

THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. V, No. 41.]

POONA—THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1922.

{ INLAND SUBNS. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN s. 10.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	481
ARTICLES:—	
The Civil Disobedience Committee's Report	483
Constantinople	484
The Multan Riots and After	487
A Remarkable Educational Report—II & III	488
CONTINENTAL LETTER. By Levin L. Schücking	490

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

THE League of Nations can hardly be said to be treating India fairly.

India and the League of Nations.

Last year the Indian delegates had to put up a strenuous fight for a due share of India in the League's secretariat appointments. As a result one appointment out of over 300 has been given to an Indian, which is ridiculously inadequate considering the financial contribution made by India, to put it on no higher grounds. The delegates of this year have had to protest against India not having been included among the eight most important industrial countries of the world. In an able and lucid speech at a meeting of the Council of the League, Lord Chelmsford showed how when it was a question of contribution to the League's expenses, India's population was duly taken account of, but when it was a matter of giving India a place on the International Labour Bureau, her large industrial and wage-earning population was ignored, though the human element was the chief concern of the International Labour Office. Lord Chelmsford further reminded the Council of the League that India was one of the first, if not the very first, countries to give effect to the recommendations of the Washington Labour Conference. Similarly Messrs. Bhupendranath Basu and N. M. Joshi protested at Geneva against the excessive representation of European Countries (75 per cent.) on the Governing Body of the International Labour Conference. There should be greater fairness, surely, in a League of Nations.

* * *

Multan

IT is a very great pity that Hindu-Moslem disunity should be so acute in the Punjab, despite the best efforts of prominent leaders of both communities from outside the province. As will be seen from our special correspondent's article published in this number, this disunity is most painful in Multan where the leaders of neither party are conciliatory. For instance, on October 31st the Municipality took up

the question of the removal of Kaacha Bandis, which are gates erected by the Hindus, soon after the riots, at the entrance of lanes entirely or mostly inhabited by them. There is no denying the fact that their erection was unauthorised. The Municipality was certainly within its rights in demanding their removal. But what is legally right is not always politically right. The Deputy Commissioner was trying to bring about the desired result by persuasion. The Municipality was requested not to hamper his work by considering the question in his absence. There was no urgency about it. Moreover, the question had been referred to a jury. But communal pique prevailed. An equal number of Hindu and Muhammadan Councillors were present at the meeting and they voted on opposite sides. The amendments and the proposition were therefore decided by the casting vote of the President who is a Muhammadan. The Hindus as a protest observed a hartal, which must have caused much inconvenience to the labouring classes. While not approving of the action of either community, we think the Hindus as the injured party were entitled to some special consideration at the hands of their Moslem fellow-citizens.

* * *

Guru-ka-Bagh

THE Guru-ka-Bagh affair was the subject of a long discussion on the opening day of the present session of the Punjab Legislative Council. Sardar Dasaundha Singh moved the following resolution:—

“That this Council recommends to the Government.—

(a) That further arrests in connection with Guru-ka-Bagh be stopped;

(b) That a Committee consisting of five Sikh members of the Council be appointed to bring about a settlement between the Mahant and the Shiromani Gurdwara Parbandhak Committee;

(c) That all persons arrested or convicted in connection with Guru-ka-Bagh be released as soon as the settlement is effected.”

After the resolution was moved and seconded, the President decided that the three clauses should be discussed separately, that clause (b) should be taken up first and then clauses (a) and (c). Clause (b) was readily accepted by the Council with the amendment that the Committee be selected by all the Sikh members of the Council. The really important part of the resolution was clause (a) and in urging it the mover pleaded that if the arrests were stopped an atmosphere favourable for settlement would be created; but if, on the other hand, the arrests continued, a very serious situation would arise. He was asked whether pending the

efforts of the Committee to bring about a compromise, the Akalis would suspend their march on Guru-ka-Bagh, or if the land once passed into their hands, they would return it. But the Sardar said that he had not consulted the Prabandhak Committee and could not give an affirmative reply to either question. Lala Harkishanlal and Sir John Maynard explained the position of the Government. They were not standing in the way of a settlement at all. But so long as the property was in the Mahant's name in the record of rights and he asked for protection against forcible dispossession, the Government was bound to give him the protection. The law could not be relaxed because the Akalis were the stronger party or because only a few acres were involved in the dispute. The clause was then put to vote and defeated. Then clause (c) was allowed to be withdrawn. It cannot be claimed that the discussion has in any way furthered the solution of the difficulty. But no other position was possible for the Government. They were rightly blamed when the Akalis were being brutally treated. But that is now past history. So long as the Akalis insist on direct action no solution is possible.

Goondas.

WE hope there will be no opposition from any quarter to the Bill which the Bengal Government proposes to introduce in next session of the Legislative Council to deal with *goondas* in Calcutta. These are up-country roughs employed ordinarily as durwans or house-guards but indulging frequently in violent crime and always a terror to the peaceful population. They are particularly dangerous in a riot or disturbance. The Bill empowers the Local Government to order the expulsion of a *goonda* who has committed or is about to commit a crime likely to cause danger or alarm to the inhabitants of Calcutta. As in each case the Local Government has to issue the order there is no fear of oppression by police subordinates. The Bill does not apply to persons who are Bengalees by birth. Another dangerous element in Calcutta are the Pathans, whom it may be useful to bring within the scope of this Bill. Why not Bombay deal similarly with its Pathan terror?

WE congratulate the C. P. Retrenchment in C.P. retrenchment Committee, which had an able and zealous President in Mr. Slocock, on being able to recommend a reduction of Rs. 84 lakhs from an annual expenditure of about Rs. 5½ crores. Though the Association of European Government Servants of the C. P. distinguished itself by addressing a letter to the Secretary of State impudently criticising the Government of India for issuing the circular on the Indianization of the Services, the senior civilians of the province strongly urged in the Legislative Council the utter necessity of stopping further recruitment in England on the ground of economy. The Slocock Committee's recommendations are bound to in-

crease one's respect for the European civilian whom the Indian has generally looked upon as caring less for economy than for his own pay and prospects. One of the most interesting of the recommendations is that the salary of the President of the Legislative Council be fixed at Rs. 10,000 a year and that the Deputy President's post be honorary. If this recommendation be accepted by the Legislative Council it will produce a great moral effect in other provinces.

* * *

IN commenting on Mr. Ramalinga Reddy's recent Poona speech in which he maintained that the reforms were a success, the *Indian Social Reformer* asks, "Is the country today better or at least more economically administered than before the reforms? Has it more freedom? Have they brought more peace and harmony to the people?" These questions, particularly the last two, we submit, should be addressed to the supporters of non-co-operation, not to those of the reforms. Self-government is not synonymous with either good or economical government. It could be either or both, but everything depends on the people themselves. Mr. Reddy pointed out in the clearest manner that the reforms had not converted, nor had professed to convert, the Government of India into a republic. If the executive exercised certain powers specifically reserved for them under the reforms, surely the reforms cannot be blamed for it. The real test is to see whether, to the extent contemplated by the reforms, the popular will has influenced the administration. So far as Madras is concerned, Mr. Reddy, by quoting specific instances, proved abundantly that the ministerial party was completely influencing the Government.

WE welcome the *Rajasthan Patrika*, the new Anglo-Gujarathi weekly devoted mainly to the problems of Native States. It is edited by Mr. Mansukhlal R. Metha and published at Ranpur in Kathiawad. Since the declaration of the goal of British policy in India as the conferment of responsible government, there has been much political awakening in the States, and British Indian subjects also are evincing an increasing interest in them. The *Rajasthan Patrika* is therefore bound to serve a useful purpose. "It will stand before the Princes for the rights of the subjects of the States and before the British Government for the rights of the institution of Indian States." Mr. Metha is opposed to the Princes' Protection Bill chiefly because he sees in it a widening of the scope for British interference in the internal affairs of the States. We do not know that there has been too much of such interference in the past. Except in a few States, the quality of administration is so bad that we should welcome a little more "interference" on the part of British Government, such as, for instance, fixing the civil list of every ruler, insistence on the publication of an annual administration report, the encouragement at least of representative institutions &c. in other words obtaining effective guarantees for a minimum of good government. We trust the *Patrika* will be as courageous in its defence of the rights of the subjects against the States as it has been in that of the rights of the States against the British Government.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

