

# THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. IV, No. 24.]

POONA—THURSDAY, JULY 14, 1921.

[ ANNUAL SUBSR. Rs. 6

CONTENTS.		PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	---	277
ARTICLE:—		
The Irish Armistice	... ..	279
SPECIAL ARTICLES:—		
The Khoreal Case. By Assam	... ..	280
Indian State Armies. By G. R. Abhyankar,	... ..	281
B. A., LL. B.	... ..	282
Direct Compulsion Necessary. By S. G. V.	... ..	282
IN OTHER LANDS	... ..	285
REVIEWS:—		
The Indian Exchange Problem. By B. P. P.	... ..	287

## TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

THE reply given by His Excellency the Viceroy to the U. P. Liberal Association's outspoken address on the 7th instant shows that he is still feeling his way in Indian administration. The address failed to elicit from the Viceroy any important announcement of policy, and indeed he pleaded at the end for more time to be able to make such an announcement. "I will ask you to remember," he said, "if you find me to-day cautious in expression that I have been here only three months, and that I should deeply deplore using language of promise which I could not in future justify by action." We fully appreciate this reason for the Viceroy's present reticence, but we look forward anxiously to a detailed exposition of the programme which he chalks out for himself when he will open the September session of the Central Legislature. Most of the questions to which the address referred will have become quite ripe for solution by then; *e. g.* the committees on the Press Act and other restrictive laws will have reported and the Government will have decided what action to take on the report. It should thus be possible for Lord Reading in his opening speech to announce that he will undertake legislation for the repeal of such laws and that he intends to give the fullest possible scope to individual freedom and civil liberty.

THIS is but one of the questions on which the Viceroy can make a pronouncement. Another is the military policy to be determined as a result of the Military Requirements Committee's deliberations. This Committee's report will have by that time been examined by the Imperial Defence Committee and Government will have formed their conclusions. If earnest efforts are made, by adopting a policy of

trust, to reduce military expenditure which, it is agreed on all hands, imposes a crushing burden on India, a great step forward will have been taken. The Legislative Assembly has already passed a number of momentous resolutions on the administration of the army, which the Government of India have accepted. Let the Viceroy announce in September Government's determination loyally to carry out those resolutions and thus give effect to the wishes expressed by the accredited representatives of the people in the Legislature. We make no doubt that such an announcement by itself will go a long way in allaying the present unrest. For the resolutions really carry us very far, and since, as the address says, "England's military policy in India is regarded by us as the touchstone of her sincerity," a declaration that Government will liberally interpret and vigorously effectuate those resolutions must undoubtedly produce a quieting effect. The resolutions cover a wide field and include questions regarding the strength of the army, the proportion between Indians and Europeans, the enlargement of the sphere of recruiting, the throwing open of commissioned ranks to Indians, the constitution of a Territorial force, etc., etc.

\* \* \*

IN the matter of the liberalisation of the Central Government also, Government must formulate its policy. The Viceroy, in his reply, seemed to object to the statement of the U. P. Liberal Association's address that in the Government of India the popular representatives wield no power. But this observation was subject to a qualifying clause that "the changes made in the constitution of the Central Government have enabled the representatives of the people to exercise a much greater influence on the policy of the Government than they could before." This they are prepared to acknowledge with the utmost readiness; it is no reply, therefore, to say that members of the Assembly and the Council of State "have in fact exerted the greatest influence over the Executive." Even if this is so, the indirect influence which alone is now possible is certainly different from direct constitutional power which the Legislature will possess when the Executive of the Central Government is made responsible in certain spheres of its administration, as are the Provincial Governments. On this and other questions of devolution of power and relaxation of central control, Government cannot withhold an announcement for long. At any rate the Viceroy can certain-

ly indicate that India's march towards self-government need not be protracted as pessimists have been telling, but that it will be completed within a very short period.

\* \* \*

THE Viceroy almost rebuked the deputation for referring to the events in the Punjab in the way they did. They had said, "The people of India have yet to receive complete satisfaction for the wrong done to them and that the self-respect of India yet remains to vindicate in full measure." We entirely agree with this sentiment; that has always been our view. The Viceroy accuses those who demand adequate amends to be made of "keeping alive the mistakes and errors of the past," and of acting contrary to the royal appeal to forgive and forget by "reviving this unhappy chapter of our history." On the contrary, we seek help to enable the people "to regard this chapter as closed," by awarding condign punishment to those who are proved to have been guilty of inhuman conduct. We have no desire to belittle what the Government have already done. Expressions of regret there have been; but it is impossible not to notice the contrast between the disapproval of the excesses committed by the mob on the one hand and by Government's officers on the other—the downright condemnation of the former and the tepid and qualified censure of the latter. Perhaps it is no use putting too fine a point on this. If it had fallen to another member of Government than Sir William Vincent to express regret, possibly he would have done it in a handsome manner. But the fact remains that the iron has entered into the souls of Indians, as Dr. Sapru so well put it, and it is not too much to ask that Government should punish the offending officials in a suitable manner. We fully recognise that Lord Chelmsford's Government by their culpable inaction in this matter has placed the new Viceroy in a difficult situation, but, as a mark of sympathy with the feelings of Indians, he can at least do this—he can remove those officials who have been implicated in this unholy affair from the scene of their operations; let the Punjab at any rate have the last of them.

\* \* \*

IT may be objected—and it has been objected—that this demand for the punishment of officials is inconsistent with the demand for a reprieve of the martial law prisoners, which is simultaneously made by the public. But the two cases stand on a different footing. A demand for the release of prisoners is made only because the trials which these prisoners have had were but a mockery of trial. They have no element about them of a judicial investigation. Evidence could be produced about several prisoners which would be enough to establish their innocence in any court of law. We have no doubt that Lord Reading will be scrupulously just in his examination of their cases; but it is impossible to do justice if he goes merely upon the records of the trials. If it were possible to hold a fresh trial, Indians would not raise their little finger to obtain the

release of those whose guilt is judicially proved. What they want is justice and not mercy; but since it is not possible to have a re trial, Indians are entitled to ask that the prisoners about whose guilt there is an element of doubt shall be released. It is to be hoped that the Viceroy's decision in this matter will be such as to give general satisfaction.

\* \* \*

THE Viceroy's reply in regard to the threatened increase in the emoluments of the imperial services is highly unsatisfactory, but we are glad he took occasion to refer, in a way which is hopeful, to a matter of very great importance—the abrogation of laws which discriminate between Indians and Europeans. The verdict in the Khoreal Shooting Case, which is commented upon in another column, invests this question with a special significance; and we believe Lord Reading had this very case of shooting in mind when he made the following observations:

I watch to the best of my ability the daily occurrences and am well aware that incidents happen at times which are quite unjustifiable and rouse the indignation that always follows upon injustice. Such acts are wholly unpardonable, either morally or politically, but I believe they are becoming rarer, and, I trust, will daily tend to disappear. You may rest assured that my attention is being directed to ascertaining and appreciating the differences in legal procedure and administration applicable to Europeans and Indians.

