drawn, following the example of the British Parliament, five out of the seven members of the Indian Commission. And in this definitive rejection of the Simon inquest by the popular part of the Indian Parliament, all had a voice—not merely the elected members as Mr. MacDonald had suggested or the elected and the nominated but only nonofficial members as Lord Birkenhead had planned, but the officials as well, who pulled their full weight in the debate and made frantic efforts to outvote the non-officials, but were themselves outvoted. We had thought that common decency would require that where the popular wishes alone were to be ascertained, the decision would be left to the free vote of the popular party and that officials would abstain from voting. But in the Assembly, as in the Councils of the Central Provinces and Madras, the official members insisted upon participation in the voting as well as in the debate. And

in all the three legislatures they found themselves in a minority and resolutions were carried in spite of their opposition, condemning the composition and procedure of the Commission and expressing their determination not to lend any kind of countenance to its proceedings. Before these resolutions were adopted, the official members took the utmost possible pains to state what the consequences of such action would be. We were told that the resolutions would be interpreted to mean what of course they were intended to mean, viz. that the Indian people did not desire to co-operate in the Commission's inquiry and would forego the advantages which might flow from such co-operation. The popular leaders have made their choice quite deliberately and finally. They are prepared to incur all the risks which attend this course of action. Will Government, on its part, now regard it as a closed chapter, taking such consequential action as it might deem fit, but in any case desist from again inviting the co-operation of the people, which has been so plainly refused. We are afraid the Government will still go on for some time longer with their manoeuvrings and will pretend that politically-thinking India still required an opportunity for sober second thoughts. As has been constantly dinned into our ears, the Commission's inquiry will still go on, whether the Legislatures wanted it or no, for apparently "millions of Moslems, millions of the depressed classes, millions of the business and Anglo-Indian community" want to put their case before the Commission. We would not object to this at all, if no further attempt was made to set up the Committees of the Legislatures. But we fear such an attempt would still be made. Why, Sir John Simon himself appears from his interview in Calcutta to regard the vote of the Assembly as not quite decisive and to hope that co-operation through Committees would still be forthcoming. It is indeed altogether improper and infamous for the head of the Commission to express any such view. The Indian Parliaments have spoken and their voice must be taken, as Mr. Ramsay MacDonald said on November 24, "the highest expression of public opinion in any country." The Viceroy himself on Feb. 2 enlarged on the necessity of recognising "the dignity and position of the Indian Legislatures." Let them therefore be done with an attempt to belittle the importance of the Legislature now that they have given an adverse decision, as unrepresentative of the real people. There must now be a truce to all talk of the British Parliament meeting the Indian Parliament through their respective Commissions on equal or any other terms, for they simply do not wish to meet. It is of course yet open to the British and Indian authorities to search out witnesses from among the "millions of Muhammadans and depressed classes and Anglo-Indians" and shape the Indian constitution as it suits "this vast community" in preference to a handful of spokesmen of "organised political opinion" who form of course "a very small fringe of the whole of India." We shall be quite content if the Commission retained contact with the millions and left the Legislatures severely alone.

We are warned in very earnest tones that there are grave risks surrounding such course of action. We would say in all humility that we are quite prepared to face up to this situation and to make all the sacrifices that our sense of self-respect would require. We know that the sacrifices are supposed to be gratuitous, but the Indian people think differently. Sir John Simon's statement has made plain what of course was quite obvious to some of us before, that it was in the nature of things impossible for Sir John to give to the Indian Committee a status of equality with the British Commission. It is unnecessary at this time of the day to bring out the points that make for inequality. But just to take one such, Sir John Simon emphasises in his statement that the Commission are "solely responsible for the statement of the effect upon their own minds of the investigation as a whole," which means that the report will be theirs and theirs alone. The Indian Committee will be consulted but the conclusions will be entirely the British Committee's. Thus there will be no room for negotiation and give-and-take with a view to arriving at a unanimous report which the presence of Indians on a mixed Commission would have made necessary and which is really what the British Government so much dread. The Indian Committee's report would also be submitted but not being an integral part of the documents meant for their guidance, obviously it cannot carry with Parliament the same weight as the report of their own Commission. But, it is said, the Indian Committee at a later stage will have joint sittings with the Joint Parliamentary Committee, where they can expose their views as the British Commission itself, not being then in existence, cannot. And to make this argument look more plausible we are told that Parliament will have a free hand with regard to any proposals that Government may formulate. But is it seriously contended that after the Statutory Commission submits its recommendations and the Cabinet drafts its Bill on the lines of those recommendations, Parliament will again throw everything into the melting pot? If it does consider any fresh proposals, is it fair to assume that these will have an equal chance with the Government's? The idea is too grotesque to deserve even a moment's consideration. In regard to the taking of evidence too, the position of inequality is glaring, as Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer has conclusively proved in his interview published in *New India*. The Committees are not intended to have any higher status than that of assessors, and the assessors can by no conceivable device be converted into judges. The Viceroy was warned betimes what the fate of the appointment of an all-White Commission with Indian assessors would be. But he persists in spite of the warnings. According to the Viceroy, the present scheme is more advantageous than a mixed Commission. But if such an overwhelming mass of thinking Indians prefer what appears to him a less advantageous scheme, why should he not fall in with that favoured by the people, which after all, according to him, demands less, not more? Why should he insist on

doing good to Indians in spite of them? The Viceroy says, "There is no question of principle involved here. It is just a choice of methods and therefore a matter for judgment." If so, the Indian view might well be allowed to prevail. The legal authority of the British Parliament to pass legislation about the Indian constitution is not seriously challenged by anyone, as the Viceroy's father just at this moment denies the authority of Parliament, which created the Church of England itself, to settle what is to be its doctrine and discipline. Indian politicians do not take up Lord Halifax's inconsistent position. They concede, as Mr. Jinnah has made plain, the right of the British Parliament to give legal force to India's extended constitution; but they claim that they shall have an effective voice in formulating concrete proposals for its extension. This right is flagrantly denied, and in face of it Indians cannot have anything to do with a Commission from which they are rigorously excluded. "This Commission will do precious little and Indians will not have in fact to undergo any large sacrifices. Whatever these sacrifices are, they are prepared for them, and it is only to be hoped that the Government will not revive the question of setting up the Indian Legislature's Committee, which will only keep up discontent in the country and prevent the leaders of public opinion from doing the constructive work which is really what matters.

SIR SANKARAN NAIR ON THE COMMISSION.

