

THE Servant of India

Acting Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY.

VOL. II., No. 36.]

POONA—THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1919.

[ANNUAL SUBSK. : RS. 4]

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	421
ARTICLE :—	
Intermarriages and Pseudo-scientists	424
SPECIAL ARTICLES :—	
An Imperial Judicature for the Indian States. By G. R. Abhyankar, B. A., LL. B.	426
The Second Chamber. By A. S. Bhandarkar, A. B. (Harvard).	429
A LETTER FROM LONDON :—	430
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
The Hindu and the Moderates. By Mr. Amichand Bogra.	431

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

THANKS to the good offices of the Executive of the Transport Workers' Union who acted as mediators between the railwaymen and Mr. Lloyd George's government, the railway strike has been settled satisfactorily to both sides. The main points of the settlement are (1) Work is to be resumed forthwith (2) All negotiations shall be completed before the 30th of December. (3) Wages shall be stabilised on the present level till the end of September, 1920. (4) The minimum wage for the railwaymen shall be 51 s. per week as long as the cost of living is 110 p. c. higher than the pre-war rate—that is to say, so long as it is as high as at present. On the whole, we think, the strikers have scored against the Government which was willing to grant only a minimum of 40 s. whereas the former had demanded 60 s. per week. Perhaps, it would be more accurate to characterise it as "a fair settlement for both sides," as one of the telegrams puts it. This is but one more instance of the innate good sense of John Bull triumphing over what looked very much like a revolution.

THE interviews given to the representative of the Associated Press by Messrs. S. N. Bannerjea and K. C. Roy of the Moderates' Deputation and Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Iyer of the Home Rule League Deputation, on their landing in Bombay on the 1st inst., make interesting reading. Judging by the optimistic tone adopted by them as well as by Sir Abbas Ali Baig in his interview with the *Times of India* representative, the prospects of Reform are bright. "The Indian situation in England to-day," said Mr. Bannerji, "was far more encouraging and satisfactory than it had been before."

SAID Mr. Banerjea :—

The Moderate Deputation also interested itself in the Punjab and South African questions. They had several informal Conferences with Mr. Montagu, and they urged the grant of a general amnesty and the appointment of an independent commission to enquire into the Punjab disturbances. Lastly, the moderate party organised a united deputation on the South African question.

We make a present of this paragraph to the *Hindu* which said that the moderates did not like to trouble Mr. Montagu with the Punjab episode and to all our esteemed contemporaries who are now bent upon proving that the moderates frustrated all attempts at any kind of united action.

MR. BANERJEA modestly claimed for the deputation of which he was the head, that it was the strongest in point of numbers and that as a party it always received attention and sympathetic hearing. Without being boastful, he could have also claimed that it was the strongest in point of ability. It is idle to say that the congress deputation had a difficult case to argue before the Parliamentary Joint Committee. That is not the point as the *Bombay Chronicle* seems to suppose. As the London correspondent of the *Tribune* and the *Hindu* has pointed out, it was not the difficulty of the case, but the aggressiveness and truculence of its advocates that spoilt their otherwise admirable evidence and rendered it ineffective so far as the Joint Committee was concerned. Other equally impartial eye-witnesses have corroborated this statement. On the other hand, even hostile witnesses have testified to the able and convincing manner in which most members of the moderate deputation presented their case and to the great impression which they produced on the Joint Committee. Outside that deputation, the only Indian whom so many impartial and even hostile witnesses have combined to praise in an equal degree is Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Iyer. Surely, then, there is much more in the manner in which one presents his case than seems to be dreamt of in the Extremist philosophy. We feel convinced that, when the history of these times comes to be written, the historian will endorse the words which Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Iyer has used with regard to the work of the Moderate deputation. "Though all the deputations did their best" said he, "the work of the Moderates was the best organised in the matter of reforms."

AMONG the resolutions passed by the "depressed classes" conference which recently met in

Bangalore under the presidency of the Hon'ble Mr. M. C. Raja, the newly nominated Panchama member of the Madras Legislative Council, is one urging the creation of a separate department of Government for the protection and elevation of the submerged population. This suggestion was first made, so far as we are aware, in the memorandum on the uplift of the Panchamas which was submitted sometime ago by the Madras Branch of the Servants of India Society to Mr. G. F. Pad-dison, who had been appointed on special duty for this purpose by the Government of Madras. Readers of this journal will remember that, among other things, that representation stated :—

As we strongly believe that a permanent department of Government interested in the uplift of the Panchamas is necessary in order to effect any tangible reform, we suggest the creation of a separate portfolio for this subject which should be in charge of a Minister in the reformed Government of the future.

* * *

FOR some time past, a rumour has been afloat that the Mysore Administration, with the courage and initiative which have characterised it of late and which make it in many respects an admirable exemplar to the British Indian provincial and central governments, have under contemplation the creation of such a department. We trust that the resolution passed by the Panchamas' conference will expedite its coming. We see that the conference has demanded that such a department should be set up in Madras also. In our opinion it is much more necessary in Madras where the Panchama question as well as all caste questions is more acute than it is ever likely to be in Mysore. Here is a piece of constructive work for Lord Willingdon to do.

* * *

ACCORDING to the Hon. Mr. M. C. Raja, Mr. C. R. Reddy has laid the foundations of "a real democracy" by his new educational scheme for Mysore which is, in the words of the President of the Panchama Conference, "the most liberal and broad-minded scheme of education that was ever introduced in this country under the Hindu regime or the British." Kolhapur is the latest recruit to the ranks of the Native States which are apparently determined to put our bureaucracy to shame by their courageous handling of social problems. The Kolhapur Durbar, we are reliably informed, has issued an order that all offices and schools receiving public grant must be thrown open to the depressed classes and that any officer of the state or manager or teacher of a school receiving state aid who obstructs the working of this order will be given short shrift—dismissed or have his grant cut off. This ought to be a valuable moral lesson to our local governments who are still shilly-shallying over the non-admission of Panchamas into several state-aided schools. Is it not high time that this cruel wrong of ages was removed by a Government which calls itself Christian, when so many neighbouring Native States have shown them the way? If any institution which is in the enjoy-

ment of any portion of public money, does not throw open its doors to all the public, but insists on maintaining its private and sectarian character, is it not but fair that that institution should immediately forfeit its claims to any part of the public funds? The argument that missionary schools and colleges which make the Bible class compulsory ought not to receive any grant-in-aid should apply with even double force to schools and colleges which refuse admission itself to a very large section of our people on the score of caste and creed.

* * *

WE hope for little and expect less from the Committee of Judges who have been appointed to revise the Martial Law trials in the Punjab, in accordance with the promise held out Sir William Vincent in the course of the debate in the Indian Legislative Council on the Indemnity Bill. We take it that the essential, nay, the sole object of appointing such a committee is to redress the wrongs done by the Martial Law Commissioners, in cases in which a miscarriage of justice may be proved. If that be so, it seems to us that that object has been sacrificed to the secondary, or rather, the infinitely smaller end of saving time and expediting work. Sir William Vincent may be right in holding that two local judges would not take long to get themselves acquainted with local conditions at the time of the outbreak of the disturbances. But is that why we wanted, and the Government gave us, this belated committee? Is gaining time its aim or is it the securing of justice for those who have fallen victims to the most flagrant reign of injustice the people of India have witnessed after the days of the Sepoy Mutiny? If it is the latter,—and no one who is in his senses will gainsay this—we maintain that a committee of two High Court Judges imported from outside the Punjab would have been better, more independent, less susceptible to judicial preconceptions and prejudices or official pressure which, as every body knows, can work in a thousand insidious ways and more likely to arrive at sane and just conclusions and render justice than Mr. Justice Chevis and Mr. Justice Rauf of the High Court of Lahore who have been now appointed.

