

# Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. VII, No. 51.]

POONA—THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 1925.

 { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6  
 FOREIGN 10 s

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	601
ARTICLES :—	
The Swarajist Policy in the C. P.	603
Indian Economic Conference—Some Impressions. By One Present.	604
The Late Mr. Justice Ranade. By V. N. Naik.	605
America in the Philippines. By J. B. Sen	607
REVIEWS :—	
The Real Labour Problem. H. C. E. Zacharias	609
Indian Taxation. V. N. G.	610
MISCELLANEA :—	
Morley on Montagu Reforms.	611
BOOKS RECEIVED	611

## TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

BY Lord Pentland's death India has lost one of her warmest friends in England. It is true that in the latter part of his regime as Governor of Madras he showed himself as anything but a liberal statesman, though he was a member of the Liberal government and belonged to the section of Radicals. What made him most unpopular was his internment of Mrs. Besant and her close associates. That, however, was during the anxious days of the war and it would not be fair to judge him solely by what he did under the stress of excitement. After retiring, he was a good friend of Mr. Montagu and a staunch supporter of the cause of Indian reforms. In a letter written so recently as the 22nd December last to Mr. Srinivasa Sastri he advocated a reform policy for India the essence of which was: "to advance by provinces, extending responsibility and self-government, wherever and whenever the conditions are favourable; at the same time devolving upon such provincial governments further responsibilities from the central government so as to reduce to a minimum the intervention of the central government. As one instrument for all this, the central and provincial electorates to be extended and better distributed than now." This is the policy that was advocated publicly some time ago by Lord Willingdon. We offer our respectful sympathy to Lady Pentland and in doing so we may be permitted to say that Indians of all shades of opinion, including those who hated Lord Pentland's policy, have always had the highest respect and admiration for the quiet, non-interfering,

kindly and noble ways of Lady Pentland whose temperament and character made a special appeal to the Indian heart.

\* \* \*

THE Hindus and Muhammadans of Nagpur are to be congratulated on having come to an amicable settlement regarding the playing of music before mosques, which only a few months ago had made the relations between the communities exceedingly strained. The credit of bringing about this settlement is entirely due to Moulana Abdul Kalam Azad, who with his vast learning was able to convince his coreligionists that their religion did not impose on them the duty of stopping music in front of mosques at the time of prayers. Muslims were no doubt enjoined to observe the strictest silence at the time of prayer, but non-Muslims were not bound by that injunction. The playing of music would only cause annoyance or inconvenience to them, but no Mussalman would be justified in inflicting an injury upon others merely to save himself annoyance or inconvenience. On thus being convinced that it was not their religious duty to stop music before mosques, the Mahammadans of Nagpur did not want to press the question of custom, but left the whole matter entirely in the hands of the Hindus. Fully appreciating this friendly attitude of the Muhammadans, the Hindus have voluntarily agreed to stop music in front of five specified mosques at the time of the mid-day and evening prayers. In accepting this the Muhammadans have however pointed out that to them all mosques and all prayers are of equal importance and have suggested to the Hindus the desirability of extending the concession accordingly. That is, however, taking too theoretical a view of the matter. To the Hindus it is not the sanctity of a mosque as mosque that appeals but the inconvenience caused to their fellow citizens. The number of persons inconvenienced is therefore an essential consideration with them, and we believe they are right in choosing the places and hours that are most used for prayers. It is very much to be hoped that the example of the Nagpur people, Mussalmans and Hindus, will be followed all over the country and a spirit of mutual accommodation will replace false notions of communal prestige.

\* \* \*

WITHIN a month of the Belgaum Berar and yarn. Congress, the Berar Provincial Congress Committee has begun to rebel against the ridiculous Khaddar and yarn provisions of the Congress

constitution. At its meeting of the 18th at Yeotmal, a member moved that the yarn franchise was unsuitable for enforcement in Berar and that the province should therefore be treated as an exception. The question was raised whether the motion was in order. The President, Mr. Aney, ruled that it was out of order, but promised to forward the resolution to the All-India Congress Committee together with his own observations. At the same meeting another member pointed out that since most of the members were not clad in Khaddar they could not proceed with the business. (Article 7 of the Congress constitution as recently amended lays down that 'no one shall be a member of any Congress Committee or organisation who does not wear hand-spun hand-woven Khaddar at political and Congress functions or while engaged in Congress business.') The President gave an ingenious ruling; he held the objection not valid because 'the Congress resolution must be interpreted in such a way as not to stultify the very existence of the Congress organisation for the preservation of which the constitution had laid down the rule.' According to this view the yarn franchise would appear to be already dead in Berar. One would certainly like to know what Pandit Motilal Nehru thinks of the proceedings of this meeting and how far he is prepared to enforce 'discipline'—of which he spoke so big at Belgaum—on Mr. Aney and his friends.

\* \* \*

**Ulema Wisdom.** ONE hopes that the Jamait-ul-Ulema will do good to the Ulema by widening their outlook and liberalising their views. For before they go through such a process precious little can they contribute to the progress or welfare of the country by their deliberations. Some astonishingly crude views were expressed by them at Moradabad last week. Discoursing on Islam a Maulana is reported to have said that God kept two registers, one of friends and the other of foes, and that the names of Muslims were entered in the one and of non-Muslims in the other! Mr. Mahomed Ali urged them to be progressive, not to look merely to outward forms but to see that Muslims led pure lives. He asked them not to spare Princes like those of Hyderabad, Tonk or Rampur, if they discovered anything in their lives which was prohibited by religion. This only elicited the reply that they had nothing new to say as God was old and the Koran also was old, and that they must see that Muslims did not shave their beards, clip their moustaches or wore their pyjamas above their ankles. No wonder that people holding such crude views should express the opinion that "Hindu-Muslim unity would not be achieved unless the Congress declared itself in favour of the rendition of Berar." Their present political education is such that they cannot distinguish between a state and an estate and they cannot understand that for anything affecting the status or interests of the former the consent of the people concerned is essential.

\* \* \*

**Egypt and the Sudan.** ENGLAND'S title to the Sudan is one of those subjects, on which the official news sources never seem to vouchsafe to an Indian

public more than generalities. On September 11th of last year we gave our readers some figures regarding the military and financial share borne by Egypt in the reconquest of the Sudan—which details seemed to make a very good *prima facie* case for Egyptian claims, though hardly sufficient to warrant the *non possumus* attitude of Zaghlul Pasha, who would not admit that the question of the Sudan's separation from Egypt, under any form whatsoever, was even open to discussion. We confess, this attitude of the Egyptian statesman had struck us always as curiously unreasonable. But we are not sure that we ought not to revise our views on the subject in the light of the facts of the case, which, culled from official P. W. D. reports by an American Judge of the Cairo Mixed Tribunal, have just been published in the December No. of the New York quarterly *Foreign Affairs*. Mr. Pierre Crabites in this article tells us that the maximum known flow of the Nile amounts to 138,000 million cubic metres of water. Whilst Egypt to-day takes annually about 34,000 of that quantity, the experts appointed by the Egyptian Government to inquire into the Nile projects have agreed that Egypt's total eventual requirements amount to 58,000, to which 10,000 must be added to equalize 'low water' years. Now this 68,000 maximum is the quantity of water needed for the grand total of cultivable land in Egypt—7½ million acres—, of which area the present cultivation falls short by 2 million acres only: a small margin seeing that the population in Egypt at present grows by two lakhs a year (total population about 13 millions). On these figures therefore one may assume that, after the needs of Egypt have been met in full, the waters of the Nile provide a surplus for not more than 7 million acres of irrigation area in the Sudan. Of that total, 500,000 are at present being developed by British cotton interests, but, says Judge Crabites, 'the present-day necessities of the Sudan are negligible. It will take decades before the Sudan can be developed to such an extent that the maximum known flow of the Nile (130,000 maximum) will be inadequate for the eventual necessities of both Egypt and the Sudan, whatever reservoirs may be erected to husband the waters of the Nile.' But, since they can be so developed, and even, apparently, far beyond that point, what will happen ultimately? Can a Sudan, bent on "realizing the magnificent future that awaits her," be allowed in equity complete independence from an Egypt, that depends on the one Nile of both countries for its very life?

