

# THE Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE

Office : KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. VI, No. 38.]

POONA—THURSDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1923.

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

## CONTENTS.

TOPICS OF THE WEEK —	—	445
<b>ARTICLES :—</b>		
Mr. Baldwin's Risks	...	447
Points for the Services Commission. By Service	...	448
Poona's Protest. By an On-looker	...	449
Protective Tariff : Some Fallacies. III. By Professor Prafullachandra Basu	...	451
A LETTER FROM LONDON	...	453
<b>REVIEW :—</b>		
Economics and Apologetics. By Z.	...	455

## TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

FROM the text of Mr. Innes' speech  
at the Empire Economic Conference, which the Government of India has published, it must be acknowledged that he did all that a Government officer could do to dissociate the Indian public and the Indian Government from the policy of imperial preference on which Great Britain and the Dominions have set their heart. He reaffirmed and endorsed the conclusion reached by a committee twenty years ago that India had little to gain and a good deal to lose or risk by a general policy for preference for Empire goods. This conclusion has received corroboration at the hands of the Fiscal Commission and may now be regarded as final and incontrovertible. Whether India should make a sacrifice out of Empire sentiment in the interests of Empire solidarity is a question that must be settled by a self-governing India, which alone can make a free-will offering to the Commonwealth: the Government which speaks for an India still on the road to self-government has no moral right to call on the people to make such a sacrifice. This was the opinion expressed by the Fiscal Commission and Mr. Innes has done well to reiterate it on this occasion. What, however, is more commendable in Mr. Innes is that he stated that political feeling in India was by no means favourable to making any tariff concessions; he might well have added that it was all in favour of so arranging its tariff as to discriminate against Great Britain and the Dominions which ill-treated the Indians. It will not be difficult, however, for the statesmen in control of the imperial policy to gauge the depth of Indian sentiment on this matter, and anyhow they will not be left in doubt when time comes for the Indian legislature to

discuss the budget of the Government of India next year.

\* \* \*

Can India Retaliate?

WE do not suppose that it will be a matter of utter indifference to the colonies and to Great Britain how we manipulate our tariff. Recently the Minister for Customs in Canada had occasion to remark in the Dominion Parliament on the rapid growth of India's trade with Canada. While India had imported \$30,000 worth of goods annually from Canada before the war she imported goods worth \$125,000 annually after the war and he hoped that this amount would quadruple itself in the current year. He knew what would make for such an expansion of trade, for he observed: "The extent to which India will trade with Canada would very probably depend upon the treatment which the natives of India received in this country." Senator Reid also employed this argument in the Commonwealth Senate with great effect in order to reinforce his plea for conceding full civic rights to Indians settled in Australia. "If we do not give this consideration [i. e. grant the franchise] to the Indians in Australia," he said, "we cannot blame India if it retaliates and grants further preference to those countries which allow the full franchise to Indians. We should make the Indians amongst us citizens in the full sense of the word and thus show that there is some meaning in the word 'Empire.' Some day India will demand this consideration at our hands, and we should not force it to wield the sword to obtain the treatment it deserves. We should not deal with its people in such a way that it might some day desire to turn all the white people out of India." This supplies an answer both to those who always harp on one chord, that we shall forfeit all sympathy in the Dominions if we speak of retaliation, and to those who harp on the other chord, that our retaliation is bound to prove ineffective. Sensible people in the Dominions understand very well that if India chooses to retaliate she has just cause for taking up this weapon and they also know that she can wield it to some purpose.

\* \* \*

Anti-Empire-Preference.

WE should have preferred the Bombay Corporation to wait till the Committee in Bombay had submitted its report before proclaiming, as it did on Monday last, the boycott of British and Empire goods by a resolution on the subject. Then the public would

have known what goods can be effectively boycotted. As it is, moreover, the resolution might have been worded somewhat differently: for it stands to reason that the purchase of British goods should not be excluded, irrespective of cost or time of delivery, and we believe that this was really the intention of the movers of the resolution—anyhow in future resolutions we think it would be as well to make clear that what really is intended, is to reverse Imperial "Preference" and rather in future to give strict preference to goods manufactured elsewhere, than in the Empire, if prices and other conditions are not altogether prohibitive. It is a mistake we think to concentrate on the piece-goods trade: even if other imports are smaller, the sudden withdrawal of Indian orders in other commodities is bound to be severely felt at such a time of slump when manufacturers are particularly sensitive; to even the smallest further slackening off. When the British Cabinet had to consider the Kenya question, it had to weigh armed revolt in Kenya and South Africa against dissatisfaction in India. The Cabinet concluded that the Indian dog barks, but bites not and gave its decision accordingly. India has certainly no wish to rival white brutality and violence: but there are other weapons left to us and of these a boycott is the most efficacious, because it touches a rather vulnerable spot—the British pocket. Will it touch the Indian pocket too? Perhaps, though we doubt the seriousness of the extent. Belgian, Swedish, German, Italian, Austrian, American can never be negligible competitors of British manufacturers. Anyhow, that some sacrifice is needed, is obvious: all we should see to, is that it should fall on the rich and fairly-to-do, and not on the poor. But that the boycott, if made effective at all, will lead to a reconsideration of the "Indian dog's bark," is not open to question. The *Times of India* still talks about inexpediency of antagonizing British public opinion and Parliament. Our contemporary is just a trifle late with its wise saws. India has tried too long already the method of asking to be made a doormat for imperial jack-boots, not to know, that its only result is increased contempt—and a deserved one at that.

