

# THE Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE

Office : KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY.

VOL. VI, No. 35

POONA—THURSDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1923.

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

## CONTENTS.

TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	421
ARTICLES :—	
Fascism and the League ...	422
The late Lord Morley. By V. N. Naik, M. A. ...	424
Kenya Helotry. What Shall We Do Next? By B. Venkatapati Raju, M. L. A. ...	426
Protective Tariff: Some Fallacies. By Prof. Prafullachandra Basu ...	427
A LETTER FROM LONDON ...	428
CONTINENTAL LETTER. By Professor Levin L. Schücking ...	429
REVIEW :—	
The Problem of Population. By V. N. G. ...	431

## TOPICS OF THE WEEK

Mr. Sastri. MR. VENKATASUBBAIYA writes this week of Mr. Sastri's health as follows :—"Sastriar was examined yesterday (Friday, 28th Sept.) by Dr. C. B. Rama Rao and another very good doctor of this place, who tested the blood pressure. In England the blood pressure was 164; in Poona when Drs. Shikhare and Gokhale examined him it was 156, and yesterday it was 145. The normal, I am told, varies from 120 to 140; so that the improvement that has taken place is quite satisfactory. He has a good appetite, sleeps soundly, and is able now to walk two to three miles a day. He goes out both in the mornings and evenings. He is also keeping quite cheerful."

Immigration and Exploitation. THE Indian Colonial Merchants' Association of which Sir Purshotamdas Thakordas is the President has submitted a useful representation to the Government of India on the question of immigration rules in regard to Kenya. The Imperial Government has charged the Governor of Kenya to formulate proposals in this behalf and submit them to the Colonial Secretary. In view of the pronounced pro-European sympathies of Sir R. Coryndon and in view particularly of the specific mention in the White Paper of the very classes of which the Indian population is mainly composed as those on whose entry into Kenya restrictions will probably have to be imposed in the economic interests of the African natives, it is of the utmost importance that the Government of India should exercise sleepless vigilance as to how these regulations bear upon the Indian community. It is doubtful, however, whether the Government will have a

chance at all to put in their say at an early enough stage, and the above-mentioned Association urges the Government to insist upon the appointment of a committee of impartial public men in England and India to investigate the question. This is an admirable suggestion, and we make no doubt that if such a committee is appointed and it recommends, without fear or favour, the exclusion of those classes of aliens who exploit the natives most, the first to come under the ban will be the Europeans, and then, after a very long interval, perhaps the Indians. We for our part rejoice that the native population has at last been drawn into the foreground of the picture, and that its interest has been declared to be paramount. And all that we hope for is that this declaration will be made good, and all exploiters will be sternly kept out.

\* \* \*

Slavery in all but Name. NOW, who is the worst exploiter in Kenya? Mr. E. D. Morel, M. P., in the *Contemporary Review* for September, gives an unimpassioned account of the system, established by the European settlers, "of unbridled exploitation, differing only in name from slavery." Only last week did we describe the system in some detail; our description receives emphatic corroboration in Mr. Morel's article, which sums up the position thus :

Europeans first destroyed native rights in land; they kept one-sixth of the land, the richest and the healthiest, exclusively for themselves, though at present there are only some 2,500 European landowners and farmers in the Colony, and confined nearly 2½ million natives to reserves, which, though technically inalienable, are being yearly diminished and which are to-day one-third of the area reserved 18 years ago. Even in these reserves natives do not enjoy a security of tenure: they may be turned out arbitrarily.

Of the land taken up only a tiny bit (some 5%) is under cultivation, and even for cultivating this area various immoral devices have to be resorted to with a view to forcing natives to serve as hired labourers on European farms: (1) natives are forbidden to grow crops for export on their reserves; (2) such inordinately high taxes are imposed that it takes the native on the average a month and a half to earn the amount of his tax and another month and a half to save it; (3) they are compelled, like members of the criminal tribes, to carry an identification card on their person at all times, failure to do which is a heavily punished crime; (4) finally, desertion is made an offence cognisable by the police, i. e. the European planter need not take out a summons, he merely has to report to the police, and the man is hunted down—whatever the cause of the desertion may have been, cruel flogging or what not. Thus is the native community of peasants converted into landless serfs working at the lowest possible wage on

the farms of its despoilers; but will these land-grabbers be kept out?

\* \* \*

Admission of Untouchables.

IT is gratifying to see that the Bombay Government has directed its officers to give effect to the resolution moved in the last session of the Legislative Council recommending admission of the untouchable classes to all public places and institutions (like watering places, wells, dharmshalas, courts, offices, dispensaries) in so far as the latter belonged to and were maintained by Government. The Bombay Government is also taking steps to bring this resolution to the notice of all local bodies. It is very opportune that the local bodies will consider this question just when the Kenya wound is so fresh and passionate protests are being uttered against the race cruelty practised by Europeans. It is undoubtedly a fact that our enemies are using this great blot on our escutcheon to cover up their own sins, let us, therefore, be true to ourselves and frankly recognise that we cannot obtain any redress of the Kenya injustice until we show readiness in a practical way to remove a greater injustice done by ourselves to a large number of our own fellow-countrymen. It may appear as if to the Imperial Government the just pleadings of Indians are as nothing before the threat of armed rebellion given by Kenya Europeans, but what really robs our plea for justice of all its force is our own treatment of the submerged millions. We hope an attempt will be made, when the Kenya decision is being denounced, to bring home to the public the iniquity of regarding any part of our population as untouchable.

\* \* \*

Liberal Conference at Akola.

THE organisers of the Berar Provincial Liberal Conference, which held a successful session at Akola last Sunday and on the following days, deserve great credit. Both the Chairman of the Reception Committee, Mr. K. G. Damle, and the President, the Hon'ble Mr. S. M. Chitnavis, who is one of the Ministers in the Central Provinces, gave a strong and yet sagacious lead to Berar in their opening addresses. In the Central Provinces the difficulties of dual Government are perhaps felt less acutely than in many other provinces, and yet the Minister had no hesitation in asking for an immediate grant of full provincial autonomy. He said that there were frequent consultations between the two halves of Government, but owing to the absence of corporate responsibility of Ministers, these consultations did not yield the best results. Indeed this joint responsibility of Ministers lies at the very root of the new form of government, and still the practice does not prevail anywhere except that it was in force for some time in the United Provinces, where the Ministers with great foresight enforced it of their own choice. On the Kenya question Mr. Chitnavis was very strong and supported all the retaliatory measures which are being pressed at public meetings, including the boycott of Empire Exhibition and an investigation into the possibilities of the boycott of British goods. Mr. Chitnavis is himself the Minister of Industries in the Central Provinces, but unfortunately he is not in a position to give effect to the proposals to boycott the Empire Exhibition as a mark of protest, as it is already being boycotted on account of financial stringency. He cannot withhold money from the Exhibition since he has none to give it.