\* \* \*

**Maternity Benefit.** THE women of Bombay are to be heartily congratulated on having given their strong support to Mr. N. M. Joshi's Maternity Benefit Bill at a public meeting specially convened for the purpose. It was presided over by Lady Jagmohandas and among others that took part in it were Mrs. Hirabai Tata, Mrs. Hodekinson, Dr. Mistry and Mrs. Avantikabai Gokhale. Dr. Mistry pointed out that maternity benefit to factory workers was the first step in the reduction of infantile mortality—which is exceedingly high in the whole of India, but perhaps nowhere in all the world so bad as in Bombay. She strongly criticised the Government for 'coolly expressing their inability' to ratify the Washington Convention regarding maternity benefit when requested to do so by the International Labour Conference.

## THE SWARAJIST POLICY IN THE C. P.

IT is idle to speculate now what policy the Swarajists in the Central Provinces will adopt when next year's budget is presented to the Legislative Council in March next. They are tied to the coat tails of the twin dictators of the Swaraj party and will therefore do just what they are allowed to do by the Deshabandhu and the Pandit. There is no doubt, however, that, left to themselves, they will accept the responsibility which the possession of an absolute majority in the Legislature entails upon a party under a system of responsible government. They are not non-co-operators at heart and do not consider themselves to be wedded to continuous and consistent obstruction. They are responsive co-operators and can accept ministerships without doing the least violence to their conscience. They do not share even the hesitation of the editor of the *Indian Social Reformer* and Lala Lajpat Rai—recent political movements have made strange bed-fellows of these two persons—in the matter of accepting the post of Ministers. These leaders, though uncompromisingly opposed to wholesale obstruction, curiously enough, express a preference for the non-acceptance of office, little realising that the refusal by a majority party to assume responsibility is itself obstruction open to the worst objections they urge against the Swarajist policy. The C. P. Swarajists can accept a salaried post without a twinge of conscience. The only question is how far they will be free to shape their own policy.

That, if all outside pressure were removed, the Swarajist leaders in the C. P. would accept office is proved by the very announcement which they made when calling a meeting of their executive committee. They said, quite ingenuously, that the meeting was to be held to consider what changes had become necessary in their policy "in view of the suspension of N.-C.-O. by the Congress." The meaning of it is perfectly plain. The policy of non-co-operation which the Swarajists adopted as their own had made it necessary for them to refuse office and to offer undiluted obstruction at all stages. The suspension of non-co-operation should, they thought, leave them free to change their former policy. Every one will agree that this is very sound logic. If you wish to go into the Council as non-co-operators, you are inevitably reduced to adopting the sterile policy of opposing every proposal made by Government and you are debarred from making any constructive proposal of your own. The C. P. Swarajists themselves never believed in non-co-operation and yet they faithfully carried out all the obligations which the adoption of N.-C.-O. entailed upon them. Indeed they carried out such obligations much better than those to whose behests they have now to bow ever did. For true non-co-operators could not have supported the Steel Protection proposals of Government as Pandit Motilal Nehru did or introduced a Bill to amend the Land Acquisition Act (a trumpety piece of legislation) as Mr. N. C. Kalkar intends to do. True non-co-operators must oppose everything indiscriminately, and the C. P.

Swarajists did so by throwing out the Budget, thus sacrificing, for the sake of opinions which they do not hold but to which they have given their acquiescence the rare opportunities which a disciplined majority placed at their command. They must naturally have been eager to revise their policy since non-co-operation was suspended, and they called a meeting of the committee to consider this definite question: what changes are now necessitated in the Swarajist policy by the Congress having given up, at least for the time being, its non-co-operation creed?

They no doubt summoned the meeting for this purpose, but they were never allowed to consider the question, as a perusal of the resolution they adopted will clearly show. The resolution says in effect: unless the constitution is suitably modified, we cannot accept office. We do not commit ourselves to the statement that the Swarajists will eventually be guided by this resolution. They have shown a remarkable dexterity in the past in twisting plain propositions into most unnatural meanings. But they have passed a resolution which means, if anything, that the obstructionist tactics of the Swaraj party in the Central Provinces will continue till the present reforms undergo a wide extension, and a committee has been appointed to report on the conditions, &c., upon which the present lines of the Swarajist policy "may, in the circumstances, be altered." The circumstances here alluded to clearly refer to the amendment of the Government of India Act to which the resolution refers so frequently in its earlier parts. Thus the C. P. Swarajists' committee is charged with the question of deciding on the change in their present policy with reference only to one thing: whether a substantial enlargement of the constitution has in the meanwhile been effected or not. As there is not the remotest possibility of the Government of India Act being amended within the next three weeks, the committee can only report, according to this resolution:—"The system of government remaining what it is—'inadequate' (we do not pretend to know what an 'inadequate system of government' connotes), 'disingenuous' and 'doomed to failure'—it is out of the question for the Swaraj party to accept office." Again, we are not so rash as to prophesy that this will be the committee's decision. They are quite capable of arriving at a contrary decision. All that we are concerned at this moment to point out is that the resolution which the meeting adopted in the end has no reference whatsoever to the one question which it was their avowed purpose to consider. Apparently they never reviewed their own situation in the light of the change which the Congress policy had actually undergone; they reviewed it in the light of the possible changes in the Government's policy.

The Congress suspended non-co-operation without reference to any possible change in the Government's attitude, and if a change is now required in the Swaraj party's policy it is necessitated not by a corresponding change in Government's policy (of this there is no sign whatever), but by the change in the policy of the Congress. It has also

been advanced by some prominent Swarajists that they first refused office, not because they felt bound to do so by the principle of non-co-operation to which they had given in their adhesion, but because they would have been exposed to the charge of self-advancement if they had accepted ministerships. To the extent that the Swarajists were influenced by this consideration, they should now consider themselves free to hold office, for they have proved their unselfishness to the satisfaction of their calumniators by refusing office for a year. Anyhow it must be remembered that the C. P. Swarajists will really have this "last chance," as Sir Frank Sly made clear, in rectifying their mistake. For with the Conservative party in control of things in England, the revocation of transferred departments, should the Budget be thrown out once again, is a foregone conclusion. It seems to be thought by some Swarajists that the Government in England feel much difficulty in withdrawing the transferred departments. It might perhaps have been a matter of some difficulty with the Labour Government, though it is difficult to understand how else even they would have dealt with the difficulty, but the Conservative Government will not be so long-suffering as the Labour Government was and would resume the transferred departments without compunction and even with a gladness of heart. Indeed the C. P. Swarajists will be missing for once and all a very unique opportunity of leaving their mark on the administration which no other party in India has yet had and which even the Swaraj party has had nowhere else. Dyarchy has no doubt been condemned by even those who gave it an honest trial, but in all these cases the trial took place in unfavourable circumstances. Ministers never before had the backing of a solid majority of the legislature as the C. P. Swarajists would have if they accepted office. Many of the defects which were pointed out before the Reforms Committee by ex-Ministers would be found on analysis to have been due to the fact that they could not depend upon an organised majority in the Legislative Council. There is not the least doubt that with the strength the Swarajists command they will be enabled to extract much greater advantage from the reforms than any other Ministers found it possible to do. Nor can the Swarajists forget that the tide of public opinion is already turning against them as is evidenced by the elections to the local bodies, in which the Swarajists came off very badly. But the electorates will not much longer allow all developments in nation-building services to be suspended, at a time when in a Province usually suffering from chronic deficits there is a surplus of something like two crores, merely because the leaders of the Swaraj party choose not to accept responsibility, either for the reason that they still profess to be non-co-operators, or that they wish to disprove the charge of selfishness brought against them or for any other reason. But we base our appeal to the Swarajists on one consideration only: this is the best chance the suspension of non-co-operation has afforded them of shaking themselves free from the

toils of a doctrine in which they never had an atom of faith and proving themselves capable of constructive statesmanship in a manner which will redound to the credit of the whole of India.