* * *

SIR ABBAS ALI BAIG'S statement in the course of his interview with the representative of the *Times of India* that self-government should go hand in hand with self-defence has furnished that paper with a theme for a little homily on the shortcomings of the Indian race in general and the sins of the Indian politicians in particular. Our contemporary says that the I. D. F. proved a failure in spite of a great deal of encouragement. We remember that in some places this encouragement took the shape of flogging the members of the Force for petty offences, in the early stages of recruitment. What a disgusting spectacle it was that even this encouragement did not induce our educated young graduates and undergrads, to join the I. D. F. in great numbers!

THE versatile editor of the *Leader* of Allahabad has signalled his stay in England by his many-sided activities on behalf of India. He has written to nearly every influential paper there on Indian topics and in this respect, we believe, he easily bears off the palm among all the members of all the various Indian deputations with the probable and solitary exception of Mrs. Besant. As Mr. Nihal Singh says, he has done more than any other member of the deputations for the Punjab sufferers. An esteemed friend in London informs us of several luncheons and dinners arranged by him, ("that being the only way of getting into touch with busy men here" as a correspondent observes) at which he made the acquaintance of Prof. Hobson, Mr. Massingham (editor of the *Nation*), Mr. Spender (editor of the *Westminster Gazette*), Mr. Wilson (editor of the *Inver's Review*), Mr. Nevinson, etc., etc., and won their sympathy and support; so much so that Mr. Massingham has promised to publish an article from his pen in the *Nation* on the Government of India Bill and Mr. Spender has promised to comment on it editorially (and, of course, favourably) if Mr. Chintamani would supply him with the requisite materials. Considering the vast amount of influence which the *Nation* wields among the thoughtful section of the British public and the important part which the *Westminster Gazette* plays in official circles, their help will be very valuable to our cause, to say the least. Mr. Chintamani has secured the support of the editor of the *Daily Chronicle* too. He has also had interviews with Lords Morley and Haldane. This is a record of work of which anyone might feel proud.

THE *Indian Social Reformer* writes:—

Justice, the organ of the non-Brahman Movement in Southern India, criticising Mr. Joshi's delegation to the Labour Conference at Washington says: "Mr. Joshi belongs to the servants of India Society. So far as we are aware, the servants of India Society is financed among others by some of the mill-owners in Bombay; and is it expected that Mr. Joshi would represent the labourers when their interests clash with those of the persons who are financing the Society? He would more rightly be the representative of the mill-owners themselves...." But may we ask in reply to our contemporary: "*Justice* is owned by the South Indian People's Association. The Association is supported by several Zamindars. How can *Justice* represent the interests of the non-Brahmans who are mostly cultivators, a certain proportion of them being tenants of these Zamindars?" The answer to both these questions is that there are mill-owners and Zamindars who are broad-minded enough to understand that their interests are identical with those of their workmen and tenants and it is these who support public movements and not those who care only for their own pleasure and profit."

To an Indian whose faith in the soundness of head and goodness of heart of John Bull has been rudely shaken, if not utterly shattered, by the sayings and doings of O'Dwyers and Craddock, the recent noble utterance of Sir Nicholson Beatson Bell, the Chief Commissioner of Assam, in bringing the proceedings of his Legislative Council to a close, comes as a healing balm. It does one's

heart good to read his manly declaration that he is no bureaucrat and that he is not frightened by the prospect of a Legislative Council and an Executive Council wholly manned by non-officials, in which the services will simply have no place, but will be merely the tools of the non-official legislature and 'Cabinet' as he calls it, carrying out their decisions and confining themselves strictly to the work of practical administration. And his earnest solicitations for his counsellor's advice and guidance are highly refreshing after the innumerable instances we have had of Viceroys, Governors, Lt. Governors and Executive Councillors flouting and trampling under foot non-official opinion. As for the relative merits of his reform scheme and that of Mr. Montagu, we do not feel ourselves called upon to say anything more at present than that the latter is about to become a *fait accompli*—so we hope—and we fancy that is for one thing, rather a bit too late in the day for ardent lovers of reform like Sir N. B. Bell to ask that dyarchy should go.

* * *

THE 9th Mysore provincial Co-operative Conference met under the Presidentship of Mr. G. K. Devadhar on the 2nd instant at Mysore. In opening the proceedings, H. H. the Yuvaraja, congratulated the Conference on having secured a co-operator of such ability, experience and earnestness as Mr. Devadhar as their president. After a word of well-deserved tribute to the success of the various forms of co-operative credit activities, His Highness observed "the time has come when, with the experience they had already gained, they should be able to extend their activities in other directions i. e. on non-credit lines".

* * *

MR. DEVDHAR, in his presidential address, after referring to the gratifying progress which Mysore had made in the various fields of co-operative work, quoted details to show that the State was far ahead of British India and of almost all other Native States. Among the various lines he put forward before the Conference for its work in the future, were the following (1) to develop co-operation on non-credit lines, on the basis of extended and democratized credit for agricultural advancement (2) to organize, on a larger scale and on systematic and modern lines, co-operative agricultural production, collection and distribution (3) co-operative supply of sanitary houses, on schemes modelled on those of Denmark and England (4) to institute Land Redemption Societies on the lines of Danish institutions (5) to establish a wholesale Co-operative Society, like the Irish wholesale or the wholesales of England and Scotland (6) To form Cattle Insurance Societies and Land-Mortgage Banks (7) To introduce on a much larger scale the social and educational activities which are outstanding features in the growth of the movement in the West, After this practical outline of work, he wound up his address with an eloquent peroration on the possibilities of co-operation as a democratic factor in modern life.

INTERMARRIAGES AND PSEUDO-SCIENTISTS.

With C. W. Saleeby, one of the foremost scientific writers of the day, we must condemn the school of "amateurs and pseudo-scientists," who take the sacred name of science in order to justify every superstition, stem the tide of reform, preserve vested interests intact or make class or caste domination secure. Some of them, we believe, do so out of self-interest. Others, we hope, sincerely believe that they are right. But the real point is that these men are "amateurs and pseudo-scientists" who have no right to speak in the name of science which is or ought to be the handmaiden, not of this or that vested interest, this or that caste, class or creed, but of Reason, Righteousness and Humanity.

A writer in *The South Indian Research* endeavours to justify the opposition to Mr. Patel's Hindu Inter-caste Marriage Bill on the score of science. His sincerity, we are glad to say, is transparent. And so is his ignorance of his subject. He has proved once again the wisdom of the old saying that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing. His acquaintance with science does not seem to extend much further than the knowledge of such trite terms as biology, heredity etc. Of biology or heredity itself he seems to know precious little and says much less. According to him the social reformer's zeal for inter-caste marriages will not appeal "to the scientists of the twentieth century." May we know who these unknown twentieth century scientists are?

