

THE Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE

Office : KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY.

VOL. VI, No. 33. }

POONA—THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1923.

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

CONTENTS.

TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	385
ARTICLES :—	
Boycott of British Goods ...	388
Personal Union.—III. By Dr. H. C. E. Zacharias	389
Malabar Land Tenures.—VIII. Fair Rents. By P. Kodanda Rao ...	391
CONTINENTAL LETTER. By Professor Levin L.	
Schucking ...	393
REVIEW ...	394
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
Rendition of Berar. By B. Ramakrishna Rao ...	395
SUPPLEMENT :—	
A Message to the Nation. From V. S. Srinivasa Sastri

TOPICS OF THE WEEK

MADRAS has given an influential lead to the other provinces by arranging a very big demonstration at the Gokhale Hall on Friday last to protest against the Kenya decision. All political parties joined enthusiastically in this demonstration, the speakers being drawn from every section of opinion: the Liberals were represented by Dewan Bahadur Govindraghava Aiyar and Mr. G. A. Natesan, the National Home Rule Leaguers by Dr. Besant and Mr. Arundale, the Swarajists by Mr. A. Rangaswami Aiyengar (Mr. Satyapurti was unavoidably absent), the Gandhian Non-co-operators by Maulana Yakub Hasan, and the Independents by Rao Bahadur T. Ranga-chariar. One of the resolutions recommended action through the Legislature, namely, giving effect to the principle of reciprocity, not only in respect of immigration, but in respect of franchise, trade facilities, employment in the public services, etc. This resolution of course cannot be supported by no-changers, but it speaks very highly of their sincere desire to make a united effort in getting the Kenya decision reversed that they did not offer active opposition to this resolution as they would otherwise have done, but allowed the resolution to be carried by those who believe in Council action, themselves refraining from voting. Mr. Yakub Hasan himself seems to stand at the present moment at the extreme left of non-co-operation, setting his face as strongly as Mr. Rajagopalachar himself against Council entry, whether for consti-

tutional opposition or for blind obstruction. That he assumed an attitude of benevolent neutrality to the above resolution may be taken, we suppose as a guarantee that nowhere will the Non-co-operators mar the much-needed unity by intruding their individual dogma into a question on which there is such a large measure of agreement. It is also creditable to the Swaraj party that they did not insist upon the adoption by the meeting of uniform obstruction in Councils, which is their distinctive creed. The resolutions passed were those which were agreed to at a conference held in Bombay on the 26th August. They may indeed be said to constitute the greatest common measure of agreement among the politically-minded in India, and it is to be hoped that no discordant note will be struck anywhere.

* * *

Vasishtha and Vishvamitras.

THERE is thus an almost complete unanimity amongst active politicians, but in certain quarters where an idealised view of politics is held or affected, a tendency is discernible to object to these measures as proceeding from anger and ill-will instead of, from love and good-will. To our mind there is nothing immoral in a demonstration of indignation, which is the principal object we have in view. The objection rests upon an entire misconception of the place held by anger in morals and the legitimate offices performed by it. Like all other emotions and impulses, anger is a great and useful force of human nature and so cannot be spared without rendering feeble the interests we have at heart. In a study on "Anger: its Religious and Moral Significance"*, just published, Professor G. M. Stratton shows that there is nothing inherently wrong, or blameworthy in anger; on the contrary, if it is organised and disciplined, it can be enlisted to righteous causes with great benefit inasmuch as it supplies such energy and vigour as placid good-will, which is often another name for spiritual poverty and torpor, never does. He says:

Anger and hatred, impossible as masters, make good servants if serving the impulse that is without blame. They are foot-loose, like celibates, ready to be sent where the work calls. And so great is the energy that it would be imprudent to refuse them employment, merely because they had been under bad masters in the past.

* * *

Professor Stratton continues:—

The use of anger in the past has been to give a flare to the fire of energy, especially when the obstacle comes

* George Allen and Unwin. London. 8s. 6d.

from one's fellows. Anger then is for the extraordinary moment, for the emergency and not for constant use. There is no call upon us to do the day's work with scowl and gnashing teeth. But I see every reason for potential anger that upon occasion becomes kinetic; every reason for steady moral antipathies existing perhaps as banked fires, but ready at the shortest notice to burst into a flame that will set the whole engine awl. The multitude of inconvenient subversive antipathies have made us timorous of them all. But let us have little faith in a love of goodness that means no hatred of evil, in an earnest desire for justice to the poor man that implies no cordial antagonism to the particular instances and representatives of injustice to him.

Indignation is needed to offset the advantage which otherwise will accrue to wrong. For the selfish and destructive effort of men is well supported by wrath; they apply with a free hand this bellows to the flame. If men will not forego anger in the service of harm, is there not something like a military necessity to enlist it for decency and good-will? The situation is not wholly unlike that of our government, which cannot afford to disarm until all disarm. The man of good-will must be prepared to be angry as long as others are prepared. We shall not rightly lay aside this instrument for the communal purpose until it shall cease to be used for partial and ill-considered ends.

And Prof. Stratton's conclusion is that there is need for "bringing our anger-responses into the service of the interests that deserve to be supreme." If thus our public life has need for Vasishthas, it has no less need for Vishvamitras.

* * *

OBJECTION is also taken to the proposed measures on the ground that they are retaliatory and prompted by a vindictive spirit. They misunderstand our object who think that, in taking these measures, we only wish to retort upon our enemies the injury they have done to us. Nothing of the kind; but we do wish to bring to bear upon them all the pressure we legitimately can in order to compel them to reverse their unjust policy. Some persons institute a comparison between these "retaliatory measures" and the method of non-co-operation and draw from it inferences to the advantage of the latter. Non-co-operation, it is said, is but a purificatory process, by which we, primarily, cleanse ourselves of all our impurities, and, only secondarily, bring our opponents to reason by undergoing sacrifices ourselves, without inflicting any harm upon them. This is, of course, an altogether undeserved glorification of non-co-operation, even as it is a fantastic debasement of retaliation to represent its advocates as desirous of doing sheer harm. In truth non-co-operation and retaliation have this in common, that they both aim at exerting a coercive pressure upon those who place themselves in opposition, and the character of non-co-operation was truly analysed by Dr. Case, when, with a real insight, he called it a method of "non-violent coercion." In exerting such a pressure, we have necessarily to make sacrifices, but our sacrifices are not aimless. They will have achieved their object if they succeed in moving our opponents from the wicked purpose by withholding from them certain advantages which they were till then

enjoying. If thus we incidentally do them any harm, our aim certainly is to have our wrongs rectified, and both in undergoing sacrifices ourselves and in imposing them upon our adversaries, retaliation and non-co-operation work in exactly the same way. There is no reason to regard non-co-operation as more exalted than retaliation.

* * *

MANY persons, however, who approve of the idea of retaliation,

boggle at the phrase. They approve, for instance, of the proposal to refuse entry into India to the nationals of those countries which ill-treat us, or to exclude them from our public service or our franchise, etc. Surely this is retaliation if anything is. And we do not know of any one who does not, in theory at any rate, admit India's claim to a mutual equality of rights and obligations. The Imperial Conference admitted it in 1918 and Mahatma Gandhi admits it. There is essentially as much retaliation in such exclusion as there is, for instance, in the boycott of British or Imperial goods, of the very idea of which some people profess a horror. There is naturally a considerable difference of opinion as to the expediency of these various measures, and we for our part have grave misgivings as to the desirability of launching upon a commercial boycott without providing several safeguards. But in principle we do not see how boycott differs from any reciprocity measure, for instance. If it is contended that we should not penalise the British people for the errors of the British Government—an objection on which much stress was laid by Mahatma Gandhi—our answer is that the objection applies equally to the exclusion of Colonials from India, to which Mahatma Gandhi has no objection. Why should the subjects of a Colony, on the same reasoning, be refused ingress because its Government pursues a wrong-headed policy towards Indian settlers? If, then, the principal objection to the boycott is that, in starting it, we are unable to fit the punishment to the offence or that we unnecessarily and unjustly extend the area of punishment, there is no measure of reciprocity which is wholly free from it. Those critics, therefore, who, with an air of lofty superiority, shrug their shoulders at the mention of the boycott of Empire goods, must in consistency abandon all plans about reciprocity arrangements.