## FASCISM AND THE LEAGUE.

SO the Italian brigand-chief, after killing and wounding 102 children and other refugees in Corfu, and having by way of ransom extorted five lakhs of pounds sterling (of which he has contemptuously flung back one into the face of his victim), has actually had to quit. Surely, if the sudden occupation of Corfu was a surprise, this withdrawal of the Italian forces from this key of the Adriatic is a greater surprise still. Of course Mr. Mussolini now says that he only took it as a "pledge," to make sure that Greece would eat all the dirt he was ordering her to swallow; the swallowing having now been accomplished, he pleads that there is no further need for his legions to remain in the island. Yet, no sooner had Corfu been occupied than the Italian dictator-in-chief reminded the world that "it had been Venetian territory for four centuries, anyway." No sooner had Corfu, the southernmost strategic point of the Adriatic, been seized, than Fiume, its northernmost counterpart, was seized similarly. If this is madness, there seems to be a good deal of method in it; if these are "pledges," the word is used obviously, not in the hitherto accepted, but in the new sense which has made the Ruhr famous and M. Poincaré infamous. No, the Italian evacuation of Corfu clearly can only be called "according to plan," as during the war every retreat by the beaten was always described as a "falling back according to plan."

Such, we think, is the "scoring" of Italy over Corfu. Mr. Mussolini of course must go on talking big. He once summed up his Fascist creed in the classic phrase: "It may happen that force will bring about consent; but if that fails, there always remains—force." Mr. Mussolini clearly must go on pretending that this policy of force has done all he intended it to do. As a Fascist, he simply has got to live up to the Fascist requirement of being a "strong man." He has got to live up to it, to keep the nation behind him; he has certainly got to live up to it, to keep his Fascist party together—a not altogether easy task, to judge from the many "purges" he has had to administer to this élite of castor oil heroes itself. Hence the lightening ultimata, the dramatic suddenness of the buccaneering expeditions, the demand for fantastic indemnities and all the rest of it. Not, one thinks, as if he ever believed that a hard world without would thereupon take this theatrical black-shirt artist at his own valuation. The very noise he makes, proves that he knows that, if Italy to-day still ranks as one of the three "Great Powers" of Europe, it certainly is very very much less of a "Great Power" than England or France. And this "complex", which in itself is responsible for Italy's imperialistic fever, finds vent in such outbursts of Mr. Mussolini's as the one in which (on the 4th ult.) he shrieked that "it was time that some of those small Balkan States learned that

Italy is not an insignificant nation of a few million inhabitants, but a Great Power strong in her own strength."

The fact remains that Corfu has been evacuated, although of all things the most obvious is that, if Italian imperialism is to be realised, it can only be because the empire over the Mediterranean has reverted to Italy, and that if this empire is to revert to her, she must possess Corfu, which commands the Adriatic. Corfu was Venetian for that very reason; and for that reason too Napoleon made it French and England (in 1815) British. And if England in 1864 ceded the Ionian Islands to Greece, she did so by an international treaty, which guaranteed Corfu "forever" as a neutral and demilitarized zone. This guarantee, this "scrap of paper", has been torn up by Italy as effectively as was done by Germany over the question of Belgium: but one is not aware of much official indignation being wasted, either in London or in Paris, on the present incident. On the other hand it is very obvious that both France and England (what an inspiring *entente!*) have put it very plainly that, trample as he might on such trifles as international justice, not to mention Greece, they would certainly not allow Mr. Mussolini to remain in Corfu. That surely is the real tragedy of the whole sorry business—that the occupation just as much as the evacuation of Corfu is a mere application of Fascism.

People usually talk, as if Fascism was necessarily a domestic policy only. It is nothing of the kind. The principle of naked force at home is certainly incompatible with democracy; but it is also incompatible abroad with a world made safe for democracy. As the 1921 constitution of the Italian Fascist Party concisely put it: "Fascism does not believe in the vitality or in the principles that inspire the so-called League of Nations." Hence Mr. Mussolini's flat refusal to submit to the finding of the League. He will submit to force; but to justice? Hence the pitiful role cast for the League in this business. Consider: the League is being appealed to in as flagrant a case of breaking the peace, as is possible to imagine. What does the League do? It promptly adjourns. But time being of the essence of the business, the adjournment cannot last. Yet it is evident, if the League agrees with Italy, that it has no jurisdiction in such a case, that thereby it would destroy its own *raison d'être*. If, on the other hand, the League maintains its right and duty to adjudicate between two of its original members: who will carry out the sentence, if it goes against Italy, one of "the Big Three," who made the Versailles "Treaty," which made the League of Nations? The formula eventually decided upon, as likely to save the appearances—and what else does anybody care for?—did not betray much originality even, consisting as it did of the old dodge of passing on such ticklish questions to the "Conference of Ambassadors." This "Conference," the successor of the once "supreme Council of Allies," after

all means just England, France and Italy: and for the League to commission this "Conference" to hear Greece's appeal against Italy therefore means that the League will say, whatever England and France wish it to say. Two and a half years ago Albania had appealed to the League to fix its boundaries, which had been left ill-defined since 1913 and upon which both Yugoslavia and Greece were encroaching. Then already the Council of the League abjectly resolved (June 1921) that "being informed that the Conference of Ambassadors had taken up the Albanian question, it considered it inadvisable (1) to take up the question simultaneously." Having subsequently sent a "Commission of Enquiry" to Albania, the League last February forwarded to the Conference of Ambassadors "a recommendation that the frontier between Greece and Albania in the district of Koritza be promptly determined": so that, when a month ago the delimitation party was ambushed and murdered, what more fatally easy, than for the League to pass on the case to the "Ambassadors' Conference"; and if that case, why not also the "pledging" of Corfu, which arose out of the murder? Yet in plain language this reference from the League to the "Conference" means just this, that three component, and therefore, theoretically subordinate, parts of the League are treated as equal to or rather as greater than the whole League. Truly here the impossible has become possible, the part being proved greater than the whole!