It is said that a country gets the Government it deserves, and we fancy Congressmen will philosophically reflect, on perusing the Civil Disobedience Committee's report, that a people get the Committee they deserve. Faced with a sharp division of opinion which only helped to confuse the public mind, the Congress authorities appointed this Committee in order that it should give a clear lead to the country; but they have now received at its hands—not enlightenment but obfuscation. The circumstances in which the Civil Disobedience Committee was called into being should be recalled. Affairs had suddenly assumed such a complexion that the author of non-co-operation was forced to lop off branch after branch of that movement, till only the so-called constructive part remained. It had become quite clear that few Congressmen cared for the humdrum work involved in the carrying out of the constructive programme, if it was not to lead, within a measurable distance of time, to some earth-shaking move on Mr. Gandhi's chess-board. Mr. Gandhi, however, seemed to leave his followers with the constructive work alone for an indefinite period and the enthusiasm of the non-co-operators rapidly waned. The Committee was appointed, firstly, in its own words, "to relieve the tension of public feeling," and, secondly, by recommending a change in the ruling policy, to revive, if that was possible, the jaded spirits of the non-co-operators. That the constructive programme in itself was not much in favour with Congressmen the Committee itself frankly admits. "Only a few," it says, "think of the constructive programme as a thing apart from mass civil disobedience and quite sufficient in itself for the ultimate attainment of Swarajya. Fewer still have any hope of the success of the constructive programme without the adventitious aid of individual civil disobedience, offensive or defensive, from time to time, as occasion arises." But when the connexion of the constructive programme with civil disobedience was broken, the non-co-operators in all provinces clamoured to be provided with something which would attract their enthusiasm and devotion, and the Civil Disobedience Committee was charged with the duty of providing that something. That this genesis is correct will be demonstrated by the following note of Mr. Hakim Ajmal Khan:—

"The constructive programme, being the basis of all our actions, we should have recommended nothing else but the working of it. As I cannot, however, shut my eyes to the obvious fact that, with the exception of a few provinces, we are not only not making any progress in this direction, but are actually going backwards, I, therefore, recommend entry into the councils, with the sole object of proving that the Reform Scheme is useless, and with a view only to make its working impossible. If the whole of our Congress organisation, from top to bottom, were to take up the constructive programme in right earnest and push it through with a firm determination, which I very

much doubt it would, I believe we should not feel the necessity of having to call to our aid any other stimulant, such as entry into the Councils.

There seemed to be two alternatives: entry into the Councils and the inauguration of civil disobedience. The latter had already been pronounced on all hands to be out of the question, and it did not require a Civil Disobedience Committee to make that discovery. The present Committee has recommended that the Provincial Congress Committees be authorised to sanction the starting of a movement of resistance on a limited scale; even if the All-India Committee were to endorse this proposal, it need hardly cause any perturbation in any quarter. Civil disobedience being thus removed out of the way, the only serious question to which the Committee could address itself was whether the Congress should not again betake itself to the constitutional means the use of which, by the adoption of the policy of non-co-operation, the Congress has denied to itself. To this question one-half of the Committee return a blank negative. It is hardly necessary to consider their arguments; they are of the standard pattern. Entry into the Councils "involves a distinct violation of the principle of non-co-operation," though entry into local boards which are invested with far less powers, is held to be in consonance with the principle of non-co-operation! Again, "the Legislative Councils are institutions on which the Government chiefly relies for its strength and prestige." This is certainly a new discovery. Everywhere else legislative councils are regarded as institutions devised for the purpose of checking and controlling the executive; it was reserved for the non-co-operators of the bluest blood to pronounce that the executive set up legislatures in order that the latter may increase their autocratic power and enhance their prestige! The other objections raised by them against Congressmen contesting Council elections are of the same order and need not be examined in detail here. If the recommendations of this half of the Committee are adopted, the desire of the country to have provided something which will really engage the deepest interest of Congressmen and once again rouse their enthusiasm will remain ungratified. There is not a shadow of doubt that non-co-operators, fed so long on excitement, are sadly in need of a pabulum less commonplace than the constructive programme. While one-half of the Committee are thus unable to suggest a remedy, the other half suggest one which is utterly impracticable. They recommend the use of the constitutional machinery, but not in order to exercise through it a salutary check on the executive, but to bring the machinery itself to a standstill, by preventing a quorum, or if that is not possible, by offering wholesale opposition to every measure of the Government, even if it should be beneficial to the people. The criticism of this proposal that is contained in the report of the other half of the

Committee is perfectly sound. They reprobate it as an "unworthy expedient," "obnoxious to the principle and spirit of the movement." These ethical considerations, it is quite plain, do not make a strong appeal to the members of the Committee, who made the proposal, but what these will have to reckon with is that the proposal is not at all feasible. For once Mr. Rajagopalachariar and his two colleagues agree with what Sir William Vincent said in the Assembly on behalf of the Government of India, that the non-co-operators, if all of them decided to contest the elections, will not come in in any large numbers, and even if they come they will not remain uncompromising opponents, but will subside into ordinary constitutionalists. Mr. Rajagopalachari and the other two members who share his opinion frankly say that the chances are remote for obtaining such a majority at the elections as is one of the essential conditions of the success of the scheme It is absolutely impossible to secure a majority sufficient to create deadlocks in the manner contemplated." If Mr. V. J. Patel and his two colleagues have no better solution to offer, then there is little chance that the non-co-operation movement will recover from the *debacle* which has overtaken it.

The obstructionists base the advocacy of their policy of indiscriminate obstruction on two considerations : the worthlessness of the reforms and the enormity of the evil that has already resulted from them. Neither of these considerations is grounded on fact. The utility of the reforms is conceded by these very obstructionists in a passage in which they try to convince the anti-Council non-co-operators how far the constructive programme can be forwarded if the non-co-operators go into the Councils. They say : "It is evident that the greater part, if not the whole, of that (constructive) programme, falls under the transferred subjects and can undoubtedly be helped to a very considerable extent if the Minister in charge took some interest in it." If national education, arbitration, temperance, home industries, etc. could be considerably promoted by the Ministers taking a little interest in those subjects, then surely there is a good deal in the reforms. If all the Ministers took all possible interest in all the subjects that are in their charge, then, on the admission of these very obstructionists, national progress will be considerably accelerated. As to how the reforms have been worked, the best testimony that could be produced is that of Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal. He was the most ardent and distinguished advocate, if not the originator, of the idea of wholesale opposition, and was the most strenuous opponent of Mr. Tilak's idea of "responsive co-operation." But after seeing the work of the legislatures for a year and over, he was compelled to abandon his own policy of indiscriminate opposition in favour of Mr. Tilak's policy of "responsive co-operation," which we need hardly add is at bottom identical with constitutional co-operation. It is worth while to quote Mr. Pal's words :

"After the experience of the new Councils, I frankly confess to-day that Mr. Tilak's political instinct was far more correct than mine; and the right policy for us, Nationalists, to-day would be to take up his old cry of responsive co-operation as a counterblast to the wild, unreasonable and intolerable tyranny of the present non-co-operation campaign....Unsatisfactory, inadequate and disappointing as the new Reforms have undoubtedly been, the new constitution of Governments in India offers, however, very large openings for Nationalist work. The Nationalists have so far kept themselves out of the new Councils. The Councils have been undoubtedly the weaker for this boycott. Yet the Government have not yet found it smooth sailing even with the present legislatures. The bureaucracy has been forced to come down from its high chair and seek the support of public opinion in many matters of vital importance. The ultimate decision rests no doubt in its hands, but precedents are being created every day which will be bound ultimately to expand the limits of popular freedom and develop a real democratic Government in the country. The Nationalists should therefore seek now to enter these Councils and direct and control the course of public policy from there."

Perhaps the strongest reason for rejecting the obstructionists' view is that it is not supported by the evidence on which it is supposed to be based. Among Congressmen, of course, there is a large majority against the entry into the Councils; but those who are in favour have no desire to go into the Councils for trying this fatuity of wholesale opposition. Of the 162 who favour entry into the Councils only 15 are for obstruction; the rest are wishful to go there for honest work, for extorting from the reforms the maximum of advantage. We have no misgivings as to the obstructionist view finding favour with the Congress as a whole. We feel sure that sound sense will assert itself in the end and that this proposal will be emphatically rejected. In the meanwhile, however, the Congress remains without the lead it sought from the Civil Disobedience Committee, but sought in vain.

CONSTANTINOPLE.

THE passing of the Ottoman Empire and its supersession by a Turkish Republic marks one of the really great events of the world's history: for it can but mark at the same time the final disappearance of the theory, according to which religious and secular functions form a unity, an indissoluble whole. The whole history of Islam up to the Turkish Revolution, as the history of Christendom up to the French Revolution, has been the history of an attempt to combine and amalgamate temporal and spiritual power in one single polity and to make that polity world-wide.