* * *

NOT agreeing with the Indian interpretation of the Kenya decision, the *Times of India* was much less

to be expected to agree with the Indian proposals to meet the situation created by that decision. But still one would hardly have thought the paper to be capable of arguing in the way it does. Retaliation is of course valueless and worse, because it will only recoil on the heads of those who indulge in that kind of talk. Self-government will not necessarily be an open sesame, for self-govern-

ing countries have not been able to remove all the disabilities attaching to their nationals resident in foreign countries. But it is not enough for the *Times* to admit that self-government by itself will not be adequate; we are gravely told that it will as a matter of fact be a hindrance rather than a help in conducting negotiations with other parts of the British Empire or with foreign countries. A bureaucratically governed India, with the Secretary of State and the whole of the Cabinet at its back—so runs the argument—will be more powerful in pleading than a self-governing India without the support of the Cabinet. But, apart from the other points that may well be taken, this reasoning makes an assumption which has no foundation in fact, viz. that, under the bureaucratic regime, Indian wishes and sentiments will find a strong champion in the Secretary of State and the Cabinet, while if India were to enjoy self-government, its view will receive scant consideration at the hands of the Imperial authorities. In this Kenya matter itself we found to our cost that the Secretary of State himself, who is supposed to be the official spokesman of the legitimate claims of India, betrayed the cause woefully. And we know also that the voice of the Government of India who stood by us to the last would if they were responsible to the people's representatives, have carried far greater weight in the councils of the Empire than they actually did, inasmuch as they could have reinforced their plea by a threat of reprisals, in regard to which there is now such a wide gulf between the opinions of non-official and official India. Anyhow Indians share the feeling to which Sir Ali Imam gave expression at the Hotel Cecil: "If India were self-governing like other units of the Empire, I for one would not have any cause to complain against what has been done in connexion with Kenya," and that should be sufficient for the *Times of India*.

* * *

Bribe the Colonies into a Conciliatory Mood! OUR Bombay contemporary also says that India only stands to lose by raising the Kenya question or the broader question of the Indians overseas at the Imperial Conference, when the feeling in the Dominions is so bitterly hostile to Indians. It thinks that the result of such a step would even be a reversal of the 1921 resolution. Well, Indians do not consider that to be such a great disaster as the *Times* imagines. For the resolution is of importance only in so far as it is likely to be carried into effect, and if it is not to be carried into effect the abrogation of the resolution will leave India unconcerned; in fact, in a way it will be an advantage. We know that Mr. Winston Churchill did his best at that Conference to except Kenya from the scope of the resolution, as South Africa had withdrawn itself. After long deliberation Kenya was left in, which means that the Imperial Government was committed to confer upon Indian settlers in Kenya full rights of citi-

zenship. If in face of this, the British Government can establish a second and third class citizenship for Kenya Indians and if Canada and Australia are still unwilling to carry out the terms of the resolution, if any colony or the British Government itself can tear up the resolution at will, then it is immaterial to India whether the resolution is kept intact or formally cancelled. The *Times of India* cavils at every one of the suggestions made in non-official circles for fighting for its rights. The only alternative it can suggest is that India should buy off the opposition of the Colonies by giving the products a preference over the products of foreign manufacture. The great advantage that our contemporary expects therefrom is that the question would then be shifted on to the economic plane and so "we could avoid raising questions of principle." Indians are not so eager to avoid these questions as this paper perhaps believes; nor are they eager to put a premium upon the wickedness of the Colonies by according special commercial concessions to them. India should rather warn the Government that, if any of its official representatives at the Economic Conference should hold out any hope to the Colonies of its entering into arrangements of imperial preference, such arrangements would not be ratified by the Indian Legislatures.

* * *

Dr. Sapru. THE *Bombay Chronicle*, naturally enough, notices and adversely comments upon the omission from the resolutions of the Council of the Liberal Federation a request, made in the resolutions adopted at the special Bombay Conference of the 26th ultimo, that Dr. Sapru should withdraw from the Imperial Conference in the event of his not being allowed to reopen the Kenya decision and lodge his protest against it. The omission, however, is not open to objection. For we know from private advices that Dr. Sapru has been accorded the permission he sought to raise the question, not specifically of Indians in Kenya but generally of Indians overseas, and that he will anyhow have an opportunity to enter his emphatic protest against the Kenya "settlement." The Council of the Federation were put in possession of this information and decided, in the light of it, to delete a resolution calling for something which they knew had already been agreed upon.

* * *

The *Associated Press* telegram of Mr. Sastri's message, which we published in the last issue, left out some very important passages, which are necessary to a clear understanding of Mr. Sastri's views. We, therefore, give the full text of the statement as a supplement.

* * * *

BOYCOTT OF BRITISH GOODS.

AMONG the resolutions adopted by the protest meetings of Madras and Bombay is one recommending the appointment of a committee of experts to advise on the question of the boycott of goods made in Great Britain and the Empire. In its essence this measure is little different from the other retaliatory measures advocated at these meetings. All of them equally aim at bringing pressure to bear upon the recalcitrant parts of the Empire, by withholding from them certain facilities which they value and which we can give or withhold at will, to modify their anti-Indian policy. To the metaphysical objections which some people urge to the boycott while supporting other measures of retaliation, we attach no weight. In principle all these measures are equally sound or unsound. On the other hand, if the proposals made by the public meetings in Bombay and Madras in regard to the boycott are tentative, there are very good practical reasons for such caution and circumspection, and we hope no body of public opinion will commit itself irrevocably to the boycott before it makes a competent investigation into its possibilities and also its reactions and is satisfied as a result of such investigation, that India will be able to make an impression on the Empire commerce without producing greater evil consequences for India. It is worse than useless to hold out threats which cannot be executed. And a commercial boycott is just one of those things, which, to be of any use, must be promptly put into operation. Our experience of the boycott of 1906 has not been particularly encouraging, and though the conditions of the country have since changed out of recognition and may make possible now what was utterly impracticable then, it behoves all serious-minded men to walk warily where such large interests are at stake. We therefore strongly deprecate the light-heartedness with which several prominent politicians are recommending this measure as if they had only to will a boycott for it immediately to come about.

But, apart from the need of exploring its potentialities, we must take two precautions before we actually launch out on this measure. They are well expressed in the resolution passed by the Madras meeting, which indeed was the resolution agreed upon at the Bombay Conference of August 26: we must be satisfied that the boycott will cause "no serious injury to the industrial progress of the country" and will not inflict "suffering on the poorer classes of the community." Of these two conditions the first, we may be sure, will not be neglected. The manufacturers form a community which is at once wideawake and powerful enough to see that its interests are properly safeguarded. But there is a very real danger of the interests of the masses of the country suffering both from the negligence and cupidity of the wealthy classes under a régime of boycott. Only too frequently have schemes of swadeshi been started and the public exhort-

ed to purchase home-made goods even at a sacrifice, merely for the purpose, or at least with the result, of filling the pockets of the already rich with the hard-earned money of the poor. We must therefore see that on this occasion the small class of capitalists and the manufacturing interests find no opportunity to mint money out of the sacrifices of the large body of consumers. If sacrifices have to be made in the public interest as indeed they must be made, let the millowners and manufacturers set the example by putting a stringent limit to their own profits. Then the poor people will follow and make their proportionate and more than proportionate contribution to national sacrifice. But they will not and must not let the present political reverse on the Kenya question be exploited to the advantage of the more affluent classes. We are very glad to see in this connexion a suggestion made by the *Bombay Chronicle* that the millowners who stand to gain by the boycott should voluntarily agree not to enhance the price of their piecegoods in consequence of the elimination of the competing piecegoods of Lancashire from the Indian market. If such a self-denying ordinance is passed by the Bombay millowners, the response from the country will be magnificent. This indeed is the test of the sincerity of those manufacturing and commercial magnates who are loud in demanding the boycott of British goods. But if such a voluntary offer is not forthcoming, we hope it will be possible to utilise the legislative machinery both for imposing tariffs on foreign articles and limiting the profits of swadeshi firms. In any case a widespread boycott of this character can only be made conditional on the adoption of such a measure in the interests of the poor. The committee appointed will no doubt go over these points, but we have adduced a few considerations here only for the purpose of drawing the public attention to what we regard as the more important factors of the problem.