Confusion of ideas is the badge of the race of all pseudo-scientists. The writer in question confounds—deliberately or ignorantly we are not in a position to say—inter-marriages between one caste of Hindus and another with inter-marriages between two such distinct races as the Americans and Negroes. Now, as every schoolboy knows, the Negroes constitute a separate racial type distinct from the Americans. But is each one of the innumerable castes and sub-castes in India a separate race? We shall leave the Sudras—the fourth caste—out of the account for the sake of argument. But is it not a matter of elementary knowledge that the twice-born castes,—the Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vysias—belong to one and the same broad grouping of mankind known to anthropologists as the Indo-Aryan race? Can inter-marriages between members of this race be considered in the same light as inter-marriages between Americans and Negroes? Can it be called a *cross* by anyone who knows the eugenic meaning of that term? We regret we are forced to be so elementary in our exposition. If the writer had no idea of comparing these two sets of inter-marriages, may we ask why, he brings in this radically false analogy at all while he is opposing Hindu Inter-caste marriages? May we know what he means by this "Surely, then, America is right in restricting marriages between Americans and Negroes."

The ignorance of facts shown in the last sen-

tence only equals the ignorance of science displayed by the writer. He speaks in a general way of America. That is a very safe thing to do, but it does not square with truth. Except some southern states, legal prohibition, either direct or indirect, against marital unions between Americans and Negroes does not exist in the United States of America, nor are any legal penalties imposed on the offspring of these unions such as the forfeiture of the right of inheritance, as that would violate the basic principle of the American Constitution, embodied in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal and ought to be given equal facilities in the pursuit of happiness. What a commentary is this on the illegality and invalidity attaching to inter-marriages between Hindus and Hindus in this country. It may be urged that the writer meant only the social restriction which obtains in the U. S. A., in the matter of Negro-American matches. Of this we shall say more presently. But what on earth has that got to do with Mr. Patel's validating Bill? It is not the object of that bill to remove social restrictions and prejudices which no power on earth can remove. Reformers do not seek that every caste in India should fly into the arms of every other or that the police should take any two members of any two castes, wherever they may be found, and get them married to each other in a court of law and that there should be no social ostracism against it. The aim of the bill is only to legalise and validate the marriage of a Hindu man and a Hindu woman who choose to marry each other. It only asks that their children should not be punished on this ground. Can any one imagine a more cruel injustice than this illegality attaching to inter-marriages between Hindus and Hindus when there is no such illegality attaching to inter-marriages between two such radically different races as the Americans and Negroes in the U. S. A.? The analogy of America is, if anything, an additional and powerful argument in favour of Mr. Patel's purely permissive Hindu Inter-caste Marriage Validating Bill.

We do not propose to enter here into the broad question of racial origins and racial differences; nor do we intend to pass any opinion on the results and effects of experimental or volitional crossings between distinct races of humanity. The former belongs to the region of ethnology and anthropology and the latter to the realm of that comparatively new Science, Eugenics which is still in the making. Suffice it to say that Anthropology and Ethnology tend more and more to the conclusion that the theory of plural origins of the human genus postulated by some nineteenth century scientists is wrong. The *Homo Genus* is one in origin. Its differences are purely accidental. The antipathies which one race feels towards another is, therefore, based on accidental variations such as colour, features or habits of life. But to speak of them as inherent or to seek to justify them on scientific grounds would be the height of

folly. At best these antipathies are rooted in sentiment. Now, it is true, as Napoleon said, that sentiment rules the world. But, then, sentiment is not science. We can understand why the white should dislike the black man. It is a matter of sentiment. But to speak of it as a matter of science is bathos. And here Eugenics steps in and confirms the conclusions of Anthropologists and Ethnologists. As a matter of fact, inter-marriages between Negroes and Americans have been going on an extensive scale in America. According to the American Census Report, one-sixth of the Negro population of America have an admixture of white blood; while according to Dr. Dubois, the friend and colleague of Booker T. Washington and the editor of the well-known negro journal, $\frac{1}{3}$ of the total Negro population of America are Mulattoes—the offspring of Americans and Negroes. Dr. Dubois is himself a mulatto. Booker T. Washington whose intellect and character remind one of an Abraham Lincoln or a Benjamin Franklin, was also a mulatto. Most mulattoes are university men. They are the natural leaders of the negroes. Therefore, it will not be true to say that crossings between Americans and Negroes have tended to lower the American type. On the contrary, they have only tended to raise the Negro type.

What shall we say, then, to those whose ignorance of these facts makes them assert that inter-marriages between one class of Hindus and another class of Hindus will involve race-degeneracy? Do they know what they are talking about? If, as all observation has tended to show, crossings between two such distinct types of Humanity as the Negroes and the Americans have improved the former, instead of impairing the latter, is it conceivable that inter-marriages between Hindu castes belonging to one and the same human stock, will bring about the deterioration of the Hindu race? On the contrary, is it not patent that cross-breeding between the Aryan and the Dravidian and the Mongolian types which are scattered all over this country in an inextricable manner, will only tend to invigorate, and raise the tone of Hindu Society? Surely, the disparity between Aryan and Dravidian or between Aryan and Mongolian is even more fanciful, even more a matter of sentiment than the disparity between the whiteman and the negro.

The writer speaks equally glibly of the law of biology and heredity. He says that all marriages should follow these laws. Granted. But is he aware that Natural Selection is the first and the fundamental law of Biology? Will he tell us in how many Hindu marriages this all-important law of natural selection has been given full scope and free play, to his knowledge? Is it not a notorious fact that the whole system of marriages among Hindus follows highly artificial rules of selection? As for heredity, men like Calton and Mendel, who were entitled to speak of it with some authority if any men ever were, frankly confessed that

their knowledge of it was like the Eton boy's knowledge of Greek—they only knew that such a thing existed. All Eugenists—Schuster, Karl Pearson, Salleeby and Newsholme, to mention but a few—are unanimous in their opinion that the laws of Heredity are the most subtle and difficult of all the laws of Nature to trace or define, let alone guide or control. What does the writer mean, then, by talking of heredity? Does Heredity consist in telling a child before its birth "Thou shalt be a Brahmin" or "Thou shalt be a Pariah"? Yet, the Hindu caste system has been based on this crude old woman's notion of heredity and this passes for its scientific basis! Well may we exclaim, varying Madame Roland's famous epigram, "O Science, what crudities, barbarities, stupidities and cruelties are perpetrated and perpetuated in thy name!"