And this deference of the League to the "Big Three" over Albania is unfortunately not the only instance of its kind. The Vilna and Memel questions were treated in just the same way, and it is certain that no question of political importance will ever be treated differently by the League as at present constituted. The war was said to be waged in order to base international affairs on the same principle of consent instead of force, as intra-national affairs were already being based. After the Armistice, the League of Nations was devised to fulfil that democratic aspiration. But not only has there as yet been no substitution of consent for force in international affairs: even for domestic consumption the idea of consent has slumped so badly, that not only Italy and Russia but now also Spain, Greece and Bulgaria, have passed to a Government within by Fascism, i. e. naked force. Europe is still suffering from the poison of war and instead of getting better, seems to be getting daily worse. The League, created by victors to make victory safe, tied as it is to that inhuman monstrosity, the Versailles "Treaty," will never, it is now quite patent, be able to rise above the level of its origin: instead of being able to help Europe out of the bog, the bog seems rapidly to be gaining both on League and Europe.

Notwithstanding the patent hardening of her tradition of subterfuges into the League's settled policy, Mr. Baldwin however considers, according to his speech at the opening of the Imperial Conference

on the 1st, that the part played by the League of Nations in connection with the Italo-Greek crisis has been a "very useful and effective one," and that "the greatest credit is due to it for placing the permanent interests of peace above the immediate interests of the League." On our part we flatly dissent from this opinion that "had the League not existed and not acted as it did, resort to arms would almost inevitably have occurred." Greece, being utterly incapable of fighting again just now, would for a certainty have appealed to France and England against Italy, and France and England would have referred the matter (for appearance sake) to the Ambassadors' Conference, of which Italy is a member: the very thing the League did. The League's rôle is still "useful and effective," just as far as any opportunity for public discussion is useful and effective. In that sense every debating society is useful and effective and a world-wide debating society must necessarily be even "very useful and effective." An international debating society is better than nothing: but as an alternative to Fascism, it is useless. The League was devised to make the world safe for democracy; it will certainly never fulfil that purpose, as long as it consents to play second fiddle to a section of the world, which wants the whole world to remain for ever safe for World Fascism.

#### THE LATE LORD MORLEY.

TO by far the largest section of the Indian people Lord Morley was known as the Secretary of State for India who introduced the measure of reform associated with his name and with that of the late Lord Minto. To know him only in that capacity is not to know him aright. For the "Philosophical Radical" of earlier years had to undergo an infinite amount of heart-searching in sanctioning certain measures, repellent to his nature, as Secretary of State for India. Yet the late Lord Morley was not only a philosophic writer of monographs and essays. He was a statesman trained in the school of the late Mr. Gladstone who defined a statesman as "one who does all that he can and does not refuse to do that because he cannot do all that he ought." When one keeps this in mind, one cannot say with truth that as the Secretary of State for India, Lord Morley swallowed the principles of a lifetime.

For what were those principles? None has put them forth so succinctly and clearly as Lord Morley himself when, exactly thirty-five years ago, he answered a charge made against him by a political opponent that he was "the Saint Just of our revolution." The answer that he gave then is well worth our study even now, for it helps us to understand Lord Morley aright. As the editor of the *Fortnightly Review* for a decade and a half, Lord Morley wrote copiously on the French writers of the Revolutionary epoch. In explain-

ing their opinions he had to defend them against exaggeration and misstatement. Studying the history of an opinion or a movement, one has to delve deep into topics which otherwise one may not touch. And writing upon them, a writer has to stretch a point here and yield some ground there that the whole may group itself into a proper perspective. A critical spirit that necessarily implied a sympathetic and historical statement of the whole subject thus came to be understood as in no way different from an entire agreement with the view that is stated. Thus the man, writing on a revolutionary epoch, its heroes and actors, came to be himself regarded as a revolutionary, if not in practice, at least in theory. Hence the nickname given to Lord Morley to which we have already alluded. In the reply, Lord Morley makes his position quite clear as a writer and thinker no less than as a man of action. After maintaining that in no sense of the term can he ever be considered as either a doctrinaire writer or politician after the French model, Lord Morley emphatically claims to be moulded in thought and action "not by revolutionists and terrorists but by writers and workers that belonged entirely to the opposite camp, namely, by Burke, Austin, Mill, Turgot and Comte—strange sponsors for the theories and principles of the terror." And with what result? The result was that he never came to look upon historical parallels and analogies as of any use at all in solving practical political questions. He held strongly to the view that the power of statesmen and publicists over the course of affairs was strictly limited; that institutions and movements were not capable of immediate or indefinite modification by any amount of mere individual will; that political truths were always relative and never absolute; that any proposals for social and political amelioration were not sound and practical simply because they conformed to abstract rights. These proposals were to be judged each on its own merits by reference not to history or abstract doctrine, but by reference to "convenience, utility, expediency and occasion." For the true and effective reformer "the considerations of time and place were paramount over all other things." In seeking to introduce a change, it will never do to substitute "retrograde aspiration for wise direction, and emotion for the discovery of a law." The crucial difficulty in all practical matters was "how to summon new force, without destroying the sound parts of a structure which it has taken many generations to erect." Governments were never either set up or reformed by reference to abstract rights. Rather, the art of managing these matters well came easy to those who started with the full knowledge of the fact that all government was "the art of dealing wisely with huge groups of conflicting interests, hostile passions, hardly reconcilable aims and vehemently opposed forces." It would, therefore, never do to shout out about natural rights in doing any piece of practical public business that serious politic-

involves. Without minimising aught of the positive shaping influence exercised by great men on the course of events, Lord Morley is careful to remind us that the really great is never grandiose and that "the grandiose types mostly failed." He also adds that "if revolutions at all succeeded, the price paid for the success was terrible." What, then, was the use of history to a statesman and a politician? Its use was not for the searching out of parallels. Analogies from history misled a politician if "he was not sharply on his guard against them." No two situations were exactly alike and, therefore, no two solutions could be exactly on a par, one with the other. History is thus no guide in the matter, except the accurate and complete history of the special problem in hand. A statesman, politician and publicist cannot possibly know too much, nor master the past course and foregone bearings of the special problem in hand too thoroughly." No one can overcome political difficulties without knowing how they came into existence, where they have their roots. Of these matters no publicist can even say that he has known enough. Apart, however, from the special problem in hand, the use of history to any one who cares to undergo that discipline with a practical aim is "to refresh, to open, to make the mind generous and hospitable, to enrich, to impart flexibility, to quicken and nourish political imagination and invention, to instruct in the common difficulties and the various experiences of government, to enable a statesman to place himself at a generous and spacious standpoint." This may help a great deal. But it cannot help in the manner one is inclined to believe. History ought to impress one great lesson upon every earnest-minded politician, and that is that "the genius of politics has not 'all or nothing' for its motto, but seeks on the contrary to extract the greatest advantage from situations the most compromised and never flings the helve after the hatchet."

If one weighs carefully the teaching of Lord Morley outlined above, one cannot charge him with having gone back upon his principles in the discharge of his duties as the Secretary of State for India. India may hold him responsible for many an act during his régime that India may not like. But India does not know all in the matter. And to judge a man on superficial evidence is to do him an obvious wrong.