Against one danger we have particularly to guard if it is decided, upon the report of the committee, to embark upon boycott—intimidation and coercion. This is by no means an idle fear. Several countries have proclaimed a boycott before and carried it out with greater or less success. In the United States and Canada, to take but two examples, it was phenomenally successful, but the oppression that was practised on the people was altogether intolerable. No boycott is worth engineering, whatever prospect it holds out, which cannot be scrupulously voluntary and which is not free from coercion. In our country, where the people at large are much less assertive than in western countries, this danger is especially great, and therefore leaders of popular movements must be particularly careful that, in creating enthusiasm and patriotic fervour in the people, a spirit of toleration will prevail towards those who either take a different view or are unwilling to undergo the sacrifice they are being called upon to make.

A MESSAGE TO THE NATION

From V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI

I FEEL it a great misfortune to be put out of action when there is such urgent call for service in the cause of the Motherland. But I have been warned that I must take complete rest if I am to avoid a collapse. Before doing so, I wish to say a few words to the public.

I advocate without hesitation a policy of vigorous action by our country to indicate our genuine feeling to a people who attach no meaning to mere verbal expression of them. I say "country" generally, because it is impossible to expect a Government which is not National, either in spirit or in personnel, and which is compelled to look to Whitehall for orders even in matters of secondary importance, to act for the people and in the name of the people, when despatch-writing and argumentation have come to an end. This proved incapacity of our Government is a grievous handicap in the maintenance of our just rights as against other communities in this Empire. If we could imagine for a moment that we had our own Government when the Cabinet decision on Kenya was announced, they would have taken instantaneous action with the same instinct with which, for example, one's right hand moves to protect from injury any part of one's body. There would be no need of public meetings and protestations, no need of harlots and passionate cries for help. There is no country in the world where, if time were allowed for popular deliberation, or the balancing of good against evil, of material interest against National honour, eminent individuals and even considerable sections of people would not be found to counsel a course of febleness and resignation. In India it is no wonder that such active feeling of indignation as there is cannot be mobilised for an immediate stroke. It is an inherent weakness of the present stage of our political evolution that a large popular effort should lead to much spectacular display but little calculable result. There is no use trying to transcend this regrettable limitation. The situation would be utterly devoid of hope if we waited till we could act on the highest plane and with shining prospects of success. With cheap cynicism people fling the word "ineffective" at all proposals which cannot bring about the surrender of the British Cabinet and revocation of the settlement of July 24th. Those who would act within the limitations of their time cannot afford to be answering these everlasting objectors.

Nor would any one seriously claim for the puny efforts proposed the dignified epithet of retaliatory or punitive. How dare we expect to punish the mighty? But there is none so weak, but he can refuse to part with his self-respect voluntarily, no community so fallen but may reject an ignoble association to which it is under no coercion to consent. Why should Imperial au-

thorities deviate from their settled policy if they find that it makes no difference to the outward action, either of the Government or of the people of India, that while the Government is prepared as ever to employ the resources of the country for purposes of Imperial glorification, the representatives of the people continue ready and willing, even on a footing of declared subordination, to participate in the councils of the Empire and to join in schemes of a voluntary or semi-voluntary nature for the common good or ostentation of the dominant communities? A hard-headed and hard-hearted employer would not be impressed by brave resolutions and declarations of rights on behalf of his workmen if he could count on their coming at the stated hours and working under the stated conditions for as long as he chose to employ them. Things would doubtless be different in the case of a right-minded and noble-hearted employer. But he offers no similitude to the present Tory Government of Great Britain.

Some time ago the representatives of two Dominions, displeased at a comparatively trifling arrangement made by the authorities of the British Empire Exhibition, 1924, threatened non-participation and carried their point. That is the way in which serious displeasure shows itself. If our Government could take such a step, no Cabinet would think of treating it as they have treated it in the case of Kenya. Few persons realise in India what great importance is attached to the Exhibition as a display of the resources of the Empire, or what glowing hopes are entertained in the business world of its material benefits. In both directions India's part in the show is imposing. Doubtless the trained exploiters of the world would see that she profited as little as possible in the end. Correspondingly, her withdrawal, if its possibility could be conceived, would be felt as in the nature of a blow at the Empire. Tremendous efforts must be made by influential local Committees to keep back private exhibitors and semi-official agencies, while the Government and statutory bodies like Improvements Trusts must be reached by the usual channels of public opinion until the new Legislatures could take the constitutional action open to them.

Nobody supposes that the withdrawal of the unofficial representatives of India from the Imperial Conference will reduce it to a state of impotence or paralysis. Those, however, who value self-respect and study its manifestations in human affairs will look for certain "prompt reactions," to use an American expression, when it is infringed. It is not easy any longer to persuade the average British politician that amongst our intelligentsia and their representatives in high circles, feelings of resentment and indignation

are of the same kind as in the rest of the world. Dominion as well as British statesmen may think our indignation misplaced and profess unconcern at our absence. But they cannot help being conscious, in contemplating our vacant places, that affronted human nature had found becoming expression. Again, who will pretend that the measures of retaliation recommended to our future Legislatures will inflict injury on the offending communities at all adequate to the injury that we have received? Nevertheless, such action as we can take is fully expected and cannot be avoided except at the risk of worse indignities and insults. I well remember being told in 1921: "If we hit you, why don't you hit us in return? We have accorded you full power of reciprocity." Where one is in the grip of a big bully, patient and philosophic submission is no remedy. To hit out with all one's strength may not be effective either, but it is at least a vindication of one's manhood. The poet has said that the imprisoned cobra strikes not so much to punish the tormentor, as out of wounded pride.

The prosecution of these measures, provoked by the denial of equality in the Empire, will be necessarily obstructed and rendered nugatory by the Government of India. In taking such an attitude, the Viceroy and his Councillors will only be increasing their own difficulties and goading the Assembly on to fixed and implacable hostility, which can only hasten the day of Responsible Government in the country. That would be a gain, not the less great for being indirect, of the course of determined opposition forced on the people and their chosen leaders at this juncture. These developments which the immediate future holds in store must be made clear to the constituencies at this general election. Their political education will thus receive an impetus which nothing else can give and candidates must regard it as their primary duty to obtain mandates in this behalf, besides canvassing votes in the usual way.

One is sometimes amused and sometimes irritated by the unscrupulous use to which the existence of castes in this country is put by our enemies. Subdued and chastened, we bow to the penalties inflicted on us by the law of National Karma. But how can they admonish us who profit by our divided condition and in not a few cases foment it? Are they our Providence? Do they set up as our teachers? If so, let them show us the better way by their example, and not quote our social strata as a justification for their unworthy practice. We are hungering, through our renovated religion and revived philosophy, for opportunities of teaching the world some spiritual truths. While these opportunities seem slow in coming, here is a degenerate Western world, copying our caste system, our practice of segregation, our social iniquities and, alas, even our diarchy, our communal elections and our "disproportionate representation" of minorities. We are endeavouring to get out of these unhealthy institutions. The reactionaries and obscurantists in our country can wish for no better support for their outworn systems than their adoption by the civilised Nations of the West in express imitation.