## INDIAN ECONOMIC CONFERENCE.

### SOME IMPRESSIONS.

THE eighth all-India Economic Conference was held at Benares under the auspices of the Hindu University for four days from Jan. 4th to 7th. About forty delegates, mostly Professors of Economics at the various Universities and colleges all over the country, were present. Some three hundred students study economics as a special subject at the Hindu University and they supplied an eager and intelligent and also a critical audience. As Indian Public Finance formed the central subject for discussion at the Conference, the president and members of the Indian Taxation Enquiry Committee had made Benares their headquarters during the Conference and attended the whole session. Though the last was the eighth annual session of the Economic Conference, it was only the last two sessions, the seventh at Bombay in Jan. 1924 and the eighth at Benares this year, which attracted a certain amount of attention at the hands of the press and the public, and the credit for that undoubtedly belongs in part to the distinguished presidents of the two years, viz. Sir M. Visvesvaraya and the Hon. Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas respectively.

H. H. the Maharaja of Benares opened the proceedings of the eighth session in a suspiciously learned speech. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya welcomed the delegates as Vice-Chancellor of the Hindu University and Chairman of the Reception Committee and in his speech he put in an emphatic plea for the creation of an Indian School of Economics. Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas then gave his presidential address, which bore a distinct mark of the long experience of a business man and a man of public affairs. He gave a fitting reply to the allegation, frequently made of late, that even industrialists and businessmen are inclined to examine questions not from the economic but from the political standpoint. He said, "I have tried my level best to find out the line dividing economics from politics and I honestly confess that I have not been successful in doing so." He touched in his address upon the need for agricultural improvement and for a proper consideration of the land revenue system in that connection. He pleaded for the extension by the Imperial Bank of the same facilities to co-operative banks as it extended to the commercial banks. He urged simultaneous development of the cottage industries and of the large-scale capitalistic industries. He dwelt upon the need for a special type of bank to finance new industries. He reiterated the necessity for the transfer of India's balances from England to this country to alleviate the dearth of floating capital here. He drew attention to the limited scope of the inquiry undertaken by the Taxation Committee, as also to the importance of the work that lies before the Foreign Capital Restrictions Committee. Finally

he exhorted the economists "to find out the amount of economic drain suffered by the country on account of all her ocean traffic—both passenger and freight—being carried in non-Indian ships."

Many able papers were submitted for discussion before the Conference and the discussion too was interesting and instructive. It would take too much space to give even a summary of the papers and discussions. For that the reader must wait till the publication of the Proceedings of the Conference in April next in the *Indian Journal of Economics*, Allahabad. The papers which evoked the greatest amount of interest and discussion were those by Prof. C. J. Hamilton of Patna, Prof. K. T. Shah of the Bombay University and Prof. R. M. Joshi of the Sydenham College, Bombay. Had there been more time available, the paper by Prof. John Matthai of the Madras University would have been included in the same category. Prof. Hamilton in a very carefully worked out paper sought to establish the thesis that the real revenue of India, making allowance for the rise of prices and the growth of population, showed practically no increase between 1900 and 1924, that in fact India was under-taxed and under-developed and that consequently if she wanted development she ought to pay more taxes. The professor made no attempt to show whether the taxable capacity of the people had in the meantime increased or decreased and whether the burden of taxation in consequence had increased or decreased. The thesis based on the study of half the problem was shown in the discussion to be not quite reliable and the danger lurking in such half-studies, viz. the drawing of misleading inferences therefrom, was adequately pointed out.

Prof. Shah gave a summary of his arguments in the monograph on Municipal Finance on which he is engaged at present. His point was that if our municipalities owned the lands around existing towns and were also engaged in running public utility enterprises like electric trams, dairies, gas and light supply, etc., then they would feel small necessity for the imposition of rates, as the example of various German municipalities amply proved. Though a great deal was said about the inefficiency of our existing municipalities and grave doubts were expressed about their ability to undertake trading enterprises, though it was also questioned whether the profits of municipal trading were not partly of the nature of veiled taxation, the theoretical soundness of Prof. Shah's argument was not shaken. Only it was felt that he was floating in the air rather than walking on solid earth.

Prof. Joshi discussed the allocation of resources between the Central and Provincial Governments under the reformed constitution. He showed how the Montford Report had imposed the liability for running the nation-building departments on the Provincial Governments without giving them any adequately expansive source of revenue for that purpose except excise on liquor, and had allotted the two most expansive sources of revenue, viz. customs and income tax, to the Central Government, though it had been relieved of the liability of running the

nation-building departments on which the public wanted more and more money to be wisely spent and for the sake of which all the agitation for Reforms had been going on for decades. Prof. Joshi's point was that it was not a question merely of provincial contributions and the injustice of the Meston award; it was a question of reconsidering the whole basis of allocation of resources as laid down in the Montford Report, with a view to securing for the Provinces an expansive item like the income tax so as to relieve them from the dilemma of educating people by the revenue from liquor. One feature of the discussion on this paper was the unfortunate ventilation of inter-provincial jealousy based on a complete misunderstanding of the issue raised.

Dr. Matthai's able paper on Industrial Finance and his valuable suggestion for the creation of an industrial side in the Imperial Bank were not adequately discussed for want of time, though Dr. Paranjpye, a member of the Taxation Committee, gave the Conference the benefit of his experience as Minister in charge of the industries portfolio in Bombay with regard to the difficulties he met with in the matter of providing state aid for industries.

Two interesting papers on the development of an Indian Mercantile Marine could not be discussed at all, again for lack of time.

The President's concluding remarks were even more brilliant than his opening address. He dwelt at greater length therein on the subject of industrial finance and pointed out what the Bihar and Orissa Government had been able to do as regards state aid to industries and what Indian States like Gwalior and Baroda had been able to accomplish in the same direction.

The Conference felt genuinely grateful for its contact with a ripe business man like the President of this year and equally grateful to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Principal A. B. Dhruva, who on behalf of the Hindu University, gave a standing invitation to the Indian Economic Association to hold its conferences at Benares whenever they were not booked elsewhere. Dr. John Matthai invited the Conference, on behalf of the Madras University, to meet next year at Madras. Prof. Hamilton was elected President for the next Conference. Thus ended the eighth all-India Economic Conference after a useful and eventful session.

ONE PRESENT.

### THE LATE MR. JUSTICE RANADE.

"He wished to be in the city of God; but the city of God in which he wished to be was a city in which he would still live as a Roman and Antonine." —Desa Inga.