CONSIDERABLE interest attaches to an article contributed by Sir Sankaran Nair to the *Contemporary Review* in view of the fact that he has done his best to adhere to the idea of co-operating with the Commission. Sir Sankaran expresses sympathy with the claim of Indians for self-determination on the commonsense ground that it is practically impossible for Englishmen to deal with social and political problems with a fair degree of success on account of the complex structure of castes and communities. An Indian can know better the psychology and the needs of his own community or caste and a scheme for Home Rule prepared by various Indian communities will be more workable. Such a scheme, he continues, may afterwards be examined by hostile critics and *later on by Parliament*. The bulk of Indian opinion, according to him, does not demand that Parliament should repudiate its own responsibility in the matter and accept a constitution mechanically. His reference to Gladstone's views is very appropriate; England after being satisfied that the demand of educated Indians for the transfer of power to the Indians was genuine ought to withdraw from India—this was the substance of Gladstone's presentation of the case. What the Indians want is a mixed Commission, consisting of Englishmen and Indian statesmen *above class interests*. Lord Birkenhead's statement that on a mixed Commission he would have to put a representative of the aborigines coming straight from the woods, Sir Sankaran Nair says, is "ludicrous and comic but for the tragedy involved in it". Representatives bent on pushing the interests of their class are

not, he says, fit to be Commissioners appointed to present an impartial report.

A good point is made by Sir Sankaran Nair when he says that mere written statements by Indians without Indians on the Commission to defend Indian claims and cross-examine witnesses with that view would be ineffective. The objection that with a mixed Commission there is bound to be a multiplicity of reports, he dismisses as disingenuous. The real key according to him is the conviction of Lord Birkenhead that the Indian Report will carry greater weight with a fair Parliamentary Committee than the report of an English Commission and it is this contingency which Lord Birkenhead wants to avoid. Sir Sankaran Nair thinks that from the Conservative members of the Commission we may expect a report to prove that no greater mistake was made when the Reforms were introduced in 1919 and that the imposition of Western ideas or constitutions must be stopped once and for all *in Indian interests*. India has to thank Lord Birkenhead, he says, that he is satisfied with the representation of the *Daily Telegraph* on the Commission and has dispensed with a representative of the *Morning Post*. Sir Sankaran Nair has done well to point out that between the two members of the Labour Party on the Commission and the rank and file of the Party there is a great split so far as India is concerned. He thinks that Dr. Besant's surmise that the Commission are coming out with instructions as to the nature of the report to be submitted by them may be correct and he believes that what has happened in the Philippines may happen in India, thanks to the immortal Miss Mayo. The upshot of all this is, according to him, that an adequate presentation of our case for the enlightenment of the civilized world is an absolute necessity.

Coming to the Committees, Sir Sankaran Nair thinks that if it is denied any opportunities of eliciting the necessary evidence in India the Committee of the Central Legislature cannot do much useful work by the examination of the Report of the Commission. Considering that the proposals about the machinery and powers of the Central Government and the proposals about the machinery and powers of the Provincial Governments are dependent it is absurd, he says, to stipulate that the Committee of the Assembly are to retain contact, when deliberations extend to matters pertaining to the Central Legislature and make room for Committees of Provincial Legislatures when provincial matters are considered. Again it is idle, he says, to ask the Committees to submit proposals if they are not allowed to cross-examine the opponents of their proposals. The proposal to obviate these difficulties by allowing the Committees to take part in the examination of the witnesses, to have access to all the papers, to send reports of their own in case they disagree with the recommendations of the Commission, if accepted, will in his opinion satisfy Indian opinion except the extreme section which questions the right of Parliament to decide on a constitution for India. Everything, therefore, he points out, depends on the Royal Commission; if the Commission does not allow the Committee of the

Assembly to work with it on a footing of equality, it will be futile to appoint such a Committee. Sir Sankaran reminds the Secretary of State, Sir John Simon and the Prime Minister that as long as the Commission rouses a feeling of injustice or resentment there cannot be any true co-operation. Similarly he would ask Mr. Lloyd George to remember that most of those who materially contributed to England's success in the War were influenced by the latter's promise of self-determination. There is a touch of bitter irony in the reflection of Sir Sankaran Nair that it may be convenient for the Conservative Party to forget the losses of India in men and money due to the War and he expresses the hope that Mr. Lloyd George, who is the only statesman having the vision and the capacity to give India Home Rule, will add this achievement as a fitting consummation to a career worthy of the successor of Gladstone. Sir Sankaran with a curiously fatalistic faith believes that the next world-war will give India Home Rule. And then India ought to take care that another reactionary Parliament would not tamper with what she wins just as the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy tried to tamper with the Montagu-Chelmsford Report. If these hopes are disappointed, his surmise is that India would sever her connection with England reducing her to the position of a fifth-rate power. Lord Birkenhead has driven even a staunch well-wisher of Britain like Sir Sankaran to such a depth of despair!

EXCISE IN BOMBAY DURING 1926-27.

THOUGH the Bombay Government are committed to total prohibition as the goal of their excise policy, it has always been felt that they are walking on the road to that goal with faltering steps. They point to the policy of rationing country liquor, in operation now for nearly six years, as a practical means of banishing drink from our midst. If this policy is logically pursued and honestly worked, there is no doubt that it will certainly lead to prohibition within a definite period; but one does not know if the Government intend to pursue it without break until the goal of prohibition is reached. Moreover their ration has been so liberal that it is far in excess of the actual needs with the result that the rationed quantity is never fully consumed. To take 1926-27, the excise administration report for which has recently been issued. The consumption of country liquor during the year was 1,302,679 gallons, a decrease of 102,758 gallons or 7 per cent. in that for the previous year. This is satisfactory, so far as it goes. But what is more important is that the ration for the presidency proper taken collectively or for each individual district has not during 1926-27 been used up, the ration and consumption being respectively 1,798,245 and 1,302,679 gallons; and this too after nearly six years' working of the rationing policy! Even so, the Excise Commissioner is in doubt "whether the pace has not been too fast and whether the object aimed at has been even partially achieved or whether we have really gone back somewhat." Between 1923-24 and 1926-27, the consumption of country liquor has gone down by 24 per cent.; while that of foreign spirit has gone up by 15 per cent. and of fermented by 29 per cent., which, in his opinion, means that people are taking more and more to foreign drinks. This may be so; but the remedy is not to relax the operation of the rationing policy as it affects country liquor but to

try and enforce it even in the case of foreign spirit. We do not know if there is any intention on the part of Government to move in that direction; but apparently some sort of restrictive action with regard to their sale and use seems to be under contemplation and the enforcement of the "more comprehensive measures as regards foreign liquor" referred to in the report will be keenly awaited.