Far be it from me to ignore or even to under-rate the enormous benefits of the British rule in India. I have often spoken and written of these

and of the glorious mission of the British Commonwealth. And I hope to live to do so again in better times, when British Imperialism shall have shed its lower and assumed its higher character. But I am sad to contemplate a people with a high destiny within their reach and calling themselves a lesser League of Nations, setting up, after mature deliberation, a colour bar after the Boer pattern.

Hard as flint, dry as the Sahara, must be the Indian heart which can survey without emotion the long tale of wrongs and indignities to which our people have been subjected within an Empire that talks all the time of human brotherhood and even-handed justice. I cannot stop now to tell the tale. Let us look at Kenya. We have gone there for some centuries now. The British Commonwealth came there only to safeguard our interests. Not only did we furnish the occasion, but we exerted our influence to establish a British Protectorate. The earliest British officers thought that the new territory could be a suitable outlet for congested Districts in India. Our cooly labour built the Railways. In fact, to-day, not only the Railways but the Government offices are run by our clerical labour. The currency system was ours till it was supplanted recently to the ruin of Indian wealth. The Indian Penal Code was introduced. Our armies fought on the soil of Kenya more than once to keep the Union Jack flying. We are the only people now that do anything to teach and train the Native in the arts of the civilised life. Great numbers of Indians were born and bred there. After many years, during which we were invited, employed and encouraged to be now told, at the bidding of a few narrow-minded whites, that we are a danger to the Native, that we are a moral and physical infection and that our future immigration must be controlled and finally stopped.

This is a refinement of ingratitude and tyranny, the thought of which still lacerates my heart, though it has been my constant companion, night and day, during some months. It may not be pleasing to Government, but it is good for them to know that there is hardly an intelligent or patriotic Indian who does not interpret and lament the Kenya settlement in the way I do. It may not be pleasing to Government, but it is good for them to know that there is hardly an intelligent and patriotic Indian who does not consider the settlement as setting aside a long succession of righteous pledges in the direction of human brotherhood, in favour of an unrighteous pledge made by incompetent authorities and in the face of earnest protests. It may not be pleasing to Government, but it is good for them to know that, when I declare the attenuation of my faith in the British Empire and in the British professions, the only Indians, even in "Moderate circles," who dissent, are those who avow that they had never any faith in either. The Kenya settlement is a grave National humiliation. It shakes the foundations of our public life. Party interests and party shibboleths seem now an irrelevance as well as a heavy handicap. I am happy to believe that the members of the Servants of India Society are unanimous in their desire, while remaining true to the Liberal creed and that of its Founder, to co-operate with men and women of all parties in the country in trying to get the grievous wrong righted and in the speedy achievement of Swaraj, which is the sovereign need of the hour.

PERSONAL UNION.—III.

IN the previous two sections* I tried to call attention to the two contradictory sets of facts which have to be taken into account in connection with any new external orientation of India: impossibility of the old Empire idea on the one hand, impossibility of severing the British connection on the other. In doing this, I also stressed the fact that no merely negative attitude will permanently do and that constructive proposals are urgently needed. *Faute de mieux* I ventured myself to come forward with the suggestion of a solution of the problem by way of Personal Union. May I here add that this solution does by no means commend itself to me as ideal, let alone as inevitable. On the contrary, I only put it forward as a tentative proposal, to stimulate and to guide discussion, if possible, into constructive channels. But since, as far as I am aware, no other concrete proposal has yet been put forward, it may perhaps be useful to pursue the "Personal Union" idea further, by considering in some detail pertinent historical parallels.

The most apposite in this connection and the one most readily recurring to one, is undoubtedly the Personal Union which formed the basis of the late Austro-Hungarian Monarchy: but it is to be feared that we in this country know very little either about the constitutional details of this polity or about the historical facts which brought it about.

The first important and striking point is the fact of complete racial disparity between the Magyars of Hungary and the Germans of Austria. The Magyars are non-Arians: closely allied to the Turks and Finns and with them intruders from Central Asia, where their kinsmen, the Turcomans and Tartars, still dwell. The coming of Magyar hordes in the 9th century was probably one of the most important events in the history of Europe. For their advent meant the driving of a wedge into the hitherto solid Slavic block of Eastern Europe, which henceforth was split into a Northern (Russians) and Western (Poles and Czechs) portion on the one part and a southeastern portion (Serbs and Bulgarians) on the other. A consequence of this weakening of the Slavic block was relatively to strengthen the eastward pressure of the Germanic races who were rapidly expanding to the east of the Elbe, absorbing and displacing such Slavic tribes there as the Pommeranians, Prussians, Kassubs, Wends, Lusatians, &c. Thus, from the very first, the Magyars proved themselves benefactors of Germany—though very much in disguise. For whatever the indirect and ultimate result of the Magyar irruption, their immediate purpose was to raid and plunder this same Germany, which they again and again invaded. In fact the very foundation of Austria is due to the desire of Charlemagne to erect (in 805) Eastern Marches as a Germanic bulwark against all troublesome alien

invaders—a point of considerable piquancy to be sure. As the founder of the Magyar nation and kingdom is considered Arpad I, who in 895 annihilated the Moravian Kingdom which until then had formed the link between Czechs and Yugoslavs. By 955 the Magyars had penetrated as far west as Bavaria, where however the German emperor, Otto the Great, so completely defeated them, as to throw them back east of the Leitha (a Southern tributary of the Danube, not 100 miles east of Vienna). Simultaneously the emperor revived the Eastern Marches (Austria) and placed them in the charge of Leopold of Babenberg as Margrave (ao. 976). The Magyars, thus prevented from further expansion and emigration, were thrown back upon themselves and began to settle down in the country they had made their own. There they were hemmed in by two cultures—the Eastern Roman (*i. e.* Greek) Empire of Byzance, and the Western ("Holy Roman") Empire of Germanic nationality. Prince Geza of Hungary, balancing the relative advantages of these two, came to the conclusion that, Constantinople being near and Rome far, it would be more politic to join up culturally with the latter rather than with the former: and so in 975 he sought baptism at the hands of Latin rather than Greek prelates. His successor, Stephen I (997—1038), went further and submitted to coronation at the hands of the Pope himself: whence the official title of the Magyar sovereign has remained to our days "Apostolic King of the Lands of S. Stephen's Crown," and Latin the official language of his Government until the 19th century.

The succeeding centuries under S. Stephen's heirs saw a further consolidation of Hungary, characterized by the wide tolerance shown to all comers who were ready to help the development of the country—full civil and religious liberty being granted to both Jews and Moslems, a rare fact indeed in those days. Still more important is the rise of the landed magnates who in 1222 extorted from their King (Andrew II) a "Golden Bull"—the very counterpart of the "Magna Charta" extorted by English Barons from their King John seven years previously.

Meanwhile there had been no further clash with Hungary's western neighbour, Austria, which under the Babenbergs had grown from a markgravedom to a dukedom (in 1156). In 1246 the House of Babenberg became extinct, whereupon the Czech neighbour of Austria in the north, King Ottokar of Bohemia, became in 1257 Duke of Austria. But Rudolf of Hapsburg (since 1273 German Emperor) successfully disputed Ottokar's claim and in 1276 wrested the Austrian duchy from him and made it hereditary in his own house. Thus did the Hapsburgs become established at Vienna, where, under one title or another, they have reigned from 1276 until November 12th 1918, when the present Austrian Republic was proclaimed.

* Published in the issues of 31st August and 6th September.