IN the stormy and distracted times of confused counsel and warring controversy through which we are passing just at present, there is no better tonic for the mind than the study of a type that calls it back to itself and restores to it calm vision and steady gaze. Of that type was Mr. M. G. Ranade, the 24th anniversary of whose death fell on the 16th instant, and the publication of whose excellent biography\*

\* *Life of the late Mr. Justice Ranade.* By N. R. PHATAK, B. A. 1924. 7¼ x 5. pp. 596. Rs. 3.

in Marathi a few months ago affords one a very good opportunity for contemplation and instruction. The biographer is a young man and a powerful Marathi writer. Only a few months ago, he was occupying the editorial chair of a paper edited by the late Mr. Justice Ranade exactly 60 years ago. This biography is the first of its kind in Marathi. It is a work absolutely free from any admixture of romance or hyperbole. It is not swollen out into a big volume by unnecessary padding. It is a plain, simple narrative, faithful in detail, in which one does not miss the wood for the trees. If at all it errs, it errs on the side of too little generalisation. It is, no doubt, marred, here and there, by, perhaps unavoidable, haste. The threads of the narrative are picked up rather too hurriedly towards the end. And the impression left upon the mind by its perusal is one of insufficiency rather than of surfeit and dullness. All the same, the portraiture of the hero is clear, and the grasp of facts and events, as also of their underlying significance in relation to the man round whom they are made to revolve, is firm and unerring. If there are obvious omissions and slips, the fault is not of the writer but of those that failed to furnish him with the necessary materials. In India the writer of a biography has a tremendous leeway to make. It is not merely the task of browsing at large in a well-stocked library, aided by meditation and work in the seclusion of one's study. The writer has to be both his own historian and artist. And not infrequently, the artist suffers in consequence. Too many of us in India leave the historian's work to take care of itself. We trust too much to hearsay. And the fabric that the artist raises out of such shabby material becomes too often but a counterfeit. The writer of Ranade's life, however much you may pronounce him to be lacking in his execution as an artist, cannot but extort, from a fair and impartial reader, the praise, that he has given to his readers a sound and honest piece of writing. He has not shirked his task, he has not wobbled; no one can pronounce him a burglar. If the writer has indulged in criticism, the criticism is never beside the point and always arises out of the subject handled. It is not so much with the object of running down the opponent as setting the hero's work in a proper perspective. Nothing is set down in mere malice or with the desire to fling mud. As every true biographer ought to be, this writer treats his subject sympathetically, but sympathy does not make him twist facts or warp the general outlook of the whole. We know Ranade's work and worth much better for Mr. Phatak's life of him, and in a proper relation to the times in which he lived, than we knew it before. And that is praise well-deserved.

The lessons that stand out prominently from the life-work of Mr. Ranade may be only touched here. Perhaps the greatest lesson of them all is that of profound hope and faith in the noble future that awaits India. If there was one thing that characterised the life of Mr. Ranade it was "work with hope, and hope with work." The prospect that stretched out before Mr. Ranade's eyes when he

began toiling for India was even darker than what it seems to us now. As one reads between the lines the annual addresses that Ranade delivered from the platform of the Social Conference, one cannot help feeling how for ages together, the night-mare of ignorance, apathy, division, jealousy and prejudice had oppressed and weighed down the soul of India. And yet the eternal refrain of those historical and social surveys, of those inspiring messages was of work, faith, hope, charity and patience. "Never despair; never give up the struggle; work on, in spite of set-backs; in spite of misunderstanding and misrepresentation; in spite of dense ignorance and hard prejudice; work like a soldier in the liberation war of Indian humanity: no rest here and no laurels, but toil, dust and a flaming sword of righteousness and truth." That is the one lesson of Ranade's life for his fellow-countrymen. Flowing from it comes the necessary corollary that that work, in order to be fruitful, must be joined to knowledge and imagination. It is work to unite and build up. It is to spread the message of light, truth and cheer in the midst of the encircling gloom. It is work for all and through all. Ranade's was essentially the gospel of work and not of airy castles that topple down at the touch of reality. And besides, it was work for long aims and an all-embracing practical programme.

Ranade's genius being essentially historical, his platform was neither narrow nor one-sided. From his sweeping vision, no activity, however insignificant—provided it really went to build up a united and enlightened India—ever escaped notice. Literature, history, social, industrial, economic and political activity—every ripple in the surging life of New India was taken up by this master-mind and guiding genius and directed into proper and fertilising channels. That was how he came to be revered and loved as "the guide, friend and philosopher" of awakened India.

And yet he was no flatterer of his people, no believer either in catchwords or pyrotechnics. No lover of lime-light he. He never cajoled either the people or his followers into accepting his leadership. If proof were needed of how outspoken he was, the reader will find it in his address on "Revival or Reform," as also in his addresses on economic and educational questions. How often would he warm up in tones of remonstrance and timely rebuke when the so-called leaders of the day deliberately played mischief, sowed dissension and sought to tear up a progressive movement by the roots! And yet that remonstrance had no tone of petulance or scorn. It was rather full of pity and sorrow, in the mood of one who would rather forgive people because they were ignorant and knew not what they did.

Ranade was the Socrates of Modern India. He had strong faith that better and deeper knowledge of men and measures, of the great issues involved and of the pitfalls ahead, would make men walk warily and work patiently. And his life's labour was one long, strenuous, unremitting endeavour to educate the educated into right ideas and long views.

And in this mission of his, broad, deep and searching knowledge of world's history and of the history of his own country, in all its multifarious aspects, helped him immensely. It saved him from the spirit of pessimism that is apt to make men violent and rabid, and follow paths that spell inevitable ruin.

Out of this capacity to take long views and to toil patiently came another of his traits. He never did or spoke anything to foster among the people a spirit of national self-conceit. No one was more proud of India's past than he, for no one knew it better. But to love a country and be proud of it did not mean for him the ignoring of its obvious defects and drawbacks, of its many weaknesses and lapses. He who would know how well he had grasped the spirit of the real India that he loved, would do well to read his address on "Vashistha and Vishwamitra." And he who would know what he meant by our defects and drawbacks should turn to his address at Madras based on Abbe Dubois's work, and to that on Revival and Reform. By patriotism he did not understand the megalomania that turns a man into a faddist, loving all that is old and hating all that is new. Ranade did not believe in mere imitation of new modes; he did not endorse the movement that advocated mere continuity. Assimilation, absorption, growth—that is what he stood for when he advocated reform. He used to say that we were not writing on a clean state; but had to complete the half-written sentence. We do need visionaries and enthusiasts that will push the nation ahead and fill it with life and self-confidence. But they must be such as are not "all in the air."

We may say of Ranade, what Lord Rosebury said of Cromwell, that he was a 'practical mystic.' He had a burning vision of what India of the future was going to be like. He had a deep, abiding religious faith. He believed in his people as the chosen of God. And he thought and laboured for his country, like the practical man that he was, to bring the promised land he dreamt of nearer for the life he lived in it.