And has not this caste system based over 2000 years ago on this barbarous and primitive notion of heredity, been weighed in the balance sufficiently long? Has not the attempt to bind and fix heredity in castes had its trial long enough in this unhappy country? What are its net results? Well, all the world knows them. If it be said that it has preserved the race, it has but preserved a race of political slaves, perpetual hewers of wood and drawers of water. If it be said that it has produced great poets, philosophers and artists, can any one calculate the number of equally great geniuses whom it has successfully suppressed? Its supporters talk of the need for a separate intellectual class! Every student of history knows that intellectual life has been consistently and uniformly on a higher level in ancient and modern Europe where no caste system existed or exists (thank goodness) and no one class ever arrogated to itself hereditary intellect (save the mark!). Has not Europe produced equally great poets, philosophers and artists? Has it not, on the plane of physical and natural sciences at least, beaten the Hindus with their hereditary intellectual caste and left them far, far behind in the race? Who can estimate the loss which this country has sustained, on the intellectual side of its life, by this monstrous, unnatural and unscientific arrangement of hereditary castes which was the most effective device which anyone could have ever hit upon for the suppression of individuality, talent and genius by the fixing of hereditary occupations and by the denial of equal opportunities to all which alone have enriched the mental and material life of the West beyond the dreams of the East? Here is what Newsholme says in his "Declining Birth-rate," after carefully and impartially weighing the evidence adduced on both sides, "It is not certain that the average inherent mental and physical qualities of the majority of the wage-earning classes are not equal to those of the rest of the population" and everyone is aware that it is these classes in the West, corresponding to the Sudras in India, who have given Europe and America a great many of their greatest men (and women too)

of genus. But in India these classes—these Sudras—have been compelled to remain Sudras, coolies and servitors, hereditarily. And yet people will talk about the intellectual superiority and inferiority of classes and the need for a separate intellectual caste! As Lamarck, the precursor of Darwin in the discovery of the theory of Evolution, than whom there is no more honoured name in the glorious annals of Western Science, used to say: "Nature knows no classes; she knows only individuals". We would advise the writer of the article in the *South Indian Research* to make a serious study of Anthropology, Ethnology and Eugenics.

AN IMPERIAL JUDICATURE FOR THE INDIAN STATES.

It is really a strange irony of fate that, while the illustrious authors of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report have been trying to give some measure of self-government to the people in British India, they have studiously abstained from making any such suggestion about the people in Indian States. The talented authors of the Report have treated this important subject of Indian States in a most perfunctory manner. They did not hold any enquiry as they did about British India. They did not try to acquaint themselves with the intricacies of this problem. They did not care to know what the Princes had to say about their own advancement and what the stand-point of the subjects of the Indian States was for their betterment. They did not even condescend to listen to representations submitted to them or give a hearing to those who wanted to place the views of the subjects before them. They did not examine the utility of the British system of supervision and control exercised through its Political Department. They did not give any thought to the antiquated institution of the 'politicals'. They wanted to thrust in the Indian States somewhere somehow in the Report and they have done it. "It was impossible to leave them (The Ruling Chiefs) out of, as to fit them into, the Montagu-Chelmsford Scheme." We therefore find loose, one-sided and imperfect generalisations, huddled up together in one chapter of this Report, which, so far as it relates to British India, discloses minute enquiry, thorough grasp, warm interest, and genuine sympathy for the subjects. It is, therefore, no wonder that the suggestions about Indian States are very vague and defective in many respects.

The well-known personality of F. C. O. B. has contributed to the *Times of India* a series of very interesting articles on the subject of Reforms and Ruling Princes. These articles deal mainly with the suggestion about Commissions of inquiry into disputes, made in Para 308 of the Report. It is suggested that Commissions should be appointed to settle disputes (1) between two or more States (2) between a State and a Local Government (3) Between a State and the Government of India (4) and

to dispose off judicially a situation created, when a state is dissatisfied with the ruling of the Government of India or the advice of any of its local representatives. These Commissions shall have to deal mainly with civil or quasi-civil disputes. There are generally three stages through which such a disputed claim of an Indian State has to pass before it is set at rest. The Political Agent or the Resident decides a case as the man on the spot. Then it is taken to the local Government and, then, either to the Government of India or the Secretary of State. At what stage a State can ask for a Commission is not at all defined in the Report—whether a party can ask for the appointment of a Commission as soon as a dispute arises or when it has been decided one way or the other by the Political Department. If, after all the worry and trouble have been undertaken in carrying out the litigation to the Secretary of State through the Political Department, and if, after the litigant has been put to an enormous expenditure in the course of these Political proceedings, this remedy of a Commission is to be resorted to as a second line of defence to be pierced through, to get justice, it will not at all then be of any practical value to the parties concerned. This machinery will exhaust the resources of the richest States even and would be too costly a luxury for a poor State to indulge in.

The distinguished authors of the Report seem to have a great fascination for the issue of certificates, throughout their policy adumbrated in their Report. Their fondness for certificated legislation in the Provinces and at the Centre is too well known to need any mention here. The same unctiousness for issuing certificates seems to characterise their policy as regards Indian States also. If the Commissions are to be more or less of a judicial character, why should they depend on the certificate of the Viceroy? They should not be open to any insinuation of favouritism or intrigue in the remotest degree. The granting of a certificate, would lead, on the other hand, to all the evils which favouritism in every Department of Government is prone to beget. If the right of asking for a commission is conceded to every litigant, this suggestion contained in the Report would be free from the heaviest drawback in the shape of a certificate, which is sure to stultify it in actual practice.

F. C. O. B. has very graphically described how a political appeal descends to the lowest member of the hierarchy of the Political Department and how ultimately the destinies of a litigant are shaped by the head clerk or the registrar who draws up the precis of the case. The head of the Political Department, either in the Province or at the Centre is generally the head of the administration, namely, the Governor or the Viceroy. His hands are too full with other important work and he cannot afford to devote any minute attention to the intricacies of law and facts of each case. Naturally, therefore, the work is relegated to the Chief Secretary (?). He in his turn, hands it over to the Under Secretary and

be in his own way transmits it to his office and there it is taken up by a clerk. "There is no right of audience except by written argument and the decision is, in a large majority of cases, contained in a sentence 'Government declines to interfere'. The procedure is wrapped up in impenetrable mystery. From the moment the papers pass the portals of the Political Department, they and everything connected with them become secret and confidential. One thing at least which might have been confidently predicted *a priori*, and which sad experience verifies, is that, the longer, the more elaborate, the more thorough and convincing a written memorial of appeal is, the less chance it has of being favourably considered, fully mastered or even read." The truth of these statements, and there is a grim humour about them all, is every day realised by many Indian States, who have to approach the Political Department for redress of their grievances. The Indian States undoubtedly will feel greatly strengthened, as a jurist of F. C. O. B.'s position and standing has expressed these views from his personal experience. If they lead to the improvement of this anomalous and detestable system, they will not have been ventilated in vain.

But this is not the first time when such a strong protest against this method of disposing of Political appeals has been raised. Ever since the transfer of the government of India from the East India Company to the Crown of England, which then assumed the *de facto* sovereignty of India, this unjust, high handed and uncivilised system has been attacked by eminent men. But theirs has been a cry in the wilderness; and there has not been the slightest change in this respect. The Policy of annexation and lapse pursued by Lord Dalhousie led to various disputes of claimants of Indian States, who had to resort to Parliament for the redress of their wrongs. Mr. John Dickinson fought very strenuously and earnestly for the many unhappy representatives of the annexed Indian States in the fifties and sixties of the last century. He strongly deplored the want of a highest tribunal in the Empire for the disposal of such Political cases. Major Evans Bell in his preface to the work of John Dickinson called 'Last Counsels of an unknown Counsellor' observes as follows: "In the course of the Indian Political appeals, Mr. Dickinson became fully acquainted with the abuses and scandals caused by the absence of any judicial authority, any code of principle or procedure for the guidance of the Calcutta Foreign Office and the Viceregal Government, in the interpretation of treaties, in settling matters of disputes with any of the Protected States, or the families of mediatised Princes, and in arranging the differences of two or more Darbars bound to abide by our arbitration. From the practice that had grown up of deciding all political cases, in secret conclaves, without reference to any jurist or law officer and, frequently, on *ex parte* statements, the most inconsistent and iniquitous decrees had

been frequently passed, chiefly during Lord Dalhousie's incumbency, stuffed with legal terms, the very misuse of which is enough to expose the imperfect and perverted acquaintance of the writers with the inter-national Hindu or Mussalman Law on which they profess to be relying. To judgment of this description, evincing an utter want of the judicial mind and method, apparently capricious and insincere, defiant of history, of existing contracts, and of innumerable precedents, it was impossible for the aggrieved parties to submit. Yet there was no tribunal before which they could be heard, and where they could be sure at least of ascertaining what adverse case had been set up against them."