We had left Hungary proceeding under the Arpads on an independent line of its own: a line which it was able to keep to until the final disaster of Mohacz (1526). The three centuries in question established the parliament of nobles as the paramount power in Hungary—the Kings being elected and their relative power defined as merely co-ordinate with Parliament: *i. e.* laws proposed by King had no force, until assented to by Parliament; and laws proposed by Parliament had no force until assented to by King. The dynasty of the Arpads having become extinct (in 1301), the crown of S. Stephen passed into the hands of the Angevin House of Naples, under whom the cultural bonds between Hungary and Italy were still further strengthened. Through marriage into this house, Sigismund of Bohemia, who later added to himself the imperial crown of Germany also, becoming King of Hungary too on the death of his wife in 1395.

Sigismund himself had an only daughter, Elizabeth, whom he married to one Albert, duke of Austria, who thereby, on his father-in-law's death, became King of Hungary. This was in 1438—and the same year saw both his accession to the throne of Bohemia and his election to that of the Holy Roman Empire. This is indeed the fateful year of the Hapsburgs: for from this year onwards a Hapsburg has been German Emperor until 1804, when Napoleon smashed up the old "Holy Roman Empire of Germanic Nationality", whereupon the Hapsburgs salvaged their imperial title by styling themselves henceforth "Emperors of Austria". The same year, 1438, saw the beginning of the Hapsburgs' connection with Hungary, as we have already seen: a connection, however, which was fitful from the start and sinister to the last. For Albert fell in battle against the Turks in 1439 and left no direct heirs—with the result that Hungary became the prey of rival claimants: the rôle of the Hapsburgs for the next 250 years being limited to the holding on to as much of the western provinces of Hungary as their military power permitted. Hungary herself was thereby torn into fragments: culminating in the position after the famous Turkish victory at Mohacz, when the Turks held Hungary proper (with Budapesth)—practically the same area as was left to the Magyars by the recent War; when a Magyar King reigned over Transylvania (now a Rumanian province); and a Hapsburg occupied the Western provinces. The highwater mark of Turkish power came with their advance upon and siege of Vienna (in 1683), which however eventuated in their complete rout at the hands of Sobieski, King of Poland. Their expulsion from the whole of Hungary was sealed by the victory of Prince Eugene of Savoy at Zenta in 1697 and the peace of Karlovic in 1699. Leopold I, who reigned at Vienna during the whole of this period (1657-1705), seized upon this opportunity to annex Hungary permanently to his house. He contended that he might treat the whole of Hungary as a conquered

country, but was "graciously pleased" to make a pact with a sort of rump-parliament of Magyar nobles, which he convened to Pressburg in 1687. The terms dictated and accepted were (1) that the crown of S. Stephen henceforth was to be hereditary in the house of Hapsburg, (2) that armed resistance to unconstitutional acts of the King was no longer to be legal. Thus, after 700 years of Magyar independence, a Hapsburg managed to turn, what had been a free nation, into a dependency of a country, Austria, which soon became a byword in Europe for absolutist despotism, police tyranny and bureaucratic ineptitude.

Yet the Magyars never quite gave in and the whole of their subsequent history, from 1687 to 1867, is a sequence of Magyar semi-revolts and Hapsburg semi-concessions. Of the latter the "Pragmatic Sanction" of 1723 is the most important, for thereby the Hungarian Parliament, in return for accepting succession in the female line, obtained a formal declaration from the King-Emperor that he and his heirs would for ever keep intact the Hungarian constitution, prerogatives, customs, laws, &c. The subsequent century however was none the less absolutistic, for being tinged with the autocratic liberalism of such monarchs as Maria Theresia and her son Joseph: and it was only with the birth of democratic liberalism as the new political creed of Western Europe and its advent to power in France, where in 1830 it substituted the constitutional régime of the Orleans for the absolutist of the Bourbons, that Hungary too awoke to these ideas. Indeed the maker of modern Hungary, L. Kossuth, and his friends strove so well in preparing the country at large for these ideas, that when the 1848 revolution broke out in Vienna, the King in a panic, to secure at least his Hungarian heritage, gave the royal assent to the so-called "March Laws", which introduced in Hungary rule by a cabinet responsible to parliament alone. But Ferdinand, who had given this assent, a few months later abdicated, whereupon his nephew Francis Joseph became Austrian Emperor and, backed by an army which had squashed the revolution in Austria, refused to be bound by his uncle's promises to the Hungarian parliament. The latter retorted that nobody could be King without its consent; that for them Ferdinand was still King of Hungary and Francis Joseph a mere usurper. Thus began the Magyar war of independence in 1849. Declaring the Hapsburgs as having forfeited the Hungarian crown through perjury, a Magyar Republic was proclaimed—a proceeding which so shocked the monarchial feelings of the Tsar of Russia, that he placed his own army at the disposal of his brother-emperor Francis Joseph. Crushed by these overwhelming numbers, the Magyar armed forces, which until then had been victorious, were annihilated and a terror was established at Budapesth which has made the Austrian generalissimo go down in history as "butcher Haynau". Martial law ceased in 1850, but for the next 10 years

Hungary was governed from Vienna as a conquered country. Ten years—and that this period lasted no longer, is not due to any Hapsburg sagacity or liberality, but merely to the monarch's increasing difficulties. Solferino (1859) and Sadowa (1866), Austrian's military defeats by Italy and by Prussia, supply the reason for Francis Joseph's growing willingness to humour " his " Hungarian Kingdom. It was at this point in Hungary's history, that " the nation's sage ", Francis Deák, arose—claiming Hungary's right to autonomy and legal independence as a State, reasserting the contractual character of the Pragmatic Sanction and refusing the bribe of sending deputies to the diet of a unitary Austro-Hungarian Empire: and yet admitting the necessity of preserving the Empire somehow. The ingenious solution of this problem was put forward by Deák in his " Contributions to Hungarian Constitutional Law ", in which he advocated Personal Union through the Monarch as the principle which was in future to bind together two political entities which, though theoretically autonomous, yet practically needed each other too much to allow of complete separation. The great difficulty lay in the devising of a method which would maintain community in military and foreign affairs, without infringing Hungary's self-government: and this method was eventually found in the " Compromise " of 1867, consideration of which I must leave over for another occasion.

H. C. E. ZACHARIAS,

MALABAR LAND TENURES.

VIII.*—FAIR RENTS.

FIXITY of tenure without the determination of fair rent is obviously useless. How, then, are fair rents to be determined? In the zamindari areas, covered by the Madras Estates Land Act, the Legislature had no definite knowledge of the area or the productivity of the soil or the net produce of cultivation and were, therefore, unable to lay down any definite proportion of the net produce as fair rent. It left it to the courts to decide what fair rent was, with the general direction that it was not to exceed " the rate prevailing for similar lands with similar advantages in the neighbourhood. " There was no attempt here to decide fair rents on the basis of the ascertained net produce but on the basis of the rents that were being paid on similar lands in the neighbourhood, however heavy, crushing and iniquitous they might be. Further, the phrase " similar lands with similar advantages in the neighbourhood ", offers for want of definition great temptations for litigation. What the tenant gains at the expense of the landlord he loses in favour of the lawyer. As if to make up for this indefiniteness, the Act empowered the Collector to determine fair rents, in case a rate could not be ascertained on the aforesaid basis—an even more arbitrary

arrangement. It follows, therefore, that rents, if they are to be fair, should be fixed at a certain rate of the net produce of cultivation. Such a course was not possible in enacting the Madras Estates Land Act, for reasons already mentioned. But the case is different in Malabar. Here the land has been surveyed and settled, in doing which the net produce has been ascertained with a view to estimating Government assessment. The net produce of every class of holdings is therefore known.