V. N. NAIK.

## AMERICA IN THE PHILIPPINES.

### IV

"THE mere extent of the American conquest is not what gives America distinction in the annals of the world, but the professed purpose of the conquest which was to see to it that every foot of this land should be the home of free, self-governed people who should have no government whatever which did not rest upon the consent of the governed." Such was the message of President Wilson, announced to Filipinos on October 6, 1913, in the address of the new Governor-General, Francis Burton Harrison. In Mr. Harrison the Filipinos had a Governor-General who gave them freedom, as far as it lay in his power, unstintedly with both hands. He was one who did not make people's freedom a mere object of after-dinner verbal homage, one who knew that phrases, whatever their amplitude and however full-throated, are nearly

not enough to satisfy the many longings of a growing nation, longings which are rooted in the national consciousness of the people. When he says that 'such principles as liberty and self-government cannot be turned on and off like water from a tap, however benevolent the hand in control,' it will give many a possessor of 'benevolent hands' cause to think. When he says, 'you cannot create a national sentiment and then arrest it half way' many a mark-timer statesman and believer in the *annus mirabilis* when a subject nation will be 'fit' for self-government, will have to revise his opinions. Mr. Harrison did not rob people's power to make himself strong; on the contrary his whole administration, lasting for nearly eight years, was a sustained endeavour on his part to strip himself of power by transferring whenever and wherever possible all responsibilities to the people. His ideas of self-government and freedom suffered no change in the tropics. Among the white rulers of coloured people he had the distinction and the rarity to believe that justice and liberty do not change like flora and fauna from country to country. He has to his credit the unique record of having offered to resign his Governor-Generalship in favour of a native of the country.

The immediate change announced in the message of President Wilson was the giving of a majority to the Filipinos on the appointed Philippine Commission. This gave to the Filipinos complete control over the legislature. Governor-General Harrison on assuming office started with the Filipinization of the services. The Americans who had held offices heretofore and professed belief in the inferiority of the Filipinos, if only to retain their own positions, were naturally indignant and raised an alarm that ruin and anarchy were at hand. In the Philippines as in India the aliens in power frankly dislike giving over positions of power and privilege to the natives of the country. Mr. Harrison was however undismayed and carried on his process of Filipinization. 'By 1921 with the exception of the bureaus of Education, Mint, Prisons, Forestry, Science, Weather and Quarantine service, the Coast and Geodetic survey and the Metropolitan Water District, the other thirty bureaus and offices of the Government had Filipinos either regularly appointed as chiefs or acting as such and in virtually all cases Filipinos were assistant chiefs, in training for future greater responsibilities.' No cataclysm, natural or political, followed the process. Of the numerous small islands constituting the Philippines not one drifted away into the waters of the Pacific or administrative anarchy.

The American residents in the Philippines were the stoutest opponents of the Philippine self-government. They threatened Mr. Harrison that 'things would go hard with him' if he continued in his policy. The American business houses in the Philippines carried on an intensive lying propaganda in America discrediting the Filipinos and accusing Mr. Harrison as an 'anti-American'! In the words of Mr. Harrison, 'No misrepresentation was too gross and no rumour too wild for transmission to those in

the United States who knew how to make use of them effectively upon the platform and in the press. 'Old Manila Residents' spread the bad tidings to all the quarters of the wind. An active lobby was maintained in the Manila Hotel which seized on each traveller upon his arrival and filled him full of race prejudice and gloom; strangers were told that the Democratic administration was turning over the Islands to a mob of irresponsible, dishonest Filipino politicians who were heading towards chaos and disorder! President Wilson, however, was more anxious to do justice than to maintain 'continuity' of policy and dared to do what he believed to be just.

## V

On August 29, 1916, the Congress passed the Philippine Autonomy Act (Jones Act). The preamble stated:

Whereas it was never the intention of the people of the United States in the incipency of the war with Spain to make it a war of conquest or for territorial aggrandisement; and whereas it is, as it always has been, the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein; and whereas for the speedy accomplishment of a such purpose it is desirable to place in the hands of the people of the Philippines as large a control of their domestic affairs as can be given them without, in the meantime, impairing the exercise of the rights of sovereignty by the people of the United States, in order that, by the use and exercise of popular franchise and governmental powers, they may be the better prepared to fully assume the responsibilities and enjoy all the privileges of complete independence; Therefore.....\*

By the Act the appointive Philippine Commission was replaced by an elective Senate of 24 members, the Governor-General was made 'the supreme executive authority' of the government and was given the 'general supervision and control of all the departments and bureaus of the government.' The Act authorised the new Legislature 'to increase the number or abolish any of the executive departments or make such changes in the names and duties thereof

\* It will be interesting to compare this with the preamble of the Government of India Act which is as follows: "Whereas it is the declared policy of Parliament to provide for the increasing association of Indians in every branch of Indian administration, and for the gradual development of self-governing institutions, with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in British India as an integral part of the empire; And whereas progress in giving effect to this policy can only be achieved by successive stages, and it is expedient that substantial steps in this direction should now be taken: And whereas the time and manner of each advance can be determined only by Parliament, upon whom responsibility lies for the welfare and the advancement of the Indian peoples: And whereas the action of Parliament in such matters must be guided by the co-operation received from those on whom new opportunities of service will be conferred, and by the extent to which it is found that confidence can be reposed in their sense of responsibility; And whereas concurrently with the gradual development of self-governing institutions in the Provinces of India it is expedient to give those Provinces in provincial matters the largest measure of independence of the Government of India which is compatible with due discharge by the latter of its own responsibilities: Be it therefore &c.

as it may see fit, and (it) shall provide for the appointment and removal of the heads of the executive departments by the Governor-General.' The power to control the trade relations between the United States and the Islands was retained by the United States. The Governor-General was given a qualified veto power (with an appeal to the President)—a power never yet exercised. Unlike the Viceroy in India the Governor-General of the Philippines has no power of 'certification.'

An amendment to the Philippine Autonomy Bill popularly known as the Clarke Amendment was moved to confer 'complete and unqualified independence upon the Philippines in not less than two years and not more than four years from the date of the approval of the Act. The amendment had President Wilson's support after its adoption by the Senate. It was defeated in the House of Representatives and struck off from the bill.

The preamble of the Act contained the promise of independence as soon as a stable government was established. On this point Mr. Harrison remarks: "There can be no doubt about the phrase 'as soon as'; it is not 'after' or 'when' but means immediately upon the fulfilment of the required condition. What then is a stable government? Does it mean a stable government composed entirely of the Filipinos? If not, there had been a stable government ever since the American occupation. What are the tests of 'stable' government? Must it be government which under any circumstances can withstand aggression from without, and at all times to preserve its independence? If so, has there ever been a stable government in history and is there one upon the earth to-day? Must it be perfect in all details? If so, has the human race ever set up a stable government? Must it be financially beyond criticism and its credit above reproach? If so, how many of the great nations answer that requirement?"

Complete separation of the executive and the legislative with co-ordinate and co-equal powers is the characteristic of the American system of government. This renders the American governmental system peculiarly liable to dead-locks. Chances of dead-lock are much greater where the executive head happens to be the representative of an alien sovereign power as in the Philippines. Dead-locks will be the permanent feature of such a system unless the representative of the sovereign power chooses to be a titular head. Mr. Harrison avoided conflict by stripping himself of many of the powers conferred on him by the Jones Act. He bridged the gulf between the legislative and the executive by creating in 1918 the Council of State by an executive order and establishing many 'conventions'. The Council of State consisted of the Governor-General, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House and the heads of six executive departments. All matters of executive policy were discussed by the Council.

J. B. SEN.

( To be concluded. )



## REVIEWS.

## THE REAL LABOUR PROBLEM.

I. E. TOWNSHEND: CREATIVE SOCIALISM. London 1924. 7×5. pp. xii & 148. (Dent's, 2/6).

II. G. W. THOMSON: THE GRAMMAR OF POWER. London. 1924. 7×5. pp. vi & 152. (Labour Publ. Co., 5/-).

NOW that the first British Labour Government has come and gone, a great general stock-taking in Socialist circles is taking place. This is a healthy sign and to those indulging in this introspection, no less than to the general student, one cannot too warmly recommend Mrs. Townshend's little book, which, though written in June last, is yet most *à propos*. "Creative Socialism" shows that the capture of the political machine by the Labour Movement is in itself not the equivalent of an overcoming of Capitalism: a fact which Mr. MacDonald's 300 days in office have painfully brought home to not a few naive souls in the Socialist camp.