\* \* \*

SIR TEJ BAHADUR SAPRU is engaged at present in preparing his ground for the discussion of the question of Indians abroad at the Empire Conference. The discussion is expected to take place on the 25th inst. and the present position of the question is as described in the following cable to the *Leader*:—

It is understood in well-informed circles that he (Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru) is taking a firm stand on the resolution of the Imperial Conference of 1921 and on its basis is making suggestions to Dominion Premiers to discover a means of giving practical effect thereto at the earliest date. Important pourparlers are now proceeding, whereafter the position will probably be cleared. It is understood that Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru will not rest contented with a mere reaffirmation of the principle of

equal citizenship or optimistic assurances unless they are coupled with some practical step. As the result of pourparlers, it is possible the Conference will have to consider the question of recommending the appointment of committees or commissions for each dominion, whereon India will be strongly represented by officials and non-officials commanding the country's confidence with a view to devise means of giving effect, in Dominions and Crown colonies, including Kenya, to the principle of equality. The best and most influential friends of India among Englishmen and most eminent Indians here, including Mr. Hasan Imam, are in constant touch with Sir T. B. Sapru and I am in a position to say they entirely approve of his line of action. He has succeeded in securing influential support outside the Conference and it is by no means unlikely that support will be forthcoming in the Conference itself. The atmosphere so far is favourable, but Sir T. B. Sapru is nevertheless prepared for an unfavourable turn. Should the worst result, we have no doubt, he will remember what the dignity and honour of India demand. He has every reason to feel encouraged by the attitude of the Government of India. The task is nevertheless extremely delicate and difficult, but he is proceeding with cautious firmness.

\* \* \*

MR. S. R. BOMANJI'S cablegram to the *Bombay Chronicle* makes the

proposal more complicated and unworkable than the one given above. According to Mr. Bomanji, Sir Tej Bahadur is going to suggest that there should be a local committee in each Dominion and Crown Colony, which should thresh out the question of granting full rights of citizenship to Indian settlers with its Government, and that there should be a committee appointed in India which should make a tour of all these overseas countries and bring Indian opinion to bear upon each Government and its Legislature. We fear that this intricate machinery of committees will do no good in the existing circumstances. Till the Kenya decision is reversed, the Government of India, which in this matter can only act as an agent of the Imperial Government, will have no moral authority to approach the Governments in the Dominions for the grant of equal status to Indian settlers. What will the Government of India say if the latter Governments turn round and ask what the Imperial Government itself has done to Indians domiciled in Kenya. And there is nothing which any Committee can do in the solution of the Kenya question, except on the one point of immigration which is ostensibly left open. All that requires to be known of the factors of this problem is known; no new light is going to be thrown on it now. A Committee might have been accepted by Indians when, faced with the certainty of an adverse decision, they could at least gain some time for further campaigning. A Committee will only be useful now, after the Kenya decision, to the Imperial Government as a way of escape therefrom if it really wants to retrace its steps. But we do not think that it has the will, and much less the capacity, to go back upon the decision, and we cannot see that any appreciable good will result from having any more committees.

\* \* \*

SIR TEJ BAHADUR is, however, the best judge of the position in England, and particularly, when he has received influential support for his proposal, we will not presume to oppose it. One thing is clear, viz. that what we want now is not a reaffirmation of the 1921 resolution or a repetition of an assurance that the Dominion States will take it into their sympathetic consideration. What we now want is some active steps to give effect to the resolution. We are told that reactionary forces are strong in London, and that they are trying to obtain a definite reversal of the resolution of equality of status and a declaration that the Empire will hereafter stand for white dominance. If this is really to be the spirit governing the policy of the Empire in future, we should much rather have it in plain terms than camouflage it under a form of words which are used only with a view to their scenic effect but are never intended to be carried out. It will of course mean the death-knell not only of the Empire, but of white domination as well. But if this is to be the guiding principle, let it be acknowledged in all its naked arrogance instead of its being cloaked under a guise of equality. In case such a new departure in policy is taken or no beginning is made in carrying out the terms of the resolution of 1921, then the duty of India's representative at the Conference is clear: he must withdraw immediately in protest, and we have not the shadow of a doubt that Sir T. B. Sapru will do all that is required to express India's righteous indignation on this matter.

\* \* \*

IT is difficult to imagine why the Bombay Government should have tried to prevent the formation of a Chamber of Princes for the Kathiawad States. The Princes could only have desired to discuss questions of their dignity and *izzat* and might have petitioned Government to give them the benefit of a stronger Press Law than the Princes Protection Act. Any such Chamber would thus have been very useful to the British Government as a foil to themselves, and it is, to say the least of it, the reverse of tactful to have discountenanced such a proposal. As to the rights of the matter, every trade union can in these days discuss questions relating to its trade, and the Princes too must be at liberty to debate matters concerning their trade—how best they can grind the faces of the poor ryots and preserve their own dignity. Being interested in the welfare of the States' subjects, we should have been very sorry to miss the fun of listening to what the Princes have to say, but, thanks to the brave stand which H. H. the Thakore Saheb of Rajkot is making, the idea of forming a Princes' Chamber is being proceeded with and will perhaps materialise. The Thakore Sahebs very wroth with the Government for looking askance at his endeavour to have a consultation with his brother Princes. We trust he and his brother Princes will now realize how just is the resentment evoked when a Prince prohibits a meeting of his subjects held only with a view to conveying the grievances to the constituted authorities in a peaceful manner. We also trust that the Princes will appreciate the action of their subjects when the latter disregard the wishes of the Princes and hold a meeting in spite of the prohibition even as they now appreciate the Thakore Saheb's action in disregarding the wishes of the Bombay Government.

### MR. BALDWIN'S RISKS.

DESCRIBING himself as "inexperienced", Mr. Baldwin at the Mansion House on the 12th said that "inexperience gave man faith to take risks—which must be taken in these days". There obviously is a good deal behind this curious phrase—a good deal of criticism, for one thing. Excitement over Kenya and the Elections, perhaps even over the Ruhr and other foreign affairs, is apt to make one forget British domestic politics. Yet this phrase of Mr. Baldwin's warns us that uneasy indeed is the Tory that carries a Premier's portfolio nowadays; and that many startling developments may be upon us, as winter and the opening of Parliament approach.