This is but a specimen. Many are the eminent men like Sir B. Frere, J. M. Ludlow, Sir D. Wedderburn, who have repeatedly and in scathing terms exposed the inequities of the present system and urged the formation of a high Judicial tribunal for the disposal of all such political cases.

In 1857, we find 'The Indian Daily News' very strongly urging the establishment of a Court of Appeal for Indian grievances. It enumerated 18 cases in which, during the last ten years suffering parties had in person or by Attorney pleaded fruitlessly to the Home authorities. In all these cases, the subject matter of dispute was of immense value. They had arisen out of the usurpation policy of Government. The redress which the parties had to seek at the hands of Government, was for the wrongs inflicted by the officers of Government, who had brought utter ruin and destitution on these members of the ruling class. But they only knocked their heads against the dead wall of Executive Government. They had not even the satisfaction of getting justice in an open forum, with the opportunity of stating their cases and that of knowing what was alleged and proved against them. They would undoubtedly have been pleased, if they had been allowed the privilege of a hearing before a judicial court, possessing all the sanctity of a fair and impartial attitude.

The only approach to the institution of such a judicial tribunal was when the Queen Empress had in 1877 created the institution of 'the Counsellors of the Empress,' the objects of which institution have been described in the following words. "The more practical form of the institution would include some special judicial procedure, quite apart from the High Courts or Judicial committee, to deal with exigencies as those in the recent case of the Raja of Zalwar or with disputed successions as that of Manipur, which, through failure in the ordinary secret executive action by the Political Department, resulted so disastrously." But these 'Counsellors' were never invited and the institution did not actually come into existence.

Indeed, the one redeeming feature of the whole situation during the sixties of the last century was, that Parliament was taking a very keen interest in Indian affairs and more especially in those

connected with Indian States. This was, no doubt, due to the revulsion of feelings caused by the grasping policy of annexation followed by Lord Dalhousie. Kingdom after kingdom was, on one pretext or another, forfeited to the British Crown. Punjab had already fallen. Satara was annexed. Jhansi and Nagpur met the same fate, Tanjore was turned into a British province. The helpless cry of the rulers of these States and the exasperating manner in which their private property was disposed of by Government, awakened a deep sense of indignation in England. Mr. Bright on one occasion described how "after the annexation of Nagpur, the dresses and wardrobes of the ladies of the court had been exposed to sale like a bankrupt's stock, a thing likely to horrify and incense the people of India who witnessed it." Mr. Dickinson in one place describes these acts of Lord Dalhousie in the following words; "it was as much an act of robbery for us to appropriate the principalities of Satara, Colaba, and Mandavie in defiance of all the heirs, as it would be for the Lord Chancellor to pocket a legacy because it was litigated in his court. We are improving upon a precedent set by Caligula in our violation of the right of adoption. When Caligula was invited to the nuptial feast, he carried away his friend's wife. When the British Resident is invited to the death-bed of a prince, he turns his friend's widow and orphans out of doors and confiscates their inheritance. (Government of India under a bureaucracy, Page 166.)

The horrifying accounts of these confiscations induced many righteous English men to bring this scandalous state of affairs before the public and Parliament. Mr. Dickinson took a prominent part in this movement, and an 'Indian Reform Society' was formed in England with the view of bringing public opinion to bear on the Imperial Parliament, so as to obtain due attention to the complaints and claims of the inhabitants of India. Nearly sixty people joined the society, forty of whom were members of Parliament. The Marquis of Ripon, then Viscount Goderich, M.P. was one of the members. Mr. Henry Danby Seymour, M. P. was the Chairman and Mr. Dickinson was the Hon. Secretary. For over sixteen years, the 'Indian Reform Society' endeavoured to bring to the notice of Parliament by means leaflets and pamphlets, by means of lectures of persons, who visited India and tried to obtain first hand information of the actual situation (like Mr. Layard) and by raising debates in the House of Commons in connection with the rightful claims of the unfortunate princes who were deprived of their principalities and their properties by the ruthless hand of Lord Dalhousie. The claims of prince Azemzah, the descendent of the Nawab of Karnatic were so constantly pressed on the attention of Parliament that he was termed 'the great Parliamentary bore.' The result of all this, added to the interest of Parliament in Indian political affairs, aroused by the Mutiny, was that, though taking a case to Parliament was

a terrible ordeal in those days and beyond the power of many, yet, when a party did succeed in carrying it there, it had the satisfaction of a thorough discussion of its case by a motion or debate in Parliament.

All this, however, belongs to the past. Questions pertaining to Indian States do not now receive adequate attention in Parliament. It is only with a view to institute a ludicrous comparison with British India that a reference is now and then made to Indian States in Parliamentary debates. The Parliament is too busy to devote its time and attention to such cases, as they did in the sixties of the last century. The necessity for the establishment of a supreme court of judicature for Indian States has, therefore, become very imperative.

The general policy which is observable in all political cases is one of supporting the man on the spot. This fetish of maintaining the prestige of the officers of the department is the bane of every bureaucracy. The policy of judicial tribunals, on the other hand, is quite the reverse. "All the High Courts in India spend a large part of their time in reversing the man on the spot and, on the whole, to the satisfaction of the public and all concerned." It has been sometimes urged that the reversal of a decision deliberately and repeatedly promulgated by the Viceroy of India in Council and approved by the Secretary of State would ruin the prestige of Government and would shake the very foundations of British Power. We will quote the opinion of an experienced statesman in reply to this argument. "This appears to me not only to be devoid of all moral principles but to be directly opposed to sound political science. The prestige of an Imperial Government, that awe and respect by which order and obedience are preserved amongst its subjects, is based partly on a belief in its material resources and partly on faith in its moral superiority. The obstinate maintenance of an unjust decree after its injustice has been publicly exposed cannot augment material strength and must destroy moral influence. Such persistent wrong does not even tend to strike terror. It rather inspires disdain."