Religion originally was purely ethnic, national—witness early Hinduism, the religion of the primitive Greek and Roman City-State, Taoism and early Judaism. Like Buddhism, early Christianity presented a complete contradiction to this conception of religion—in that it was essentially universal, transcending the bounds of Nation and State. Hence the early clash between Cæsar and Christ. Rome, having outgrown the limits of a city-state and even of a Latin nation, strove under the

Caesars to satisfy that supra-national tendency by the creation of a world empire. In doing this it offered a solution for the very problem, for which Christianity offered an alternative: Cæsar's Empire on the one hand, and God's Kingdom "which is not of this world," on the other.

The fierce struggle between these two rival conceptions lasted for three centuries and ended in the complete defeat of Christianity. By offering to adopt the form of Christianity, the Empire led it away captive and confined it within its own boundaries. Henceforth the religion, which had been that of Humanity, became the religion of merely that part of humanity which was comprised within the Roman Empire and as a consequence the spread of the one depended on the spread of the other; the spiritual power of the one would henceforth have to subserve the temporal power of the other, whilst as a bribe, the temporal promised to sustain and defend the spiritual: as if compulsion and conviction were not mutually exclusive terms.

This happened in 313 A. D. and within fifteen years the Emperor, Constantine by name, had founded a city which was to embody this new idea of a World Empire expressing a World Religion, by becoming the world capital of both. Thus arose the city (Gk. *polis*) of Constantine, Constantinople; and for sixteen long centuries she has remained true to the purpose for which she was founded. True, the "world" of which she was capital, had shrunk much during the time of the successors of Constantine, who lost all Western Europe to the Northern barbarians and to their Pope; true, the world religion itself, since 1453 A. D. was no longer Christianity, but Islam: still, the symbol remained true: Constantinople, as of yore, was the World Capital of a World Religion expressing itself as a World Empire.

In the West, the Constantinopolitan ideal received its first blow in 800, when the Pope solemnly crowned Charlemagne to be "Holy Roman Emperor of Teutonic Nationality." For the very idea of an Emperor is his uniqueness—he is a world-ruler, or he is not *the* Emperor. The very existence of two Emperors and two Empires necessarily undermined the validity of the whole conception. Christendom in the West tenaciously clung to the ideal throughout the Middle Ages, 'tis true, but the distance between the ideal and the real grew greater and greater, the temporal power of the Emperor waned apace, until nothing but a shadow remained and a great name—and even that was surrendered in 1804, when the last of the Holy Roman Emperors of Teutonic Nationality contented himself to be but an Emperor of Austria. Since when "Emperor" and "Empire" have become courtesy titles; arrogated to himself by a Napoleon, won for himself by a Hohenzollern; heading a British Premier's Honours' List in 1877.

In the West, as the idea of Emperor and World-Empire declined, it was succeeded by that of Nationality. Universality was at a discount; the old

ideal of humanity organised as one politico-religious entity disappeared and for it was substituted the motto of modern diplomacy: "Every nation for itself and the devil take the hindmost." The Pope, as spiritual representative of the world ideal, had often encouraged individual Princes against their Emperor, in order to prevent the latter's temporal world power swallowing his own spiritual world power; now these Princes only too readily turned against him, as presenting a catholic ideal, which was naturally hostile to their own particularism. When the Reformation therefore gave them a theological basis for a revolt against the Papacy, not a few availed themselves of it and thereupon proceeded to "establish" a church of their own, which meant a national Christianity expressing itself in a national State: *i. e.* an atavistic reversion to the religion and polity of the old Greek City State. This condition still flourishes in the three Scandinavian kingdoms and lingers on in Great Britain (hence the "Ecclesiastical Establishment" in India!), but elsewhere has become altogether extinct. To the credit of Christianity it must be said, that so universal is it by its very nature, that it has never submitted for long, when forced to disguise itself as a "national" religion. As a consequence, wherever a "State Religion" has been introduced in modern times, "Sects" have made their appearance, "Nonconformists", who have obstinately refused to be dictated to by the State as to their religion. And in the conflict that has followed, the "Nonconformists" have everywhere come out victorious and in the end the State has had everywhere to issue its "Acts of Toleration" and to admit that a man might be a good citizen without adhering to the "national" religion. This was the English solution of the problem—religion becoming the private affair of each individual—though with its love of ancient forms, England had no more the heart of giving up the pretence of an "Established Church" than the wigs of its judges. This English solution has won its way everywhere—notwithstanding the French attempt during a few delirious years of their Great Revolution to solve the problem, by abolishing religion altogether. This attempt failed then: it failed again when a French Atheist Government twenty years ago essayed to "extinguish the lights of Heaven"; it has failed wherever tried, just as the English plan has succeeded wherever tried. And the English plan, after all, is based on the original plan of Christianity, which was universal, because spiritual; and by a divine paradox, because spiritual, individual.

In the East, the Constantinople ideal has held undisputed sway to our own days. Ever since Muhammad in 622 had to flee from his own city-state, Mahomedanism has made its appeal to the world as a world-religion. It aims at being the religion of Humanity, not of a mere section of it; it boldly transcends nationality, race, class, caste. And to the everlasting glory of Islam be it said, that it transcends them, not in theory only, but

also in practice. In that sense it vindicates its claim to be a universal religion; in that sense it spread and within a century or two had overrun the world from Granada to Malabar, from Turkestan to Timbuktoo. And in its spread it naturally accepted the Imperial concept of its time, the only idea of universality then available. In its onward march Islam almost everywhere found itself confronted and opposed by the Eastern Roman Empire: the clash thus was between one world-religion expressing itself in a world-empire, and another world-religion expressing itself in another world-empire. Both stood for the idea of a Religio-Political World State—the only question being which of the two alternative claimants was to prevail. The contest lasted for centuries, but year after year the Byzantine Empire shrank, until the last of the successors of Constantine fell, defending the last remnant of the old Empire, Constantine's city itself, and his Turkish protagonist, proudly seated on his charger, which pawed the dead bodies on the floor of St. Sophia the great cathedral church of the Christian Empire that had been, exultingly recited the creed of that Islamic world religion which had conquered and thereby transformed St. Sophia into the central shrine of Moslem Empire.

The East has retained that conception to our own days, undisturbed by the development which went on in the West and which had there culminated in the disestablishment of religion. And when we say the East, we not only mean the Moslem East, but the Christian East as well. For if the last of the Caesars fell in the person of Palaiologos in 1453, the line of the Caesars did not terminate, but re-emerged in its Russian form of Tsars, when a Grand Prince of Muscovy, Ivan the Terrible, (whose grandfather had married a Greek princess, a niece of Palaiologos) in 1547 caused himself to be crowned as " Tsar ". As Tsars, the Romanoffs felt themselves heirs to the imperial tradition of Byzantium; as Tsars they aspired naturally to reverse the verdict of 1453 and, when seated in their new-old capital Constantinople, to resuscitate the Christian World Empire of Constantine; as Tsar, the last of the Romanoffs started the world-war of 1914, so that he might wrest Constantinople from Mohammed and the Empire from the Turks.

He perished; not by the hand of Moslem rival, but of Russian subject. The revolutionary wave to end autocracy, which had begun in England in 1649, was taken up by France in 1789, and was continued throughout the Continent of Europe in 1848: at last, in 1917 reached also Russia; and as it engulfed the " Autocrat of all the Russias ", it swept away also the Cesaro-Papacy, which hitherto had made in Russia Church and State synonymous terms. The Soviet Rulers of a new Russia faithfully copied the French Revolution and, like them, for a time tried the abolition of all religion as the best method of abolishing the temporal pretensions of the Church and the spiri-

tual pretensions of the State. Failing in this, as fail they must, they are now more and more contenting themselves with letting religion be the private affair of the individual.

But no sooner was the Russian claimant to Constantinople out of the way, than a new one appeared in the person of the King of the Hellenes, Constantine I of Greece, and, as he loved to be called, Constantine VI of Byzantium. For whom indeed was Constantinople more clearly destined than to this Constantine, wedded as he was to Victory? (The name of the German ex-Kaiser's sister, whom he had married, was Victoria.) Alas for all such fancies—an exiled Prince of Glücksburg, carrying on an undistinguished existence at the fashionable watering places of Europe amongst throngs of other ex-royalty, is all that is left of the highflying ambitions of Empire.

Will the Greek nation have learnt its lesson this time? How fervently one hopes that they may; and how little one will be able to believe it, until they too have separated Church and State and will cease from looking upon their clergy abroad as so many *foci* of Greek nationalism and as natural instruments for the furthering of their own secular ends. Be that as it may: come, it must, sooner or later; and the best guarantee of it all is the joyful news that the last conqueror of Constantine's imperial city has refused to carry on the *damnosa hereditas* of the ages. By declaring the Ottoman Empire at an end, by proclaiming a Turkish Free State, by depriving the Khalifah of all temporal power, Ghazi Mustafa Kemal has cut the Gordian Knot,—and for the first time ordered progress towards freedom and self-determination is becoming possible throughout the Near East. The sinister identification of temporal and spiritual power, which has wrecked every country which has practised it, is at last removed from the fair lands of the Levant; the National Pact of Angora in 1920 is the earnest of a new and better future of a vigorous modern Turkey.