Mrs. Townshend of course is not original in this thesis—nothing is further from her avowed intention—but she has the great merit of putting it in readable, lucid, often epigrammatic form, that Labour at present is organized almost exclusively "for protection and not for function" (I, 31); that workers are taught "to demand pay, not responsibility" (I, 123); that Socialists believe "that the work of revolution can be done for them, instead of by them" (I, 146). "The mentality of the Trade Union is antagonism—but an atmosphere of well-ordered antagonism and class warfare does not favour the growth of the creative impulse nor of the desire for civic responsibility and social service." (I, 5). "The spirit of 'ca'canny,'" adds Mrs. Townshend (I, 97) caustically, "is not the spirit of creative revolution." Yet if Socialism is to supersede Capitalism, how is it to do so, unless the workers take the work of production out of the hands of the capitalists and do it themselves—not only as well, but better, than under the capitalist régime? The producers, under any Socialist system, must be self-determining producers instead of mere "wage slaves"; freely co-operating autonomous members of an industrial democracy, instead of passively obedient automatic tenders of machines in industrial autocracies. The only British movement consciously working towards that end was the Guild Movement, whose Building Guilds however crashed ignominiously in the general post-war slump: so that when Mr. Wheatley wanted last year to get houses built for the masses, he had—good Socialist though he be—to "employ private capitalism, since there was no competent competitor in the field" (I, 139). Capitalism indeed is utterly discredited as a system in the eyes of the least thinking: that negative part of criticism Socialism has by this time perfectly achieved. Unfortunately that is not enough: for what is to take the place of Capitalism, which, unsound and evil as it is, still does manage to "deliver the goods"? And here Mrs. Townshend puts her finger on the gravest spot when she adds that "Capitalism, crippled though it is, still holds the field, and so long as there is no rival ready to supersede it, the more crippled it becomes, the worse will be the fate of the workers who slave for it" (I, 37).

Mrs. Townshend's instructive little book shows the historical development of the Labour Movement, which, starting as collectivism on a materialistic metaphysic, emphasised class and property and distinguished between 'haves' and 'have nots'—whilst the reaction against this, Syndicalism, based itself

on a pragmatic metaphysic of function and action: its vital antithesis being workers and drones. Syndicalism was native to Catholic thought and thus flourished mainly in Latin countries—and English readers should therefore be particularly grateful for two chapters (III and IV) which sketch the work of two solitary English protagonists against the Collectivism of Protestant countries: Morris and Penty. It was Ruskin who really started, or rather restarted the line of thought—a commonplace once, in the Middle Ages,—that political economy is a moral science. Is it a coincidence that in the same age religion was the creative force at the centre of society, the mainspring and guiding principle that shaped art, politics, business, and all other activities to a common end? "Morris thought of the worker, not as an abstraction, but as a comrade, with motives more or less his own." (I, 41). It is only along such humanistic, moral lines, that the desire for creation, for self-expression through a man's daily work, can be stimulated and kept alive. Hence, as Mrs. Townshend remarks with profound truth, "the social revolution is not merely the creation of a new form of society, but the creation of character and of capacity" (I, 91); "strikes and state action can effect but little without a change of heart, of attitude, of mentality in the workers themselves." (I, 21).

The whole question of questions is thus seen to be a moral one. Marxism and Collectivism having begun by being a moral, are ending by being immoral and have produced a mood in the workers, out of sympathy with their work, and therefore inimical to production. Intimidation on the part of the employees has been met by intimidation on the part of the employers: and as a net result the whole work of production is putrefying at the very core through ca'cannism. "Labour leaders", says Mrs. Townshend (I, 102), "with an eye to the coming revolution, should have realized that an intelligent interest in processes of production and habits of strenuous application were of infinitely greater importance in the long run than the attempt to force the hand of the employer by giving as little as possible for stunted wages." It has been said that what is wanted under a better social order is not the abolition of privilege, but privileges for all: it is even more true that no better order can ever come about, until the general clamour is not for 'rights for all', but 'more duties for all'.

Mr. Thomson's is a pretentious little book, pretentiously written. It presumably deals with the same subject as Mrs. Townshend's book and has the same aim: but it is so confused, so loaded with irrelevancies and repetitions, that it is not easy to discover what the author is really driving at. He is fond of disparaging "power for power's sake," but one is tempted to retort that his case seems one of writing for writing's sake. Irritating and unimportant as the book is, one might leave it at that. But there is one point reverted to often by him, viz., the alleged failure of Christianity, which forms part of the belief of so many, that it is perhaps as well to meet it here. Mrs. Townshend's book ends on the note of a prayer for "a new heart." Mr. Thomson also sighs for "the organisation of the Great Society" (II, 34), "devoted to the creation of beauty and the achievement of human well-being" (II, 20): but he conceives of its coming as an automatic reflex *ab extra* and has not yet realized that "this act of creation is, unfortunately, no necessary and predestined result of social evolution" (I, 91), but may as conceivably come to nothing, because of the failure of a change of heart—with the result of our drifting, not into a 'Great Society', but into an exceeding great savagery. The, to me, only conceivable power to "create a new heart within one," is religious. Mr. Thomson calls the

Church's theology 'outmoded' and its morality "open to grave question" (II, 61): yet admits elsewhere (II, 80) that its "conceptions concerning usury had prevented overtime and bad workmanship," that (II, 86) its monasteries had organized relief and its guilds the working people, and (II, 45) praises "the Church's stand against the abuse of temporal power, and its notions of equality before God, which permeated the whole mediæval civilization, and made it human as no other period of civilization that we know of has been." Mr Thomson, however, quite inconsistently with such avowals, lets hardly a chapter go by, with at some outburst against that same Church and its "failure." Which reminds one of the famous saying of Mr. Chesterton's, not that Christianity has been tried and found wanting, but that Christianity has been found difficult and therefore not tried. And to sum up the whole matter, one might add that until the Labour Movement on its part makes that trial in dead earnest, it stands, one is afraid, in deadly peril, of itself being found wanting.

H. C. E. ZACHARIAS.

## INDIAN TAXATION.

### WEALTH AND TAXABLE CAPACITY IN INDIA.

By K. T. SHAH and K. G. KHAMBATA (D. B. Tara porewala, Bombay.) 1924. 10 × 6½. pp. 347. Rs. 10.

AN enquiry into the per capita income in India was long overdue since so many things hang on this important datum, in questions relating to national welfare. We are glad to pitch upon a book dealing with this topic in the full light of the facts of the last twenty years, including the period of the great war with its economic transformations. Are we progressing or are we going back? Progress depends on the material requisites of well-being and the question is: How does India fare with regard to these requisites? Let us see how the volume before us answers the question.

Nearly sixty pages are devoted to various definitions and classifications. In spite of a little hair-splitting, which is waste of energy, this survey is essential in order to clear up the leading difficulties in the estimation of the national dividend. The *Times of India* in a leader on the Taxation Inquiry during the last week deprecated doctrinaire economics, but commonsense economics without the guidance of academic doctrines would ultimately land us in worse inconsistencies than those of the arm-chair professor. Logic is an anathema to the practical man because he is ignorant of it, but logical analysis is an essential safeguard against haphazard conduct. Hence we are not inclined to quarrel with this discussion. One important decision arrived at in this part is that 'services,' as they cannot be measured in terms of money, should be excluded from national wealth which is equivalent to material and tangible commodities. This decision is correct from the standpoint of the statist, although it is untenable on philosophic grounds. We are also not convinced of the impossibility of measuring services in terms of money, but it is quite true that the task is attended with very great difficulties and hence may be put aside.