Removal of the racial distinctions which at present disfigure the Statute Book in India is a matter to which we are happy to see that Lord Reading has addressed himself.

\* \* \*

THE official and non-official versions of the circumstances under which the recent firing took place at Dharwar differ materially on vital points. While the Government plead provocation and justify the firing on the ground of self-defence, it is alleged on behalf of the people that the attack was quite unprovoked, that no warning was given before the firing started, and that no magistrate was present on the spot. They regard the firing as unauthorised and unjustifiable; nay, they go even further and hint at the possibility of the whole trouble being the result of a preconceived official plot to throttle the temperance campaign at Dharwar. Mention is made in this connection of a conversation that took place between the Collector and a local leader but the vindictive remarks attributed to the former have since been contradicted by Government. There is thus a wide divergence between the two versions and the man in the street is placed at a serious disadvantage in arriving at the truth. We would therefore strongly recommend to Government the desirability of appointing a small committee of impartial men to go into the causes of the firing and to report as to the responsibility of both sides in the affair. It is worthy of note that even the local Congress Committee which is supposed to be a non-co-operating body has supported the demand for a committee like the one suggested above. The demand, though strange when it comes from non-co-operators, is quite just.

### THE IRISH ARMISTICE.

WHEN Mr. Lloyd George started on the present war in Ireland, he boasted that, if it took a million casualties and five years to do it, he would yet reduce these impossible Irish rebels. Less than a year ago his henchman, Sir Hamar Greenwood, assured the Commons, that he had got "Sinn Fein on the run," and that, if only they let him continue his highly successful policy for another month or so, he could guarantee the last of Sinn Fein by then. Since then there has nothing further been forthcoming from the Treasury Bench, than appeals for prolonging the time in which to redeem such "guarantee."

But to judge from the latest telegrams to hand, we seem to have reached suddenly a very different outlook. Mr. Lloyd George appears at last to have realised that the Irish are not made of such stuff as can be dragooned into submission, however much you may pile frightfulness upon frightfulness and horror upon horror. There is no question but that Mr. George, whatever his many defects, lacks that one at least, of being obstinate and of trying to persevere in any action, because he is ashamed of eating his words. With a bland smile he will wave aside all such considerations with the easy assurance that circumstances have completely altered, and retrieve a position which a weaker man would have sacrificed in a vain attempt of preserving his dignity.

For this all lovers of Ireland and of Humanity will be truly thankful, even though they recognise that it is not only to the facts in Ireland, which are too strong for him, that the Prime Minister now bows. If he had Great Britain, i. e. the electorate, solid behind him in his "firm policy" towards Ireland, we may be quite sure that we would not find him nowadays changing it for a policy of reconciliation. Mr. George is not the man to educate his electors; on the contrary, gifted as he is with the *flair* of knowing exactly what "the man in the street" is going to say to-morrow, he manages to say it just the moment before the masses are going to say it themselves. And there is no doubt that a great revulsion of feeling has come over English opinion as regards Ireland. The splendid stand made by the Anglican bishops against a policy of outrage seems to have been the first indication of a great awakening of the English conscience to the dastardly Black-and-Tannery that it had for so long countenanced. Mr. George never is slow in reading the political barometer—and we are, for the honour of England, extremely grateful and happy to find that the barometer was pointing to "Storm," a great storm of indignation at the futility, the wickedness and the wastefulness of the old policy in the sister Isle.

Wastefulness: that is another point which must weigh heavily in Mr. George's eyes. The whole Kingdom is tired of official waste in the spending of public money and all Ministers are trying hard to pacify the angry gods, by cutting out subsidy

after subsidy and adventure after adventure. But, as everywhere, it is the Army and Navy that devour most and no real economy is possible without some radical change in those two departments. As regards the Army, it must be obvious that a large Army of Occupation in Ireland costs a mint of money which no tax-payer can contemplate with equanimity. If that is the case with regard to military expenditure, still more alarming is the naval prospect. With Germany wiped out as a naval competitor for at least one generation, the pace in naval armaments is nowadays set by America, but the U. S. Navy Department have embarked on so grandiose a programme, that so far from slackening, the burden of naval expenditure threatens to attain to a pitch altogether intolerable to an England which is already hard put to, to make both sides of its national budget to balance. If there is, therefore, to be a "Naval Holiday," it can only be with the consent of and by an agreement with the United States. But it is quite certain that no American Government could come to any such close understanding with England, unless the Irish vote in the United States withdraws its veto on all such Anglo-American *rapprochements*. And that again is impossible, unless Ireland is given a Peace with Honour.

Last but not least of all considerations that are making for such a peace, must no doubt be counted the session of the Empire Conference at this time. To talk Pecksniff-like about the essential philanthropy, moral beauty and political wisdom of the British Empire, whilst almost under the very noses of such pre- and post-prandial orators there is displayed by the forces of that same Empire a jack-boot policy of Prussianism which vies with the choicest fruits achieved by the latter during its reign of terror in Belgium—well, that sort of thing was really getting just a trifle too "thin." Something had got to be done—and who better to do it than the old rebel Smuts of Boer War fame?

Indian opinion will find it useful thus to analyse the various currents which make for a righteous settlement of the Irish question and will be very glad to see that there are to-day solid grounds for hopefulness. Reuter has not done justice to this by insinuating that the whole of this new orientation is due to an "impassioned speech" of the King's at the opening of the Ulster Parliament. His Majesty is a constitutional monarch, and if he makes "impassioned speeches," he does so by reading a type-script given to him by the Prime Minister. To find in such a speech a reason for Mr. George's new policy, is to confound cause and effect. The true causes we have tried to outline above, and the King's speech is merely a result of such causes. Nor was it the first result—for "Mr. Edwards" (Lord Derby's) secret mission to Mr. de Valera and Sir Jas. Craig took place more than two months before. It is doing an ill service to England, to reduce so momentous, so deeply considered and so far-reaching a change of policy to a mere whim, royal or otherwise, instead of making it clear how pro-

found and inevitable the forces are which at last promise Justice to poor "dark Rosaleen."

And having settled the Irish question, no less than the Coal Strike, Mr. George no doubt will now terminate the life of the present Parliament and appeal to the country as to whether they have got any alternative to the Welsh Wizard.