No country can hail this crowning event of the Turkish Revolution more joyfully than modern India, which herself can never attain to freedom and self-determination, as long as she has crores of citizens who insist on identifying spiritual with temporal allegiance to a foreign potentate and whose dream is not nationhood for India, but Empire for Islam.

Now that Constantinople has ceased to be anything but the chief town of a Vilayet and the Khalifah more than the spiritual head of a religion, we would ask our Moslem fellow-citizens to forget what lies behind of vain and mischievous politico-religious conceptions of a bye-gone age, and rather to stretch forth their hands toward the purely spiritual values of religion on the one hand, and, on the other to a wholehearted Hindu-Moslem fellowship of temporal work in which both parties can and must join, because in temporal matters we are Indian citizens first and last, and because India is the motherland of the one as much as of the other.

Supplement to

THE SERVANT OF INDIA

[POONA, THURSDAY 9th NOVEMBER 1922.]

[The following is the petition, signed by Mr. S. B. Bapat, President, and Messrs. N. C. Kelkar and A. V. Patvardhan, Secretaries of the Daxini Sansthan Hitawardhak Sabha (Deccan States Association), Poona, which was despatched to England on 3rd November, to be presented on behalf of the Sabha to the two Houses of Parliament.]

The humble petition of the Daxini
Sansthan Hitawardhak Sabha, Poona,
(India),

SHOWETH

That the Indian States (Protection against Disaffection) Bill, presented to the Indian Council of State under the exceptional procedure laid down in Section 67 B of the Government of India Act, 1919, and passed in that Council on 26th September, 1922, is

- (a) unnecessary, inasmuch as the Indian Princes really do not stand in need of such protection as is afforded by the Bill;
- (b) likely to have injurious effects on British Indian journalists as well as on the subjects of the Princes; and
- (c) not required by the treaties into which the British Government has entered with the Ruling Princes of Indian States, or by any other pledges made by the former to the latter.

In support of their first contention, viz. that it is unnecessary to give to Indian Princes the kind of protection provided for in the Bill, your petitioners would appeal to the voluminous evidence recorded by the Press Act Committee in 1921. Among the witnesses of various shades of opinion that appeared before the Committee there was not even one who stated that Indian Princes or their Administrations were being attacked in British Indian newspapers in such a violent manner as to necessitate a special measure giving them protection from such attacks. In this connection the petitioners would particularly refer to two European witnesses who stated definitely that to their knowledge such attacks were not made. Let Mr. Edwin Haward, Assistant Editor of the *Pioneer*, first speak. He is not a man who is likely to be insensible of the danger of seditious attempts if such a danger really existed. Mr. Haward was asked by the Hon'ble Sir William Vincent, Home Member in the Government of India: "Have you heard of any instance in which attempts have been made to promote sedition against Indian Princes?" to which question Mr. Haward returned the answer, "No, I know nothing of such attempts." The testimony of Mr. L. F. Rushbrook-Williams is even more weighty and convincing, for he occupies the responsible position of Director of the Central Bureau of Information, one of whose main functions is to keep in close touch with newspaper criticisms. The questions put to him and the answers given by him are given below:--

"QUESTION:—One of the powers which the Press Act gives us is that we may proceed against any newspapers under the Act by executive action if it promotes sedition and disaffection, against an Indian Prince. There is no such power given to us by the ordinary law of the land. Would you suggest that if we repeal the Press Act we should take certain powers for the protection of these Indian Princes not against criticism but against sedition and disaffection?"

ANSWER:—I have been in the country only a few years, Sir, and I have not had immediately under my notice any concrete examples which might fairly be taken as falling under the description you give. I have seen plenty of criticisms but nothing which I think can fairly be described as calculated to excite sedition against an Indian Prince.

QUESTION:— Suppose a newspaper made it a business to write articles against a Native Prince with a view to levying blackmail? Would you not deal with it effectively? Would you give us some special powers for that?

ANSWER:— I should not have thought so. I think the Indian Princes are well able to look after themselves. If there is any truth in the criticism, they may rectify the matter of which complaint is made; if there is not, well, it cannot damage them except in the eyes of Government, who presumably will know the facts. If an Indian Prince does not like criticism, there is no reason why he should be obliged to read the Journals containing it.

QUESTION:— Now as regards the prevention of disaffection concerning Indian States?

ANSWER:— I can only base my statement on my personal experience. During the course of my study I have not come across anything which in its substance went beyond the grounds of legitimate criticism.

QUESTION:— You have not seen anything beyond legitimate criticism and therefore you did not think any protection is necessary?

ANSWER:— Yes.

QUESTION:— You have said something about the protection of Indian Princes. If any very strong and virulent article was written in the vernacular Press about the Indian States, do you think it is likely that it would be brought to your notice in your official capacity?

ANSWER:— Yes. I certainly think so. The major portion of the more important newspapers passes through my office.

QUESTION:— May I take it that you have not come across any article so far written against the Indian States which in your opinion would justify the introduction of any provision in the ordinary law of the land?

ANSWER:— So far as my experience goes, Sir, that is so. I should be inclined to say that while the tone of some of the criticisms which have been directed against the Indian Princes can only be described as regrettable, the subject matter of the articles has been, to the extent of my knowledge, as a rule unobjectionable.

QUESTION:— You will agree with me that whether a certain matter is regrettable or not is a matter of opinion?

ANSWER:— That is certainly so, but within fairly well defined limits."

The fact is that so little information is vouchsafed to the public regarding affairs in the Indian States that already the complaint is loud that journalists either in British India or in the States are not properly discharging their duty in the matter of exposing the state of maladministration that prevails in many of the States. Considering how closely intertwined are the interests of the subjects of the British Government and the Indian States, it is surprising how rarely newspapers in British India concern themselves with acts of the rulers of States, though newspapers in States constantly deal with British Indian politics. The reason is that the government of Indian States is a sealed book to all but those who are actively engaged in it, while the government of British India is open to the scrutiny of all those who may care to study it. Your petitioners, of course, do not maintain that such criticism against Indian States as appears in British Indian papers, is always as fair or as well-informed as it should be. But the petitioners contend that legislation penalising seditious writings in newspapers will not be justified till it is proved that such writings are of frequent occurrence and have become a serious peril. The case of your petitioners is that this has not been proved; indeed, it can be proved on the Government of India's own showing that no serious evil has arisen which demands the remedy proposed by the Bill. The instances, quoted by the Hon'ble Sir William Vincent in the Legislative Assembly and by the Hon'ble Mr. J. P. Thompson in the Council of State, of attempts to stir up hatred or disaffection against Indian Princes must be regarded, *ex hypothesi*, as the very worst instances that have occurred recently; and yet not one of them answers to the description given in the Bill as justifying a measure specially directed against such attacks. If the criticisms were aimed at the British Government, the latter would certainly never worry about them, and would never think of launching a prosecution against them under Section 124A of the Indian Penal Code. It would be a great misfortune indeed if the British Government afforded to the Indian Princes protection of which, in similar circumstances, they would never think of availing themselves, protection, again, which creates a new offence for their own subjects. However, if perchance any newspaper issued in British India began habitually to criticise a State in an unfair manner and excited

disaffection among its subjects, the State has a weapon ready to its hand against that particular newspaper. It can, as suggested by Mr. Rushbrook-Williams, exclude that paper from its borders and thus prevent the mischief, without involving all the British Indian newspapers in the meshes of such a piece of legislation as is contemplated by the Indian States Bill.