Coming now to the agricultural income, the total yield of every crop is multiplied by the average of the wholesale price per unit all over India, resulting in the final total of money-value to the tune of 2155 crores for the year 1921-22. Adding 31 crores for the products from forests and fisheries, the final total comes to 2186 crores. The methods adopted for calculating the production are quite faultless. Adding 235 crores for industrial wealth, the total

gross production comes to 2421 crores, giving a per capita income of 74 Rs. a year.

We now come to the crux of the problem of the taxable capacity of India, which is engaging the attention of the Taxation Committee. In this connection Prof. Shah makes deductions from the total wealth for the following items; Public Revenue, Home Charges, payment of interest on foreign Capital, Freight, Profits of foreign merchants and professional men. The items of Home Charges and the following are deductions in the sense that the benefit of their money-value is not available to the Indians for 'enjoyment.' But we fail to see how in considering our capacity for paying taxes the taxes themselves can be deducted from the total resources. Of course the drift of the argument is that after paying the taxes hardly the bare subsistence is left to the average man; even so we regard the deduction of the taxes as a questionable procedure. The residue left after the above deductions, which amount to 520 crores, are made is 1900 crores. This works at approximately sixty rupees per capita income.

Comparing this with the food cost at the lowest standard of calculation, which is 90 Rs. per head, there is a clear deficit of Rs. 30 per head, leaving nothing for clothing, amusement, house-room and spiritual needs. In other words there is food only for 20 crores out of the population. The rest must either starve or vacate this sub-lunar world. This is really a strong indictment of the present social organisation.

The next consideration is how much of the public expenditure again returns to the people in various forms and the computation gives 200 crores as the total benefit to the people, leaving 200 as taxation benefiting non-Indian elements of the population or going out of the country as a return for foreign capital and foreign services. This is the so-called drain and works out at Rs. 7 per head per year. The question however arises whether no benefit accrues to India absolutely from this drain-expenditure. The question is not discussed as it ought to be, but the suggestion of the authors clearly is that it is a sheer loss due to the exigencies of foreign rule. So far however as the foreign capital assists in the production of industrial wealth in India and the smooth running of commercial and transport organisations, the interest on it cannot be counted as drain proper. Although we deprecate the piling up of the national debt, which at present amounts to nearly 1000 crores with an interest charge of nearly 48 crores, we are not inclined to regard the interest on foreign capital as an unrequited loss. The explanation of the authors is that "in valuing wealth we have altogether left out of our calculation all services." The fact is that in computations of national wealth in commodities and in money values, the services which are intangible get lost sight of. The service that capital renders is priceless and the innuendo contained in the word drain may easily be misleading.

The table on page 291 is very interesting as showing how unequal the present tax-burden is. The amount paid by the rich classes is 105 crores and that paid by the poor is 143 crores. This ought to be remedied by increasing the yield from the rich by suitable adjustments. One such adjustment is to wipe out the salt tax altogether and increase the customs duties on luxuries and assessing larger incomes at a higher rate.

The suggestion of the authors that Zamindars who are absentees and mere rent-receivers ought to pay an income tax on agricultural income is worth considering as this income is calculated at 175 crores and even at the rate of 1 anna in the rupee might

yield about 11 crores. But what about the Permanent Settlement which is regarded as the only panacea for all the ills of agriculture? Besides this, the difficulty would be about the violation of promises and a lot of dust would be raised if this proposal were put into practice.

At the end of the book some suggestions are offered for developing the potential resources of India and in this connection the authors come to the perennial topic of over-population. Apart from the remedy of voluntary restraint the authors seem to rely largely on emigration as a remedy and appeal to the countries with undeveloped resources to admit Indians freely. "It is a positive crime against humanity that so much potential wealth should be suffered to remain unutilized because the stupid primitive mentality of a few jealous gentry should refuse to take a broader view of world-responsibilities." Considering the treatment of Indians abroad one is inclined to smile at such a remedy. But we must be patient and wait. In the meantime we think that limitation of population ought to be relied on as the principal palliative for "a life which is a disgrace to any community calling itself civilized."

The volume before us attempts a task which was not essayed systematically since the Curzon-Digby controversy and there is no gainsaying that infinite pains have been taken by Mr. Khambatta in preparing the material and by Prof. Shah in manipulating it in order to elicit findings. As the Anglo-Indian journals are carping at such estimates of national income on the ground that many figures are mere guess-work, it is better if in the next edition all guess-work is replaced by figures derived from minute calculations even by issuing questionnaires to private individuals. We are also beginning to think that many figures from government publications are not fully reliable as the data are ultimately supplied by ignorant village officials. But in big totals the mistake of a few laos or even a few crores does not much matter. And if the figures from blue-books are regarded as sufficiently correct for all purposes some at least of the conclusions in the book appear irresistible. But there is room for optimism in the fact pointed out by Mr. Khambatta on page 204 that there is an increase of about Rs 2 per head during the last fifteen years. 'The cultivation of land which is not yet brought under the plough may bring in another 250 crores and the introduction of a more extensive system of commercial crops may bring in another 1400 crores.' There is also a great potentiality for further development in industry. We are progressing and are likely to progress further.

V. N. G.

MISCELLANEA.

MORLEY ON MONTAGU REFORMS.  
WAS HE AGAINST THEM?

In a signed review of "John, Viscount Morley" by Brig.-Gen. John H. Morgan (Murray) in the SPECTATOR of December 20th, 1924, the Editor of the journal, Mr. J. St. Loe Strachey writes as follows on his impression as to what Lord Morley thought of the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms:—

"I may add that, feeling very strongly, as I did, about the Montagu policy, I took this opportunity to play a little of the part he had been playing with Clemenceau and to ask him what he really thought about the state into which India was rapidly drifting. As I felt would probably be the case, I found him very strongly against the new way of governing India. I urged him to speak out—indeed told him it was his duty to do so; but he refused, partly, I think, from the physical difficulty

of making a speech in the House of Lords, and partly from his desire not to embarrass the Government and the new Secretary of State.

"It is evident, however, from his talks with General Morgan that what he said to me was no passing impatience, but a settled conviction. Here is a confirmatory passage dated January 21st, 1921:—

Montagu calls himself my disciple, he went on, in accents of repudiation. I see very little of my teaching in him. This dyarchy won't work. As for his strange plea for rousing the masses of India out of their 'pathetic content' by reforms for which they do not ask, and for which they cannot work, it's a most unwise remark. My reforms were quite enough for a generation at least."

As we in India have received a directly contradictory report of Lord Morley's views about the Montagu constitution the Editor of this paper wrote to Mr. Srinivasa Sastri requesting him to give his own recollection of the matter and obtained from him the following statement:—

MY DEAR VAZE,

I had noticed the extract from the Spectator of December 20 of last year before you sent it to me. I was greatly surprised when I read it as its tenor did not accord with my recollection of what passed at a small dinner towards the end of 1919. It was at Lord Morley's residence. The party was very small and included, besides the host and myself, Sir Lawrence Jenkins and Sir K. G. Gupta. I believe it was the latter who took the liberty of suggesting that M. should attend the Lords when the Government of India Bill would be passed and pronounce his benediction. The idea was very attractive to Lord Morley; but as he was not sure of his strength, he desired Sir Krishna to remember the matter a few days in advance so that arrangements might be made, if necessary, to conduct him from his conveyance to his seat. I do not remember a single sentiment or expression deprecatory of the scope or provisions of the bill. There was no attempt at discussing the measure seriously or in detail, but his talk was marked by his distinct friendliness to it, which gave me a general glow of satisfaction. In fact, I was prepared, in view of what he had said upon a former occasion about the unsuitability of Parliamentary institutions for India, for some disapprobation of the Montagu bill. My surprise and satisfaction were the greater for that reason.