Another factor which makes the Commissioner anxious about the whole excise outlook is the growth in offences relating to liquor; and he gives statistics for 1923-24 to 1926-27 to prove his contention. We do not believe there is any necessary relation between reduced licit consumption and increasing excise crime. Confining our attention to the year under review, it will be observed that the districts which drank more than during the previous year do not necessarily show a smaller number of excise offences and vice versa. Thus we find that Thana district which consumed 178,916 gallons during 1926-27 whereas it did 177,646 the previous year had 357 abkari cases to its credit as against 307 in 1925-26. On the contrary Dharwar consumed 32,176 gallons as against 37,802 in 1925-26; and yet had 129 excise cases against 168 the year before. The Excise Commissioner's contention therefore that reduced licit consumption is always accompanied by increased excise crime seems to us to be devoid of sure foundation.

In both the report and the Government resolution on it one notices a note of regret at the diminishing excise revenue. While a feeling of regret is not unnatural, it cannot be said that the loss of revenue was unexpected or sudden. With prohibition as their goal, the Government has to be prepared to face total extinction of the excise revenue in course of time and must set about betimes finding ways and means of filling the gap. The excise revenue in 1920-21 was Rs. 39,019,787 while that during 1926-27 has dwindled down to Rs. 29,753,214. Allowing for certain interdepartmental adjustments, the Excise Commissioner estimates the net loss to Government at Rs. 84 lakhs. He has chosen 1920-21 for comparison perhaps because it was more favourable than others for his purpose. But if we take into account the following figures of revenue for the three years preceding 1920-21 the loss will not be found to be as heavy as is made out to be:—

1917-18	...	Rs. 28,064,835
1918-19	...	Rs. 33,615,393
1919-20	...	Rs. 35,322,450.

Apart from this however, a word of praise is due to Government for having foregone as much revenue as they have done.

Though the report says that the recommendations of the reorganised excise advisory committees were accepted wherever possible, those which were not carried into effect far outnumber those that were. The number of recommendations made was 584; while those wholly or partly carried out numbered respectively 197 and 49, and those that were ignored 338. Thus in spite of the so-called reorganisation, their recommendations do not command better attention at the hands of Government. Nor can it be said that they are now meeting more frequently than they did before being placed on a reformed basis; and in some cases no meeting seems to have been held throughout the year. This is very unsatisfactory and if these bodies are to be encouraged to perform properly their true function of representing Indian opinion to the authorities, it can be done only by treating their recommendations with greater courtesy.

WITHIN OR WITHOUT ?

I.

"The day will come when the Mother-Country will take second place to Canada"—Reginald McKenna.

THE "Independence Resolution" of the last Congress makes the issue of India being within or without the Empire interesting. I do not say important because the realities of the situation place on the same level both Mr. Satyamurti's suggestion that the Congress resolution has done away with all preoccupations about constitution-making and Sir Frederick Whyte's suggestion in the *Observer* that all that stands in the way of Indian Nationalism is its lack of definition of the constitutional issue. The interest is heightened by the coincidence of the doctrinaire procedure at Madras with the very concrete steps the Canadian Government is taking to have direct diplomatic relations not only with Japan and France following upon the precedent with the United States but with Great Britain herself! Everything unattained in every sphere is in the domain of speculation which admits of contraries, and the purpose of this article is not to insist on any actual or even possible parallel between Canada and India. Temperament is a reality which one doubtless encounters in the political field as much as any other, its factual basis notwithstanding, and the lesson of the constitutional developments in the "Premier Dominion" may impress on some at least the stupendous contrast between the formal and actual in general, and the advisability, if not the necessity, of tackling certain problems piecemeal rather than wholesale.

The developments in what is sometimes called "The New Canada" mostly belong to the post-War period and are largely due to Canada's participation in the War. But we might make the date 1837 the starting point of this brief study because the events of that year led up to the establishment of autonomy in 1840 in the Dominion. In 1837 both Upper and Lower Canada, the French and English Canadians, were up in arms, demanding an extension of their political rights. At this time they had only a consultative or deliberative right and no control whatever on the Executive which the Governor-General represented. The risings were suppressed easily enough but the consequences of a similar occurrence previously further South were not lost sight of, and the British Government sent out Lord Durham to Canada to deal with the situation. There is an analogy between the Durham Report and the Montagu-Chelmsford Report in many ways. Lord Durham recommended responsible Government for Canada, but not until 1849, fully twelve years after the vigorous manifestation for liberty, was the principle of what may be called Colonial autonomy established. Once there, it started to work: in 1854, the United Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada entered into a commercial reciprocity treaty with the United States; in 1859, Canadian Tariffs imposed protective duties on foreign goods including British, and in 1898, the Canadian-German Tariff War commenced almost compelling the Mother Country to confine strictly to herself the obligations in her commercial treaties with other Powers. Ottawa was also the scene of the first Colonial Conference in 1887 which in 1907 gave place to the Imperial Conference. When in 1911 the proposal of the Dominions' contribution to the British Navy came before the Conference, Sir Robert Borden, the Canadian Premier, consented to it in principle only to find later that he had underestimated the feeling about it in his country. Canada like Australia was for making a start with national defence. Thus to the War.

In reply to a suggestion that the demonstration of loyalty on the part of the Dominions during the

war would pave the way for Imperial Federation, Sir Robert Borden is reported to have said: "I am not sure. The result may be exactly the opposite... It may be that the spirit of national pride which the war is evolving will create psychological conditions unanticipated... in Great Britain, and favour processes of decentralization rather than centralization." At least as far as Canada was concerned he proved a true prophet. The Imperial War Cabinet of 1917 and the famous resolution of the Imperial Conference of that year embodying the recognition of the rights of the Dominions and India for an adequate voice in the foreign policy of the Empire are affirmations of the Canadian statesman's anticipations. But these affirmations were little more than affirmations of principle. Its practice was due to Canada's initiative. When on October 27, 1918, Mr. Lloyd George cabled to Sir Robert Borden asking him to come over to London to take part in the preliminaries of Peace, the latter replied: "There is need of serious consideration as to the representation of the Dominion in the Peace negotiations. The Press and people of this country take it for granted that Canada will be represented in the Peace Conference. I appreciate possible difficulties as to representation of the Dominions, but I hope you will keep in mind that certainly a very unfortunate impression would be created, and possibly a dangerous feeling might be aroused, if these difficulties are not overcome by some solution which will meet the national spirit of the Canadian people. We discussed the subject to-day in Council and I found among my colleagues a striking insistence, which doubtless is indicative of the general opinion entertained in this country. In a word, they feel that new conditions must be met by new precedents". In due course a Canadian Order in Council requested His Majesty the King "to issue letters patent to the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden and the Hon. Charles Joseph Doherty as Commissioners and Plenipotentiaries in respect of the Dominion of Canada with full power and authority to sign any treaties concluded at the Peace Congress." The request was complied with, and the Royal authority bestowed.