Mr. Baldwin, as Mr. Law's successor, carries on a right-wing Conservative government, which came into power for the definite purpose of ousting a left-wing Conservative *cum* right-wing Liberal one. Yet, what is the record of this Tory government since it came into being? Let us try to look at it from a Tory point of view—and let us begin with Foreign Politics. The latter to-day mean France; and towards France two British attitudes are possible: either to go against France and save Central Europe for British trade, or else go with France and try to get as many pickings, as France will permit. With his note of Aug. 11th Mr. Baldwin seemed to have decided definitely for attitude No. 1; and in this he had the hearty support of all Big Business in Great Britain, though of course he thereby earned automatically the distrust of the Rothermere-led Francophiles, who still talk about "our dear French Ally" and "the beastly Boche", as if 1918 was still in front of us, instead of being so far, far behind us, as to seem to belong already to the Dark Ages. But what has followed upon that note of Aug. 11th? Nothing. To the utter consternation of all people who still look up to England as leader of Europe, not only did no deeds follow upon these fair words, but the words themselves—*incredible dictu*—were swallowed with quite Georgian docility by Mr. Baldwin at M. Poincaré's command, when the former dutifully called upon the latter a month ago on his way from Aix to London. Never, we believe, has British prestige experienced a more complete eclipse. Such an act of course does not exactly strengthen the position of any Prime Minister—least of all of one who depends for his backing on all the "patriots", from the *Morning Post* downwards. To nothing do Tories react so sensitively as to slights from foreigners: is it a wonder that after seeing M. Poincaré make rings round the British Premier, voices from within the Tory fold should become audible, charging Mr. Baldwin with being a duffer ("inexperienced", in the language of diplomacy)?

The second point is one that is still being debated—at the Imperial Conference. French policy for the complete extinction of Germany having been submitted to, British manufacturers must look permanently elsewhere for markets. But

where are markets to be got from in these hard times of slump? Certainly not abroad, where people either already manufacture what England would like to sell to them, or else where other countries already are hard at work dumping down their own surplus manufactures at cut-throat competition with British manufactures. Only one alternative remains: the Empire; the great, the glorious Empire. But even in this preserve of loyalty and brotherhood and sentiment apparently business remains business. Even there tit for tat and mighty little for sixpence is apparently the rule. Hence the sweet charms of "Preference": you buy my currants and I'll buy your cloth. All this of course is in the very best Tory style and if only Mr. Baldwin could carry it through, there is no doubt, that much would be forgiven him over his "inexperience" with friend Poincaré. But—alas and alack—the primrose path of preference has proved not easy. For one thing, the British public prefers a cheap breakfast to an Imperial one: a preference so deep-seated that all Preference schemes have invariably come to grief over it so far. No sooner were Australian plums and South African raisins dangled before John Bull, than the *Daily Mail* brought down his fist for him on the Conference table with an emphatic "Not at that price!" Mind you, the *Daily Mail*—not merely the *Manchester Guardian* and *Daily News* and such-like liberal free-trade "fanatics"! In addition, Mr. Innes was allowed to make it quite clear that as far as India is concerned, the less it was considered as a passive "market," into which all surplus goods could be shot, the fewer would be the otherwise inevitable disappointments. What with one thing and another, "Preference" seems now as far off as ever: and if such is the case under a true-blue Tory Premier, what, do Tories bitterly ask, is the use of having a Tory government at all? Is Mr. Baldwin's "inexperience" to be allowed to go on playing the bull in the Tory china shop much longer?

This question, one feels, is pretty soon going to be put quite plainly by the rank and file of Mr. Baldwin's party. If the ground for revolt has already been well prepared by the loss of prestige abroad and of preference at home, the raising of the Ulster problem will assuredly consummate it. And raised it will be. Mr. Cosgrave has bided his time well; so well, that many may have thought that old boundary question between Ulster and the Free State to be dead and buried. But, it so happens that it is surprisingly alive in the breasts of all Irishmen. The great ovation which one was somewhat surprised to find given the other day to the Irish Delegation (headed by Mr. Cosgrave) on their return from Geneva, expressed clearly a trifle more than mere pleasure at Ireland's "Dominion Status" (blessed word!) having been recognized by the League of Nations. What more there was behind it, has now suddenly become obvious by the recent news that the Irish Free State has sent to the League for registration its treaty with Great Bri-

tain. That treaty, however, stipulates for the rectification of the existing boundary between Ulster and the Free State by a Commission, which Ulster has sworn it will never submit to. But the treaty having been registered at Geneva, protests against Ulster obstreperousness need in future no longer be addressed only to Whitehall, where it is safe to say they will never elicit anything but "sympathy"—but also to the League of Nations. Yet imagine the position of England being at Geneva, called to account for non-fulfilment of a solemn treaty, with Ireland of all countries! It simply could not be allowed. But what is the alternative, except coercion of Ulster by England? And who is to do that—a doctrinaire Gladstonian, a bolshevik Marxian? Alas no: Mr. Baldwin, the Tory leader of a Tory government and of a handsome Tory majority in Parliament—he, of all people is to coerce "loyal" Ulster to make a Sinn Fein holiday!

Poor Mr. Baldwin! Yet poorer Tories!

#### POINTS FOR THE SERVICES COMMISSION.

NOW that the Public Services Commission will soon commence an inquiry into the possibility of extending the process of Indianisation and also an adjustment of the scale of salaries, I would set down here a few thoughts running in the minds of the Indian officers. They are first of all very keen about maintaining perfect equality of status between Indian and European officers possessing equal qualifications and doing the same kind of work. This is a point on which no compromise is possible. It may seem rather late in the day now to insist on so elementary a right as equality of status without distinction of race or nationality. But it has become necessary to do so, in view of the Bombay Retrenchment Committee's recommendation to provincialise the services for Indians, putting only European officers in the imperial services. The Committee probably did not realise all the implications of this recommendation, but if it means a division of the high-grade services into a higher and a lower branch, based upon the nationality of the officers, I must say that the Indian officers will not accept such a position for one single moment. If the report of the Committee has not yet evoked a storm of protest, it is only because it is felt that the signatories did not really mean to institute such a racial discrimination against Indians as the unfortunate words used in the report would seem to imply.

Having cleared the ground so far, I should like to remove a misconception which is but too common in the minds of our publicists. It is taken for granted that the rate of pay admits of a sweeping reduction, and the Indianisation of services is advocated as a measure of economy inasmuch as if the salaries are based upon the Indian market rates instead of the English, as at present, it would effect, it is thought, considerable saving. Now I wish to make it clear (and my remarks are applicable on this point to all services except the I.C.S.) that

save for salaries at the top, say beyond Rs. 1200, there is no scope for retrenchment. In one way of course there will be some economy consequent upon the Indianisation of services. The overseas allowance—which is now regularised by calling it overseas pay—will be done away with, but even there, in order to maintain the efficiency of the services, the State ought to and must send at its own expense Indian-recruited officers to foreign countries to bring their knowledge up to date and level with the most recent developments. A good part of the money saved would thus have to be spent on giving foreign training to its servants. But Indianisation of services must not be pressed as an economy measure at all. There are good enough reasons even otherwise why the services of India should be filled with Indians, and time has now come when foreign recruitment may altogether be stopped as a normal course of things in technical and scientific services, of which alone I am speaking here. Overseas pay can therefore be abolished, and if any Europeans wish to enter the services in India, they must be prepared to do so on Indian rates of pay, just as they must satisfy Indian tests. I would not exclude foreigners from our services, but I would give them no special concessions and privileges. It is, however, necessary for our publicists to know that, though overseas pay can be done away with, the substantive pays of the post (excepting the topmost) cannot be lowered, without gravely impairing the efficiency of the services.