While the Bill is thus unnecessary, it is sure, in the opinion of your petitioners, if enacted into law, to have injurious effects upon the public life both in British India and the Indian States. The little voice that is occasionally raised in British India against the misrule that prevails in not a few of the States will be effectually hushed if such a law is placed on the Statute book, and consequently the *morale* of British Indian journalists will be prejudicially affected. That the safeguards said to be provided in the Bill against its injudicious use by overzealous officers will not avail in actual practice, is clear from the very fact that certain effusions of a low type of press, characterised more by stupidity and vulgarity than by a deliberate intent to do mischief, effusions at which, in British India, officials would only smile and of which they would take no further notice, are produced by the representatives of the Government of India, as serious attempts to kindle a revolt, or create disaffection. But the people on whom the evil effects of this measure will weigh most heavily are of course the subjects of Indian States. The British Government, in enacting this Bill, simply puts the subjects of Indian States out of account, as if they did not exist, though, in fact, they are most vitally concerned in it. The British Government recognises certain obligations towards Indian Princes; it also recognises certain obligations towards its own subjects; but in the welfare of the subjects of Indian States it does not feel any direct interest. But your petitioners feel special concern in the interests of the States subjects, and therefore they wish to draw prominent attention to the harmful effects the Indian States Bill, when passed into law, will have upon them. There is no question that in most of the States the prevailing standard of administration is far more backward than in British India and that in some States misrule and oppression prevail. This was fully borne out by the Hon'ble Mr. Thompson himself in the Council of State on the 26th September:—

“I believe that much of the feeling which exists against this Bill is due to a conviction on the part of the members of the Legislature that there is a good deal of oppression and misrule in some of the Indian States. The feeling is a feeling which is based on humanity and it is a feeling which I honour and respect. I regret that I cannot deny the charge and I do not think that Ruling Princes themselves would deny it. It is true, too, that Government cannot always intervene even in cases which come to its notice.”

If it is admitted that a good deal of misrule and oppression prevails in Indian States and that the British Government is unable to prevent it, then surely the least that the British Government owes to the subjects of Indian States is that the little flicker of criticism that is found on too rare occasions to burn in British India should not be blown out by the British Government by its own action. As matters stand at present, there cannot arise a vigorous and independent press in Indian States; for some time to come the States subjects must rely upon the British Indian press for any effective criticism; the criticism that is now appearing in the newspapers of British India is very far from effective; and if even the little spasmodic criticism that does find its way to British Indian newspapers is silenced, there will be no check whatever on the autocracies that flourish in most of the States. England is noted for having afforded a safe asylum to patriot-exiles who in their adopted country planned the downfall of the autocracy in their native land. Will England now with her own hand stifle the little criticism that is being directed against misrule and oppression in States enjoying her own protection and owing allegiance to her?

But it is contended that the British Government is bound by its pledges to give the sort of protection which the Indian States Bill affords to Indian Princes. Of all the arguments advanced in support of the Bill, this has the least substance. No doubt there are many treaties and engagements, royal and vice-royal pronouncements, which speak in general terms of “perpetual friendship, alliance, and unity of interests” between the two contracting parties and the preservation intact of “the honour and rank and dignity” of the Princes, but apparently it did not occur to any one, either in British India or in Indian States till very recently, that is, probably till 1920, to construe them into a definite undertaking on the part of the British Government to penalise seditious writings directed against Indian States. If this interpretation had been accepted by the British Government from the beginning, the law that is now sought to be passed would have been in force for a century. As a matter of fact, no kind of protection has been given to the States so far except under the Regulation of 1823 (which was repealed in 1835) and the Press Act of 1910, on each occa-

sion for twelve years. What is more, on neither of these two occasions was the measure passed in redemption of the pledges made to the Ruling Princes. The Hon'ble Mr. Thompson no doubt stated as a matter of inference that "the protection which was given under the Press Act of 1910 must have been given in pursuance of those pledges," but adduced no evidence in support of this inference. Your petitioners feel morally certain that to the minds of those who were responsible for the Press Act the notion that their treaty obligations bound them to give protection to the Princes was never present. It is doubtful if before 1920 any Prince ever put forward such a claim; and, at any rate, it is quite plain that so late as July 1921 the Government of India did not allow it. For Sir John Wood, the then Political Secretary in the Government of India, when he appeared before the Press Act Committee, brought out all the implications of the treaty obligations, and pleaded that they were bound to give protection to the Princes; but this plea the Law Member and the Home Member in the Government of India emphatically rejected. This means that a meaning is now being read into the ancient treaties with Princes which almost till the other day no one ever thought of reading. It is interesting to see how the desired meaning is being evolved out of the treaties. The latter often stress the essential identity of interests between the British Government and the ruling Princes and say that "the friends and enemies of one shall be the friends and enemies of both." On the strength of these declarations, the Princes say to the British Government: "Our enemies you regard as your own enemies and pledge us all the support that you can give us against their machinations. But the category of enemies does not end with those who use their swords against us. In modern times, equally great, if not greater, mischief is done by those who wield pens. We'll manage our own fellows; we shall depend upon you to manage yours. You must see that there shall be no derogation from our character of respectability on account of criticism that appears in newspapers published within your borders." Your petitioners wish seriously to ask if the military alliances that were contemplated in these treaties are also to be interpreted to mean an alliance shutting out criticism against each other. Will not the British Government rather say to the Princes: "We shall protect you from foreign aggression and internal insecurity; but the respect that you will enjoy among your subjects will depend upon how you rule them." The Hon'ble Mr. Thompson held out a bait in the Council. He said: "Several of these States have interpreted their obligations so as to include the duty of providing protection for the British Government against what we may call seditious attacks. The principle underlying the clause which I have read is that of reciprocity in regard to the matters therein mentioned." Because the Princes interpret their treaty obligations in a particular way, is the British Government also to do so, apart from what the treaties may in fact mean? The Princes have not provided in their press laws a safeguard corresponding to the one which the present Bill contains, viz., that no prosecution can be initiated except when sanctioned by the Governor-General in Council. Have not the Princes reason to complain, on this theory of reciprocity, that the British Government is not sufficiently regardful of its pledges? Further, in the Indian States seditious speeches as well as writings against the British Government receive short shrift. Is it not then incumbent upon the British Government to penalise seditious speeches also, which, however, are outside the scope of the present Bill? Do not one's enemies work havoc with the spoken word just as they do with the written word and the sword, and is not the British Government bound to give succour to the Princes against enemies who adopt the weapon of the spoken word? One treaty is construed by the Hon'ble Mr. Thompson to require the British Government to mete out to a British Indian publisher of a lampoon against a Prince the same treatment that the Mogul Emperors might have been expected to mete out. Surely, this reasoning leads the British Government to the very edge of a precipice. It cannot accept these fantastic extensions of the limited obligations that the treaties imply without abrogating its character as a civilized Government. It must repudiate these obligations as flowing from the engagements which it has entered into with the Princes.

The prayer of your petitioners therefore is that the Indian States (Protection against disaffection) Bill may not receive the assent of His Majesty.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray, etc.

THE MULTAN RIOTS AND AFTER.

(From our Correspondent.)

THE story of the regrettable Moharrum riots that took place in Multan City on the 3rd and 4th of September begins with a *tazia* which was being taken in procession along a narrow street across which overhead telephone wires ran; the wires struck the *tazia* and the dome thereof was torn and came down. It was hastily stitched on, and some Hindus from adjacent shops helped the Moslems with thread and needle and in putting it back in its place. But the inauspicious event of the dome coming down enraged some of the mourners in the procession, who attributed the event to the owner of the wires who is a Hindu, and feelings ran very high. It is alleged that in the meantime a brickbat was thrown from the upper floor of a Hindu house, and that was sufficient to excite the inflammable portion of the Moslems. Panic and lawlessness followed, shops were looted, lathis were freely used and a Hindu stampede took place. All this took place in spite of the presence of a strong police guard with the *tazia* and of the fact that the Central Police Station of the City was not more than 50 yards away. No arrests were made and no serious attempt to nip the riot in the bud was made. After this the troops from the adjacent Cantonments were called out, but they arrived on the spot after about three hours and in the meantime the mob had done its work of destruction—looting of shops, desecrating Hindu temples and burning religious books, breaking idols, removing valuables from temple premises, molesting women, and burning looted articles too heavy to be removed. This was all on the 3rd. The presence of troops restored order, the police being unable (and, as Hindus allege, too partizan) to do so, and things were quiet for the rest of that day and night.

On the 4th an old Mahomedan was killed in a fight in a Hindu street and, as alleged, the rumour of a mosque having been burnt, enraged the already excited Moslems, and they had their full revenge on that day in spite of the troops. They desecrated more temples, burnt more houses, did not spare even the burning ground premises and, worst of all, as it is freely said, ravished some Hindu women in their houses. It is also said that a woman was stripped naked and was being dragged about in that condition in a street when a Hindu policeman saved her. All this is horrible, too horrible to think of. Both sides have to be thoroughly ashamed of the events if true: Moslems for freely resorting to the brutal and inhuman acts, and Hindus for not being able to protect their temples and even their women. But we are concerned more with the future than with the past.