Nor was the ratification of the Peace Treaty uneventful. On July 4, 1919, Lord Milner cabled to the Canadian Prime Minister: "It is hoped that the German Treaty may be ratified by the three of the principal Allied and Associated Powers and by Germany before the end of July" and received the reply: "No copy of the Treaty has yet arrived, and Parliament has been prorogued. Kindly advise how you expect to accomplish the ratification on behalf of the whole Empire before the end of July." Lord Milner responded: "I have now consulted with the Prime Minister in regard to your most secret telegram of July 9th. Our view is that an early ratification, especially now that Germany has ratified, is of the highest importance. In the British constitution there is nothing which makes it necessary for the King to obtain the consent of Parliament before ratifying the Treaty. With perfect constitutional propriety the King can ratify on the advice of his Ministers. For a Treaty of this far-reaching importance, and one embracing the whole Empire, the King has only to act at the instance of his constitutional advisers, the Dominion Ministries as well as that of the United Kingdom. But inasmuch as the Dominion Ministers participated in the Peace Conference, and, side by side with the Ministers of the United Kingdom, signed the preliminaries of the Treaty, we hold that His Majesty, if he now ratified the Treaty for the whole Empire, would have the same constitutional justification in doing so in respect of the Dominions as he has in respect of the United Kingdom. The King, by a single act, would bind the Empire as it is right that:

he should do so, but that act would represent the considered judgment of his constitutional advisers in all the self-governing States of the Empire because it would be merely giving effect to an international pact which they had all agreed to. We realise at the same time the difficulty in which you are placed by your pledge to Parliament. We are willing, in order to meet this difficulty, to delay ratification (which, if we alone are concerned, we should desire to effect immediately) as long as we possibly can, in order to give you time to lay the Treaty before your Parliament. I am communicating with the Governments of South Africa and New Zealand and Australia, explaining the urgency, and begging them to submit the Treaty to their Parliaments without delay, if they feel bound to do so before assenting to its ratification." But Canada was evidently determined not to let a single precedent go by.

RAGHUNATH ROW

OUR SOUTH AFRICAN LETTER.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

PRETORIA, January 26.

LIQUOR BILL IN PARLIAMENT.

THE Indian community and all those who accepted the Cape Town Agreement as a Gentlemen's Agreement have been thrown into violent agitation over the speech of the Minister of Justice, Mr. Tielman Roos, on Section 104 of the Liquor Bill in the House of Assembly on the 25th inst. Mr. Roos renewed his promise of last year, that he would treat the whole Bill as a non-party measure and assured the House that he was not bound down by the clauses of the Bill and that he would himself move amendments in the Committee stage. But with regard to Sec. 104 he is reported to have said, "It might well be that the position the House should adopt was not to take the work away from the present Indian waiters, but on the other hand not to allow any more to be employed. He thought that something along these lines would be done by the Select Committee". This is indeed a most amazing statement coming from a member of the same Cabinet as signed the Cape Town Agreement. Dr. Reitz of Transvaal hoped that the section would be made a party matter. Mr. Leslie Blackwell, on the other hand, severely attacked the "white labour" clause, as this section is termed, and called it "a most damnable proposition". Finally he said, "This Parliament will never pass such a clause, and Dr. Reitz recognises that by his S. O. S. to the Minister to crack the party whip." And Mr. Blackwell is no pro-Indian; if anything, he is the reverse. Mr. Morris Alexander, that great and consistent friend of the Indian community, was surprised to see that clause after the Agreement was concluded, as it was an invitation to the Government of India to tear it up. The section was an insult and stigma on Indians. He made effective use of the Prime Minister's recent speech at Lydenberg in which he said that "the Government had undertaken to help those Indians who chose to remain in this country to attain not only the highest degree of European civilisation, but also to develop as far as possible on their own lines. The Government would do what was right and fair." Mr. Alexander on the strength of this utterance appealed to the House to scrap the clause altogether, for, he said, Mr. Roos's compromise was no compromise and was, therefore, unacceptable. Mr. Patrick Duncan, the next in command to General Smuts in the South African Party and Minister of the Interior in Gen. Smuts's Government, described the white labour clause as being nothing short of "abominable." Their honour as a nation was bound up with the Agreement and this clause simply tore

it up. "If the white man has to rely on this kind of protection," continued Mr. Duncan, "then his day is done. I suppose this is the new Socialism—living by the exploitation of the coloured proletariat, using this Parliament to keep these people down to the level of the proletariat. I object with all my power to a doctrine like this being adopted in this House—that we are here to get what we can." He hoped the Bill will go through without this clause. Mr. M. Kentridge, Labourite, who more than any single individual, is supposed to be behind this section, contended that it did not in any way conflict with the Agreement! The Agreement was concerned with only two principal items: the withdrawal of the Areas Reservation Bill and, in consideration of this concession, the undertaking by the Government of India to encourage voluntary repatriation of Indians! And neither of these was affected by the section. As for the colour bar, South Africa was familiar with it and it operated even against the whites, for whites were prohibited from getting employment in the Native territories.

THE PRESS ON THE SECTION.

In my last letter I gave a summary of the leading article in the *Natal Mercury* on this section. The *Natal Advertiser* wrote a fierce denunciation of it. "We do say in all earnestness that the proposals in this Liquor Bill are infamous, are tyrannical, are palpably of a persecutive kind, and are the negation of the most elementary sense of British fair-play". The *Cape Times* and the *Cape Argus* of Cape Town, the *Star* and the *Rand Daily Mail* of Johannesburg and the *Natal Witness*, in fact all the leading papers published in English, have denounced the section in no uncertain terms. Since Mr. Roos's speech on the second reading of the Bill on the 25th, the *Cape Times* promptly came out with a very spirited leader, in which it said, "To compromise upon Section 104 is out of the question". The real issue is the effect of the clause on the status of Indians in South Africa. "In accepting the Cape Town Agreement the Union Government gave various promises which, if they mean anything at all, mean that the general position of Indians at the time the Agreement was concluded will not be altered for the worse and mean, in particular, that no occupation will be debarred from them by law. Sec. 104 seeks to erect such a legal bar. It thus directly violates the pledge which the Union Government has given to the Government of India. The matter is simply and solely one of the honour, not only of the Government, but of South Africa. . . . If the Government consider Section 104 of sufficient material significance to be worth the sacrifice of the Cape Town Agreement, then let them say so and terminate the Agreement openly in the manner for which it itself provides. But do not let them lend themselves to the dishonesty of an unexplained repudiation of their plighted word."

THE PROSPECT.