### THE KHOREAL CASE.

THE Assam Shooting Case known as the Khoreal Case has created much sensation and evoked a great deal of trenchant criticism on the special system of trial when a European is the accused person: A European accused is under the Criminal Procedure Code entitled to be tried by a jury with a majority of Europeans. No such privilege is given to an Indian accused. Why? Because the European is of the ruling class and the Indian is of the subject class. It is an instance of statutory race inequality in India, Lord Reading notwithstanding. It is not race-inequality in practice, but in theory and policy. The Indian law says that in criminal trials the Indian may not claim the same right as the European. Starting with such an inequality in law, when we come to practice various considerations arise, e.g., the prestige of the ruling class. If a European accused be punished for an offence against the person or property of an Indian, does not administration become difficult by reason of the non-recognition of the superiority of the ruling class? If an Indian accused of an offence against a European be let off, what becomes of the sacredness of the European person or the inviolability of the European right? The Indians count by the millions in India, the Europeans by the thousands. Therefore, on simple arithmetical basis one European is equal to many hundred Indians. If a green fly is killed of a summer evening, no fuss need be made; but if a horse is killed it requires investigation. If in practice the life of a horse is more valuable than the life of a green fly, why should not the liberty of a European in India be on a higher plane than the liberty of an Indian? Taking the analogy a little further, why should not a scratch on the horse's body be regarded with greater consideration than the crushing of a green fly? In theory and practice therefore the race-inequality is based upon the relative value to the Government of the members of the two races. India is a land of dreams. What wonder that Lord Reading should dream of race-equality?

The facts of the Khoreal case are shortly these. Gangadhar is a coolie in the Khoreal tea garden, the managing agents of which is the powerful firm of Jardine, Skinner and Co. Grant is the manager and Reed is the assistant manager of the garden. Gangadhar lived in the coolie lines with his wife and children. His eldest child is Hira, a strapping girl of sixteen, healthy and well-developed. She also works as a coolie in the garden. Gangadhar's case is that on one hot May day Reed made an immoral proposal to Hira; Hira

refused. Reed used persuasion through his chowkidar and bearer. Gangadhar and his wife were obdurate. Reed thereupon resorted to force. He came at night to Gangadhar's hut with a loaded revolver and called out Hira, who escaped with her mother. Gangadhar was not in, but hearing his little son Nepal shout, he came home and found Reed in his courtyard. Reed in exasperation shot at Gangadhar: the bullet hit him on the right side of the chest, broke a rib and passed out at the back. Gangadhar fell down and lay on the road in a pool of blood. Reed walked away. Just consider the story for a moment. Assuming it is all true, what is there to make a fuss about? Is not Hira a coolie girl? If by reason of her health and age she excited desire in Reed in hot season, what right has she or her father or mother to thwart such desire? The most they could do was to beg for a few rupees, and if Reed was so minded he might have paid them. Instead of that, the girl had the temerity to refuse Reed to his face: the father had the temerity to do likewise, not only when the chowkidar and bearer came, but again to Reed's face when Reed had on a previous occasion come himself. These however were preliminary advances. What of the night of the occurrence? Reed had come not for advances, but for execution. The girl fled and the father was not at home to make over the girl to Reed. It was a hot May night and—after all Reed was flesh and blood. Who could keep equanimity under such provocation? Reed fired at Gangadhar, taught him a lesson and went away. Gangadhar should thank his stars that the bullet did not hit him on a vital point of his Indian anatomy: the difference of an inch or two would have settled his obstinacy for good. Was not Gangadhar a mere coolie; was not Hira a coolie girl; was not she the property of the *Sahab's*? Was not their refusal an act of maddening disobedience, indiscipline and impertinence? What did Reed do? Why, he merely shot at Gangadhar to teach the recalcitrant coolies a lesson. Gangadhar fell down and lay in a pool of blood and Reed walked away. It was not Reed's job to attend to the wounded man. A mere coolie shot at and not even shot dead! Shot for gross impertinence and positive obstruction. What is wrong about it? This is all on the supposition that Gangadhar's story is true. This is on the basis of Assam tea garden rights and duties. Reed was tried before a Deputy Commissioner of Assam and five European jurors and they all found him not guilty, of course. A coolie shot for breach of duty. The Assam Court acquitted Reed, without so much as the formality of taking a statement from him.

A great fuss was made by natives in the press. Gangadhar moved the High Court of Calcutta, after the Assam Government had refused to move. The High Court found that there were irregularities in the Assam trial and, much to the annoyance of the European community, ordered a retrial at the Calcutta High Court Sessions. The case had created a flutter among the natives, and in the High Court

be a reluctance to make this confession, as it is understood to reflect adversely upon the capacity and earnestness of municipalities; but no discredit can properly belong to municipalities in India for being unable to do what local bodies in no other country have succeeded in doing. The experience of all the western countries teaches the lesson that the local authorities cannot be trusted to take the initiative in adopting compulsion in elementary education, and that if universal education is desired Government must boldly enforce such an obligation on them.

To illustrate this point, one may cite the instance of England. In most countries of the west, optional compulsion was never tried at all, direct compulsion alone being exercised there. In England, however, permissive legislation was given a chance for a little time, and the results obtained during this period have a lesson for India. But the central fact has to be borne in mind, that the permissive legislation tried in England was of an entirely different kind from what obtains at present in this country. The Act of 1870, no doubt, left the enforcement of compulsory attendance to the option of the local authorities and was, in this sense, of a permissive character; yet it compelled the supply of education throughout the country, and, in this sense, it was really compulsory in its provisions. Till then the school provision depended entirely upon voluntary effort. When a school was established the State would give aid on certain conditions; but if no school existed in a certain locality, or if an existing school was stopped, the State could do nothing to establish or revive it. The initiative must come from the locality and State aid was made to wait in every case upon local effort. "The pivot on which the whole system of Government aid turned was that of voluntary enterprise, and the Education Department could not extend the range of popular education any further than the voluntary zeal of the country was minded to carry it. Previous to 1870 there existed in England no public authority charged with the duty of calling into being elementary schools in localities where voluntary zeal was unequal to the task, or armed with the authority to require that those already established should continue to be carried on, and carried on efficiently."\* Naturally, much dissatisfaction was felt with this state of things, and long before 1870 attempts were repeatedly made to improve it. Proposals were made year after year that power be given to the local authorities to impose rates for the supply of schools; the most important of these proposals was the "Education of the Poor Bill" introduced by Mr. H. A. Bruce (afterwards Lord Aberdare), and Messrs. W. E. Forster and Algernon Egerton, in 1867. This was a permissive measure, to be brought into operation where a majority of the inhabitant ratepayers so desired, for levying a local rate for the provision of new schools. It was anticipated even when the Bill was intro-

\*Final Report of Royal Commission on Elementary Education, 1888 p. 22.

duced that the measure would fail of its purpose; for the ratepayers could hardly be expected to summon enthusiasm enough to apply the rating system voluntarily to their locality for the purpose of education. Mr. Bruce, in moving the Bill, alluded to this weakness in the following terms:—

It might be objected to it (the Bill) that it would be found inefficacious. Now, he admitted that for a complete national system much more was required; that instead of the measure being only permissive, every district ought to be obliged to provide full school accommodation, just as it had to provide for its highways or its poor; and, again, that even such provision of schools could not suffice, unless measures were adopted for enforcing the attendance of children at school. It might be asked why he did not give effect to those principles. His answer was because he wished to carry that Bill and to make an experiment. There would be nothing to prevent the Legislature from afterwards changing the measure from a permissive into a compulsory one. He had no abstract objection to compulsory attendance at school, but he thought it would be premature and injurious to the cause of education itself, if they were now to attempt to enforce that principle in this country. When they had provided schools all over the country, and by the Factory Act and other means had improved the education of the working classes, and awakened among them a greater desire for it, then they might, if they thought fit, apply a compulsory system of attendance against a residuum of 10 or 12 per cent. of children who might be absent from school; but to apply it now against so large a proportion as 50 per cent. appeared to him to be quixotic and impracticable.—Mr. Bruce, July 10, 1867.