This requires to be emphasized now, because I know that Europeans are unashamedly going to demand an increase in their salaries at the expense of their Indian brethren. They know that there is a strong feeling in the country that Indians can be paid at a much lower rate than Europeans. No doubt those who voice this feeling desire thereby to strengthen their case for Indianization, by giving an additional reason that Indianised services will also be cheaper services. But the European officers wish to exploit this admission about a possibility of reduction to secure an increment in their own pay. The fact is, that those who speak glibly of cheapening the services are labouring under a delusion. There was no doubt a time when the current rates of salary were exorbitant. But prices have since gone up and the rise in salary has not kept pace with the increase in rates of pay, thus making what was at one time an excessive salary now a just adequate one. The English rates of pay of that time have now come down to the level of Indian rates, and that is just the complaint of European officers. Their one aim is to continue in the enjoyment of those extraordinarily high salaries which they enjoyed till a few years ago. This is of course an altogether unreasonable demand and Indian leaders cannot grant it, but the latter must not on that account reduce the scale to a level so as to be unattractive to Indian-recruited public servants themselves. And as Europeans are now plumping for increased pay, I should like to say from experience that any differential treat-

ment based on considerations of race must be sternly discountenanced by the Commission. Two rates of pay in one service completely undermine its *esprit de corps*, and will not be tolerated by Indian officers. Even if there is one man who receives any special advantages, it means an inferior status to all the rest and even the special advantage of an overseas pay to which Indian officers did not object to must not be continued hereafter. Equal work, equal pay, is a principle which must be rigidly followed in the organization of services, and no such deviation from it should be allowed as is implied in the continuance of overseas pay to foreign-recruited servants.

SERVICE.

### POONA'S PROTEST.

THE public meeting held in Poona last week to protest against the Kenya decision will long live in the memory of the local public. It was a crowded meeting, attended by some 7,000 people, but the size was not its most remarkable feature. Poona has seen meetings more numerous attended; e.g. the temperance meeting held in 1907 under the presidency of Dr. Bhandarkar was a much bigger affair, but what gave its distinctive character to this demonstration was the fact that people of all political persuasions took part in it. It is true that in the temperance meeting of fifteen years ago, to which it challenges a comparison, the two parties in which political feeling then expressed itself, had also coalesced for the moment to press on Government the supreme need of modifying its excise policy. But since then various other parties have appeared on the scene, each of which has within the last few months split itself into several. The approach of elections has at present given a new edge to strife and contention, from which Poona has been none too free for forty years and more. The exchange of compliments between no-changers and pro-changers alone, both of whom till a short time ago were known by the common designation of Extremists, falls little short of the abuse which they used unitedly to level against the Moderates. The regular scuffle that took place between them the other day, after this meeting, necessitating a requisition for police help is but symptomatic of the normal relations that subsist at present between these two sects of Congressmen in the Deccan. Again, the non-Brahmans have now attained a political consciousness as they had not done before, and they may well give points to the extremists of old in the art of invective against the whole class of Brahmins. Disintegration has now set in amongst the non-Brahmins also, who are now divided among three or four warring factions, the depressed classes, of course, being again arrayed against all these groups.

Instead of two, therefore, there were these seven or eight mutually antagonistic parties to be dealt with on this occasion and all of them were fully represented in the Kenya meeting. Judging from the sentiments expressed by one against the others, it might well have seemed incredible that representatives of these parties could be induced to come together on the same platform and—what is more—disperse without making any covert if not open attacks. But such an apparently impossible phenomenon was actually observed last Thursday. In order to demonstrate the complete unanimity that prevailed on the subject of Kenya



among all sections of the public, steps were taken to obtain signatures of the leading men of all professions, castes and opinions to a requisition to the President of the Municipality for convening a meeting to adopt resolutions of similar import to those passed at the Town Hall meeting in Bombay. These resolutions were first decided upon at a preliminary meeting of Liberals and the two fragments of non-co-operators, but no difficulty was experienced in enlisting the support of all the other sections as well. Among the signatories were the leaders of the depressed classes, pro-Brahman, anti-Brahman and neutral non-Brahmans of various castes, Mahomedans, Parsees, Marwaris, Goans, Europeans and Americans of either sex. They could all be persuaded to speak in support of the resolutions too. What, however, was still apprehended was that some of the speakers would still be unable to resist the temptation of having a dig at their rivals. The speeches actually made were not all wise or on a high moral plane, but they were on this occasion altogether free from the besetting sin of our public life—mutual recrimination. Nor was there a hiss or the least sign of disapproval at the sight of people whose opinions are unpopular; on the contrary, the big audience seemed to realize very well the value of all the diverse elements in politics taking common action on this matter.