We do not wish to emphasize what hooligans of both communities did in the two days of their madness and frenzy, but to smoothen matters and to narrow the gulf which has sprung between the two. The relations of the two communities at the present moment in that unfortunate city are bitter enough, but things are now less so than immediately after the event. In course of time they are bound to improve in spite of the present policy of pinpricks adopted by either side, and the authorities are doing their best to smoothen matters. But there are two points in connection with, or rather as a result of these riots, which are now agitating the minds of the citizens of Multan and which require mature and calm consideration by all

concerned, specially by the Punjab Government. These are (1) *kucha bandhi* or the closing of Hindu lanes by gates or doors and (2) the levy of compensation on the citizens for the benefit of those who have suffered, under Section 15A of the Police Act.

As one of the means of self-protection in case of such things recurring in future, the Hindus, immediately after the riots, put up scores of doors or gates across their lanes at the points where they branch off from the main street, without obtaining the permission of the municipal authorities. The municipality, where too unfortunately communal feelings are running high, connived at the lanes being thus shut up, in the abnormal state of things. The District Magistrate, or the Deputy Commissioner, is now inquiring into the matter of these illegally put up obstructions and intends to remove some of them. It does look rather awkward and unpleasant for a strong Government, and Governments should be strong, to admit, though in an indirect way, that it has been unable to prevent such riots resulting in loss of life (5 Hindus and 2 Muslims) and loss of lacs of rupees worth of property, not to speak of other brutalities; but things have to be faced squarely. The Hindus are evidently weaker physically and in numbers and will ever remain so in the Punjab; but they count upon full protection from the British Government. They argue: well, law and order were practically in abeyance for the two days in September last (for several reasons which need not be discussed in this article); is it not reasonable for us then to barricade our lanes as a means of self-protection in an emergency when arms are denied to us or, say, if you please, when we are too emasculated to use them? No sane man will argue that where an appreciable number of Mahomedan houses or a mosque is situated in a Hindu lane, it should be thus closed, even for an emergency. But where the lanes, wholly or mostly, contain Hindu houses, there should not be the least objection to the gates or doors being allowed to remain, now that they are already there. It is hoped that the local authorities will not by their action lead the Hindus to believe that the Government wishes to make the weak community still weaker and that they side with the stronger, irrespective of the justice of the case.

The other question immediately affecting the Multanis is the payment of compensation to the injured of both communities for the loss of property, limb or life. They, in any case, must be paid, and money must be found for it. It was suggested and agreed to by the Hindus in a moment of generosity, that a common fund should be raised by the citizens of Multan City and District, without apportioning the amounts contributable by the two communities, that is, without going into the question of who was responsible for the unfortunate riots; but the idea was opposed by the Hindus subsequently. This proposed joint fund had no doubt the appearance of a voluntary fund, but as it was organized by Government officers, the Hindus thought later that when due pressure, inevitable in such cases, will be put upon them, being the richer community, they would have to pay much more than the other community, whose hooligans had broken into their temples and insulted their women. Thus not only would the other community escape to a great extent the penalty of the misdeeds of their badmashes, but those very hooligans would feel encouraged and Moslem leaders would not take the trouble of checking them in any way in the future. The idea had therefore to be dropped. It may be mentioned in passing that after enquir-

ing into the whole case Hakim Ajmal Khan and Pandit Malaviya came to the conclusion that as the damage to the Hindus was much greater, and the Moslems had given much greater offence a much larger compensation should necessarily come from them for the satisfaction of the victimised Hindus. This was not accepted by the Moslem leaders of Multan, on the advice offered to them by their well-wishers. Thus the Congress leaders too could not solve the difficulty of compensation money.

Now Section 15 A of the Police Act is being put into operation for collecting compensation money, which empowers the District Magistrate to apportion the amount among the citizens of Multan, or a section or class of them. Thus the law contemplates that when it is found or proved that only a class or a section of the population is at fault, only that class or section should be punished with the levy, and not the whole town. In fact while unavoidably punishing the innocent, in cases where the actual culprits cannot be found out or money cannot be recovered from them, the circle of innocents made liable for payment should be narrowed down as far as possible. It was on this principle that only the Parsis and Mahomedans of only two wards of the City of Bombay were assessed for compensation money payable to the Tramway Company after the riot of 1919. To levy money on the whole town, Hindu and Moslem alike, without regard to the losses suffered by each, is looked upon by the Hindus as adding insult to injury. They indignantly assert that if they are penalised, though they have suffered so heavily and almost exclusively, they can only say that Government is not treating them fairly and justly but taking sides with the stronger community. The local officers cannot perhaps be expected to take a detached and unbiassed view, especially when communal interests are clashing; but the Government in Lahore can, and let us hope the matter will be fairly and satisfactorily decided by them.

A REMARKABLE EDUCATIONAL REPORT.

II.

In the previous article we have followed the Gold Coast Committee's scheme for a child's education—Kindergarten from 3 to 5 years of age, Infant School from 5 to 8, Primary School from 9 to 15, being the respective minimum ages. As we shall presently see, it is not expected that the majority of pupils will get through the whole of this course at all, let alone at these minimum ages. Before dealing with them, we shall now however turn to the—possibly small—minority who get through their 7th standard of a Primary School and seem fitted for higher education.

In India we would at this point find ourselves in an Intermediate College; at Accra they propose—a Secondary School. This again is characteristic. Words after all are not capricious trifles: they signify. A School Leaving Certificate from a Secondary or Middle School does sound different from that of an uncompromisingly "Primary School". The worst enemy of education is not the ignorant, but the semi-educated—and there is nothing more devastatingly semi-educated than the lad who has managed to get through the 7th

standard. To make him believe that this education is more than primary, i. e. of more than the most elementary nature is no kindness; still less is it, to make a pupil who proceeds further fancy that he is now a "College student". We only wish that this eminently sound nomenclature could be imported from West Africa into India!

Education at "the Secondary School" as proposed by the Committee, differs from all that has gone before in that it is purely boarding and purely English. The Accra "Secondary School" therefore knows of no day scholars; all pupils are to be accommodated in houses, where a House Master would live with a maximum of 30 boys; thus enabling the former to exert to the full his influence for the making of character, and the latter to imbibe "those habits of punctuality, regularity, good manners, self control, responsibility and discipline, which are so necessary in the life of the country to-day" and which are acquired not by cramming, but only by the mutual impact of personalities. Only by such a house-system and its intimate and continuous contact between pupils and staff can "quiet methodical study be provided, without either cram or overstrain on the one hand or laziness or too much slackness on the other." Only thus, finally, will these boys be led "to a sound and correct knowledge of English, that they may think, and even dream in good English. The object of all this is obvious, namely, that all higher study, every avenue of knowledge, all facilities of spending leisure hours with profit and pleasure can only come from a thorough grasp of the English language and literature".

As a consequence, the first two years spent at this "Secondary School" will be devoted merely "to widen and deepen the Primary Instruction", not to introduce new subjects. The same subjects which were taught in the 7th standard of the Primary School, are to be the subjects of this two-years' work—combined "and varied with much handwork in garden, drawing office, and carpenter's shop. But the greatest emphasis will be on English." This policy seems to us supremely right and its absence the main defect of Indian education. To save time, as we think, we change simultaneously medium of instruction and subjects of instruction: but how can children possibly master and assimilate both at the same time? The result in the majority of cases, is to kill interest in the subject; to force our unfortunate youth to concentrate on memory, so as to be able to repeat correctly set answers (in an incompletely understood language) to set questions (on an incompletely understood subject). We expect the impossible, of a mind so flexible as to be capable of adjusting itself simultaneously to new knowledge and to a new medium of knowledge—and we end by almost preventing our children from assimilating knowledge at all. The result is, that they do not think for themselves, that they lose all the initiative with which their intellect is naturally endowed, that they sink into the slave mentality of copyists and

never acquire the burning desire for original research. And if anybody considers this judgment too severe, one would ask him what contribution to modern thought—of the sort that Sir Jagadish Bose is making—the lakhs, not to say millions, of Indians have made, who, during this century alone, have undergone a university education: and how the proportion of the Jagadish Boses to the total number of Indian graduates compares with that of the great original investigators of other lands?

"Above all", says our Gold Coast Report, will the pupil "be encouraged to think for himself and express his thoughts clearly. Right methods rather than accurate results will be welcomed." And after two years of such maturing, and even then only if the "boy has completed his general training to the satisfaction of the Head Master," is he permitted to proceed to the next two years' course, which is intended to specialize and prepare the student for immediate entrance into Inn of Court, Hospital, University or to whatever analogous institution his desired profession directs him. The careers contemplated are Engineering, Medicine, Law, Commerce, Teaching, Forestry and Agriculture and, pending the formation of a West-African University (advocated by our authors), the passing out of the "Secondary School" at a minimum age of 19, would mean in most cases finishing up one's education at an English University. But for teachers, a four years' course at a local training college is provided; similarly a Forestry and an Agricultural College are to be started locally; whilst students wishing to qualify as engineers are to be drafted into the Public Works Department as apprentices and after five or six years pass locally examinations set by the English Examining Bodies for Civil or Electrical Engineers.