This Bill had to be withdrawn, and the following year Messrs. Bruce, Forster and Egerton introduced another Bill, which substituted compulsion, so far as rating was concerned, for the local option which was allowed in the former measure. The central authority was thereby empowered, after an inquiry, to require local bodies to levy a rate for the purpose of supplying their educational wants in full. The variation of this Bill from that of the preceding year was thus explained and justified by Mr. Bruce:—

The Bill he proposed last year might be briefly described as one for permissive rating. Its object was to give every community throughout the country the power of raising funds to provide a sufficient education for the inhabitants of the district. If such a Bill would not have accomplished all that was desired it would at least have afforded a means of reducing evils the existence of which all deplored. . . . He was bound to say that many thought the Bill of last year did not go far enough, and throughout the country, wherever he had consulted those who took a deep interest in the matter, he found the feeling was almost universal that a permissive Bill alone would be insufficient. It was argued that, although, undoubtedly, the primary duty of providing education for children rested with the parents, it was obligatory upon the State to see that they performed their duty, and that obligation could not be fulfilled under any merely permissive Bill. It was said that if it rested with a municipality to take an initiative which it was indisposed to take in the way of supplying a deficiency of school accommodation, there would still be thousands of children uneducated. Such a conclusion pointed inevitably to the necessity for some compulsory measure. He yielded to the arguments that were so advanced, and he undertook that in the Bill it was his intention to introduce this year means should be provided to meet the case of an indifferent local authority. Therefore the present Bill contained all the main provisions of the Bill of 1867, with the addition of machinery for its

compulsory enforcement where the existence of educational destitution had, after formal inquiry, been proved. It did not propose to interfere, or to give any power of interference, with districts adequately supplied under the existing voluntary system. It provided in the first place for the voluntary adoption of the Act (by municipal boroughs, etc.) . . . An order for the compulsory application of the Act either to an ordinary or a special district might be made by the Committee of Council after due inquiry. This inquiry might either be demanded by one-tenth in number or rateable value of the persons who were or would be electors of the district, or it might be directed by the Committee of Council on their own authority. It would be conducted on the spot, after due notice, by a Commissioner, who would report fully to the Committee of Council, stating the reasons for the adoption of the Act and the objections, and concluding with his recommendations. The Committee of Council would thereupon make such order as they might think expedient, either enforcing or not the adoption of the Act.—*Mr. Bruce, March 17, 1868.*

These long extracts are given here because they go to the very heart of the matter we are considering. This Bill also was withdrawn and was followed by that of Mr. Forster, which passed into law in 1870. Mr. Forster's Act provided machinery, which it would be superfluous to detail here, for ascertaining educational deficiency and for supplying it. Its chief merit consisted in that it set up an organisation for compulsorily providing school accommodation wherever it might be inadequate. The most important provision of the Act of 1870 runs thus: "There shall be provided for every school district a sufficient amount of accommodation in public elementary schools . . . available for all the children resident in such district, for whose elementary education efficient and suitable provision is not otherwise made." It was estimated that "in the great majority of cases the local rate would not amount to anything like 3d. in the pound," but the local authorities were required by law to raise whatever money was necessary to make up the deficiency of the school board's fund, and no limit was fixed to its amount. Now, what was the state of elementary education in England in 1870, when this Act for compelling local authorities to raise requisite funds by rates was passed? "The existing provision for effective elementary education in England included some million and a half scholars, on the books of about 11,000 aided schools, of whom about a million were in average attendance. These numbers, however, represented not more than two-fifths of those children between 6 and 10 years old, and one-third of those between 10 and 12, who ought to have been at school. Thus, there were left outside the range of any educational institution of guaranteed efficiency not less than one million children between the former ages, and half a million between the latter." Two-fifths of the children of school age is the very proportion which obtains in the municipalities in the Bombay Presidency at present, and if it was necessary to enforce compulsion in England to provide educational facilities for all children of school age, can it be believed that in India, where people are accustomed to look to the State for everything, entire reliance can safely be

placed on the initiative of local bodies? As a result of the Act of 1870, it is estimated that 1,600,000 school-places were added between 1869 and 1876, in which last year the history of English education turned over a new page.

For the Act of 1876 declared that "it shall be the duty of the parent of every child to cause such child to receive efficient elementary instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic; and if such parent fail to perform such duty, he shall be liable to such orders and penalties as are provided by this Act." A child was defined under this Act as between the ages of five and fourteen years. With a view to enforce the obligation of attendance in an indirect manner, the Act proceeded first to place restrictions on the employment of children until they had complied with certain educational conditions, and in the view of the Act the parent of a child who employed it for the purpose of gain was deemed its employer. The fifth section made it a statutory offence, with a penalty on conviction not exceeding forty shillings, on the part of any employer to take into his employment (a) any child who is under 10 years of age, and (b) any child over 10 and under 14, who shall not have attained proficiency in reading, writing, and arithmetic prescribed in the Fourth Standard. The Act of 1876 made another change. "By the Act of 1870 the power of making bye-laws for directly compelling attendance at school was limited to districts under school boards. In 1876, Lord Sandon's Act required school attendance committees, on the application of the parishes concerned, to make bye-laws compelling attendance within their limits, thus extending the option of adopting direct compulsion to every school district in England, though it stopped short of an universal system of direct compulsion. . . . Generally, it may be said that the administrative machinery constituted by the Act of 1870 for working out the provisions of that Act is extended by the Act of 1876 to all school districts. In 1880 Mr. Mundella's Act was passed, which established universal direct compulsion by the school authority, in contradistinction to the optional compulsion of Mr. Forster's Act and the indirect compulsion of Lord Sandon's Act. Mr. Forster's Act had made the adoption of bye-laws, regulating the attendance of children at school, optional in school board districts. Lord Sandon's Act had extended this option to all other school districts in England, and had aimed at securing education by enabling the school authority to forbid the employment of uninstructed children, and by stringent provisions against wastrel and idle children up to the age of 14. Mr. Mundella converted this option into an obligation on the part of every school authority."\*

Thus, it will be seen that, in the only important country in which optional compulsion was tried, option was allowed only as regards compelling the attendance of children at school, but the very Act which allowed it made the supply of adequate edu-

\* *Ibid.* pp. 31-36.

Reed made a statement. Why it was necessary for him to make a statement is not known. He was tried by an English Judge and a Jury consisting of eight Britishers and one native.