The prospect of the clause passing the House of Assembly is uncertain. As has been said already, it is painfully amazing that Mr. Roos should have made the statement that he has made. After the ratification and tacit acceptance by all parties in the Union of the Cape Town Agreement, the clause had no place in the revised Bill. It was bad enough that it was there. One would have expected that Mr. Roos in his speech would have apologised for its appearance and proposed its deletion. One would expect that if a private member had sought to retain it, Mr. Roos would have opposed it with all might and main. But what do we find? The Minister leaves it, along with the whole Bill, to the free non-party vote of the House; not satisfied with that, he actually gives a lead to the House in the wrong direction and virtually proposes that the Agreement should be repudiated

One would fain hope that Mr. Roos had not the whole Cabinet behind him in this matter, though how it could be so in a Cabinet system of government is inexplicable. But then in the recent past over the Flag controversy Ministers, for instance Dr. Malan and Mr. Roos, spoke with different voices in public. The *Cape Times* makes pointed reference to Mr. Roos's "jealousy of Dr. Malan, the putative father of the Agreement" and it is just possible that Mr. Roos has run away with the bit to annoy Dr. Malan. But in the absence of repudiation of Mr. Roos's statement by any other member of the Cabinet—and so far none has appeared though the second reading of the Bill is over—it must be taken that his view represents the considered view of the Cabinet. If that be the case, the worst that can happen has happened. There is no escape from the inference that the Union Government, the very Cabinet that signed and sealed the Cape Town Agreement, has indirectly but no less deliberately repudiated the Agreement. Nothing can retrieve the honour of the Government. It may be the House by deleting the clause altogether will uphold the honour of South Africa. But in view of the lead given by the very Government that concluded the Agreement, it is very problematical if the House would consider it necessary to take such an extraordinary step.

INDIAN VERNACULARS.

Mr. Sastri's views on the place of Indian vernaculars in the education of Indians in South Africa have drawn on him some adverse criticism. When Mr. Sastri opened the new extension of the Tamil Institute in Durban on the 27th, it was apparent from the numerous speeches made thereat that there is a strong and genuine feeling among the leaders of the Indian community that the Indian vernaculars should be encouraged on patriotic and cultural grounds. Mr. Sastri, in his reply, said that he stood by all that he had said at the Kimberley Conference but he recognised the volume of feeling and would give it due weight. He thought that the best solution was to see if the Education Commission could be persuaded to include the Indian languages in the regular curriculum. Failing it, he would fall back upon private schools conducted by the community. He pleaded that the management of these institutions should be efficient and not strain the children too much and handicap them more than was absolutely necessary.

NEW INDIAN BARRACKS IN DURBAN.

The Durban Municipality has decided to demolish the present Indian "Stable" Barracks for its employees in Brickhill Road and build new barracks on the site of the Magazine barracks in Depot Road, at a cost of some £12,000.

SITE FOR TRAINING COLLEGE.

In a previous letter I reported that the Superintendent of Education in Natal had written to the Mayor of Durban that Mr. Sastri's scheme had the approval of the Department and that two acres was insufficient for it and recommended that from four to six acres should be given. The Town Council has turned down the recommendation and confirmed the original grant of two acres. I understand the notorious anti-Indian Councillor Eaton sent in an amendment that ten acres might be granted in Cato Manor outside the Borough!

OUR PARLIAMENTARY LETTER.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

DELHI, February 17.

THE MINER'S WORKING HOURS.

THE fate of the resolution of no confidence in the Commission overshadows all other questions in the

Assembly. On Monday Government moved that the Mining Act Amendment Bill be referred to a Select Committee. Mr. Joshi, representing labour interests, took the opportunity of exposing the slow manner in which the Government machinery moved. He wondered how a Government which called itself civilised hesitated to put a limit of 12 hours, when nowhere else in the civilised world a miner was made to work for more than 8 hours a day. He showed how it was impossible in the nature of things for a miner to work intensively when he was compelled to work for more than 12 hours a day, and hoped that Government would not be guided by the opinion of capitalists and of the Bihar Government which was swayed by capitalist opinion. Sir B. N. Mitra had not much argument on his side, but he seemed to raise the bogey of 'industry going to dogs' when he said, Government had to move very slowly and cautiously in the matter when the coal industry was passing through very difficult times.

REGISTRATION OF HINDU PARTITIONS.

Tuesday was a day for lawyers, when Government introduced a Bill for the registration of Partitions and Separations in Joint Hindu Families. The Bill proposes enactments of a very far-reaching effect on Hindus and Government took the strange course of first getting it passed in the Council of State with very little opposition and then trying to force it on the Assembly. The Hon'ble Mr. P. C. D. Chari put up a single-handed fight in the Council of State, but, as was inevitable, he failed. He had expressed the hope that the Assembly would either throw it out or considerably improve it. The Bill was mercilessly attacked by Pandit Thakurdas Bhargav, Sir H. S. Gour and Messrs. Neogy, Jayakar and Iswar Saran. Mr. Jayakar stamped it as a retrograde measure which would stand in the way of the social evolution which was going on in the Hindu society by "the silent and imperceptible process of disintegration." It was also attacked as making an unheard of distinction between Hindus and non-Hindus. Mr. Jayakar also pointed out the various imperfections in the drafting of the Bill and thought that he could see no alternative but to oppose it if the Government would not accept the suggestion of referring it back to the select committee. The debate was, however, adjourned for want of quorum. Pressure is being put on the Swarajist members to throw out the Bill altogether when it again comes before the House.

THE TERRITORIAL AND AUXILIARY FORCES BILLS.

The Territorial and Auxiliary Forces Bills were also introduced as passed by the Council of State. As in the case of the Partition Bill, these Bills also have got through the Upper House without any change. They do not give effect to the main recommendation of the Shea Committee about racial distinction; and it was mainly on these grounds that they were attacked by Pandit Kunzru, Mr. Neogy and Dr. Moonje. Mr. K. C. Roy regretted the policy of the Government in having put forward no scheme for the expansion of the Territorial Force. The proposal to refer it back to a Select Committee was accepted by Government.

DEBATE ON THE SIMON COMMISSION.