The President's ( Mr. N. C. Kelkar's ) opening speech was rather a tame affair: he wisely refrained from dealing in detail with the resolutions, so as to take the wind out of the sails of the speakers that might follow; but he lacked the power of depicting in a few bold strokes the situation that has arisen out of the Kenya decision or of delineating the new orientation of policy which the country has now resolved on following. Himself a long-winded speaker, he could not put a limit to the speeches of others, with the result that the meeting lasted for three hours, though only at rare intervals did the speakers advance beyond the stage of mere platitudes. The President's was altogether a poor performance, but he was at his worst when he referred to the condition of the native Africans and dismissed the matter as of no concern to the Indians. He gave an entirely wrong lead to the meeting, and if it had not been for Miss Fuller's speech, which was exclusively devoted to the cruel oppression that is practised upon the indigenous inhabitants of Kenya, this aspect of the matter would not have been touched upon at all. And yet it is of the essence of this question to show that Europeans are following a policy of "unbridled exploitation" and Indians one of friendly helpfulness towards natives. Mr. Kamat, in moving the resolution of protest, made a speech in Marathi which by the easy flow of the words used and the choice diction must have surprised those who had never heard him speak in Marathi before. It was a strong speech too, but not excessively strong, and it never degenerated into the vulgar or the braggart, as did the speeches of some of those who followed him. He did not treat in detail of the points in controversy but gripped the audience at once by fastening on the main point that stood out from this affair, viz. that the British Government simply caved in to the threat of armed rebellion held out by the European settlers. There was no question of doing justice to Indians; it was only a question of putting a good face on the abject surrender which the Cabinet had to make to the white adventurers and buccaneers of Kenya. Mrs. Ramabai Saheb Ranade, the widow of the late Mr. Justice Ranade, followed and pronounced her

judgment that an Empire, which first uses any of its subjects in hazardous adventures and then unceremoniously casts them aside when the task is achieved, as the British Empire has used and cast aside Indians in Kenya, has surely an unstable foundation and must come to an end. There had been such a succession of national wrongs for India, she said, that a boycott of British goods would be ethically justified and economists might therefore set about devising methods of bringing it about. It was a short but weighty condemnation of the Empire policy which imperial statesmen will ignore only at their peril.

Miss L. B. Fuller made the evening's most informing speech, examining the contention of the British Government that if most of the Indian claims had to be rejected it was only because they had to give primary consideration to the welfare of the natives. She described in detail how the native's rights to land were destroyed, how the reserves to which they were confined were cut down, and how by means of heavy taxation they were being forced on to the European farms for labour under conditions which made it indistinguishable from slavery. In all her speech she did not employ one single English word, while there was no Indian speaker probably who did not use at least a few English words. Her speech supplied the very necessary corrective to the tendency of most Indians to ignore native interests in the advocacy of the Indian claims, whereas the real fact is that these claims will most recommend themselves to people when they are advanced in relation to the native's interests. Miss Fuller was followed by a local leader of the depressed classes who appealed to the audience to sink party differences in face of the national humiliation in the shape of the Kenya decision. Mr. V. R. Shinde of the Depressed Classes Mission made a very effective speech, urging upon the country the need to abolish the internal Kenya wrong, viz. untouchability, if they wished to do away with the external Kenya wrong; and prophesied that General Smuts and others who had deliberately approved the policy of race segregation within their borders would surely not enjoy self-government for long, but would become subject to foreign rule even as India had become. It was well that Mr. Shinde asked the audience to turn the searchlight inwards, and the audience took it well, feeling certain that a people who had imposed segregation in their own country upon some sixty millions of their fellow-countrymen for generations have no moral right to complain, if foreigners denied to a few thousands of their people some of their civic rights in a distant colony. The resolution protesting against the decision was on the whole very ably spoken to and enthusiastically adopted by the meeting.

The second resolution merely declared that India's voice will not avail in the councils of the Empire against such wrongs till she attains self-government and asked the people to spare no efforts or sacrifice in attaining it. This could well have been disposed of in a five minutes' speech, but there were five speakers, each taking some ten minutes and they exhibited an inexhaustible capacity to expatiate on most elementary truths at tiresome length. Among these speeches was a pointed one by Mr. Shripatrao Shinde, the leader of the most extreme section of the local non-Brahman or anti-Brahman party, who gave unreserved support to the resolution and declared that self-government would not come till caste distinctions were obliterated and unity was brought about between backward and advanced

classes. Thus the backward and depressed classes leaders pointed the moral of the Kenya decision, but, out of consideration to the feelings of the other parts of the meeting, wisely abstained from rubbing it in. In fact no one made party capital out of the meeting. It was throughout a fair deal.

The last resolution suggested measures which India should take in answer to the insult flung in her teeth, and no worse speaker could have been selected to move it than Mr. Bhopatkar, who by his appeal to sordid emotions dragged down the discussion to the lowest level imaginable. He began by saying that with him it was not a matter of legitimate sorrow at all if the imperial Government had sided with the Europeans in Kenya rather than with Indians. On the contrary he felt some admiration for the essentially human quality they had shown in espousing the cause, though unjust, of their own kith and kin, in preference to the just cause of people of a different race. The British had shown themselves to be just human. He was neither surprised nor grieved at it. What would however surprise and grieve him was if Indians on their part were not equally human, and did not show the same partiality for things Indian which the Britishers showed for things British. He ridiculed the idea that it could at all be possible for mere mortals to put justice above colour, and he had nothing but contempt for the pussillanimity of those Indians who would not go the uttermost lengths in taking revenge. To these who excluded Indians from the Highlands in Kenya the right place to settle in India would be, Mr. Bhopatkar said—public latrines; and much more in this strain. It is not only natural but entirely praiseworthy to feel a righteous indignation at the affront offered to India in the Kenya decision and to take all measures calculated to awaken the conscience of the British public to the grave wrong, but it is utterly unjustifiable to erect selfishness into a virtue to which every other consideration should be subordinated. The speech of Mr. Bhopatkar, who is regarded as a great asset by the Nationalists of Maharashtra, exposes once more the great vice of the Tilak school of politics.

Dr. V. C. Gokhale, who belongs to the National Home Rule League, then made a very good businesslike speech in support of a judicious boycott of British and Empire-made goods. It is noteworthy that Gandhian non-co-operators of the Deccan do not share the objection felt by true non-co-operators everywhere else, to the boycott of British goods as based on hatred; indeed, Dr. Phatak, a leader of this section of non-co-operators, did not scruple to advise his hearers to buy goods from foreign countries other than England, if swadeshi goods were not available, and he was himself following, he said with much unctious, the same principle of discrimination against England. Nor did the Maharashtra no-changers think it necessary to dissociate themselves from the resolutions which called for legislative action of one kind or another. The fact is that the faith of the so-called followers of Mr. Gandhi in Maharashtra in the principle of non-co-operation is not even skin-deep. It was altogether a successful meeting unanimous as to the principal aim, but even in this unanimity one could discern two strains of Nationalism, a higher and a lower one, which are always contending with each other for mastery in the Deccan.

AN ON-LOOKER.