Reed's story is this. On the fateful night he heard a deer barking near his bungalow where he lived with the manager, Grant. He had no gun of his own. There was a revolver in the bungalow belonging to one Bull. He took this revolver and followed the deer through a swamp, when the deer escaped into the jungle. Reed lost his way and eventually struck the road in the coolie lines near Gangadhar's house. He asked a passing coolie, "here road hai?" The coolie did not answer. He asked another coolie and suddenly a large number of coolies attacked him with stones and sticks. In self-defence he fired the revolver, dispersed the coolies and returned to the bungalow. He fired in the air and on the ground. A ricochet might have struck Gangadhar. He came and told Grant what had happened, and Grant prescribed a pint of iodine on the parts of the body where Reed had been struck.

Grant gave evidence for the defence and said that the day after the occurrence Reed took him through the swamp and along the route which Reed had pursued overnight. In cross-examination Grant admitted that Reed had never before that night attempted any shooting, deer, native or any other animal or bird. They dined together that night, but there was no talk of a barking deer. The Assam deer was as shy an animal as any other deer. The next day he found footprints of pigs and cattle on the mud along Reed's route, but no footprints of deer or Reed. Grant did not deny that the sister of Reed's bearer was his mistress.

The Standing Counsel, Mr. B. L. Mitter, described Reed's story as grotesque. The on-looker was at a loss to see the necessity for any story. The Jury retired for five minutes and returned a verdict of *Not Guilty*, eight to one, in the racial proportion. Reed was acquitted and the European's prestige was vindicated.

Does Lord Reading know of this case?

ASSAM.

### INDIAN STATE ARMIES.

THE principal cause of the utter inefficiency of the armies of Indian States is the policy of distrust pursued by the British Government towards them for over a century and a quarter. It manifested itself in the subsidiary system which brought about the collapse of the *morale* of these States. The subsidiary forces were not ordinarily to be employed in the duties of civil administration, nor in the collection of revenues. The protected States furnished a subsidy for the payment of these forces either by periodical money payments or by territorial cessions. Sometimes a contingent was maintained and named after a State and paid by the State, but controlled by the British Government.

Lord Wellesley, who developed this system to the fullest extent, frankly avowed the motive of creating it in the following words: "The fundamental principle of His Excellency the Governor-General's policy in establishing subsidiary alliance with the principal States of India is to place those States *in such a degree of dependence on the British power as may deprive them of the means of prosecuting any measures, or of forming any confederacy hazardous to the security of the British Empire* and may enable us to preserve the tranquillity of India by exercising a general control over those States calculated to prevent the operation of that restless spirit of ambition and violence which is the characteristic of every Asiatic Government." The system undoubtedly led to the complete emasculation of these warlike States and rendered them helpless. The effects of this system were graphically summarised before a parliamentary inquiry by Mr. James Mill, the distinguished historian and statesman of England:

"One of the most striking effects—perhaps the most striking of all—which a close connection with us produced upon the native States that have embraced subsidiary system is the condition of premature decrepitude into which it inevitably hurried them. Every faculty that is valuable to a State, every organ that contributes to its wholesome existence, seems to decay under our alliance. From the moment that we engage to protect a foreign prince he ceases to have any inducement to maintain himself. The habit of going upon crutches deprives him of the use of his limbs; by taking away the occasion we take away in the end all power of exertion."

The system thus brought about a complete demoralisation of the Indian States in the beginning of the nineteenth century when the work of expansion was vigorously carried on by the makers of British India. Small wonder then that the Indian States entered into most humiliating engagements with the East India Company which was then the dominant power in the land. The treaties and engagements concluded with the Indian States, do not reflect any generosity or nobility on the part of the Company's Government. Every effort was deliberately made to demartialise the States, to cripple their resources, and to keep their armies in a moribund condition. The Indian States were strictly enjoined to restrict the strength of their armies. They were forbidden to recruit foreign soldiers or to enlist foreigners in their service. They were prevented from maintaining fortifications. They were restrained in the manufacture and purchase of arms and ammunition. They were not allowed to keep arms of precision and canon. The ports in the native States were under the control of the paramount power. They were bound to grant rights of passage and occupation of forts and cantonments to the Imperial army; they were in duty bound to give every assistance in the matter of supplies and the extradition of deserters. The Indian States were not to negotiate or communicate with one another. These and other disabilities of a similar character which were imposed by the dominant partner and acquiesced in by the helpless princes disclose a state of abject dependence to which they were reduced. This state of things

continued upon the assumption of suzerainty over India by the British Crown. But so far as the condition of the Indian States was concerned, there was absolutely no change in the angle of vision which was maintained by Her Majesty's Government even after she became Empress of India. A military Commission appointed about the year 1888 gave its opinion that the armies of Indian States were a menace to the safety of the British *Raj*. They observed that the native States with a population of 53 millions of people and a total revenue of 18 millions sterling maintain armed forces of whom 69 thousand were cavalry and 10,964 artillery. They possessed 2,698 serviceable guns. The Commission therefore maintained in their report that one of the duties of the Imperial army of India was the watching and overawing of the armies of feudatory native States. "It cannot be overlooked that these armies are or may become a danger to the British power." The Commission remarked that the only native armies which from their numbers, discipline and organisation required watching at the hands of the British Government were the armies of Maharaja Scindia of Gwalior and of the Nizam of Hyderabad in the Deccan. The Commission advised that on no account should arms of precision be given to the troops of native States, that their field artillery should be kept within the smallest possible limits and that the British Government should take no steps to employ or exercise the contingents of different States together. They thought that the Indian States owed to the paramount power the duty of restricting the number of their forces within such limits as would cause the least possible risk and anxiety to the British Empire in India. Simultaneously a strong agitation was set on foot in England and was supported by "The Thunderer" in the early eighties. A writer in the *Times* wrote a series of articles, bitterly complaining about the vastness of these armies. He candidly admitted that the armies of Scindia and Holkar and Nizam were a danger to the British power, and that the cantonments at Mhow, Morar and Secunderabad were maintained solely for overawing the forces of these powerful States and as a military equipoise for the safety of the British dominions. The British Government was maintaining nearly 12,000 men at Mhow, Murar, Sehore and Sirdarpur permanently for watching and neutralising the armies of the two great Mahratta chiefs, Scindia and Holkar, and of Central Indian Agency States. The writer complained that the existence of the great Mahratta armies, while unjust to the subjects of Scindia and Holkar, also bears heavily on the Government and taxpayers of British India by compelling them to keep 10,000 men of their small army and five or six batteries in permanent inaction. The remedy suggested by this bureaucratic writer was the total annihilation of the armies of these States. He seemed to be overflowing with sympathy for the subjects of Gwalior and Indora. He did not care to suggest any remedy to provide means of subsistence to these vast numbers

employed by these States in their armies in case they were to be thrown out of employment in compliance with his voluntary and valuable advice. The idea of turning these troops to better account by a change of policy inspired by trust instead of one of suspicion and distrust did not at all appeal to him. But the cry raised against the existence of the armies of the Indian States, though undisciplined, untrained and unequipped, had a deteriorating effect, and within a space of nearly thirty years there has been a reduction of 50 p. c. in the strength of these armies, though admitted on all hands to be inefficient for any warlike purpose. This result unmistakably proves the intense feeling of suspicion and distrust which actuated British statesmen during this period. Even though they were conscious that the effete condition of these armies was not at all a source of danger to any military power, much less to so well-disciplined and well-equipped as their own, they did not tolerate even the mere existence of these harmless forces. The inevitable consequence of this unfortunate attitude of the paramount power has been that the armies of Indian States are a disgrace alike to themselves and to their employers at the present moment. But who is the prime cause of this stagnation and demoralisation? The only answer that could be given is, that the British Government is solely responsible for the degradation and degeneration of the armies of Indian States.