What proportion, then, should a fair rent bear to the net produce? In the third article of this series (published in the issue of 5th July), it was mentioned, in discussing the case of the verumpattamdar, that there was an ancient custom regarding rent, which was acknowledged by the janmis and the Government in the proclamation of 1805, and which now forms the basis of the Government assessment. According to this custom, the cultivator retains one-third of the net produce to himself and pays the balance of two-thirds to the janmi as rent. This proportion, though not quite as favourable to the cultivator as in typical ryotwari areas where he retains one-half the net produce, may still be considered fair and equitable. This proportion has the further advantage of being well-known to the people, the cultivators and the janmis alike, and according to the Cochin Landlord and Tenant Commission, the best among the janmis respected that proportion even in recent years. It should, therefore, be enacted that the landlord's rent should be two-thirds of the net produce of the land, a proposal which was strongly urged by Mr. Logan as long ago as 1881.

Agency to fix rents.—It has been said in the third article that the Government assessment is calculated at one-third of the net produce as ascertained by the settlement officer. If the rent is to be two-thirds net, and the Government assessment one-third, the latter has only to be doubled to give the rent—a simple procedure—which is absolutely fair and which at the same time obviates all ruinous litigation in fixing fair rents.

Assessment to be paid by the Cultivator.—At present the Government assessment is being paid by the janmis out of the rents they collect. Instead they may be relieved of the responsibility of paying assessment, which should be transferred to the shoulders of the cultivators. The cultivator will then pay one-third of the net produce as rent to the janmis. Then the rent payable to the janmi will equal the assessment payable to the Government and thus the settlement officer determines at once both the assessment and the rent, even as he does in the Central Provinces where the Malguzari tenure prevails.

It may also be provided that, if the janmis wish it, their rents may be collected for them by the Government along with its assessment and paid over to the janmis, without any cost to them, which procedure will save the janmis the trouble

* Previous articles in this series appeared in the issues of June 21 and 28, July 5, August 2, 9 and 30 and September 6.

and expense of collecting their rents themselves or through their agents.

Reform of Settlement by the Legislature.—It is not proposed here to examine whether the present principles of settlement do or do not require a thorough overhauling. Very possibly they do. All that need be emphasised here is that both the Government and the landlord stand exactly in the same position as regards their individual share, which is one-third of the net produce and whatever principles are followed in the calculation of the net produce in the one case will equally hold good in the other case. It is, however, gratifying to note that it is proposed to bring settlement operations under the control of the reformed Legislatures. And as the Legislature becomes more and more popular and representative, the principles of settlement will also be cast into a popular mould. And as the principles will be common to the whole ryotwari area in the Madras Presidency, there is no fear of the Government and the janmis colluding to the disadvantage of the Malabar cultivator.

Revision of rent.—Revision of assessment now occurs once in thirty years. And if the rents depend on assessment the revision of both will take place at the same time, once in either thirty or fifteen years. The latter would be a better course. The janmis are at present accustomed to have rent fixed for twelve years, as in the case of kanamdars, and it cannot be a hardship or injustice to them to extend the period to fifteen years. And as the principles of settlement become more and more simple and perfect, the process of resettlement will neither be too costly nor too long-drawn for Government. At any rate the possibility of sharing the unearned increment once in fifteen instead of thirty years cannot be unwelcome to the Government, nor illegitimate either.

It is, therefore, suggested that rents should be fixed, once in fifteen years, at one-third the net produce, as ascertained by the Government Settlement department, according to principles which have been subjected to legislative scrutiny and sanction. The cultivator should be made liable directly for Government assessment and be given the right to commute the rent which he now pays in kind into a money payment. All kanamans, renewal fees and other perquisites will automatically disappear and the released money can be invested in co-operative credit societies and thus be made available for loans to cultivators.

Consequences of the proposal. How will this system of rent calculation affect the landowners? They are now collecting either less than, or equal to, or more than the one-third net amount. If it is less, they ought to welcome the change, as it means more income to them. If it is equal, they have nothing to complain of. If it is more—and there is reason to believe that it is so (vide article III)—then the janmis have been rackrenting, which, merely because

they have been doing so long with impunity, they cannot be allowed to continue to do in future. In this case, there will undoubtedly be a diminution of their rents, and that must be faced. It will be remembered that the Irish land legislation of 1881 authorised a revision of rents in order to relieve rackrenting and the rents of landlords suffered a diminution of over 25 p. c. Nor was the loss compensated and it was but right that it was not compensated. The case of the janmis who, in recent years, have purchased for hard cash the janman rights of their holdings stand on a different footing and will be dealt with later on. Even in the Madras Estates Land Bill Government had proposed the revision of rents, though unfortunately they subsequently dropped the idea. In Malabar anything over one-third net must be considered a rack-rent and cannot be defended.

This reform will leave a larger income to the actual cultivator and relieve him to a large extent of the frequent need for obtaining credit to carry on his cultivation. The cultivator will then be able to bear heavier local taxation for educational and other social betterment.

The transfer of the responsibility of paying Government assessment to the cultivator will ensure the benefit of remission of revenue in bad seasons—which, however, are rare in Malabar—to the cultivator, who is legitimately entitled to it. Mr. Forbes made a strong point about this benefit reaching the cultivator, in the debate on the Madras Estates Land Bill.

If these proposals are accepted, the land system in Malabar will be brought into line with the Malguzar system in the Central Provinces, where the landlord, called the Malguzar, has no power of eviction or enhancement of rent, which is fixed by the settlement officer for the term of settlement.

Improvements.—Though the cultivator should be free to make improvements, it would be undesirable to prevent improvements by an enterprising landlord, who wishes to effect them without undertaking the responsibility of farming the land himself. It should, therefore, be provided that the landlord may, on the refusal of the cultivator to make an improvement and with the consent of an officer of the Agricultural Department, carry out an improvement, claiming an enhancement of rent commensurate with the increased production caused thereby.

Cultivable Waste.—In the case of cultivable waste belonging to the janmis, it should be provided that, beyond such land as the janmis are at present cultivating themselves with or without hired labour, all other land should be available for cultivation by others. If a janmi refuses to lease such land to a cultivator, a revenue officer of suitable rank should have the power to let in cultivators in accordance with the present provisions for leasing out Darkhast lands. An amount equal to the assessment in each year shall be made payable to the janmi. The janmi, however, shall

have the power to resume the land for cultivation by himself or for other similar purposes already discussed. The Collectors of the District had utilised this power to let in tenants on the janmis' lands on cowls, and the janmis and the tenants are used to it. There need, therefore, be no hesitation in making this power statutory, since it constitutes no violent departure from well-known tradition.

Sub-division.—In the case of land already under cultivation, it is very difficult to bring about either consolidation of scattered holdings or to constitute economic holdings. These should, however, be secured in all land that is to be brought under cultivation hereafter. If, in each amsam, a few bits of new land are brought under cultivation under the new condition of consolidated and economic holdings, the influence of the advantages accruing therefrom is likely to spread and bring about a voluntary movement among the cultivators in general for consolidating their holdings. As regards the land already under cultivation, further subdivision and stripping of land should be prohibited.

P. KODANDA RAO.

CONTINENTAL LETTER.

BRESLAU, 15th AUGUST.

THE nickname of "The Trimmer" was given by his contemporaries to Sir George Saville, First Marquess of Halifax, who was at the head of public affairs in a very difficult period of British politics at the time of the Restoration. The imputation was, that he trimmed his sails to the various breezes of opinion, but he himself took the metaphor in a different sense. A boat, he said, in a famous pamphlet of his, goes ill and is in danger of capsizing, if the people in it weigh it down all on one side or all on the other. But there is a kind of man, the trimmer, whose business it is to see that the boat goes evenly without endangering the passengers. A similar ambition seems to animate Mr. Baldwin. What we have seen of his statesmanship up to now would justify the application of Halifax's nickname to him. What the contemporaries objected to in Halifax's methods holds, however, in his case too: for it should not be the principal aim of the ship of state to go as evenly as possible in stormy weather, but to reach the harbour safely. There are periods in the life of the individual as well as in the life of the nations when a certain risk *must* be taken in order to save one's existence. It seems, however, that Mr. Baldwin hesitates to take the risk of a really serious step in his relations to France. After being fooled for months by the French Government who have succeeded in delaying the negotiations in a most provocative way, he at last receives an answer which is brusque enough to leave no doubt as to the feeling of unassailability with inspires the French Premier's notions.