## PROTECTIVE TARIFF: SOME FALLACIES.

### 3. INDUSTRIAL COMBINATIONS.

MANY people seem to think that the protective tariff can be very widely used without creating strong vested interests and fostering industrial combinations. The tariff is spoken of as if it can be imposed, altered, and withdrawn at pleasure, and as if the political instruments always reflect the opinion and interests of the people of the country, and effectively give expression to them through the legislature and the other organs of government. Theoretically this seems to be so. But in practice there has not been an instance of any protectionist country in which a tariff has been removed or even lowered during the prosperous condition of the protected industries. Normally an industry is protected, the products of which are widely consumed, because this makes that industry useful to the country generally. The industry in all cases is a manufacturing industry. Thus production in the protected industries is mostly on a large scale, turning out standardised articles of general consumption. The leaders of such an industry are all shrewd men of business who will avail themselves of the circumstances whenever they find these in their favour. With a tariff there is little competition from outside. But within the country competition still remains. This means that the firms within the country have either of two courses open to them. They may compete among themselves and try to undercut one another, or they may combine with one another and form a monopolistic body. In the initial stages there is little need for this combination. If the tariff be prudently fixed, it is likely to leave to the firms a little more than normal profit to run them. But some people urge that a high profit should be guaranteed to the industry in order to develop it rapidly. Combination comes gradually in the former case, and rapidly in the latter. In the former case, that is, when the tariff is moderate or just sufficient to develop the industry, the profit, in the initial stages, is normal. But if the tariff be not retrogressive from the beginning, in time as the industry is developing its profits also increase. From such time in this case and from the beginning in the case of a high tariff internal competition will reduce the profit of the competing firms by a reduction in the price of the products. This is always for the benefit of the consumers. In fact this is what every body wants to have in the long run. But the consumers are disorganised, whereas the firms are few in number and know their business well; in India the number will be particularly small. If they compete among themselves they get only the normal profit. If they combine they can keep up the price at the full height permitted by the tariff. With such combination the leaders of the industry become powerful and can wield an influence quite beyond their legitimate sphere. In the United States of America they

wield great political power. In modern democracies power is held by political demagogues, using that word in its best sense, and the recognised principle is fostering of class interests so as to balance them all in the legislature of the country. Therefore, there is no stigma if one attempts to thrust the interest of his class before all other ordinary considerations. Another important factor is the great expense of electioneering campaigns, most of which depend for their success upon the length of the purse commanded by the party putting forward the candidates. Both these help the cause of the industrial magnate in his debut into the political arena with the one aim of securing or fostering his own economic interest as distinguished from or as contrasted with those of the country as a whole.

It has been said that in India combinations of this type will be disallowed, and the evils of monopolies obviated by the lessons derived from the experience of other countries. It is futile to expect that India's new-born or yet unborn democracy will achieve what the fuller-grown democracies of the west have failed to do. The measures which are likely to eliminate these evils which exist in the western countries have not yet been discovered and explained by the protectionist enthusiast of India. In the west two methods have been tried, viz., monopoly has been declared illegal, and the protective tariff has been declared to be for the infant industries only. Both of them have failed in the west. Time after time drastic laws have been framed to suppress combinations but they have successfully eluded the grasp of the law. Thus the Standard Oil Company, the ideal Trust which had been organised as a combination in the eighties of the last century, was sought to be suppressed. It evaded the law and became a pool. The next attempt of the law converted it into a trust. Persecuted as a trust, it became a community of interest, a change only in name and form to evade the law, but really a closer union. The last attempt saw it yet evading the law and a still better organised body as a holding corporation, a sort of mobile combination, the combination part of which is the reality and the mobile part of which is to befool the law. In 1910 by a judicial decree it was dissolved. Legally it stands dissolved even now and is no longer one body. But for purposes of business it is as much one body as is the physical body of any living organism. In 1922 it made an unprecedented profit when the United States of America was undergoing an acute industrial depression. Its example has been widely followed by other trusts with good success in their respective spheres.

In this struggle the most pernicious feature is the successful attempt at corruption of the judiciary and both corruption and intimidation of the executive. The latter is possible because the combinations wield great political influence, and the executive cannot always afford to enforce the law against the combinations which in the legislature

are their masters. They spend huge sums of money to put up candidates for election to the legislature. This is partly helped by the party organisation in the political system of the United States of America where votes are first recorded by parties and the nominees of the parties are put up *en bloc* as candidates. Such party organisations are highly expensive, and as the code of private morality does not apply to the public life of those countries, there is no scruple in making terms with rich corporations in framing the programmes of the parties. Such party organisations make matters easy for the combinations inasmuch as the most effective political machinery is controlled by a few professional politicians. Thus is formed an unholy alliance between the industrial magnates and the latter for the exploitation of the general body of the people with the help of their own votes. With such power in the legislature it is not difficult to gain over or bribe the executive. Thus, although in principle the protective tariff is meant only for the infant industries, the grown-up industries, especially the stronger ones, hold a greater share of the advantages. The steel and petroleum industries of the United States of America are models for the whole world, and by no stretch of the imagination can be called infant or struggling industries. Yet they are protected by a high tariff which cannot be taken off. On the contrary in September 1922 the general rates of the tariff were further raised. Within the country the price is always kept up as high as the tariff would permit, and outside in foreign markets the goods are dumped, and fierce competition is started by which the Asiatic and African peoples are made pawns in the industrial and commercial rivalry of the western countries.