III.

We have so far dealt with the, perhaps very small, minority of children, whose mental equipment marks them out for higher education. But there will be many casualties on the way. Some may be unfit for more than the first few standards of the Primary School; others may have to stop as the top of that School is reached. Already no child is allowed to remain in an Infant School after the age of 12; no boy of 16 who has not passed Standard IV in a Primary School. What is it proposed to do with them?

It is here that another very interesting group of proposals is being made in the nature of Industrial or Trade Schools which "we consider as very necessary to the development of the education of the country." For the two types of boys are now to be drafted into Junior and Senior Trade Schools respectively instead of being allowed to remain undeveloped, because they happen to be slow at book work. Handicraftsmen need education equally, though of another nature, to develop to the maximum of their personal capacity, in which they should make themselves as useful to

the commonwealth, as their intellectually more gifted brethren, though in a different manner.

In the Junior Trade Schools children would "be taught various simple trades, especially those of use in helping and extending native handicraft", such as weaving, plaiting, pottery, brick making, simple house building, blacksmithing, leather work, farming. But even here these trades are to "be taught for two-thirds of the school week only, but one-third must be given to the continuation of English writing and reading, plain arithmetic, dealing with the work arising from their trade, making out bills and so on, and some simple teaching in hygiene and geography."

"From the Primary School Standards V, VI, VII there should be a steady flow into the Senior Trade Schools" intended for the type of boy who could thereby become a railway apprentice, or fit himself for a subordinate career in Public Works, Surveying &c. "At least one Senior Trade School should be devoted entirely to agriculture and allied subjects", and "we are of opinion that few trades only should be taught at each Senior Trade School, but that in the Junior there should be greater variety."

It should be mentioned that our authors suggest that all these Trade Schools be boarding schools and, like the Secondary School, aim "at deep influence, not large numbers in any one School. The Boarding School provides an opportunity of cultivating and developing corporate life to a degree impracticable in a Day School. One of the finest elements in normal African society is the strong communal sense. European education and civilization tend to the development of the individual, and the older communistic ideas are weakened. An objection sometimes raised against the Boarding School system in Europe that the boy loses at an impressionable age the benefits of the Home influence, has no force in this country at the present time."

We have quoted the whole passage, though evidently not applicable *in toto* to Indian conditions, at least as far as the grade of Junior Trade Schools is concerned. But it is surely interesting to see how this Report tries to deal not only with the surface, but with the very substance of the educational problem and in this connection we should add that the boarding system is specially advocated because it makes possible the establishment of School Courts and the regularization of the principle that "the boys should be trusted to settle all minor disputes themselves and that only the more important cases should be referred to the Principal." On the other hand, our authors do not advocate the boarding school system, so that they may "systematize" every least fraction of a boy's life: on the contrary, they emphasize that in "preparing time tables for the school outside class-hours, every moment of the day and night should not be tabulated. Room must be left for the exercise of natural and legitimate freedom."

The Report does not seem to mention the age

limit, up to which children are to be kept in these trade schools; but it is evident that they do not contemplate the age of 14 as the end of most education. They distinguish clearly between the infant (up to 8 years of age), the child (8-14) and the adolescent (above 14), and are obviously very much alive to the fact that if education stops at the close of the "child" stage, the "adolescent" in most cases will rapidly forget all that he has learnt previously, and be, perhaps, even worse off, than if he had had no schooling at all. As a matter of fact, it is the adolescent alone, who is just beginning to learn in the full sense of the word: "it is the time for their wits to be sharpened, not laid to rust. Therefore, the extra discipline of 3-4 years in a good boarding school to lead them to manhood and a profession simultaneously may be the making of them both in character and mental capacity."

It would therefore seem that these Educationists have in view a system of education, whereby every boy remains at school until 17-19 years old—be it at a trade or a secondary school: and in this the Report of course only lays down boldly and definitely, what Mr. Fisher's Education Act tried to do haltingly and halfheartedly. One only hopes that in India too the conviction will become general that to content oneself with schooling up to the age of 12 or 14, is to achieve anything but universal education; and, "education" not being a synonym for bookiness, that the great desideratum is the introduction of trade schools—in our case, that is, agricultural schools—after the Gold Coast model.

CONTINENTAL LETTER.

BRESLAU, 12-10-22.

INEVITABLY, as a rock hurtling down the mountainside, does the German *mark* rush further and further on its downward course. This recent daily and rapidly increasing, depreciation is intimately connected with a change of attitude, which has gained more and more ground during the last few weeks. Hitherto one looked upon the German currency as "sick", but by no means hopeless; nowadays more and more people of all classes consider it as irrecoverably lost. Whence a general *saute qui peut* follows and even small peasants and the man-in-the-street flee before the *mark*. At one time, everybody bought goods to save the money which depreciated in one's hands; to-day people buy foreign exchange which has been recognized as a far more simple method of protecting oneself against the lamentable devaluation of one's money. The moment one gets one's pay, one changes the *marks* one receives into Dutch *guilders* or English *sterling* and is thus proof against the fairy gold which turns into dry leaves when one wants to use it. As a consequence the currency of foreign money has increased to such an extent in Germany, as to endanger the whole economic life of the country. The thing has reached such a pass that some shops refuse to sell at all, except against Swiss *francs*, sterling, guild-

ers &c. ! But since the purchasing power of the *mark* inside Germany after all still remains above that which it commands outside, such dodges naturally embitter people and the Government is being pressed to take decisive steps against a development which automatically reduces the *mark's* value further and ever further.

A mere prohibition of selling and buying in foreign currencies, as is imminent, will however not produce any radical change. More useful would seem the plan of an internal Gold Loan, which would guarantee to the investor interest and capital amortization, not in paper, but in gold marks. Since the *mark* in future would thus no longer have to bolt into foreign exchanges, its depreciation would therefore naturally slow down. Plausible as the idea is in theory, in practice it is not likely to be a success on account of the universal lack of confidence. For what citizen would confide his money to a country, over which there stands menacingly a foreign executioner with his sword; a country which is no longer mistress of her own, but depends on the behests of foreigners?

This era of the "Self-Determination of People" has received a further illustration in the example of Austria. Its Clerical Government had hit upon the idea of a masked incorporation into Italy, in order to stop the country's bankruptcy and to purchase a new lease of life. The plan had gone pretty far already, when the jealousy of the "Great" Powers—including France's protégé, Czechoslovakia—wrecked it. As a substitute the League of Nations was put forward and the Geneva scheme of succour now consists of a credit of 650 million gold crowns, which several countries have opened at the price of a Reform programme which includes: the abandonment of all nationalized undertakings which do not pay their way; the dismissal of all superfluous officials; the enhancement of all railway &c. tariffs; heavier taxation; and—the repeal of the *Eight-Hour day*! Of course, if one is bankrupt, one has got to cut down expenses: that goes without saying. Still, it must be remembered that one eighth of the population (of the little Austria that is left) are officials (of the former Austrian Empire) and their dependents and that therefore their dismissal would only increase still further the misery of the unhappy population. Still, if the country could be saved that way, however painfully, the people might reconcile themselves to the method. But could it? The Peace of St. Germain resulted in a mutilated creature, quite incapable of a separate economic life of its own, and it is therefore more than doubtful whether Austria, even at the cost of such vast new sacrifices and dolours, could attain to any complete recovery. And consider, how these methods are to be carried out: the Austrian Parliament is simply to abdicate all its functions for two years and in its place is to be put a Committee of the Guarantor States, sitting at Geneva, functioning through a High Commissioner to be stationed in Vienna! The forced de-democratization of Europe

progresses irresistibly as a consequence of the Versailles Treaty. As in the Saar Territory half a million highly cultured people have been done out of their political rights for 15 years, so now in Austria we get a whole country politically put into Chancery. Quite apart from the indignity of the procedure, what Austrians fear most is the fact that the Geneva Committee, in whose hands they are to be put without any chance of resistance, may at any time command a majority of Frenchmen, Poles, Czechoslovakians—notorious enemies of everything German, who open to the wretched German Austrians a doleful vista indeed of this "economic sanitation programme" of theirs. Austrians, especially the Socialist parties, are therefore up in arms against it—but it is questionable whether they are powerful enough to frustrate the League's plan.