Now to return to our Commissions adumbrated in the Report. They are to be resorted to, even after the certificate of the Viceroy, only by those States who enjoy full sovereign powers of internal administration. Such States, according to the most liberal calculation, are not more than a hundred. The Report does not make any provision for the disposal of cases pertaining to the remaining six hundred Indian States. Their lot seems to be indissolubly wedded to the Political Department. Why this right of asking for Commissions has been withheld from the six hundred States it is very difficult to understand. The disputes of these States are as important as those of autonomous States. The interests involved are equally great. The Privy Council does not close its doors against poor litigants. The

meanest subject of His Majesty is entitled to get redress at the hands of the highest tribunal in the Empire. Why then such an invidious distinction should be made in the case of the smaller Indian States, it is more than one can imagine. Indeed, if one State more than another needs this concession of Judicial tribunal it is, we believe, the smaller States in India. They have no means of redress if their litigation is disposed of "by the no reason to interfere" formula of the Political Department. They can never hope to get any relief. In the case of bigger States, it is different. They have many opportunities of meeting the representatives of the Crown, of laying before them their complaints and of agitating for the redress of their wrongs. These opportunities and these privileges are not open to the smaller States and the withholding of this concession from them would be regarded as a great wrong by these States, who have been so unjustly treated in other respects also, in this Report.

(To be concluded.)

G. R. ABHYANKAR.

THE SECOND CHAMBER.

THE advocates of the Second Chamber favor it chiefly on two grounds, (1) that it is found in almost every European country which we call civilized and (2) that it acts as a beneficial restraining influence on hasty legislation. That a certain institution or law exists in a European country is no argument for, or the justification of, its introduction elsewhere e. g. in India. European countries have constitutions which are far from perfect, and which came into being according to the exigencies of the times; and as the circumstances that gave them birth are constantly changing, they also are gradually falling out of date. The House of Lords in England is an instance in point. It dates as far back as the feudal times when the king used to consult the nobility around him in the administration of his public affairs. The English constitution is the result of a slow organic growth and as England is one of the most conservative nations in the West, she has not got the political courage to get rid of the House, especially in the face of opposition from the higher moneyed classes whose voice counts there as in no other country except, perhaps, America. The fact that the House of Lords had out-grown its purpose was, however, clearly recognised by the British Ministry which passed the Parliamentary Act in 1911 giving the upper House only the provincial power of delaying legislation.

The other argument that the Second Chamber has a wholesome restraining influence takes for granted that such an influence is necessary. Is this always so? In every country with a wide franchise, the elected popular Assembly is mainly composed of platform orators as the people who return them are more easily moved by their rhetorical phrases and catchwords, and their appeal to imagination and emotion than by cold logic based on facts. But it is not by sentiment or catchwords, but by cold logic that a country is successfully governed. Headlong sentiment untempered by cool thought in politics leads to revolution and not evolution. The chaos of Bolshevism in Russia is mostly a fruit of sentimentalism and radicalism run mad. In a country like India teeming, unfortunately, with illiterate masses, the lack of independent

thought is very much in evidence and will continue to be so for some time to come, at least, even after the advent of the expected Reforms. In such a case, it is, no doubt, extremely necessary to guard against ill-considered and hasty action on the part of the elected Assembly. But there is no reason, theoretically, why this should be necessary where a people is given to independent thinking and can judge for themselves what conduces to the good of their country. A remedy that naturally suggests itself against the evils of haste and sentiment and at the same time can afford to dispense with the Second Chamber, is not to have a too extensive franchise; but this is against all the accepted tenets of a popular, democratic government as well as unsafe, for, a minority cannot rule long over a majority when it is discontented or unwilling to be so ruled over. The French Revolution was a result of the tyranny of an aristocratic minority over a discontented and poverty-stricken peasantry. We are thus led to have recourse to the Second Chamber for a salutary 'restraint'. It should be borne in mind, however, that not all restraint is salutary. Its desirability depends upon its kind and the source whence it comes. It may turn out to be reactionary or selfish in its origin. A House whose members are entitled to their seats through heredity or are nominated for life, e. g. the Upper House in Canada, is apt to grow dull or lifeless with years, tho' not reactionary. The Second Chamber should by no means be composed of wealthy land-owners, capitalists or other moneyed interests. The opposition of the House of Lords to liberal measures aiming at the material and social amelioration of the labouring classes is too notorious to require detailed mention here. That House and the only become useless, but was also trying to become a formidable obstacle and a positive danger to England's true progress and prosperity. It was especially this recognition that impelled the Parliament to pass the epoch-making Parliamentary Act referred to above. The opposition of the Bombay Corporation to the Building Bye-laws is another instance before us when the narrow interests of the property-owning majority in it were affected. The intended extension of the franchise to tenants will, we hope, mend matters in the future.

Again, in the Council of State and provisional provincial councils proposed in the M.-C. Scheme, for passing emergency measures, such as budgets &c., there is going to be either an official or a nominated majority who, whether they be given the right of independent voting or not, will always be indirectly influenced by and expected to vote with the Government, as is the case at present, and, under those circumstances, the passing of such measures cannot be said to have received the popular sanction. The political trick will deceive nobody, as it only apparently diffuses responsibility for a measure over the whole Council which ought rightly to fall on the Executive or its head. It is far more desirable, we think, to invest these authorities with extra-ordinary powers, or make it constitutionally incumbent upon the former to use them where such exist, rather than manufacture hybrid councils with servile majorities in order to carry out their will, since, strictly limited personal responsibility psychologically acts as the greatest deterrent to any abuse of power on the part of an obdurate autocratic or bureaucratic Government. If it is intended that the Second Chamber should exert a beneficial restraining influence upon the popular Assembly, there are better ways of bringing this about than by creating in it a dummy

official or semi-official block in permanent opposition to the wishes of the people. This object can be secured, for instance, by making the Chamber electively representative of various interests such as education, sanitation, agriculture, commerce, industries &c., in all their branches, while the electors should have a certain educational qualification, say, a University degree. Every bill or budget should receive the sanction of this Chamber along with that of the popular Assembly. Such a Second Chamber will not only serve as a wholesome check to a permanently hasty and sentimental popular House as desired, but will also enable every individual and collective body to ventilate their grievances and express their views on questions of national importance and on matters which might happen to affect their interests however remotely or indirectly. In India where, under a broad franchise, the popular councils bid fair to be representative only of mob orators, social reactionaries and fanatical champions of orthodoxy, the representation of the various interests mentioned above becomes all the more necessary. Moreover, it will not be difficult to pass through such a chamber a liberal measure conceived in the highest interests of a nation, since, unlike the House of Lords, it will not be monopolized by a particular class or section of society whose cupidity might chance to come in its way. It is certainly far more safe and desirable, however, to let the popular Assembly have its own way rather than allow an aristocratic or bureaucratic Second Chamber to stand as a permanent barrier to a country's progress and prosperity.

A. S. BHANDARKAR.

A LETTER FROM LONDON.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

LONDON, SEP. 10.

PRESS LUNCHEONS TO INDIAN JOURNALISTS.

INDIAN Journalism received last week a good advertisement, for there were no less than two press luncheons attended by representatives of the Indian press. Unfortunately they clashed, for Messrs. Rangaswami and Horniman sent out their invitations before they knew that a similar function had been arranged by Lord Burnham for the same day and at the same hour. The delegates of the Indian Press Association made a strong attack upon the Indian Press Act. They dwelt upon the extraordinarily wide range of its provisions and cited the testimony of High Court Judges in support of the contention that they could be stretched to cover almost any kind of writing. Mr. Horniman, who presided, waxed eloquent, and showed how, since the Act was passed, some £50,000 or £60,000 has been taken as security and a great part of it forfeited—a very heavy tax indeed on a struggling industry. Mr. Wadia and Mr. B. C. Pal gave corroborative evidence and appealed for the restoration of the Free Press in India.