The resolution on the Statutory Commission was moved by Lala Lajpat Rai. In deference to the wishes of the House all other resolutions were withdrawn and the consideration of the resolution on the establishment of a Supreme Court for India was adjourned. The President also proposed to put only one amendment by Sir Zulfikar Ali, which gave a clear-cut issue to debate upon, viz. whether the House wished to co-operate with the Commission or not. Lala Lajpat Rai, in moving the resolution, made a scathing attack on the Government and their policy and tried to meet the arguments advanced by Lord Birkenhead. Passion, however, swayed more with him than reason. The Home Member, in opposing the resolution said that an enquiry was a necessity and that the statements about preconceived decisions were absolutely without ground. His speech did not produce much effect on his listeners. Sir Darcy Lindsay laid emphasis on the fact that hardly any constructive proposals were put forward by those who raised the wind. He harped upon this point and opined that the resolutions so far passed had been framed on wrong premises. Mr. Jayakar had so far been withering under public criticisms at his attitude and he welcomed the opportunity to unburden his mind. He called it 'a day of deliverance' for which he had so long looked forward. He told the House that he had incurred the odium of the country by holding out his hand for honourable co-operation, but he regretted to say that the Government had practically done nothing to meet his and his party's wishes. He read an extract from the manifesto issued by his party on the 16th of November and said that the Chairman's offer to it was a travesty of equality. Mr. Jayakar added that only on equal and honourable terms could there be any negotiations. He then made an offer of co-operation on a Round Table Conference basis and concluded, "The door is still open to you. It is now for the Government to accept this hand of friendship." Mr. Jinnah made it clear that he and all those who thought with him were fighting for a principle and not for a petty thing like the procedure. He categorically stated that unless the Legislative Committees were given equal power and equal status no Commission would be acceptable to Indians, even though it were composed of the most eminent men. Sir John Simon's letter to the Viceroy, whatever else it offered, had not offered equality to the Committees with the Commission and as such hardly changed the situation. The only speaker who welcomed the Commission was Mr. M. C. Raja, the nominated depressed classes member. But the debate was adjourned that day owing to the death of Mr. Vishandas, who had come to Delhi to vote in favour of boycotting the Commission but suddenly collapsed on arrival there.

WORK IN THE COUNCIL OF STATE.

In the Council of State Sir Phiroz Sethna succeeded this time in getting his resolutions about the appointment of Trade Commissioners in foreign countries accepted. Sir Phiroz showed how Canada and other countries had made vast strides in trade by means of this method, and he thought India could not

thrust the matter aside if she were to compete and keep pace with the other industrial countries of the world. He instanced the case of Japan, and showed how it had systematically pushed its trade through their agents and how it had outdone India even in the matter of curios. He hoped that the matter would not be delayed and no inconvenient objections raised. Government accepted the resolution but tried to defer the matter by saying that men in I.C.S. would have to be specially trained for it. Sir Phiroz replied that if Government were in earnest there would be no dearth of experienced men and hoped that Government would not defer the matter under one pretext or another. Mr. P. C. D. Chari's resolution on unemployment received scant attention of the House. Mr. Chari contended that all avenues like the Army and the Navy were blocked by Government; nor was there any remedy possible for India like the one used by the western countries of sending their men to the Dependencies. He hoped Government would tackle the 'economical' question before it had assumed a 'political' aspect. Government opposed the resolution saying that it was a matter for the provincial Governments; and it was lost without a division.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN LIQUOR BILL.

Great relief was felt when Government announced in both the Houses that the Union Government had withdrawn Section 104 of the Liquor Bill. It showed that the South African Government were showing signs of friendship. Mr. Bajpai in the Assembly and Sir Md. Habibullah paid a tribute to Mr. Sastri for the rare skill and tact with which he had handled the delicate question. The wise restraint shown by the Assembly, he said, had also strengthened the hands of the Government of India in their negotiations and Government thanked the members for it.

OUR BENGAL LETTER.

CALCUTTA, 12th FEBRUARY.

THE BENGAL LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

THE Bengal Council met on the 7th inst., when the Swarajists as a body were absent, but a few hung about the lobby, and one, Mr. J. L. Bannerjea, signified his intention of disobeying the Congress mandate and attending the meetings. In a letter to the leader of the Party explaining his decision, he very sensibly says he does not see the connection between the boycott of the Simon Commission and temporarily withdrawing from the Councils, or how the boycott of the Commission can be furthered by this step. Councillors have a duty to their constituents which is larger and anterior to what they owe to their party. The implication is that if the people were asked for a mandate now they would elect for Council entry. Mr. Bannerjea is not alone in this attitude among the members of his party. But as a body Swarajists are pledged to non-attendance. The result has been that on the three days that the Council has met, it has been adjourned early for want of a quorum. There has been nothing of interest to hold the members except last Friday when Mr. Bannerjea was to have moved a resolution expressing regret at the exclusion of Indians from the Commission. But when the time came he declined, and twitted his brothe

Swarajists with their absence. "I find that my party are not quite conspicuous by their presence," he said. "Perhaps they do not desire to express their indignation. Presumably they are satisfied with the constitution of the Commission." One of the members entered a protest against this state of affairs, but the President told him that he was unable to do anything in the matter. This is the logical outcome of a negative policy of boycott, with which unfortunately the Province is painfully familiar. Nothing is done, and public business is reduced to a farce. Stagnation takes the place of progress; and instead of action, people are content with the idle word. What is needed more than ever to-day is a new and constructive leadership, which will tell the old leaders that they have become bankrupt, and had better depart with their shibboleths. But there is no sign of this desirable state of affairs yet.

THE GOVERNOR'S THREAT TO THE UNIVERSITY.

There are two bills coming before the Council dealing with the University. And now in the wake of the *hartal*, trouble has arisen at the Presidency College and Bethune College for women. Indiscipline among the students and misunderstanding between them and their teachers led to the closing of the Colleges as a result of measures sought to be taken to restore order among those students who brought themselves into collision with their authorities over the *hartal*. Bethune College, true to its tradition as the weaker sex, yielded and will reopen tomorrow. But at the Presidency the Governing Body is going into the cases of the students, and normal relations have still to be restored. The annual Convocation could not therefore have been held at a more inopportune moment than yesterday. General surprise and regret is felt at the minatory words of the Governor warning the University that the Government's assistance might be withheld if the present disorders and indiscipline continued, and it is admitted on all sides that, as even the *Statesman* is constrained to remark, Sir Stanley Jackson has been badly served by his advisers in the educational department. His actual words are: "As Chancellor it should be my duty and pleasure to assist as best as I can your just requests for support from Government. This I am prepared to do, but I am alarmed lest Government may be forced to feel it their duty to consider seriously whether the measure of support which is at present given might not, in the general interests of education, be diverted into other channels, from which experience has shown they may expect better results." Strangely enough, it has been left to such reactionary papers as the *Statesman* to enter a protest on behalf of the University. *Forward* hardly notices this part of the address. The Vice-Chancellor too uttered a warning, (but nothing to which one might take exception) against the outside political influences that are entering the life of the University to its detriment as an academic institution. He pointed out that true patriotism consisted in bringing a fully developed mind and a disciplined will to the service of one's country. "If," he said, "it be true of the individual that—

Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control,
These three alone lead life to sovereign power,
it is no less true of that aggregate of individuals
which we call a nation."

REVIEWS.

NEAR EASTERN POLITICS.

EGYPT. By GEORGE YOUNG. (Modern World Series.) (Ernest Benn Ltd., London.) 1927. 8¾ x 5¾. pp. 352. 15s.