G. R. ABHYANKAR.

#### DIRECT COMPULSION NECESSARY.

THE system of optional compulsion adopted by the Elementary Education Acts in this country has not yielded the results expected of it by persons of a sanguine temperament. In some provinces it has had a sufficiently long trial to enable the public to pronounce it a failure; in the others, though it has not had such a trial, it is already foredoomed to failure. The main cause of this failure is, of course, want of adequate funds; but even if the Government increased the grant they make at present to a figure which might reasonably be held sufficient to place it in the power of local bodies to introduce compulsion within their borders, it is more than doubtful if the local bodies would do so. Much practical importance attaches to this question in the Bombay Presidency at the present time by reason of the announcement made by the Minister that Government are now prepared to assume a two-thirds share of the educational expenditure of municipalities, instead of one-half as heretofore. It is the general opinion that, with this larger pecuniary assistance, most of the municipalities will be in a position to put the Compulsory Education Act in force, particularly in view of a fruitful source of economy pointed out by the Minister in the shape of the double shifts system. And still the apprehension is commonly felt that, although municipalities can, if they are so minded, introduce compulsion, they will fail in discharging this duty if the initiative is solely left to them. In some quarters there will perhaps



educational facilities obligatory on the authorities. And, further, progress was made by rapid steps towards universal direct compulsion within the brief space of ten years. The experience gained in England points the obvious moral, that it must be made legally incumbent on the local authorities to introduce compulsion when it is found that their share of educational expenditure is not beyond their capacity to bear.

S. G. V.

### IN OTHER LANDS.

THE European residents in Kenya Colony, apparently alarmed at the prospect that some measure of justice might be done to the Indian settlers in that country, are urging the Colonial Office to carry out "the original Milner policy of a White Kenya." A White Kenya! For cool presumption and racial insolence this demand is surely hard to beat. For who are these colonists in the heart of Africa who clamour for a White Reservation? Are they colonizing an empty, vacant, uninhabited stretch of country, a no-man's-land? If so, why do they permit, nay entice Negro labour to contaminate the pure "whiteness" of their colony? If they are really out for a "White Kenya" and require "coolies," why don't they indent for them from amongst the unemployed of their own country? Would not "white coolies for a White Kenya" make an attractive recruiting poster? But we forgot—white men never can be coolies. Therefore a "White Kenya" really means a Black-and-White Kenya, with the white floating on the top like cream, and the inferior (but alas, necessary) black stuff below: and the thing really feared is that the Indian element introduced may prove a leaven which will set the whole fermenting—and who knows what might then happen to the white *crème de la crème*?

LITHUANIA is one of the many new States set up by the Versailles peace-making. Precarious as the new life of so many of these new political entities must be, Lithuania is particularly unfortunate, in that it happens to border on Poland. Needless to say, with the present epidemic of megalomania and imperialism at Warsaw, Poland does by no means think it proper that Lithuania should be Lithuanian, when it might so much better be Polish. In fact it has acted up to that belief and last year sent its General Zeligowski to occupy the Lithuanian capital, Vilna. This deliberate flouting of the Allies, not to mention the League of Nations, resulted in a great diplomatic flutter which ended in Zeligowski being "disowned" by Warsaw, but remaining in possession of Vilna in defiance of Poland, of the Big Four, of the whole world—much as d'Annunzio carried on at Fiume.

Being Poles and not Germans, there could of course be no question of "sanctions" or other drastic measures, to bring the precious Zeligowski and his Poles to their senses. Instead of which a "Conference" was called of Polish and Lithuanian

delegates to decide amicably the fate of Vilna in particular and of Lithuania in general. This Conference has been sitting at Brussels since April and has now come to an end, on the Poles presenting an "ultimatum." They had no objection to a Conference provided they were granted the suzerainty over Lithuania, but as soon as the Belgian President made it clear that there could be no just settlement except on the basis of Lithuanian, no less than Polish, sovereignty, the Poles terminated the proceedings forthwith. What will be the further developments now?

It is a commonplace that the last war was brought about through the German mentality of overweening arrogance based on the worship of Power and the idolatry of Country. It is equally common knowledge that this mentality was deliberately fostered by the late rulers of Germany through an elaborate educational machinery, whereby such ideas were instilled into every German from tenderest school-going age onwards. If the late German Empire has shown how education can be made to subserve the cause of the devils, the honour belongs to Sweden of showing how it can be made to subserve that of the angels. For the Swedish educational authorities have just issued the following instructions to teachers of history—instructions which we would like to see issued to *all* teachers of *all* the countries of the world:

"The teaching of history must be planned and carried out in such a manner as to make the development of peaceful culture and of a political system of government through the centuries its chief object. . . . It should be impressed upon the student that the greater the degree of culture the more has war been looked upon as an evil, and attention should be drawn to the misery war always brings in its train, though at the same time the difference between defensive and aggressive wars should be emphasised.

"The teacher should take pains, not to foster hatred and enmity towards other nations, and should impress upon his pupils that peace and a good understanding between all nations is the chief condition upon which the common progress of humanity depends. Children must be made to feel that heroes in the work of peace exist, and that through their courage and self-sacrifice their countries have been well served."

Mr. Paranjpye, please note!

OF all the astonishing figures in English political life to-day, surely Mr. Winston Churchill must be the most surprising. Ever changing, he ever comes out in a new rôle or with some new scheme. To a public that had come to look upon him as one of the most reactionary members of the Cabinet; as the friend of Koltchak & Co. who engineered the £100 million stunt against Soviet Russia; as the most unscrupulous shouter of "Make Germany pay;" as the believer in a Big Navy, and a Big Air force and a Big Army, according to the respective Cabinet rank he was holding at the time: we say that to a public, that had come to look for surprises from him only in the direction of fantastic new adventures, he has given the greatest surprise of all, by delivering the other day a speech at the Manchester

Chamber of Commerce which for soberness and sanity, for absence of all flamboyant rhodomontade and for plain blunt common sense must rank with the best utterances ever made by men who aspire to be statesmen rather than mere politicians. "Winnie" and statesmanship? One may well rub one's eyes. Yet there it is.