In the neighbouring country of Italy the Socialists certainly are at present reduced to complete impotence. Whatever one's own attitude to the various points of their programme, it certainly was a politically progressive one, and to see how such a one can suddenly give way to an ultra-reactionary programme amongst millions of voters, is really enough to frighten anybody. Yet such is the case in Italy, where recently the political power of the Socialists has shrunk to the dimensions of the *mark's* purchasing power. At least five sixths of all formerly Socialist organizations have corporately and individually gone over to the party of wildest jingoism and nationalism—the Fascists. Fascism is the party which bases itself frankly on force as a political method; and a pretty illustration of its mentality comes from the Southern Tirol—the purely German district which the Entente's victory had enabled Italy to annex: the same Italy which for so long and with such righteous indignation had apostrophized the world on the iniquity of allowing Italian districts to languish under the Austrian yoke. Anyhow, the Southern tirol, German as far as history will take us, was annexed by Italy, though it must gladly be acknowledged that the Italian Government refused to resort to those methods of gross oppression which the less civilized amongst the victor nations deemed their good right. Such "weakness" has naturally provoked the Fascisti. As a consequence organized masses of them have recently invaded this province, driven all the officials from their posts, closed all German schools and established a reign of terror amongst the defenceless population. The Government, feeling itself utterly powerless towards this Bolshevism of the Right, has allowed all these occurrences to take place, without daring to take any counter-measure. What the end of all this abdication of the State's authority is going to be, is somewhat difficult to foresee—for brute force ever demands the use of more force and yet more force. Already Mussolini, the leader of the Fascisti, is virtual dictator of Italy and those opposed to him belong to so many mutually quarrelling parties, as to be politically powerless.

Unlike the two German Socialist parties which have hitherto been in existence, but have recently closed their ranks, the better to fight reaction, the Italian Socialist Party must needs choose this moment in the political history of their country, to split up into two bitterly hostile camps! One of these two groups looks fixedly towards Moscow—though in the rest of Europe's Socialist parties the credit of Moscow has never been so low before. The reason for this must be sought partly in the luxurious life alleged against the Soviet representatives abroad, partly in the theoretical inconsistencies in which the "New Economic Policy" involves its authors. More and more does this practical and intellectual dishonesty put people off—in Germany for instance, where the Independent Socialists for years after the Revolution never could mention Russia without getting into a perfect ecstacy of enthusiasm, even Radical Communists nowadays less and less quote the Russian example. The worst case of complete surrender of all their principles was surely the Urquhart agreement—which indeed has now been refused ratification, but apparently only, in order to compel Great Britain to recognize the Soviet Government. This agreement, it will be remembered, gave back to Mr. Leslie Urquhart's Company the whole of the vast possessions they owned in Siberia and the Ural before the Revolution. It stipulated that the Company has the right to take on or dismiss workers on their property, as they like; that Trade Unions are not allowed to interfere in the administration or method of management; that taxation is limited to 8 p.c. on the gross value of the production and finally, the Russian Government is precluded from enacting any laws contrary to the tenour of the agreement! Surely there never was such a surrender of every social principle in favour of a capitalistic individualism; and people like Stinnes must indeed envy the Urquhart Company its sovereign position towards its workers. Such provisos, as the guarantee against any factory legislation and the extraordinary low rate of taxation, are certainly unparalleled anywhere else in Europe.

The negotiations with Mr. Urquhart have clearly shown, how much the Russian Government's attitude to foreign governments has changed. The one thing aimed at, is to make one's influence felt in European politics. The old Tsarist traditions are taken up again, anti-British sentiments in Asia Minor are being fostered; the French politician Heriot is received at Petrograd with an exceptional show of honour; in the Turkish conflict, Poincaré is backed as against Lloyd George—in short, Russia once more begins to flirt with its ally of olden days. Lloyd Georgian politics are no doubt responsible for a good deal of all this; but the main point is that Russia has returned to the old Tsaristic diplomacy with all its international machinations and bid for imperialistic gains. A tragic look-out indeed for any genuine pacifist, who in spite of all the terrible lessons which the world has received since 1914, still sees in all countries the old policy triumphant—the policy of brute force.

LEVIN L. SCRÜCKING.

BOOKS OF THE DAY

ON

Indian Politics.

	Ra. A.
1. Martial Law Administration in the Punjab with an introduction. By Sir P. S. Shivaswami Aiyar	0 14
2. My Motherland. By Prof. T. L. Vaswani	1 8
3. Mughal Administration. By Jadunath Sirkar, M. A.,	2 0
4. The National Congress. Its Evolution. By A. S. Rajam.	1 8
5. National Self-Realisation, By S. Stoke.	1 8
6. The New India, A simpler explanation of the Reforms. By Sir Narayan Chandavarkar, Kt.	0 8
7. Gandhian Non-Co-operation, or Shall India Commit Suicide? A Vademecum against Non-Co-operation for Indian Patriots	0 14
8. Non-Co-Operation, in its Historical and Practical Aspects. By Sir N. Chandavarkar	0 4
9. The Press under the Press Act. By K. Vyasa Rao, B. A.	0 2
10. Problem of Reform, in the Government of India (Transaction No. 2, New Fabian Society, Madras).	1 0
11. The Public Services in India. By Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru	0 13
12. The Reforms Explained. By Prof. V. G. Kale... ..	1 0
13. The Revolt in the East. By Bernard Houghton	1 8
14. The Sedition Committee Report (1918).	1 0

Theosophical Publishing House.

Adyar

Madras.

AND

INDIAN BOOK SHOP

55 Meadows Street.

Fort, BOMBAY.

ADVERTISEMENT.

'Eminent Doctors of England, America, Africa nay of every part of the world, admire and strongly recommend to the sufferers, our infallible Cure for Gonorrhoea, Gleet, Syphilis, Impetency and Granulation (eye diseases). If you want the surest cure for any, please apply with 2 annas postage for particulars to:—

G. R. KHORANA,
LYALLPUR.

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 COSSI 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.....

THE
Servants of India Society
PAMPHLETS.

1. Self-Government for India under the British Flag— 0-8-0 by the Rt. Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, President, Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. pp. 91.	0-8-0
2. The Public Services in India— 0-10-0 by Mr. Hirday Nath Kunzru, Senior Member Upper India Branch, Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. pp. 175.	0-10-0
3. The Congress-League Scheme: An exposition— 0-6-0 by the Rt. Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, President, Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. pp. 66.	0-6-0
4. The Co-operative Movement— 1-0-0 by Mr. V. Venkatasubbaiya, Member, Servants of India Society and Mr. V. L. Metha, Manager, Bombay Central Co-operative Bank Ltd. Bombay. Crown 16 mo. pp. 191.	1-0-0
5. The Medical Services in India— 0-8-0 by an I. M. S. Officer. Crown 16 mo. pp. 58.	0-8-0
6. Trade Union Legislation— 0-4-0 by A Labour Advocate. Crown 16 mo. pp. 32.	0-4-0
7. The Conscience Clause for Indians in Indian Education Codes (With a reply to certain Criticisms)— 0-8-0 by The Rt. Hon. Mr. V.S. Srinivasa Sastri, President, Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. pp. 67.	0-8-0
8. Hindu Law in the New Era— 0-10-0 by K. K. Gokhale Esq., Sub-Judge, Jath State Crown m.o. pp. 80	0-10-0

These books can be had of:—

1 The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City.

2 The Bombay Valbhav Press, Bombay.No.4.

Hon'ble Prof. V. G. Kale's Works.

	Es.s.p.
1. Indian Economics— 8-0-0 (4th edition). Featherweight paper Demi. 8 vo. pp. 700. Cloth Bound. Revised & enlarged.	8-0-0
2. Gokhale and Economic Reforms— 2-0-0 Crown 16 mo. pp. 250. Cloth Bound.	2-0-0
3. Indian Administration— 3-0-0 (4th edition). With additional chapters on the Reforms Act. Demi. 8 vo. pp. 528. Cloth Bound.	3-0-0
4. The Reforms Explained— 1-0-0 Demi. 8 vo. pp. 100.	1-0-0
5. Indian Industrial and Economic Problems— 1-8-0 (2nd edition). Crown 16 mo. pp. 340.	1-8-0
6. India's War Finance and Post-War Problems— 2-0-0 Crown 16 mo. pp. 164. Cloth Bound.	2-0-0
7. Currency Reform in India— 1-0-0 Crown 16 mo. pp. 120.	1-0-0
8. Dawn of Modern Finance in India— 2-0-0 Crown 16 mo. pp. 154.	2-0-0

These books can be had of:—

1. The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City.

HINDU LAW.

(3rd Edition.)

BY

J. R. GHARPURE, Esq., B. A., LL B., (Hons.)

High Court Vakil, Bombay.

Price Rupees Ten, Postage Extra.

Copies can be had at:—

The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City.