Commander Kenworthy, speaking as an English radical member of Parliament, reminded his hearers that, wherever there was autocratic Government, there would be attempts to interfere with the liberty of the Press. If we could not allow freedom of the Press in India, he said, British Government there had failed and the sooner it was handed over to the people the better.

Mr. George Lansbury spoke in a similar strain. Mr. J. A. Hobson, reminded the gathering that we had not yet got back freedom in England. It was not merely a question of liberty here, he said, but of tolerance; and people who would not tolerate differences of opinion, had not the seeds of liberty

with them. He had the temerity to quote Mill, but was promptly assured by many Indians present that Mill was prohibited in India. Among other speakers were Messrs. Tilak and Satyamurti. It was somewhat to be regretted that Mr. Rangaswami, who, it must be admitted, had been very energetic in promoting this gathering, chose to express the opinion that the other one was intended as a rival affair. This sort of pettiness does no good whatever and simply leaves a nasty taste in the mouth—of the speaker.

THE INDIAN PRESS AND THE EMPIRE PRESS UNION

Among those who were Lord Burnham's guests, were Mr. Surendranath Banerjea and Mr. P. C. Roy, representing the "Bengalee", Mr. C. Y. Chintamani, the "Leader", Mr. K. C. Roy, the Associated Press of India, Mr. Jinah, "The Bombay Chronicle," and Mr. V. S. S. Sastri "The Servant of India." Welcoming the guests on behalf of the Empire Press Union, Lord Burnham said that the Union knew no distinction of shade in matters of politics. They had no test, Act as to colour or creed in their membership. The only conditions that they made were that their members should represent newspapers, which were genuinely newspapers, and which were loyal to the Empire. He regarded the occasion as a confabulation of newspaper men, who wished to establish friendly relations between the newspaper Press of this country and the Native Press of the Indian Empire. No one among them could regard any problem before them as equal in its vital importance to that of the future contentment and prosperity of India, and he expressed on behalf of his fellow-countrymen the sentiment that, in regard to the future which lay before India, now that she was about to enter upon the British training ground of constitutional Government, their feelings were those of good-will and good hope. He had heard Indians themselves complain that the new service and the literary side of the Indian Press were not sufficiently strong, and he hoped that through the Empire Press Union something could be done to add to its efficiency and information. He thought that the time had come when the Empire Press Union would be wanting in completeness if they did not have a branch of the Native Press of India, and expressed the hope that it would soon be accomplished and that delegates might be present at the next Imperial Press Conference to be held in Canada. I should not be at all surprised if either Mr. Chintamani or Mr. Sastri or both of them were to receive such an invitation. The toast was supported by Sir Stanley Reed, and was responded to by Mr. Banerjea in his vigorous way. He pleaded for opportunities to ventilate Indian grievances and aspirations in the Public Press in this country, and commented upon the fact that, whilst Britishers studied European and American history generally, they made no study of Indian history. He therefore urged the creation of a feeling in the minds of the British public that there should be this education of the English youth in matters relating to Indian history. Among those present were several noted leaders of the London Press and News Agencies.

LORD BURNHAM'S SPEECH.

Lord Burnham's speech is indicative of the great change that has come over a considerable section of the British Press, whose friendship for India has hitherto been somewhat lukewarm. The "Daily Telegraph" itself, Lord Burnham's paper, was, until recently, unable to make up its mind whether or not it was prepared to support the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms. It has now definitely decided to do so. It is hopeful, in spite of the many difficulties with which in its opinion the

problem bristles, and on the day following the luncheon, the "Telegraph" devoted a column of its editorial space to weighing up the pros and cons and explaining how its conclusions were arrived at. The visit of the Indian Press delegates has been productive of good in another way, for the "Times" has come more under their influence and a little bird whispers to me that in the course of a day or two, Mr. Chintamani will achieve fame as being the only Indian, or at any rate the only Indian politician-journalist, to have a letter a column and a third long, published by that august journal. He must have been reminded of days not so long ago when he reigned in the editorial chair in South Road, Allahabad. Perhaps the day is not very far distant when the "Times" may be prepared to accept signed articles from prominent Indian journalists. I do not think that our Congress friends appreciate these matters at their full value. They do not realise that to-day, and for a very long time to come, those for whom such papers as the "Times" and the "Telegraph" cater, will have enormous influence upon the course of events, both here and in the Empire at large. It seems, therefore, absurd and peevish on the part of Messrs. Horniman and Rangaswamy to spend time and space in explaining to the British public, how they and their immediate colleagues are the only authorised and authentic delegates of the Indian Press Association, whilst the guests at the other luncheon were merely Indian journalists, who happened to be in this country as members of the Moderate Deputation. One would really imagine from the care with which this attempt has been made to separate the sheep from the goats, that Lord Burnham's guests had actually done an injury to India and Indian journalism. I foresee that these displays of party spirit will simply result in disgusting decent people here with Indian politics and politicians.

EVIL RESULTS OF EXTREMIST'S TRUCULENCE.

It is yet too early to prophesy when and how the Government of India Bill will be enacted, but that it will pass, is now, I think, practically beyond doubt. I know that Mr. Montagu is in hopes that it will pass by Christmas, but there may be domestic difficulties which will prevent its going through all stages until March of next year. It is, therefore, necessary that the Indian public should be prepared for a small disappointment. I hope that there will be none, but it is better to be prepared for an emergency, whose occurrence may be beyond control. My impression of the final form of the Bill is, that it will shed many of its unpleasant features, but that as regards the Central Government, the changes that will be made, will not be so far-reaching as we had hoped. I do not think it is unfair to say that the evidence given before the Joint Committee by the Congress spokesmen, was of such a character as to alarm several members and their friends, who were inclined to be sympathetic, and it may not be possible to overcome the prejudice and resentment aroused at the time, not so much by the excessiveness of their demand, which after all is a matter of opinion, as by the truculent manner in which it was put forward. Englishmen are not apt to appreciate aggressiveness, even from their own countrymen; they are far less likely to take to it, when used as a method of approach by those who come before them, asking that Parliament should yield up some of its power. On the whole, I think that the Bill, as finally passed, without being anything to be over-enthusiastic about, will be acceptable and capable of being put to good use. It seems to me that the most sen-

sible thing would be loyally to make the best use of it, and if, in fact, it be unworkable, as some of its critics on the Indian side allege, to show that it is so, in spite of the most loyal attempts to work it. The argument for a further change of a much more advanced character will, then, be unanswerable. It is, of course, impossible at this stage to foretell how parties will be formed and work carried on in India, until after the Bill is through, but it does not require great perception to convince oneself that the present parties are of unstable equilibrium. There will have to be a great shedding of useless members, and without any disparagement to those who have laboured mightily in the past, but, on the contrary, building upon the foundations that they have laid with much sacrifice and great labour, new leadership is called for, that will fix its eyes upon the future rather than upon the days gone by, and march forward youthfully, with bright eye, head erect, elastic step, a high goal in view and a clarion call of hope and faith for their following. This implies discipline, on the part alike of leaders and followers. I do not wish to preach, but it seems to me that, like ourselves, you in India are badly in need of political discipline and organisation. It will be a sad thing if, in the days to come, patriotism in India cannot be independent of vituperation, invective, the imputing of unworthy motives and base party conflict.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE HINDU AND THE MODERATES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—It has caused me great pain to see the various articles that are appearing in many papers in India, over what is being done in England for the Punjab by the several deputations present there at this time.