MR. CHURCHILL began by saying that "we could not afford to be guided by passion or legitimate resentment in judging of facts in the economic sphere."

"But," Mr. Churchill went on, "in so far as goods from Germany come here, not as a result of natural trade between two countries, but in the mere payment of a debt, undoubtedly they would exercise a depressing influence over domestic industry and hamper in a serious manner our export trade. Trade is exchange; profitable trade is exchange profitable to both parties; and the transference to one country of the productions of another, not as a part of exchange but as a measure of war reparation, can never be attended by results inseparable from those associated with the phenomenon described as dumping.

If Germany during the next 40 or 50 years were able to pay her debts to everybody, she would by that process have become master of every market in the world. She would have become the greatest exporting nation ever heard of—almost the sole exporting nation of the world. She would have achieved that conquest on the basis of the most miserable industrial population, ground down under her heels. And if during the next 40 or 50 years the United States of America received all that was owing to her she would, in that process, have largely destroyed her export trade. She would have robbed her people of many of their essential arts and industries. She would have ruptured the whole completeness of her interior economy.

And not America only, but every creditor nation. And the remedy for such a prospect? Mr. Churchill advises,

"as part of a gigantic operation beneficial to all, to reduce the mutual indebtedness of nations to limits which are not incompatible with healthy trade, normal exchanges, and with decent labour conditions."

To make Germany *not* to pay! This is startling enough, coming from such lips: but more amazement is yet to follow. For, "If," he continues,

"you are to set Europe on her feet again, and prevent another terrible war breaking out all of a sudden, like the last, there is only one way—this is a hard saying which I am going to utter, but I give you my sincere counsel,—there must be true peace between Britain, France, and Germany. There must be real co-operation between these three mighty nations to repair the ruin of war and to rebuild the glory and the unity of Europe. If you want to secure the full fruits of victory, believe me, you will have to make arrangements which will secure the co-operation not of France and Britain alone, but of France, Britain, and Germany together in the work of reconstruction."

Well said indeed, and if there is anything that can heighten the effects of such words, it must be found in the round of applause that greeted the speech of Mr. Secretary of State Churchill. A double portent indeed.

AFTER many contradictory statements in the news telegrams it now looks as if the Anglo-Japanese Treaty would automatically continue to exist until July, 1922. Whenever it is due for re-

newal, one hopes that it will not be renewed anyhow. It is these alliances of some Powers which inevitably lead to the counter-alliances of other Powers and the end of all such unstable "balances" of Powers can only be war. The League of Nations was purposely introduced to make all such partial alliances unnecessary and every Treaty such as the Anglo-Japanese Treaty is a shrewd blow aimed at the authority of the League. If both Japan and England have really only got the Peace of the World in mind, their purpose would be very much better served by their backing instead the League of Nations with all the power at their command.

INCIDENTALLY that leads one to ask what the necessity is for tightening up the bonds that hold the British Empire together? If the British Empire only means Peace and Liberty and the safe-guarding of these and of all the other pleasant things that one hears about when an Imperial Conference is sitting: then why not do all that through the League of Nations, of which all Dominions (and India) are already members? If the police protection in a country is sufficient, why start a volunteer corps amongst a few? And if it is not, is it not cheaper and more effective to make the police more efficient rather than allow indiscriminate banding together of some individuals? The latter may have the best intentions in the world—but firearms have a habit of leading to accidents even amongst the best regulated families!

IN quite another sense, France undoubtedly is the one country that has carried the "regulation of families" furthest. Reuter tells us that the latest census there shows a decrease of 2'3 millions. Reuter as usual is not explicit about these figures—for with the addition of Alsace-Lorraine present-day France surely must show a larger population than she had at the time of the previous census. For all that, her population cannot be more than  $\frac{2}{3}$  that of Germany. And this fact has become an obsession of France—that do what she may, there across the Rhine is a nation, which, already numbering 20 millions more than France, increases from year to year, whilst she is decreasing. Hence the inhuman policy of the rulers of France to-day to crush, mutilate, throttle this defeated Germany, which, for all her writhing in the mire to-day, yet makes France fear for her very life. Hence her desire to *sabotage* the economic life of Germany by handing Silesia to Poland and occupying the Ruhr, by preventing Austria to join up with the Reich and by allying herself with Poland, so as to keep Germany as between two pincers. But facts are stubborn things—and the last French census has revealed one of them. Will not France recognize that her ultimate safety lies not in trying the impossible by a display of brutality, but in being fair even to the "Boches" and, resting on her own justice, in straining everything to make the League of Nations a reality and a safe bulwark against all future aggression?

## REVIEW.

## THE INDIAN EXCHANGE PROBLEM.

The Indian Exchange Problem: By F. V. Rushforth (Oxford University Press).

IN a small pamphlet of about 40 pages Mr. Rushforth admirably summarises the present position of this fascinating problem. Having dealt briefly with the general principles of exchange (paras. 1-6), he proceeds at once to examine the recent position. The recommendations of the Babington-Smith Committee are summarised (para. 7), the difference between gold and sterling is adverted to (para. 9), and then the action of the Government on the Currency Committee's Report is described (para. 10). The Government accepted the new rate recommended by the Committee, and in order to make it effective began selling Reverse Councils at the uniform rate of Re. 1=2s. (gold), which, of course, meant a variable rate of 2s 10d., or 2s. 8d. etc., in sterling, as measured by the London New York Cross rate. This is information for which, we think, we have to thank the author, for most of us, we remember, were puzzled at the time by the Government rate. The Government rate, however, varied markedly from the then market rate, and the reasons for this variation are dealt with (paras. 11-15). Briefly stated, these reasons are: that the demand for sterling was far greater than the supply, and could not be satisfied by the limited amount of Reverse Councils which the Government were prepared to sell; nor could the gap between demand and supply be bridged by the export of silver, for the export of silver was prohibited. This prohibition is taken as a primary fact, and no justification offered for it. Unconvincing, too, is the reply to the question, "Why then did Government sell Reverse Councils at all?" We are told (para. 10) that it was necessary for them to sell gold at the desired parity, as otherwise "the ratio would settle itself under the law of supply and demand as expressed through the exchange and bullion markets." This, however, is exactly what is at present happening; in the meanwhile the Government's want of insight has cost the country dear, and its action has amounted to, if not organised, at any rate, legalised, loot.

If, "letting the dead past bury its dead," we look to the future, our author does not offer much consolation. So long as India demands gold and is willing to pay more than Rs. 15-14-8 per tola, exchange cannot rise to the gold point recommended by the Currency Committee, and if there is a balance of trade against India, she must settle it by the export of silver, as she used to do before 1893 (paras. 24 and 35). And until exchange begins to adopt some settled course, the average merchant should "take every precaution to eliminate risks of exchange moving against him, in the same way as he takes precautions against fluctuations in other markets" (para. 47).