I cannot of course shut out of my mind the possibility that at our dinner, Lord Morley did not feel called upon to express himself fully on the subject of Indian reform. At his age, he would not be eager to provoke a controversy with three such supporters of it as Jenkins, Gupta and myself. General Morgan and Strachey probably touched the chord of personal antagonism to Mr. Montagu and elicited the sympathetic note they wanted.

Yours affectionately,  
V. S. SRINIVASAN.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE BRITISH OVERSEAS EMPIRE, 1763-1914. By L. C. A. KNOWLES. (George Routledge & Sons, London.) 1924. 8 x 5 1/4. pp. 555. 10s. 6d.

MODERN POLITICAL THEORIES. By C. E. M. JOAD. (Oxford University Press.) 1924. 7 x 4 1/4. pp. 127. 2s. 6d.

CRIME IN INDIA. By S. M. EDWARDS. (Oxford University Press.) 1924. 8 1/4 x 5. pp. 169. Rs. 6.

THE CORNER-STONE OF PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE. By B. F. HARRISON. (The Century Co., N. Y.) 1923. 7 1/4 x 5. pp. 343. \$3.00.

SIND: A REINTERPRETATION OF THE UNHAPPY VALLEY. By J. ABBOTT. (Oxford University Press.) 1924. 9 x 5 1/4. pp. 113. Rs. 5.

A HISTORY OF LAND TENURE IN ENGLAND. By J. GHOSH. (Kar, Majumdar & Co., Calcutta.) 1924. 7 x 4 1/4. pp. 380. Rs. 5.

## SPECIAL CONVENTION SALES.

### A Grand Opportunity

For Political Students-Workers and Libraries.  
Important and Useful Books

AT

Half Prices and Under

	Original Price.		Reduction Price.	
	Rs. a.	Rs. a.	Rs. a.	Rs. a.
<b>Bal Gangadhar Tilak: His Writings and Speeches, Appreciation by Babu Aurobindo Ghose.</b> ...	1	8	12	
<b>The Congress, Conferences and Conventions of 1909.</b> Containing also the resolutions passed therein. ...	0	12	0	6
<b>The Ethics of Passive Resistance.</b> By Mr. M. S. Maurice. ...	0	4	0	1
<b>Heroes of the Hour: Mahatma Gandhi, Tilak Maharaj, Sir, S. Subramania Iyer.</b> ...	1	8	0	12
<b>How India can save the Empire.</b> A collection of the speeches delivered by the Members of the Indian Deputation and other leaders on the present situation and the future work before us. With a foreword by B. P. Wadia. ...	1	0	0	8
<b>India's Claim for Home Rule.</b> A collection of speeches and writings of most of the eminent men both Indian and European on "India's Claim for Home Rule". ...	2	0	1	0
<b>India's Coal.</b> Constructive criticisms by leading Indians on the Montagu-Chelmsford scheme. ...	0	8	0	4
<b>Is India Civilised?</b> Essays on Indian Culture. By Sir John Woodroffe. ...	2	8	1	4
<b>M. K. Gandhi's Speeches and Writings.</b> Authorised, up-to-date and comprehensive collection. ...	1	8	0	12
<b>Mohomed Ali Jinnah: An Ambassador of Unity, His Speeches and Writings 1912-1917.</b> With a biographical appreciation by Sarojini Naidu and a foreword by The Hon'ble The Rajah of Mahmudabad. ...	2	0	0	1
<b>Muhammad Ali: His Life and Services.</b> With a foreword by C. P. Ramaswami Iyer, B. A., B. L. ...	1	0	0	8
<b>Pictures of Indian Life.</b> By Shishir Kumar Ghose. With a life sketch of the author. With a foreword by Dr. Sir Rash Behari Ghose Kt, C.S.I., C. I. E., D. L., etc. ...	1	8	0	12
<b>The Press under The Press Act.</b> By K. Vyasa Rao, B. A. ...	0	10	0	5
<b>The Renaissance in India.</b> By James H. Cousins. ...	2	0	1	0
<b>Sakuntala.</b> By R. Vasudeva Row, B. A. ...	0	4	0	2

The Theosophical Publishing House,

Adyar

Madras.

THE INDIAN BOOK SHOP  
NEW INDIA OFFICE.

George Town,

Madras.

## THE LUCKNOW UNIVERSITY JOURNAL.

A high class University Journal for the promotion of original research.

Four issues will be published during each academic year viz., in September, December, February and May.

**Editor**—W. Burridge, M. A., M. B., B. Ch., L. M. S., S. A., and N. K. Siddhanta, M. A.,—supported by a strong Consultative Board representative of all the Departments in the University.

### Special Features.

The Journal will contain original contributions from members of the Lucknow University and will also publish Vernacular contributions in Hindi or Urdu of a suitable character. It will contain portraits and illustrations from time to time. It will also publish Reviews and Notices of all important Books and Reports coming out in the educational world. Another important feature of the Journal will be the publication of the latest news about University affairs and other interesting informations about educational matters.

### Annual Subscription

	Town.	Mofussil.	Foreign.
For Students of the University,	Rs. 2	0	2 8
For all others	Rs. 4	0	4 8

} 10s.

Matters for publication should be sent to the EDITOR: All business communications relating to subscriptions and advertisements should be sent to the Business Manager.

The Journal is an excellent medium for advertisement. For advertisement rates and other particulars apply to—

**M. B. REHMAN,**

*Business Manager.*

LUCKNOW UNIVERSITY, }  
LUCKNOW, }

Lucknow University Journal.

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

LONDON: P. S. KING & SONS, Orchard House, 3 & 4 Great-Smith Street, Westminster, Lond., S, W.

## DEAFNESS CAN BE CURED.



Deafness, Noises in the Head and  
Nasal Catarrh.

### "LARMALENE" (Regd.)

Is a simple harmless home-treatment which absolutely cures deafness, noises in the head, etc. NO EXPENSIVE APPLIANCES NEEDED for this new Ointment, instantly operates upon the affected parts with complete and permanent success. SCORES OF WONDERFUL CURES REPORTED.

### Reliable Testimony.

Mrs. K. Wilkinson, of Sled Road, Stroud, writes:—"Please could I trouble you to send me another box of the Ointment. It is not for myself, but for a friend of mine who is as bad as I was, and cannot get any rest for the noises in the head. I feel a new woman, and can go to bed now and get a good night's rest, which I had not been able to do for many months. It is a wonderful remedy and am most delighted to recommend it."

Mrs. E. Crowe, of Whitehorse Road, Croydon, writes:—"I am pleased to tell you that the small tin of ointment you sent to me at Ventnor, has proved a complete success, my hearing is now quite normal, and the horrible head noises have ceased. The action of this new remedy must be very remarkable, for I have been troubled with these complaints for nearly ten years, and have had some of the very best medical advice together with other expensive ear instruments all to no purpose. I need hardly say how very grateful I am, for my life has undergone an entire change."

Try one box to-day, which can be forwarded to any address on receipt of money order for Rs. 4 THERE IS NOTHING BETTER AT ANY PRICE.

Address orders to:—

HENRY THOMAS ("Larmalene" Co.),

The "Woodlands,"

BEAN, DARTFORD, KENT,