THE standard of this series for sound exposition as well as for interesting reading is well maintained by

this book. The formidable equipment of the writer as author of the "Corps de Droit Ottoman" in seven volumes gives an authority to his vigorous and independent judgment which disarms beforehand the charges of ignorance, superficiality and prejudice. The writing is clear and vigorous, the views always independent and original, and sometimes surprising, the knowledge wide and the experience first-hand. The style has not the rhythmic flow of great prose, it is incisive, witty and often conversational in tone. There are few flights of eloquence, but there is a variety and force which maintains the interest to the end. It is less than literature but more than journalism—a series of methodised conversations with all the brilliance of the witty and well stocked talker and most of the method of the careful writer. The writer freely expresses his views throughout the book, but he never distorts his facts to fit his argument, and keeps his concrete political suggestions for his last two chapters. It is possible always to separate the facts from his argument and to draw one's own conclusions; the book is an example of the most sincere of all methods of writing history—placing the facts before the reader and revealing to him the process by which the writer reached his conclusion from them.

Egypt provides a particularly interesting study in the growth of nationalism. From being a state without being a nation it has slowly changed into being a nation without being fully a state. A hundred years ago it was a nation only in name, and its gradual welding into a nation is one more proof that nationalism does not consist in a common race, language, historical tradition or even literature, but in the simple desire of a given number of people to be independent and to rule themselves. At the opening of the 19th century Egypt was ruled by Turkish pashas with a governing class of Circassian "mamelukes" and contingents of Turkish janissaries, who both desregarded, as they despised, the peasant "fellaheen" of dominantly Arabian origin and the literary Copts.

The Copts were racially the sole survivors of the old Pharaonic race, who had escaped intermixture with the conquering Arabs in the 7th century by retaining their religion. The fellaheen were the descendants of the mixed Arab and Egyptian stock, who spoke Arabic and were Muslims. The mamelukes were themselves the descendants of military slaves who, by forming themselves into a separate community and obtaining fresh recruits regularly from the Circassian highlands, had dominated Egypt for 500 years. Finally the Turkish pasha was the fruit of the Ottoman conquest in 1520, who maintained a state rigidly limited by the divan of Mameluke Beys from the 24 provinces and the commanders of the seven corps of janissaries.

The military power of the mamelukes was broken by Napoleon, and after his departure his mantle fell on Mahomet Ali, who like him was a foreign adventurer, but who like him asserted Egyptian independence from Constantinople. His reign is full of originality and enterprise with his State Socialism, his discovery of the reliability of fellaheen as soldiers after his failure to discipline his own Albanians after the European model, and his bid for the Ottoman empire, but his government was purely personal based on the service of the demilitarised mamelukes, and a disciplined army of peasants. Of any genuine nationalism there was no sign at all. The state was in effect a branch cut off from the Turkish tree and endowed with a separate life of its own but one of the military monarchs and not the nationalist species. This explains why the age of bankers, foreign loans and speculation inaugurated by Said and continued by Ismail so easily led to the control of foreign

creditors without any effort being made to prevent it by the Egyptians themselves.

The first really genuine nationalist movement was that of Arabi Pasha, himself a peasant, and came from the army which was then the only means of expression for the Egyptians. With his fall began the British occupation, and their real control of affairs behind an imposing façade of Egyptian ministries. At first the country was impressed by the work of reconstruction and overawed by the menace of the Mahdi in the Sudan, but with the passing of both these sobering influences about 1900 a new nationalist movement began. This movement did not come from the peasantry with the patronage of the ruling class but was the product of the new educated middle class or "effendiat." That middle class was itself the product of the new education and of the increasing prosperity, and it found its vent in the press and its leader in the journalist Mastapha Kamil. The agitator replaced the soldier and the noble as the national hero. Against this new nationalism Sir Eldon Gorst tried the corrosive force of concession and office, and Lord Kitchener the heavy weight of suppression, but neither killed it. The war increased this politically conscious class by the unbounded prosperity it gave and at the same time brought other classes into sympathy with them by giving each a special grievance.

The Copts resented their loss of their clerical posts, all parties the obtrusion of British officials throughout the administration and above all the fellahs the re-imposition of forced labour, compulsory disarmament and the levies made on them by the village headmen as voluntary contributions to the war (pp. 224-5). The new emergence of the peasant into politics was symbolised in the person of the new nationalist leader, Zagloul Pasha.

Egyptian nationalism is, then, the joint product of individual daring which first made Egypt a political unit, of outside interference which first provided a motive for unity, and of western education which first gave to these unorganised desires a doctrine and an ideal. The process is far from complete, but it has gone far enough to demonstrate again, as with the Italian and German movements, that a movement to obtain national unity is often the best way to create the reality of it in the minds of the very people who are supposed already to possess it. As in economics a demand is not always necessary for supply; a supply can sometimes create a demand.

T. G. P. SPEAR.

CAPITAL AND LABOUR.

NEW TACTICS IN SOCIAL CONFLICT.

Edited By H. W. LAIDLER and NORMAN THOMAS. (Vanguard Press, New York.) 1926. 7¼ x 4½. pp. 230. 50 cents.

It was one of the dictums of Karl Marx that capitalism had within it the seeds of its own dissolution. He held that until those seeds had ripened, and society was ready to give birth to a new economic system in any particular country, any attempt to force the matter unduly would result in abortion, and that revolution would come most natural in those countries in which capitalism was the most perfectly developed. If this doctrine is true, and we think it is, Russia would be the last place in the world to look for a revolution (that is a natural and not a forced revolution) and America the first; for it is in America where capitalism has reached its highest point of perfection; it is in America where the latest improvements and developments in social conflict are to be found. The book under review—*New Tactics in Social Conflict*—is a clear confirma-

tion of the above affirmation of Marx and is extremely interesting reading, if only from this point of view; but it has many other points of interest.

To hear some people talk one would think that America is a workers' paradise, with high wages and short hours and labour banks and profit sharing schemes and joint management of industry and an efficiency and a mutual understanding and co-operation between employer and employed that make ordinary Trade Unionism look very vulgar and out of date. Nothing could be further from the truth than this. It is true of course that high wages and the five day week do obtain in many of the industries in America, but it is equally true to say that these do but seek to conceal the conflict between capital and labour. The basic conflict between these two remains untouched and unaltered. How could it be otherwise when land and natural resources and the principal means of production are privately owned and managed for profit, which profit legally belongs not to the hired workers but to the owners?