Before concluding, we should like to refer to a passage where the author seems to have fallen into a curious error through oversight. Having deduced (para. 17) the general principle that the Cross rate can affect the rate of exchange only when the rate is near the gold import point, he goes on to say (para. 18), "An error which was made by many operators in the early months of 1920 was the assumption that the Cross rate would inevitably react on exchange," etc. In our opinion, the error is the author's. He forgets that the Cross rate will affect the rate of exchange, not only when it is near the gold import point, but also when it is near the silver export point; and throughout the early months of 1920 the rate was near this latter point, as his own chart in the Appendix shows. On the whole, however, the pamphlet is a very able exposition of the whole problem, and we heartily recommend it to all those who take an interest in the subject.

R. P. P.

## TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

BENGAL stands in the unenviable position of spending a disproportionately large portion of reve-

nue on its police department, which has been the subject of searching criticism both inside and outside the legislative council. It will be remembered that at the last budget debate the legislative council reduced the Government demand for Police grant by about twenty-three lacs, and that this was subsequently passed in the form of a supplementary estimate. The council has now appointed a committee to scrutinise the expenditure on that department with a view to see if no economies could be effected without sacrificing the efficiency of the Police. It is to be hoped that Bengal's example will be followed by the other provinces in India. So far as the Bombay Presidency is concerned, the last session of the council decided upon the appointment of a retrenchment committee, and though nearly four months have since elapsed, the public has heard nothing about the matter. The expenditure on Police in Bombay has nearly doubled during the last seven years or so, and it is feared that the many new posts created in the department are a superfluity, inasmuch as they do not appear to have added to the efficiency of the Police in any appreciable degree. We hope that the Bombay Government will lose no time in setting up the retrenchment committee proposed by the council.

A VALUED correspondent writes: Your London letter for last week makes the announcement that the transfer of Aden to the Colonial Office is "as good as settled." To do all this without as much as saying "By your leave" or "with your leave" to either India or the people of Aden, must strike everybody as highly reprehensible. But whether in itself the severance of Aden from India is right or not, is of course another question. The protection of one's nationals in a foreign country is one thing; but to annex that foreign country so as to be able the better to protect one's nationals—what is that but rank Imperialism? Have not all Empires started like that? Aden to-day; Fiji to-morrow; the whole of the African Continent the day after that?

ON the contrary, he adds, it is well arguable, not, whether Aden should not be transferred, but whether *more* territory, which is not really Indian, should not be transferred as well, once we are about it. Why not add Baluchistan and the Frontier Provinces? These stretches of country are—so we are always told—of the greatest Imperial value. Then, why should they not be transferred to—and, well understood, paid for by "the Empire"? The ruthless curtailment of the military burden on India is the foremost financial necessity: is this perhaps not a possible way of effecting it? The people inhabiting those marches have everything in common with Afghanistan, Persia, Central Asia, Mesopotamia even, rather than with India. Culturally, politically, historically the ties that bind them to India are of the slenderest; and if this is so to-day, what of the great, democratic Indian Commonwealth of to-morrow? Will these ties not become our own shackles?

## GOOD SEEDS.

We have the best seeds in India,—both vegetable and flower—suitable to our climate. Sow the right kind of seeds at the right time and have disappointment.



Large descriptive catalogue with numerous illustrations free on application. Mention this paper when writing.

PESTONJEE P. POCHA & SONS,  
SEED MERCHANTS, POONA,  
Bombay Presidency,  
INDIA.

## TRADE UNION LEGISLATION

OR

### Notes on the Trade Disputes Act.

A reprint is being taken of the four articles that were contributed to the SERVANT OF INDIA by "A Labour Advocate."

To those who wish to study the subject, this little compilation, which puts together materials rather inaccessible to the ordinary reader would be found highly useful.

*Register orders immediately.*

**F**OR terms of Advertisement, please apply to the Manager, SERVANT OF INDIA, Kibe Wada, Budhwar Peth, POONA CITY.

AWARDED A FIRST CLASS CERTIFICATE BY THE SOUTH INDIA AYURVEDIC CONFERENCE AND EXHIBITION,

## SIDDHA KALPA MAKARADHWAJA

THE WONDERFUL DISCOVERY IN THE MEDICAL WORLD.

FOR ALL "ACUTE" AND "CHRONIC" DISEASE.

Prepared Scientifically by Ayurveda Ratna Pandit N. V. Srirama Charlu, Ph. D. Sc. Sole proprietor and Senior physician of the Madras Ayurvedic Pharmacy.

This unparalleled and Ancient medicine is prepared in exact accordance with Aurvedic and Western Modern Principles carefully tested and Standardized by expert analysis and found to be an unrivalled Elixir for the general prolongation of life, and particularly a guaranteed remedy for Nervous Debility, Skin Eruptions, Eczema, Vertigo, Loss of Nerve Power, Vigour, Memory and Appetite, Depression of Spirits, constant Mental Misgivings, want of spirit and energy. Melancholia, Rheumatism, Gout, Paralysis, Insanity, Hysteria, Dropsy, Diabetes, Piles, Asthma, Consumption, Dyspepsia all Uterine complaints, and all sorts of Urethral Discharges, Acute or Chronic, of all kinds and all men and women's ailments, etc. This is the only safe and reliable remedy for all diseases resulting from youthful indiscretions and loss of Vitality. It imparts New life and Energy, by increasing and purifying the blood. It contains such valuable ingredients as Siddha, Makradhwaja, Mukta Suvarna, Loha and vegetable drugs. This can be taken also as a tonic by every one of either sex, without any restriction of Diet Season or Climate. Complete Directions are sent with the Phial one Phial of 60 pills (for a complete cure) Price Rs. 10 (Ten) only. V. P. Extra

Apply to:—AYURVEDA RATNA PANDIT N. V. SRIRAMA CHARLU, Ph. D. Sc.

The Madras Ayurvedic Pharmacy,

"Telegraphic Address"—"KALPAM," MADRAS.

POST-BOX No. 151, MADRAS

Printed at the Arya-Bhushan Press and published at 'The Servant of India' Office,  
541, Budhwar Peth, Poona City, by Anant Vinayak Patwardhan.

## READY FOR SALE.

A reprint of the articles

ON

## Medical Services in India.

BY

AN I. M. S. OFFICER,

Price As. 8 Postage extra.

In convenient form. Only a limited number of copies available for sale.

Please order your requirements at once from:—

THE ARYABHUSHAN PRESS,

POONA CITY.

## Dr. BAILUR'S MEDICINES.

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



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

As for our catalogue for other medicines & Particulars.

Liberal commission for Merchants.

Dr. H. M. BAILUR.

Dispensary, BELGAUM

## CUT ME OUT

and mail me, with your name and address, to  
Good Luck Co., Benares City.

I will bring you, per V. P. P., one **COSY SILK SUIT** length for Rs. 12 only. These pieces are economical, hard wear and handsome ever made.

Test them any way you please—Why not give it a trial?

Name.....

Address.....

## Currency Reform in India

BY

Prof. V. G. KALE,

Price Re. One.

Copies may be had from booksellers or —

The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City