Those people however who had hoped that the French declaration would be immediately answered

by a well-considered counter move on the political chess-board from the side of Mr. Baldwin, saw their expectations blighted. For the decision to publish the negotiations is quite obviously nothing but an attempt to extricate himself from a perplexing situation. There were several possibilities. England might have announced that it was going to call together a conference of experts to inquire into the German ability to pay. Or she might have applied to the League of Nations or to the International Court of Justice at the Hague to give an official interpretation of those articles of the Versailles Treaty which the French use as a pretext for their invasion into Germany. If England wanted to take a more important step than these, she might have summoned a general conference of all European states, including Germany herself and the Neutrals, in order to discuss the reconstruction of Europe. This of course would not be considered a very friendly act in France. But there can be no doubt that the time has come when the same situation that prevailed in Europe twice already, at the time of Louis XIV and Napoleon I, makes again the union of the non-French part of the world a question of self-preservation.

To bring about such a union without setting the world again on fire is the demand of the moment. Nothing of the sort however has been tried up to now so that the French have a certain right to consider the end of the first bout between the two parties as a complete victory of their policy. They feel the general need less than the others. Their economic situation leaves little to be desired. France knows no unemployment, the restoration of her destroyed districts is—at least as regards their industry—near its completion. But the reconstruction of her agriculture too will soon attain the pre-war state. Her want of agricultural labourers is made up for by the import of foreign hands and the introduction of agricultural machines on a hitherto unknown scale. She has been enriched by new resources consisting of ore, coal, potash and oil and by several new industries in the newly won districts. She has made great progress in industrial organisation. Her export trade has—according to British authorities—long since surpassed the pre-war amount. It is true that her financial situation is far from being satisfactory. That, however, is to a great extent the result of a policy which carefully avoids to apply social justice in the taxation of the different strata of society. At the same time in England the unemployment has taken on such dimensions, that it compels the state to spend more than 1½ million pounds weekly.

The state of things in Germany is difficult to describe. When the French entered the Ruhr district in January the French Government declared to the whole world, that their only intention was to fetch their reparations with their own hands. Meanwhile the mask has been thrown off in public. The official note of the French government of the 30th of

July says of the enterprise, that its aim was "to disarrange the economic and political organisation of Germany". The first part of the programme has turned out a success. The second has not. This has come as a surprise even to Germany herself, much more so to France. The German money has lost its value to an extent, that ten or twenty mark notes are the cheapest material now to paper your walls with. Needless to say what sufferings this state of things means for a great part of the population. Still the expected political results have not been reached. It is true that the social antagonisms have become stronger. The impossibility to gather taxes under such conditions has favoured the wealthy and consequently created bitterness among the wage-earners. But much greater than the need and the social bitterness are the exasperation and the hatred against the torturer. Germany to-day is kept together by the common hatred against French militarism.

It is characteristic and helps to get the right view of the situation that the fall of the present German Government, which as a sign of the beginning chaos was eagerly expected in France, has not come to pass. This, of course, does not mean that public opinion is convinced of its having steered the right course during the last exciting months. On the contrary it seems almost incredible that it should have repeated the grave mistakes in its financial policy since the beginning of the "Ruhr war" which the Imperial Government committed during the world-war, running the country into debts and making the poor poorer instead of imposing taxes on those parts of the nation which up to now have been able to escape the general ruin, viz., agriculture and industry. The incapacity of this sort of statesmanship has meanwhile given rise to the most serious censure and several times it seemed indeed as if the position of the government had become untenable. But the pressure from the outside is strong enough to make the idea of unity appear the principal law of the day. A great and radical reform of the financial and economic politics of the Reich is what more or less all parties—especially eagerly those of the left—demand. Unheard of sacrifices will be required from those whose contribution up to now has consisted mainly in well-sounding patriotic phrases. The next weeks will show how far these endeavours will succeed and if it is possible to put the economic life of the nation in this way upon a healthier basis.

One thing is to be seen from these endeavours at any rate: that the German nation is very far from giving up the game. It is the same with the passive resisters in the Ruhr district. That is why M. Poincaré has hit upon new methods. Another system has been initiated. Up to now the confiscation of the railways, the banishment of the officials, the imprisonment of the authorities, the obstruction of the traffic, the vexation of the public, the spoliation of the public banks, the extortion of money from the communities were the

means tried to curb the spirit of the population. Coal and the industrial products were taken away by force. But the spirit of the population is still unbroken and the output of coal has decreased from day to day. The coke-stocks, especially those which French industry requires, are dwindling away. In these circumstances the occupation authorities have issued a proclamation according to which they are going to take possession of the mines themselves and to manage them in their own *regie*. The announcement is of extraordinary importance. Up to now the French military had not given up the hope to make friends with the working men themselves. For months they have tried to incite them against their "capitalist oppressors". But the working men who are of the opinion that capitalism and militarism are birds of a feather laughed at these naive endeavours to take them in. At the court martial trials where German officials and directors of the great industrial enterprises were habitually sentenced the working man was sure to get off scot-free. But this sort of wooing for the favour of the working man was too clumsy and offended his sense of justice too much to turn out anything but an entire failure. So the French generals seem to have decided to give it up altogether. For to take possession of the mines would mean to open the fight against the miner himself. There is little doubt that the miner will refuse to obey the commands of French superiors. In this case the military leaders of the invaders will chase him away from his home as the railway officials have been chased away who refused to accept orders from foreign intruders. What this will lead to is difficult to say. Nobody knows if the patience of the tortured population will stand this new trial. But so much is sure that the plan to take possession of the German mines against the will of the miners is a technical impossibility. Very likely the French are fully aware of it. What they intend to bring about in this way is the slow destruction of the mines. Indeed influential French journalists like Bainville recommended this months ago. The Diehards and the Rothermere papers however are not tired of proclaiming the opinion that justice and humanity are on the side of these people.

LEVIN L. SCHÜCKING.

REVIEW.

INDIAN ART AND ART CRAFTS. Five lectures given during the T. S. ANNUAL CONVENTION, December 1922. With a foreword by ANNIE BESANT. Madras. 1923. 9½ x 7. pp. vi and 78. Rs. 2.

Of the five lectures we would single out Mr. R. Srinivasan's paper on "Indian Music of the South" as the best, giving as he does not only an able *aperçu* of the whole subject, but tempering his own enthusiasm for the subject with a recognition of the defects of the art as practised. Amongst these he—rightly—places first the neglect paid to the quality of a singer's voice: all that tradition demands

being ability to "produce certain combinations of notes and sounds in his throat"; and the whole tendency "to make the system mechanical and not living."

Mr. T. S. Krishnaswami Pillay in his "Art Crafts of South India" is purely descriptive, whilst Mr. W. D. S. Brown tries to bring "Guild Socialism and Indian Handcrafts" together. In the latter this author fails in our opinion, since craftsmanship is essentially a home industry which does not require any social basis of production outside the family: a point very clearly brought out at the recently held (June 17th) General Confederation of Master Craftsmen of France at Bordeaux, to the proceedings of which we would refer Mr. Brown. His "outline of a typical guild unit" (p. 66) seems to us utterly impracticable: if the handicrafts and arts of India are ever to revive, it will only be after public opinion at large has been educated to distinguish between the hideous western tinpot-ware, made to sell, and the beautiful wares of traditional Indian craftsmanship, made for use. Once public taste has been educated, public demand for such wares will revive; and once an attractive price is being offered, traditional craftsmanship will revive too of its own accord. At all events, the guild system of medieval Europe and the guild socialism applied to modern machine production have nothing in common, but the ambiguity of a word.