Lord Morley's greatness lies in the world of letters and humanities. And those who study his monographs on Burke, Walpole, Cromwell, Voltaire and others, as well as his monumental biographies of Cobden and Gladstone, know how great he was and in how many directions. He was great as a political biographer. He was great as a wise, deep and penetrating critic of movements of world-importance in human history. He was great as a master of literary style and method and was versatile and deep in his knowledge of human motives and character, of human institutions and of the men at their helm.

As may be gathered from the reading of his "Recollections," he knew thoroughly and described faithfully the thought-currents in later European history. Who that has read his "Miscellanies" and his great little book on "Politics and History," can deny him the first rank as a healthy and great formative influence of his age? Indeed, he was one of its choice spirits along with Hutton Bagehot and the noble band of writers that made the *Fortnightly*, with Lord Morley at its helm, a stronghold of liberal opinion and generous emotion. Lord Morley's vein in writing is of the austere kind. His phrase is apt to be ponderous but it is weighted with thought. There is nothing of thinness or attenuation either in his style or matter. And like his great master Mill, the aim is always social. He goes deep down into the forces that make an epoch great. And in determining the place of a writer or worker in that epoch, he lays emphasis on his contribution to it either as a critic or creator of new forms. It used to be said about Macaulay and Carlyle that if one read their writings one got a fairly good acquaintance with the eighteenth century that was their principal theme. If one reads carefully all the volumes that Lord Morley has given to the world, one would get an all-sided and full view of the many forces, social, political and religious, that have contributed to make our century what it is. And Lord Morley is not content to give you mere pictures. He makes you think. He gives you the sanity and poise, the steady vision that helps to clear up the mists of the understanding. There is plenty of idealism in all his books: there is inspiration enough to lift you to great heights of political and social thinking. But the gaze is steady and firm, the bearings are never missed. And the whole falls into a proper perspective. His writings are both a stimulant and solvent, full of critical and historical spirit. And they are eminent above all for serious thinking that braces.

As one thinks of the intellectual revolution worked in one's outlook on life and its many problems by contact with a master mind-like his, one cannot help echoing the just and noble tribute paid to him on a memorable occasion by the late Mr. Gokhale. Would that the men of the present generation studied these writings as earnestly and thoroughly as men did in the past. They will learn much there that will remove the cobwebs on their understanding and set their feet on the right road. For above everything else, Lord Morley was one of those "who sought truth and desired goodness and let the light shine before men." For want of light we do not know if our opinions are true or false; intellectually we live like lunatics; and politically and morally we are apt to constitute a great peril to the cause we love. The only and proper correlative is serious thinking. And such a tonic for the mind and the heart we get in the works of the men who served their generation faithfully and never "let enthusiasm do duty for reasoned scrutiny".

V. N. NAIK.

## KENYA HELOTRY.

## WHAT SHALL WE DO NEXT ?

THE decision of the British Government on the Kenya question is extremely farcical, though the status of Indians abroad should have been treated as a serious problem. British East Africa had close trade relations with India for several centuries before the advent of the British and it was officially admitted that, but for the Indian pioneer settlement, Britain would have no hold there.

The original East African charter of 1888 declares that there shall be no differential treatment of the subjects of any power as to trade or settlement and definitely mentions that the grant was calculated to be advantageous to the commercial and other interests of Indian subjects and to protect them from the necessity of trading and residing under an alien rule. Mr. Winston Churchill in his book "My African Journey" writes:

It was the Sikh soldier who bore an honourable part in the conquest and pacification of these East African countries. It is the Indian trader who, penetrating himself in all sorts of places to which no white man would go or in which no white man could earn a living, has more than anyone else developed the early beginnings of trade and opened up the first slender means of communication. It was Indian labour that the one vital Railway on which everything else depends was constructed. It is the Indian banker who supplies, perhaps the larger part of the capital yet available for business and enterprise and to whom the white settlers have not hesitated to recur for financial aid. The Indian was here long before the first British officer. He may point to as many generations of useful industry on the coast and inland as the white settlers, especially the most recently arrived contingents from South Africa (the loudest against him of all) can count years of residence. Is it possible for any Government with a scrap of respect for honest dealing between man and man, to embark on a policy of deliberately squeezing out that native of India from regions in which he has established himself, under every security of public faith?"

When the Colony changed hands from the Foreign Office to the Colonial Office troubles began, though Lord Elgin openly declared that the Imperial Government would be no party to statutory discrimination of a racial character. The Imperial Conference, recognising the incogruity between the position of India as an equal member of the British Empire and the existence of disabilities upon British Indians lawfully domiciled in some parts of the Empire, expressed the opinion that in the interests of the solidarity of the British Commonwealth "it is desirable that the rights of such Indians to citizenship should be recognized."

In spite of this, in a Crown Colony where Indians have settled long before any white settler, Indians were treated as helots. Now in Kenya there are 9651 white settlers and 35,355 Asiatics of whom more than two-thirds are Indians, while the African population is 2½ millions. The white settlers complain that the Indians in Kenya are demanding not merely a measure of representation but equal rights with the white settlers and assert that there was a promise made in 1904 that the country

would be reserved for white population. They assert that the Indians ought not to be placed on terms of political equality with the white men throughout the British Commonwealth of Nations. The post-prandial speech of Mr. Churchill at the East African Banquet in London in January 1922 stiffened the backs of these white settlers.

Lord Cranworth emphatically stated, regarding the future constitution of Kenya, that all three partners, Africans, Indians and Europeans, should be admitted to one common electoral roll on equal terms. The Right Hon'ble Srinivasa Sastri is perfectly right when he stated that the question of the treatment of Indians in Kenya was a matter of life and death not only to India but to the British Commonwealth. The white settlers have demanded strict control of Indian immigration with a view to ultimate prohibition and segregation of residential areas by the exclusion of Asiatics from the Highlands. These white planters pleaded through their Government to secure labour from India some time ago on the ground that there was land suitable for Indian settlement and the Protectorate was popular with Indians, as was shown by the fact that there were 3071 Indian settlers in Nairobi and 5500 in Mombasa, and their Governor then pleaded that labour from India was absolutely essential for the promotion of industries and development of the Colony. The Duke of Devonshire, the Colonial Secretary, has pledged himself that no alteration shall take place in the reservation of the Highlands and he cannot bind his successors. The Indian Government's plea for equal treatment and equality of status was set at naught. The memorandum on Indians in Kenya presented to Parliament by the British Cabinet in July 1923 states that the protection and advancement of the native races in Africa is the duty cast on the Government. We know how Indian interests are safeguarded in India. This plea of trusteeship for the native races and satisfaction of the legitimate aspirations of all communities is good if real, but Indians know full well that it is a camouflage. The reasons for the rejection of a common electoral roll are palpably unsound. Segregation in townships was abandoned, but reservation of Highlands for white settlers was approved. Immigration of Indians is controlled in the alleged economic interest of the natives. India as a body expressed in unmistakable terms her indignation that the British Cabinet should deny equal rights of citizenship in the Crown Colonies to Indians, while treating the white settlers of any nationality most favourably.