The title of the book is really a copy of the general title of the subject of the Twelfth Annual Conference of the League for Industrial Democracy recently held at Camp Tamiment, Pa. The Conference, lasted several days and was conducted on the lines of a discussion in which many of the leading Trade Unionists, as well as a few prominent industrialists, took part. These discussions, and the results arrived at, are recorded in the book. The scope of the discussions may be judged from the title of the various subjects, which were dealt with in the order given. These are: "Changing relations between property ownership and control"; "Trade Unions enter business"; "Changing tactics of employers towards the workers"; "The sweep towards industrial combination"; "American economic imperialism"; "The new propaganda," and "Power, coal, and forests".

Each subject is dealt with primarily by an expert on that subject; in fact the Conference was a gathering of experts. That is what makes the book valuable. Take as an example the argument put forward quite frankly by one industrialist concerning the benefits to the employer of employee stock ownership. As he states them these possible benefits are: (1) "It encourages saving and thus maintains employee efficiency in periods of unemployment or illness. (2) It testifies to the good will of the employer and thus strengthens working morale. (3) It reduces labour turnover by binding the employee to the company with a financial bond. (4) It attracts labour which is above the average in responsibility. (5) It improves working efficiency through the knowledge of the worker that his income is partly dependent on the company's prosperity. (6) It makes the worker a capitalist in viewpoint and thus renders him conservative and immune to radical ideas. (7) It gives the employee a first-hand experience with investments. (8) It protects the power of existing management by widening the distribution of stock and thus making it harder for outsiders to buy up a controlling interest. (9) It taps new sources of capital, thus making it easier for the company to secure funds. (10) It strengthens the trend to popular ownership which is believed to be desirable in general."

Arguments on the other side are of course equally trenchant. Take for instance the following *finale* of one speech: "Even if Mr. Soule's picture were possible of achievement when, in each organisation, each industry, the workers, through the investment trust, did own a larger and larger part of the shares, still, when that were carried out to its complete realisation we should only have a number of separa-

tely owned, disjointed, industrial units throughout the country. . . . That sort of thing is not going to solve the industrial problem. What is needed is a complete change of ownership throughout the entire nation, or, better still, throughout the entire world, in which the units all work together and there is no profit motive whatever".

But apart from the fascination of having an important subject presented to you from different angles of view by skilled representatives of different, and sometimes conflicting, interests, the book contains a large amount of valuable and reliable information on the subject of American labour and Trade Unionism which it might be difficult to secure elsewhere at double or treble the price. The Vanguard Press is to be congratulated on the excellence of this welcome production.

ERNEST KIRK.

SHORT NOTICES.

THE QUAKERS—THEIR STORY AND MESSAGE. By A. NEAVE BRAYSHAW. (Swarthmore Press, Ltd., London.) 1927. 7¼ × 1¾. pp. 301. 3s. 6d.

THE QUAKERS IN IRELAND, 1654-1900. By ISABEL GRUBB. (Swarthmore Press, Ltd., London.) 1927. 7½ × 5. pp. 158. 3s. 6d.

THERE is apparent in the West to-day a greatly increased interest in mystical religion—or at any rate in those types of mystical religion which insist that the claim to spiritual experience must be made good in genuine purity and beneficence of life. Institutional religion is under a cloud, possibly as the result of a War which saw the national Churches busily invoking the Divine wrath upon the enemy and the Divine blessing upon the ally, from both sides of the fighting-line. It is being increasingly felt that if religion is to survive as an active and effective force in the modern world, it can only be if religion is drastically reinterpreted—as a thing of living experience, able to transform character, both individual and corporate, rather than as an affair of credal allegiance or ecclesiastical organisation. The Society of Friends (the 'Quakers') has for nearly three hundred years endeavoured to embody this ideal of religion in the actual life of a company of men and women bound together by the common experience of such a living and working religion. Mr. Brayshaw's book gives an accurate and stimulating account of this great enterprise, from its beginning, and traces the development of the wide-spread philanthropic activities and of the fearless testimony against all war which have come to be characteristic of the Quaker community and the Quaker way of life. His book forms an important chapter in the history of religion. But it is more than this. It witnesses strikingly to the fact that, given the will and the devotion, religion may so work in the world as to achieve miracles—perhaps through an agency which seems insignificant—for the uplifting of the enslaved and the oppressed, the breaking down of barriers, and the fulfilment of the highest ideals of national and international welfare.

The second book named above is slighter, but is still full of interest, especially in the sections which deal with the stand taken by the Irish Friends against hatred and violence at times of social and political upheaval.

J. S. HOYLAND.

ART AS WILL AND IDEA. By C. JINARAJA DASA. (Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar) 1927. pp. 197.

THIS small volume on art is a collection of six articles, two of which were lectures delivered a few years ago in Australia. The author, who professes to be a non-artist, shows however a masterly study of art in all its aspects and argues quite convincingly about the higher and nobler functions of art, its intensely ethical meaning and its highly religious value. He wants the artists not merely to create but to release the capacity of creation in other through their work. He considers life incomplete besides being religious, scientific and philosophical—we do not transmute a little of life through the faculty of art as well. Thus, his most passionate appeal to the artists for raising art to a noble pedestal and to the non-artists to make their own lives complete by at least appreciating it is, we should think, the most reasonable one in these days of an all-absorbing interest in science almost to the exclusion of art altogether.

K. V. SANKARAN NAIR.

THE TAJ MAHAL OF AGRA. By J. W. HAMINGTON. (Liddell's Press, Simla.) 1928. 7¼ × 5. pp. 42. Re. 1-8-0.

THIS little booklet, somewhat too costly, is very useful to those who want to see a 'sigh of love in marble' scientifically. It contains much useful information about the Taj which must have cost the author a good deal of labour to collect. Who designed the Taj, how much money was spent upon it—these and similar points of historical interest are dealt with in the booklet.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MARRIAGE AGE IN SOUTH AFRICA.
TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—A propos of your note on the "Marriage Age in England" the following figures taken from the Official Year Book of the Union of South Africa 1910-1925, may interest your readers:—

AGE AT MARRIAGE OF EUROPEANS.

Brides at 13 in 1922, 3; in 1923, 0; and in 1924, 2
Brides at 14 in 1922, 9; in 1923, 0; and in 1924, 6
Brides at 15 in 1922, 35; in 1924, 40; and in 1924, 44
Brides at 16 in 1922, 257; in 1923, 220; and in 1924, 210

The proportion per cent. in the first three cases is less than 5 and in the last, more than 1.5. On comparison with the United Kingdom and the various British Dominions, the percentage of brides who marry under the age of 21 in the Union is higher except for Canada—Yours, etc.

YOUR EUROPEAN CORRESPONDENT.

Geneva, Feb. 2.

2/6 to £ 3 Daily. Any person with good business capabilities could add considerably to his income. Address Hollandsche Verkoop Centrale Buitenveldert Amsterdam, Holland.