Miss Stella Kramrisch of Visvabharati fame contributes the first and the last of these addresses—"The Significance of Indian Art" and "Recent Movements in Western Art". In these she develops the idea that rigid submissiveness to convention has given a character of uniformity and monotony to Indian art: in glaring contrast to the individual freedom carried to extremes in ultra-modern Western art the leading ideas of some of which schools she describes for us. Thus "Impressionists" who "painted men with purple noses and green cheeks" are explained as meaning "nothing more than that all things possible and actual are mere surface refractions of the one universal light"; the "Futurists" are quoted as saying that it is "not necessary to show that a human being had a head, a body and other details"; and another school, that its "first pictures were painted without any allusion to anything seen." After this one is quite prepared for the "Dadaist" who drew "a simple circle and called it the romance of the young lady!" All this is quite amusing, but Miss Kramrisch unfortunately takes it all *au grand sérieux* and not infrequently gives one the impression of a High Priestess of Nonsense. There is a good deal of this sort of thing in her two addresses as that "the lustre of a pearl is suggestive of melodious waviness"—the kind of "higher" thought and "higher" art, for which, as a frankly Philistine worshipper of common-sense, one has, candidly, very little use.

Z.

CORRESPONDENCE.

RENDITION OF BERAR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—I am afraid your comments on my letter are not very enlightening, nor convincing. I did not contend that the wishes of the people of Berar should not be consulted in case of any transfer of Government; but what I remarked was that it was premature to discuss that question when the British Government had not yet admitted the legal rights and

the indubitable claims of the Nizam to the territory. So far as I am concerned, therefore, your able article on "The Right of People" was not necessary to convince me of their right of self-determination.

I do not see any inconsistency in holding that the form of government is independent of the actual results, beneficial or otherwise, arising from the rule and yet asking for real democratic institutions. Because it is only too well-known that even an autocrat can be and is more beneficial than democratic institutions when the latter possess not the substance but merely the shadow of political power as they do in British India; and yet that cannot mean that democratic institutions with real power are not desirable. Sometimes the representatives may not be worthy of the trust reposed in them or may not be men of independence and real worth; and the results of their administration may even compare unfavourably with those of an autocratic rule. But to admit that fact is not to dispute the desirability of democratic institutions. I made my point sufficiently clear when I said, "The Nizam's administration may be 'autocratic' but you are not justified in calling it 'misrule' unless you are in possession of reliable information and sufficient grounds".

Again my "naive suggestion" that the Nizam might confer full responsible government by a firman on the people of Berar is as much a suggestion to the Nizam as to the people because I do believe that if the people of Berar offer their allegiance to him on that condition, there is every possibility of the Nizam accepting it. I do not think, also, that your jibe at the 'home population of Hyderabad' will alter my reasonable expectation; because if the latter are content to be governed by an autocratic rule and have not demanded their share of government, it is their own fault. Even in their case you should remember that without any popular agitation or demand, the Nizam's Government is already contemplating a scheme of popularising the Legislative Assembly and it may not be very long before the representatives of the people will be called upon to participate in the Government. But the case of the people of Berar is different. Their political status has improved under the British, and when they demand responsible government as a condition precedent to their allegiance, the Nizam will not deny them if he is serious about the rendition of the districts. In case the mere promise of the Nizam be considered insufficient, I suggested that guarantees may be taken from him for the preservation and development of democratic institutions.

I still hold, therefore, that you are needlessly alarmed at the situation, and I believe that your fears about the people of Berar being duped are entirely unfounded. They are wise enough to demand their right of self-determination when the time for transfer comes, and I am sure that, if they do consider that "their material and moral progress under the Nizam is assured," and "do not object to the transfer", they will not alter their views to gain your admiration of their wisdom, which after all is not the thing that matters.—Yours, etc.

B. RAMAKRISHNA RAO.

Byculla, Bombay,

August 22.

[If the reforms in British India concede only a shadow of power and if the apparently autocratic rule of the Nizam is far more conducive to popular good, we do not understand why our correspondent should so earnestly advise the people of Berar to ask for the continuance of the existing "democratic" institutions as a condition precedent to the transfer? If the people share his opinion of the superiority of the Nizam's administration to that obtaining under the British aegis, the condition they would prefer, we believe, is not that the backward British institutions should continue under the Nizam but that they should be given the full benefit of the advanced institutions which exist at present at Hyderabad. Why is our correspondent so unkind as to deprive them of this great benefit?—Ed.]

The Mystery of Death.

- | | |
|--|--------|
| | Rs. a. |
| 1. Before Death. Death and its mystery. By Camille Flammarion. "A persevering study of this great problem leads us to think to-day that the mystery of death is less obscure and less sombre than has generally been supposed up to the present." | 8 9 |
| 2. At the Moment of Death. Death and its mystery. By do. do. "Arresting greater interest than that of survival after Death." | 8 9 |
| 3. After Death. Death and its mystery. By do. do. Is full of authentic cases of phenomena and appearances from the other world which are undoubtedly proved as the result of exhaustive enquiries and investigation by the author. | 8 9 |
| 4. Do the Dead Live? By Paul Heuze. An inquiry into the present state of psychical research. | 4 1 |
| 5. Letters From A Living Dead Man. By Elsa Barker. "The communicant enters in the spirit of an explorer, seeking new fields of knowledge, and his report of his experiences is as refreshingly broad-minded as it is original and free from bias." | 3 11 |
| 6. Life After Death. By James H. Hyslop, Ph. D., LL. D. Problems of the future life and its nature. | 8 9 |

The Theosophical Publishing House,
Adyar. Madras.
INDIAN BOOK SHOP
George Town, Madras.

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

A Wonderful Discovery.

No medical expert could say that there was ever a guaranteed cure for diabetes in the world. Our cure for diabetes is a Heavenly Blessing which never fails to cure it. Accordingly instead of quoting excellent references we are ready to offer it gratis to all Provincial Governments and the Chiefs for trial on the condition that the results thereof are duly published for public information. We undertake conditional treatment on satisfactory terms. It restores also lost vitality and removes general debility of either sex. A sample for trial at Rs. 3 will give complete satisfaction and remove bias against advertisements in general.

Apply with 2 as. postage for further 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 CUSSE 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 LUCKNOW UNIVERSITY JOURNAL.

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

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

Editor—C. J. Brown, M. A.,—supported by a strong Consultative Board representative of all the Departments in the University.

Special Features.

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

Annual Subscription.

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

10s.

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

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

B. MUKHERJEE,

LUCKNOW UNIVERSITY, (Business Manager.)
LUCKNOW, Lucknow University Journal.

LUCKNOW: UPPER INDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, Ltd., 4th Aminabad Park.

LONDON: P. S. KING & SONS, Orchard House, 2 & 4 Great Smith Street, Westminster, Lond., S. W.

READY FOR SALE.

Indian States Act, 1922.

(Protection of Princes Against Disaffection Act)

Demi 8 vo., pp. 450, Paper cover

This pamphlet is published under the authority of the Daxini Sansthan Hitvardhak Sabha. It contains a full report of the debate in the Legislative Assembly at the time of the introduction of the Bill, in the Council of State at its passing and in the House of Commons on the motion of Col. Wedgwood, M. P. It contains all the published Government papers pertaining this question; the evidence given on this subject by witnesses before the Press Laws Committee; the petitions presented to Parliament on behalf of the Daxini Sansthan Hitvardhak Sabha, Kathiawar Hitvardhak Sabha and the Progressive Association of Bombay. The articles of Messrs. N. C. Kelkar, Mansukhalal Metha and G. R. Abhyankar dealing with this question are fully reproduced. Press opinions from about 25 leading papers are given in a separate Appendix. In the introduction the Government case has been fully examined and the unsoundness of its arguments exposed. Price Rupees two. Postage Extra.

All those who are interested in Indian States should possess a copy.

Copies can be had from —

The Manager, Aryabhushan Press,
Budhwar Peth, POONA CITY.