Various suggestions were made by politicians to secure redress of these wrongs, but I am afraid the only vital retaliatory measure which India should adopt without any delay, viz. the stoppage of emigration of assisted labour to any Crown Colony whatsoever till the British Cabinet recognises the equality of status of Indians, was put in the background, though resolutions favouring it were passed in Bombay, Allahabad, and Madras

some time back. Indians, they say, should feel a sense of pride in the Imperial partnership. In these talks of Imperial Federation India was treated as a dependency without a volition of its own. The present attitude of the British Cabinet towards India is clearly lacking in statesmanship and discretion, leading to unforeseen disastrous consequences both to India and the Empire.

The hesitation on the part of some Indian politicians to advocate stoppage of further emigration to Crown Colonies is evidently due to the fear that the slight advantage which Indian labourers would get in the increased wages in foreign lands would be lost. I made myself closely acquainted with the treatment accorded to Indian labourers in the Crown Colonies. I have no hesitation to come to the conclusion that Indians were not treated at all fairly in any Crown Colony and none of them were treated as British subjects in any sense of the term. If I am permitted to dive into the problem I can cite instances of how their treatment is not far removed from the treatment accorded to them in the days of indenture, which was semi-slavery. I can assert without fear of contradiction that in no Crown Colony is a fair living wage given to Indian labourers. Any additional member emigrating to any Crown Colony would flood the labour market and drive those Indians who are already there to accept starvation wages. In most cases these emigrant labourers are both physical and moral wrecks. Indians possess no political status there. The treatment accorded to them is not at all tempting to labourers here. Why should self-respecting Indians go there to work on servile conditions? Indians have as a nation lost all prestige on account of these coolie emigrants. Indians are known as a Coolie race in those places. We should prevent exploitation of cheap Indian labour by the planters for their sole benefit, while being ever ready to kick them out when the necessity ceases. Bad sanitation, filthy surroundings, low wages and sweating are the lot of our poor fellow Indian citizens. Apart from this, there are some Colonies which cannot get on without the help of Indian labourers. Hence I am perfectly certain that these Colonies, where Britishers invested more than 100 million sterling, would be the first to bring pressure on the Home Government to grant equal political status to Indians in the Crown Colonies to secure Indian labour. It is shortsighted policy to forego such an opportunity, to recover the lost prestige and equal status with the white settlers. The only pertinent question is whether Indians should be a self-respecting nation. If so, why hesitate to advocate stoppage of emigration when our status is denied in the Empire and the request of the Colonies for Indian labour now is an affront to our intelligence, an insult to our honour and an outrage to our feelings?

B. VENKATAPATI RAJU.

## PROTECTIVE TARIFF: SOME FALLACIES

IN this article I shall deal with some common fallacies current in India with regard to the protective tariff. It is necessary to examine them because some of them are, in authoritative quarters, accepted almost as axioms. Also most of them are so widely accepted as articles of popular belief that the real case for the tariff is only injured by its being mixed up with them.

### 1. KEY INDUSTRIES.

It is held by some that the protective tariff is the only means of developing the key industries of India, that is, those industries which are vitally necessary for the development of other industries. We may here distinguish these from the dependent industries, that is, those industries which use the products of the key industries as their raw materials. Key industries will include the industries to produce coal, petroleum, iron and steel, chemicals, dyes, glass insulators, some leather goods, etc. It is no doubt true that no country can ever hope to be industrially efficient unless its key industries are developed, that is, unless the basic commodities are produced within the country. If any country be without the resources necessary for these industries, it can never develop its dependent industries so well by importing the products of the key industries from outside. Fortunately the economic resources of India are rich in most of the materials necessary for the development of these industries.

The question therefore is how to stimulate their growth. A general impression prevails that the protective tariff is the only efficacious means for this purpose. At any rate this is the suggestion with regard to an important key industry of India, viz., the iron and steel industry.\* But not only is a tariff not suitable for such industries, but there cannot be any surer means of inflicting great harm on these industries, on the dependent industries, and on the country at large. The importance of the key industries lies in the fact that their products are essential for other kinds of products which confer great benefits upon the country. Therefore, if a high import tariff be imposed upon those products, their price will rise in India to the full extent of the tariff, unless the rate of the tariff be too high and therefore allow some reduction in the price by internal competition. This naturally would raise the cost of production of all the dependent industries. As these latter are the

\*Report of the Committee of Members of the Indian Legislature, appointed to consider what steps should be taken by the Government of India to encourage the establishment of the necessary industries, so that as large an amount as possible of the Rs. 150 crores proposed to be set aside for the rehabilitation of the railways during the next five years be spent in India, and, further, to advise the Government of India in regard to the revision of the Indian Stores Rules; April, 1923. Vide specially the joint note by the minority. Also Report of the Indian Fiscal Commission, paragraph 59: "The question of extending protection to the manufacture of steel should be one of the first subjects for enquiry by the Tariff Board." But vide also paragraph 99.

main producers of consumption articles, there would tend to be a general rise in the prices of most articles of consumption. This must lead to reduced consumption, which must make the dependent industries less able to buy the same quantity from the key industries at higher prices. If it be argued that the key industries should be first developed and that we should turn after this to the development of the dependent industries, that also is ineffective, inasmuch as the key industries can never develop so long as the dependent industries do not buy their products. In fact the greater the supposed stimulus given to the key industries in the form of a high tariff, that is, the higher the tariff, the greater will be the rise in the price of these articles and the greater will be the inability of the dependent industries to provide a market for them. Thus it is a suicidal policy to impose a tariff for developing the key industries. Some means must be devised by which the interests of the key and the dependent industries will be reconciled, and the two will grow together. Such a device it is not difficult to find, if the key industries, selected for protection; be really key industries, that is, industries whose development either means the development of many dependent industries which produce articles of general consumption and thus confer great benefits upon the country as a whole or whose development means the production directly of commodities, e. g., of railway locomotives, wagons, etc., which are of great utility to the country.