To the present writer it seems that such combinations cannot be prevented from growing in a country which adopts the protective tariff and the evil is only intensified by the attempt to suppress all combinations wholesale. In many respects they are so clearly the product of the modern industrial system that they cannot be suppressed. The attempt should, therefore, be made to minimise the evils when they appear and create unfavourable conditions for them before they grow. According to a distinguished American economist,\* the possibilities of good in the combinations are worth preserving, although he condemns very strongly the vices of the system. The measures which he suggests to deal with monopolies are to control them by inspection, publicity, and some control over unreasonable prices. To the present writer it appears that such control will be only partially effective so long as the combinations can control the legislature, bribe or overawe the executive, and corrupt the judiciary. Subject to this they are good remedies. On the principle that prevention is better than cure, such combinations as are not the product of natural causes, e. g., the size

\*Clarke: The Trust Problem.



of the business unit as a result of large scale production and use of specialised skill and plants, should be discouraged from being organised. I shall suggest three other methods. All these along with the measures suggested above for America should be used in India to make their joint effect appreciable. The first is to use the protective tariff in as few cases as possible. If the alternative be between development of industries and combinations on the one hand and industrial backwardness without combinations on the other, I should be inclined to support the latter because the consumers in this case do not pay higher prices for the evil of maintaining the octopus which saps their life-blood. The second method is to lay down a principle to be rigidly followed, according to which all protective tariffs should be definitely limited in time after which they will automatically cease, and during which they will be retrogressive, the rate of retrogression being according to the expected rate of development of the industries concerned. A probable danger here is to go to the other extreme and foil what is attempted to be done with the help of the protective tariff. By these means combinations can be made innocuous to some extent. But if they once grow powerful as they have done in other countries in spite of more drastic efforts to suppress them, these remedies will decline in their effectiveness inasmuch as the influence of the monopolies may preponderate over the legislature which is to take all decisions. The third method is to tax the monopoly incomes very heavily. This is really no remedy but relieves the burdened consumers by making the monopolies pay towards the expenses of the Government which otherwise would fall upon the consumers. Here also the political power of the monopolies can frustrate the interests of the consumers. Of all the above measures the best is to taboo the protective tariff and in cases where it is granted it should come as an exceptional measure and a necessary evil. The danger will be considerably minimised if it be so rare that large combinations in several important industries are not fostered by the protective tariff.

PRAFULLACHANDRA BASU.

### A LETTER FROM LONDON.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

LONDON, SEPTEMBER 27.

THE President and Members of the Committee of Management of the Indian and Ceylon Students' Union and Hostel announce the formal opening ceremony of the new permanent premises at No. 112 Gower Street, about five minutes' walk from the present Shakespeare Hut. Among the principal speakers will be the Hon. Mr. Justice Greaves, of the Calcutta High Court, who is the Chairman of the Indian National Council of Y.M.C.A.'s, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, who will dedicate the building to its new uses. The ceremony will be on Saturday afternoon, October 6, and it is

hoped that among others who will attend will be Mr. Hasan Imam, fresh from the League of Nations Assembly at Geneva, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, who will be attending the Imperial Conference, and the Hon. James Peiris, M. L. C., Ceylon. The new premises are an immense improvement upon the old ones at Keppel Street, and the work of administration will take on a very different character, though I am sure that there will be no increase of formality in the welcome given to the students who make such enormous use of the facilities provided. The total cost of the new venture—the premises are freehold—is about £21,000, of which the major portion has been met by handsome donations from India, Great Britain, and the United States. Permanent accommodation is provided for about 43 residents, who will include about half a dozen non-Oriental. The restaurant accommodation is excellent, study and library rooms are spacious, and ample space is provided for games. Downstairs there is a large hall capable of seating at least 300 people. Altogether, the Indian and Ceylon students in this country cannot complain that they are not adequately catered for. The lecture programme for the Autumn is well in hand, and the new year's work should have a fine send-off on the 6th. If there is one fly in the ointment it is that there still remains a sum of about £6,000 to be covered to complete the total purchase price, which has so far been met by a private loan. There must be many prominent men and others in India and Ceylon who will desire to be associated with this piece of patriotic work started by the Indian National Council and carried on on an entirely non-sectarian basis. Subscriptions and donations will be welcomed by Mr. K. T. Paul, in Calcutta, or Mr. H. Judd, the Treasurer of the Hostel, in London. I trust that there will be no hesitation in responding to this appeal, and that the debt will soon be wiped off.

Whilst I am on the subject of Indian work on this side, I would draw attention to the fact that, at this juncture, when the Secretary of State ought to be in daily contact with his members of Council of Indian birth, instead of with old fogies and others who cannot advise him of the import of the various movements and tendencies in India that must constantly be brought to his notice, he is entirely deprived of their advice and assistance, and he seems to make no complaint of the fact. At this moment there is not a single Indian member of Council at hand. Sir P. Rajagopalachari, who takes Mr. Dalal's place, is not yet admitted and is absent on a health cure. He will not take his seat until next January. Mr. Aftab Ahmad Khan, who has done a great deal of most useful work, has recently returned to India on leave. Mr. Basu is now a member of the Lee Commission, and has not resigned his seat, so that no new appointment can be made. So long as the India Council is retained, there should constantly be here as active members of it the largest possible number of qualified Indians with recent

experience of the needs of their country. If nothing else is accomplished by them, they can at least often prevent even worse mistakes being committed than have already been contemplated or made.

Here the situation is very complex. The Tory Government is by no means as firmly seated in power as appears on the surface. The Conservative Party may easily be rent asunder by either of two subjects. The Irish Boundary problem is one of the most acute and difficult of all the problems with which this Government is faced. It is bound by its own pledges and by those of its predecessors. But all the latter are not known or at all events published. Ulster will not give way to compulsion or to seeing herself deprived of large slices of territory in order to placate the Free State. The Free State may be driven, in order to conciliate Republican opponents, to force the pace as regards Ulster, and the British Government will be placed in a cleft stick. Again, Conservatism is in peril as to its unity, by the pressure that is being exerted in influential quarters for the adoption of high Imperial preference and even Protection. Lancashire has so far prevented any great landslide in the latter direction. But the Conservatives were always poor economists, and they may well be driven to desperation by the pressure of an enormous unemployed army. The Liberals are still disunited and reunion seems as far away as ever, in spite of the pretensions of the Asquithian leaders. Should the Conservatives fail, the Liberals cannot possibly form a Government, for they will not have the support of the country. The only alternative Government in that event would be a Labour one, and for this, notwithstanding loud assurances from the Labour leaders, they are not really prepared. The political future is not a very inspiring one.

Lord Morley—honest John Morley—is dead, full of honours and of honour. The papers vie with each other in paying tribute to the great Liberal statesman and writer. It almost seems like a past age when John Morley was in the forefront of literature or politics. Now he, too, has passed, and his remains are to be cremated at Golder's Green to-day. I understand that Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, who is prevented by official engagements from being present, is sending a wreath on behalf of the National Liberal Federation of India.