Is it not quite sufficient for us to be divided over the question of Reforms and is there any need for us to quarrel as to what those who do not hold exactly the same views as we do on one subject are doing or are not doing regarding the Punjab?

Punjabees, like myself, are very thankful to all those who are trying to alleviate our lot and we hate to see dissensions on a question which is so vital to us. We are just as thankful to Moderates as we are to the Extremists and we do not discriminate between the two in giving our thanks. To us, all those who help us are Nationalists—we at present do not think of Moderates or Extremists—we think of all of them as Indian Patriots first and last.

The *Hindu* first takes the Moderates to task and the "*Bengalee*" and the "*Leader*" reply. It is no use for us to quarrel—if the Moderates are doing all they can for the Punjab in England, the Extremists are doing an equal amount for the Punjab here in India. Neither party can claim to be doing more on the whole than the other—both parties are in fact children of one parent for whose good both are working in different places and on different lines.

It was a great shame that we had to divide on the question of Reforms and it will be a still greater shame if we divide on this question. Dissension seems to be an inherent quality of Indians—difference of opinion prevails all over the world—but I know of no country in the world where less respect is shown for the opinion of others who happen not to agree with us. Had it not been for the good of India, whom we all profess to love so well and had it not been for our supreme faith in British Justice, which of late came so near to being shattered one felt inclined to run away one million miles into the jungles.

Let us unite on this question, if on no other, and let us, Moderates, Nationalists, and Extremists exclaim with one voice, "*Tria Juncta in Una*".

AMICHAND BOGRA.

Lahore, September 15, 1919.

[Our correspondent is the son of Lala Dunichand, one of the Punjab martyrs, and as such he is entitled to speak with authority and inside knowledge. We heartily recommend a perusal of his letter to all Extremist journals and especially to the *Hindu* which "first took the Moderates to task" as he euphemistically expresses it. We take it that his letter is a symptom of the disgust which the people of the Punjab feel at the tactics of our Madras contemporary. We may recall here a statement recently made by the *Mahratta* that the Moderates have done quite as much for the Punjab sufferers as the Extremists—Ed., S. of I.]

GET GOOD SIGHT.

By removing the cause of bad sight. Don't commit the common error and take to spectacles as the only remedy for eye-trouble—they will correct your sight. But what you want is something to cure your eyes viz.—the Actina Treatment. Actina has succeeded where Specialists had failed, simply because it assists and not opposes Nature. It is essentially a natural treatment and the hundreds of testimonials are proof that it is a successful treatment. To use it is simplicity itself—remove the two screw caps from the Actina instrument releasing the powerful vapor, which applied to the eyes and inhaled through the mouth and nostrils sets up and maintains a good circulation in all parts of the eye, removes congestion and restores in the organ to perfect health. It is just as effective in other catarrhal Diseases such as Hay Fever, Asthma, Bronchitis, Headache, Sore Throat, Influenza, Deafness etc. Invest Rs 25-8 in an Actina and save specialists' fees. Valuable booklet entitled "Prof. Wilson's Treatise on Disease" containing particulars of Conditional Trial Offer and convincing testimonials post free from Rai B. S. Bhandari M. A. Batala, (India).

2

THE ACTINA WAY.**HOW TO BECOME A DRUGLESS-DOCTOR.**

If you want money, happiness, fame; be a doctor of drugless-therapy. This chance will be given to one candidate in a town and two candidates in a city. Read our booklet "How to become a drugless-doctor" sending two annas stamps to—

Dr. SURATKER, (S.) N. C. Institute,
BARODA.

JUST A WORD

or two to remind you to send your order To-Day for our famous

COSSI SILK SUIT PIECES

Worth the price, and a piece guaranteed for one suit complete

Price Rs. 8 per piece.

Order from:—GOOD LUCK COMPANY, BENARES CITY.

Dr. BAILUR'S MEDICINES.

HIVA-JWAR.
Ague pills.
Price As. 8.
Per bottle.



BALAGRAHA
CHURNA.
Epileptic powder.
Price Re. 1.
Per bottle.

Ask for our catalogue for other medicines & Particulars.

Liberal commission for Merchants.

Dr. H. M. BAILUR,

Dispensary BELGAUM.

Notice to Subscribers.

While communicating with the office on any subject, subscribers are requested to quote their register number which is printed on the address slip, **without fail**. This will help the office in the speedy disposal of their communications and avoid any inconvenience that may otherwise be caused to them.

Manager, 'The Servant of India,'
Budhwar Peth, Poona City.

Ramchandra Govind & Son,

BOOK-SELLERS AND PUBLISHERS, KALKADEVI, BOMBAY.

INDIAN CURRENCY AND BANKING PROBLEMS

BY MOHAN LAL TANNAN, B. COM., (Birmingham), BAR-AT-LAW, F. R. E. S.
Lecturer in Banking, Sydenham College of Commerce and Economics, Bombay.

AND

KHUSHAL T. SHAH, B. A., B. SC. (Econ. London), BAR-AT-LAW.

Professor of Economics, Maharajah's College, Mysore.

Crown Octavo. Nicely bound, Gold-lettered, nearly 350 Pages with Index. Price Rs. 5.

GOVERNANCE OF INDIA, Price Rs. 3.

BY KHUSHAL T. SHAH, B. A., B. SC. (Econ., London), BAR-AT-LAW.

Professor of Economics, Maharajah's College, Mysore.

(1) Higher Accounting With Auditing Notes. By S. R. Davar.

Officially recognized by the Government of Mysore for use in Colleges and Schools of Commerce and recommended as a text to the Students of the Premier College of Commerce in India.

A book specially written for the use of Professional Accountancy students as well as that of Accountants, Legal Practitioners and Businessmen, Price Rs. 6-8.

(2) Elements of Indian Mercantile Law. By S. R. Davar.

Recognized and Recommended as a text-book by the Government Accountancy Diploma Board, as well as by the Premier College of Commerce for the University, Commercial and Accountancy Examinations *Specially written for the use of " Commerce " and " Accountancy " students as well as that of Businessmen and Accountants. Rs. 6-8-0.*

(3) Business Organization. An excellent book for the use of students of commerce and businessman, particularly those in charge of the management of large enterprises such as public companies, Mill Agencies, etc, By **S. R. Davar, BAR-AT-LAW.**

(In Press. Expected to be out shortly.) Price Rs. 6. net.

Twentieth Century English-Marathi Dictionary:—Pronouncing Etymological, Literary, Scientific and Technical by N. B. Ranade, B. A. 2 vols. half Morocco bound. **Rs. 25.**

Shah and Haji's (Profs.) Guide to Economics:—In form of question and answer very useful to students of Economics. **Rs. 4.**

Shah's (Prof.) Guide to Indian Administration:—Very useful to Intermediate Arts students. **Rs. 1-4-0.**