The total benefit of a commodity to the country consists of the gains of both the consumers and the producers. The greater the consumption of an article, the wider the classes by whom it is consumed; and the greater the amount consumed by each individual or group of individuals within the country, the greater will be the gain which the consumers will derive from that commodity. The reason is to be found in the principle of consumers' surplus. Therefore, if our choice of the key industries be right, they will affect widely the consumers of a large number of important dependent industries, so that the total gain of the consumers will be greater with a greater use of the products of the key industries at comparatively low prices. Thus the solution of the problem of developing the key industries without injuring the dependent industries and therefore the community in general and ultimately the key industries themselves, lies in the latter's development without any substantial increase in their prices. If such industries require protection it means that of the two items which make up the total gain to the country, one, viz., the gain of the consumers, is a positive figure, while the other, viz., the gain of the producers, is a negative figure, that is, it is a net loss to the producers. If such industries be properly chosen, that is, those which are useful and likely to succeed, it means that the gain of the consumers will be very great and that the loss of the producers will be compa-

ratively very small. In such circumstances the interests of these key industries, their dependent industries, and of the direct or indirect consumers of the products of both can be reconciled by taxing the consumers in order to pay a subsidy to the key industries. This will convert the loss of the producers in the key industries into a gain. This will not raise the price of their products, at the same time that the key industries will develop as effectively as with the tariff. Thus the progress of the dependent industries will not be hampered and may even be encouraged with a fall of their cost of production. The consumers will also gain inasmuch as the tax which they will pay by way of direct subsidy to the key industries will be more than compensated by their gain as consumers owing to the development of the dependent industries, that is, there will be a net gain to them to the extent of the difference between the positive consumers' surplus and the negative producers' surplus, i. e. the loss. This seems to be the only way out of the difficulty. In such cases the tariff will not develop the industries, for the rise in the prices of their products will reduce their market; it will hamper the development of the dependent industries, for the rise in their cost of production will put them at a disadvantage; and it will injure the consumers since they will be paying a higher price for the products of both without much chance of developing either.

( To be continued. )

PRAFULLACHANDRA BASU.

### A LETTER FROM LONDON.

( FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT. )

LONDON, AUG. 16.

THERE is a reactionary and indiscreet weekly here called the *Patriot*, which is open to all the Die-hards, Fascisti, and Anti-Semites that this country can produce and they are influential, if few. It is a sort of weekly distillate of the worst that the *Morning Post* contains. Here Lord Sydenham holds forth to his heart's content upon the absorbing theme of the disintegration of India. Why he should write so bitterly about the administration of those great statesmen who at present preside over the destinies of India at the India Office it is a little hard to say. If Lord Sydenham and Sir Michael O'Dwyer do not find things cosy for them under the post-Montagu régime at the King Charles Street offices, it can only be for some temperamental differences between them and the Whitehall divinities, for as to policy there can be no great barrier between them, notwithstanding Lord Winterton's occasional display of sparring with their protagonist in the House of Commons, Sir Charles Yate, whose urbanity is only exceeded by his malicious inferences as to the situation in India, which he and his collaborators of the Indo-British Association have done so much to bring about. There is no doubt that the very worst service that non-co-operation has done here is to



prove to sceptical Britishers that India is a dog that cannot bite. The generally prevailing feeling in this country is that British rule there is safe for another generation. Eminent Britishers who have returned here during the last few months all tell the same tale, and there is no doubt that it will be repeated throughout the land when Sir George Lloyd does us the honour of resuming his residence among us. That is why some of the most experienced Indians who have come here strongly deprecate empty threats and pointless, if indignant, protests regarding the Crown Colonies and Dominions. Mere objurgation and fulmination cannot supply the place of organized self-development and external propaganda. If the Kenya controversy has any lesson to teach in India it is surely this, that we here are realists. We respect those who are strongly organized, and we prefer those British territories to others where active, dynamic effort is either paralysed or else is so dissipated by internal quarrels and social weaknesses as to be easily ignored in the "settling" of disputes. Take, for instance, the present riots between Hindus and Mussulmans in Northern India. They are almost daily the theme of disparaging telegrams from the Indian correspondents of the *Morning Post* and the *Daily Telegraph*. Occasionally the correspondents of the *Times* join in. What can the Indian spokesmen here validly say in reply to those who cast these things in their teeth, as a reason for delaying the rate of Indianisation of the Services? What is the use of trying to conceal manifest weaknesses? Is it not better to recognise them frankly and take measures to remedy the evil? That is the real hope of the future. Had India been as really and effectively united about the Kenya matter as the country was on the platform and in the press, it is inconceivable that the matter would have been decided as it has been, for India would have been so far on the road to Dominion status, which to-day must be her immediate objective.

In this week's *Solicitors' Journal* there is an interesting paragraph bearing upon current conditions in India. The periodical recalls Sir Alfred Lyall's remark, in his monograph on Warren Hastings. Telling how Hastings gave evidence in extreme old age, thirty years after his return from Bengal before a Committee of the House of Commons inquiring into Indian reforms, and how his evidence was so out of date that it disappointed all his admirers, Lyall goes on to point out the paradox of the East. "Although we talk justly of the "unchanging East," he says, "yet the social and political conditions of India change so very rapidly that administrative experience acquired there goes out of date far more quickly than it does in Europe. Retired civilians find in ten years that their information is out of date, and that their views are not considered worth discussing by young members of the Service home on leave." However true that might have been when Sir Alfred Lyall wrote, it is trebly true to-day, when

an absence from India of two years makes one out of date. But Lord Sydenham and his colleagues in misrepresentation do not appear to remember this.

### CONTINENTAL LETTER.

SASSENBERG in Westphalia.

SEPTEMBER 9th.

THERE can be little doubt that the period of "passive resistance" in the Rhineland and in Westphalia is drawing to an end. The spirit of the population, it is true, is unbroken, their conception of the political situation is unaltered, their hatred against the oppressors has increased from day to day, but in spite of all that the movement is doomed because the economic loss of blood is too great. What all tortures have not been able to produce is being brought about by the appalling state of the rate of exchange. In a few days, in spite of all energetic endeavours from the new Government to stop the inflation by imposing enormous taxes on those parts of the nation that had hitherto got off cheap, a Russian state of things will have been reached in regard to financial matters. Great districts there are where already the currency has almost lost its meaning. In the Westphalian country, for instance, where I write this, payments in money are in very many cases accepted with reluctance from strangers only. The people have returned among themselves to more primitive methods: the servants, the doctor, the lawyer, the apothecary being paid in hundredweights of rye. Rye-currency has replaced money-currency. It is easy to imagine the difficulties connected with this system. You cannot pocket a sack of rye as you used to do a mark! It indicates in fact the break-down of the whole financial system of Germany which has been unable to stand any longer the tremendous losses caused by the great anti-French strike on the Ruhr, the most gigantic strike the world has ever seen.

Enormous sums of ready money have been robbed by the French authorities in the occupied districts, but greater are the values which have been destroyed by the occupation. One must bear in mind that since the 11th of January the Reich pays the wages for about 600,000 working-men who are either compelled to do nothing or whose products cannot be sold. Moreover, already at present there is a latent unemployment in the industry of the unoccupied Germany of about 30 per cent which expresses itself mostly in reduced hours of work. Worse conditions are threatening in the near future. The output of coal having in many cases come to a standstill by the occupation, or being unavailable in the other parts of the country because of it, vast amounts of English coal have had to be imported, a measure which is in itself sufficient to bring about an extraordinary increase in the cost of production. The German export has consequently decreased rapidly, from 614 mil-

lion gold mark in May to 380 in June and 105 in July. The price of the necessaries of life rises not daily but hourly. Under these circumstances PEACE is the most urgent necessity.

A wise Government, it is true, should have anticipated these things and acted accordingly. No doubt many mistakes have been made. As to the Ruhr invasion however, it was difficult to act differently, the whole of public opinion being unanimous in its indignation and its will to resist. The attitude of the British Cabinet has greatly contributed to strengthen this resistance and to keep it alive. A man who sees himself attacked by robbers will part with his shirt as long as he hears his cry for help answered by a well-known voice from afar. The voice—alas!—has become silent again. That is why a feeling of deep disappointment as to the British politicians pervades the whole of Central Europe to-day. The premiership of Mr. Baldwin seemed to announce a new course of politics. We all knew that his path would be thorny, but what nobody expected was that he would give up his journey as soon as the first thorn pricked him. The future will show if England, if the world at large, profits by it. For the end of the "passive" resistance being in sight, the aims of France become more distinct, and these aims mean a menace to England which nobody can overlook.

The new German Chancellor Stresemann, a clever man, although (as his attitude during the war made clear) by no means a far-sighted politician, has begun his career with some speeches, which try to avert the unavoidable by offering concessions to France. The whole economic substance of Germany, including the railways, is being presented as a pledge for the reparations. International control of it is agreed to, a fusion of French and German industry is proposed. The French press takes these things as mere symbols of the relenting resistance. French politics do not seem to be seriously influenced by them. Their aim becomes clearer than ever by a new ordinance issued in the occupied district by which the French occupation authorities claim the right to obtain knowledge of every official document destined for members of the German administration and to fill the vacant posts of the German administration with persons they think fit for them. It is easy to see that measures like these fall little short of an outspoken annexation. What it means to a country in which all respectable people shrink from the touch of the invader as if from somebody unclean need not be said. The next step, however, will be the demand that Germany submits to this state of things as the legal one. Hunger has compelled Germany to sign the Versailles Treaty, and hunger, it is to be feared, will compel her before winter to sign a new Treaty, which makes France practically the possessor of Ruhr and Rhine, that is, the lord of all Europe. What Herr Stresemann offers now will then presumably be

only a few minor items, of the new treaty. French industry will suck up the German coal-mines. Those German industries which mean a competition to France will be brought to a standstill. France evidently thinks to be able in this way to compete with English industry all over the world, the more so as it will keep the enslaved German employees and workers in a state of semi-starvation and makes them work on the lowest possible wages.

The whole thing means an enormous reaction not only from the political point of view, but also from the standpoint of social progress. For unsympathetic as the features of all capitalism are, one must not forget that French capitalism has an especially ugly and cruel face. This to a large extent explains the nature of the passive resistance of the Westphalian working-man. It was not the result of his belief in the right of self-determination of the nations only, but also his fear to lose all the social rights that he has won in the hard struggle of more than two generations, including the eight hours' day, which determined his attitude. He is not in the dark about the things that threaten him. Those Upper Silesian industrial works which have passed over into the hands of French employers offer a warning of what will become of the rights of the working man in the Ruhr district under the French rule. The absolute impotence of the French trade-unions too speaks volumes. Moreover, though it is true that the great *entrepreneurs* of the Stinnes type are in many respects not the particular glory of their country, still justice demands to acknowledge that they could not be what they are, unless every one of their employees knew that they too are hard-working men, by no means *fruges consumere nati*. It serves to take the edge off the difficulties that arise out of the social antagonism between employer and working-man in these districts that the former lives and works in the midst of his men who cannot fail to see that the greater part of his time is by no means spent on idle amusements, but on the improvement and extension of the enterprise. It is this very trait of German industrialism that has greatly contributed to the great progress of German industry before the world-war in creating new possibilities for work and sale.

The type of the great French industrialist is different. There are, it is true, a few exceptions to the rule, but on the whole the different French attitude towards life makes itself felt nowhere more strongly than in these circles. French *entrepreneurs* of the Krupp type do not as a rule appear at nine o'clock in the morning at the latest in their office in order to take as full a share of work during the day as everybody else. They move to Paris, the great European centre of the *joie de vivre*, in order to "live their life" as they call it, and their ambition with regard to their industrial work is confined to their endeavour to see the shares reaching such heights at the

'Bourse' as to enable them to make large stock-exchange gains. This aim requires more than anything else high dividends. You cannot, however, make new investments and pay high dividends at the same time. So improvements and extension of the works naturally suffer. This is one of the reasons why French industry could not in the past keep pace with Central Europe. Another consists in the want of efficiency that characterises the French *entrepreneurs* in regard to their technical ability. They lack the necessary accuracy and neatness which in other parts of the world are met with. It is evidently due to these shortcomings that the great foundries of Lorraine which used to flourish in German hands began to have deficits as soon as the Versailles Treaty made them pass over into French ownership, long before the Ruhr conflict deprived them of the German coke which plays so important a part in the great struggle now.

What general effect in these circumstances the change of ownership—for nothing less is intended—of the works in the Ruhr district would mean, is easy to be imagined: it would exert a paralysing influence where the greatest activity and the spirit of initiative is required to conquer the misery produced by four years of open and as many years of hidden war. Neither would it take the intolerable burden of the London ultimatum off the shoulders of an almost crushed Germany. For owing to our difficulties the stock-exchange value of the shares of the industrial works in question is rather low. That means that the French would take them over for a trifling price and the reparation sum of 132 milliards of gold-marks fixed by the London ultimatum would only be inconsiderably diminished by what they would allow for them. So the old system of squeezing the last penny out of Germany would go on unaltered no matter if Rhine and Ruhr were French or formed for international decency's sake an "Independent Rhine State" under French guidance. May be that the pressure would be relaxed if the French aim, which M. Poincaré only lately in a public speech hinted at, was reached—to dissolve again Germany into a conglomeration of little States. It is characteristic for the progressiveness of the rulers of France that what their principal political idea has in view is nothing else but a silly turning back of the wheel of history.

LEVIN L. SCHÜCKING.

## REVIEW.

### THE POPULATION QUESTION.

WRIGHT, HAROLD: POPULATION.. (Cambridge Economic Handbook.) 1923. 7½ x 4½ p.p. 178. (Nisbet and Co, Ltd., London.)

THE phenomenal depletion of men and resources during the world war is bound to attract the attention to the problem of population of all interested in the reconstruction after the war. For the time being it appears that the teaching of Malthus and Mill has become antiquated and the need of the hour is the increase of population. A book, therefore, dispassionately reviewing the whole data and outlining the main features of the problem is decidedly welcome. The question is the greatest of all questions and involves instincts and emotions which are of the deepest and most primordial.

The author begins by giving the history of population theories and a full account of the essay of Malthus, the great classic on the subject. The conclusion of Malthus was that a decline in general standard of comfort was inevitable if population continued to increase. Malthus took a gloomy view of the prospects of mankind. After a time there was a reaction against Malthus when the Industrialism of the new era showed increasing returns and there was a large increase of wealth. Mill spoke of the progress of civilization including under that term skill, invention, mechanical improvements and transport facilities. The Great War, however, has "proved that we were living in a fool's paradise" and to-day England has got 46 millions of people to feed, for whom she must export, and that means exhaustion of coal and other resources. The civilization of the 19th century has simply increased the numbers, and pressure of the population on the means of subsistence is being felt again. So we are returning to Malthus again.

After this the food and raw materials of the world are discussed and the conclusion arrived at is that the law of diminishing returns is operating slowly but surely. We think that the conclusion is quite sound and ought to be a warning against a too facile optimism which exists in certain quarters in England about a tendency to perfection leading ultimately to a millenium.

With regard to coal and iron the position of Europe and especially Great Britain is disquieting. The British costs were quadrupled during the war and after a century coal would not be as cheap as it is to-day. It should be noted here that the book is written from the point of view of Britain and consequently the possibility of importing coal from America is viewed with apprehension.

The phenomenon of a falling birth-rate is now experienced in almost all the countries of Europe and it is surmised that voluntary restraint is the main cause operating. Prof. Wright believes that the birth-rate will fall still more and opines that it is better to limit birth-rate than adjust the balance by a high death-rate.

With regard to international problems the most complicated question is whether they are brought about merely by the pressure of population. The scramble for places under the sun and the rage for exploitation of backward races ultimately mean nothing more than the pressure of population on the means of subsistence. It is interesting to see the contrast here between Malthus' idea of war as reducing the population and our idea of it as reducing the productivity of nations.

"It would seem that modern war is not a check to population in the Malthusian sense at all." It diminishes men, but it diminishes food and other necessaries to a larger extent. From the standpoint of the pacifist this is a welcome addition to his other arguments against war. Admitting this, however, the author is careful in adding that wars are due to complex causes and population is only one amongst others.

The emigration problems reveal the unpleasant truth that the present tendency is away from co-operation and towards a keen and self-seeking nationalism. This leads to a bitter struggle for the necessaries of life. The proper remedy is the supremacy of reason over blind impulse; in other words restraint of population all round. So far the author is on firm ground. But we are constrained to remark that

religious and emotional considerations are so closely interwoven with the problem of population that it would be unscientific to judge the question as a purely material issue to be decided only with reference to subsistence. In any case it is not safe to dogmatise over this solution.

The novel feature about the book is the consideration of the quality of the population. A whole chapter at the end is devoted to this topic. In most of the books on the subject the question has been treated only quantitatively. Statistics reveal difference in the fertility of different classes. The worst stocks breed fastest and the result is racial deterioration. The author, however, admits that Eugenics is an infant science and too much should not be made of the present labels of higher and lower. The present class is likely to be as good as the higher classes. No connection has been established between wealth and quality so far. Equality of opportunity is needed not only in the interests of justice "but to enrich the world by opening the reservoirs of hidden talent" among the poor. The difficulty of Eugenics lies in our inability to answer the question "What is the ideal of our breeding and what type are we to regard as our goal?"

As against the socialist, however, the author says that no claim to a certain standard of comfort on the part of every child can be conceded unless society also regulates the number. Thus we are back to Malthus again. The parents are responsible for the support of the child-not society.

Prof. Wright is to be congratulated on giving in the small compass of 178 pages a very clear account of one of the knottiest problems in Economics and Sociology.

V. N. G.

## 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,**  
Business Manager,  
Lucknow University Journal,  
LUCKNOW: UPPER INDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, Ltd., 4,  
Aminabad Park.  
LONDON: P. S. KING & SONS, Orchard House, 2 & 4 Great  
Smith Street, Westminster, Lond., S. W.

## JUST RECEIVED.

### LEAFLETS AND BOOKLETS BY AND ABOUT TOLSTOY

	Rs A.
Anna Karenina, Vols. 1 and 2, each	... 1 10
A Confession and What I Believe	... 1 10
What I Believe ( My Religion )	... 1 2
The Cossacks	... 1 10
The Overthrow of Hell and Its Restoration	6 4
Essays and Letters	... 1 10
How I Came to Believe	... 0 7
King Assarhadon and Other Stories	... 0 7
A Great Iniquity	... 6 7
Sayings of Tolstoy (A thought for each day)	0 7
The Slavery of Our Times. 75 chapters, introduction and an afterward—pages 127. ( Eng. ed. )	... 1 1
War and Peace	... 1 10
Social Evils and Their Remedies ( Cloth )	... 1 10
Tolstoy's Teaching. An epitome with a programme of study	... 0 8
The Relation of the Sexes	... 1 0
Popular Stories and Legends	... 0 10
Sevastopol	... 1 13
My Childhood and Boyhood	... 1 10
My Youth	... 1 10
Two Generations	... 1 10
Thou Shalt Not Kill	... 0 2
Twenty-three Tales	... 1 10
Resurrection	... 1 10
Rule by Murder	... 0 2
How I Came to Believe (cloth)	... 1 10
Autobiography of Count Leo Tolstoy	... 5 4
Reminiscences of Tolstoy	... 5 4
Two Pilgrims	... 0 5
Last Days of Tolstoy	... 6 2
Tolstoy—By Edward Garnett	... 1 4

The Theosophical Publishing House,

Adyar,

Madras.

INDIAN BOOK SHOP

George Town,

Madras.

## 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. E. 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 **COSI SILK SUIT** length for Rs. 12 only. These pieces are economical, hard wearing and handsome ever made.

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

NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_