## REVIEW.

### ECONOMICS AND APOLOGETICS.

**O'BRIEN, GEORGE: AN ESSAY ON THE ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF THE REFORMATION. LONDON. 1923. 8 x 5½. pp. x+194. (BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE. 7s. 6d.)**

We in this country are fully aware, how the industrialism of the machine age, introduced by Western invaders, has "shaken the old faith from top to bottom" and has socially and economically,

led to "deep and revolutionary consequences." In Europe however, whence all these blessings flow, the sequence has been in an exactly reversed order—the attack by Protestantism on the old religion of the Middle Ages coming first, and the economic consequences after. This fact and the causal nexus are undisputed and the author of the book before us states but a universally accepted axiom, when he says that "just as the social and economic conceptions of mediæval Europe were the reflection of the universal acceptance of the Catholic Church, so the social and economic conceptions of modern Europe are the reflection of its rejection." (p. 66.) These modern conceptions Dr. O'Brien sums up as Capitalism and Socialism, both of which, though contradictory to each other, he would derive from Protestantism.

In this central thesis the book in our opinion fails. If "the Reformation was directly responsible for whatever there is of narrowness or reactionism in modern Catholicism" (p. 175), the Reformation most decidedly is responsible for this essay: and unfortunately this "narrowness and reactionism" altogether spoils the intrinsically good case, which the author has got. The "narrowness" is very manifest in the author's attitude towards socialism as "a principle, not only questioning inequality of property, but inevitably advancing to question every other institution as well—marriage, parental control, and religious institutions" (p. 167): an attitude one is painfully familiar with from Roman Catholic literature of the last century. How up-to-date Dr. O'Brien is, can be gathered from the fact that to him "Modern Socialism" means "the omnipotence of the State" (p. 157) and that both the word and the idea of guild socialism are completely absent from his pages. Nothing surely is more significant than this refusal of even alluding to the powerful link between Catholicism and Socialism, which the guilds of the Middle Ages and the doctrine of the Just Price provide. Dr. O'Brien quotes Tawney: it is inconceivable therefore that he should be ignorant of the arguments common to all Christian Socialists, or that he should consider them so flimsy, as to be unworthy even of notice. The conclusion one is driven to is, that these arguments and facts on which they are based do not fit in with Dr. O'Brien's brief and are therefore on purpose left out: a "reactionism" which strikes one not only as particularly bad tactics, but which anyhow convinces one that this essay is not the product of a scientist, but of an advocate.

Dr. O'Brien is apt to mislead at the outset by not strictly defining capital and by his further failure of distinguishing between property for use, for production and for income. Property for income is the only type of property peculiar to capitalism: it is the only form of property which by its nature is immoral. To store property for

future use, is not to convert it from property for use into property for income: what so converts it, is the power with which that property is endowed of spontaneously multiplying. Yet not a word of all this is breathed in these pages.

Similarly, socialism is defined as a "theory of the State's action" ( p. 136 ) and that aspect—which has so completely receded in the last decade—is stressed almost to the entire exclusion of that other aspect of socialism as "a demand for social justice." To have done so of course would not have suited Dr. O'Brien's book: for if Socialism and Catholicism are to be proved as antagonistic, it would of course never do to show that both attack modern capital on the same ground, viz. because it is "essentially a form of property which has not its duties as well as its rights." Yet such is obviously the case; just as it is obvious that both Catholicism and Socialism agree in this further point, that they stress corporate ( not necessarily the State's ! ) action and interests, as against individual action and interests, which latter capitalism has exclusively in view. That this individualism is common both to Capitalism and Protestantism, is a commonplace, which Dr. O'Brien of course has no difficulty in proving yet once more, in chapter 2 of his book. Yet in the face of that, in a succeeding chapter, he asserts that "Socialism is social Protestantism; just as Protestantism was religious Socialism" ( p. 169 ).

The book does well to bring out clearly that to Scholasticism economics and politics were a mere subsection of ethics, whilst the modern unnatural divorce of both economics and politics from ethics goes back directly to Sir Thomas More and Machiavelli ( p. 45 ), and indirectly to the Protestant demand for the separation of temporal and secular. It is also quite true that this tendency developed as a result of the Protestant failure to distinguish between the natural and the supernatural orders. By confounding the two, Protestantism was led to advocate an intramundane asceticism which on the one hand stamped with contempt *Ho'y Poverty* and on the other exalted the work of a man's calling into an end in itself. In this connection, however, Dr. O'Brien seems to us not to bring out sufficiently that the Puritans, leading a frugal honest life of unremitting toil, were bound to amass a wealth, which Catholics would neither be so anxious or capable to produce, nor so disinclined to spend on charity and magnificence, as Protestants, whose motto was "work", instead of "good works," as hitherto. Idleness became the worst sin in Protestant eyes: was it a wonder that Protestants should have frowned on the idleness of capital too and should thus have led an attack on the very strict scholastic inhibitions of usury?

Another point which our author touches upon but does not work out, is that the confusion of natural and supernatural led necessarily to the old Jewish distinction between the "elect" and the "heathen." By the fall—according to Luther—man had lost completely his likeness to God; but if only the "elect" have been restored to that likeness, it follows that "heathens" must be essentially inferior creatures, to be treated as the Israelites treated the Canaanites of old: a fact, which strikingly and satisfactorily explains why virulent colour prejudice is absent in non-Protestant countries. There are many other instances—not altogether novel, but true for all that—by which the chaos of our modern nationalistic politics and of

our egotistic economics is traced back to the mistaken theology of Protestantism. Dr. O'Brien, it should however be remembered, supplies not very much of his own to this little book: a fact which will be better understood when we say that into the 180 pages of his Essay he manages to cram 500 references and 164 actual quotations; a fact furthermore, which makes reading rather tedious. And not as if all these references were to sources: on the contrary, of *Quellenstudium* there are no traces; if the author wishes to tell us what Luther said, he quotes Grisar; if Calvin Bossuet ( p. 162 ), if Robert Owen, what "we are told by two modern socialistic writers" ( p. 174 ).

But the fundamental error of the author lies in his facile identification of the doctrines of Catholicism with the practice of the Roman Catholic Church. True, More and Machiavelli worked out an un-moral politics and economics: but their inspiration came from the immoral practices of the Papal Court itself. If under the Borgias, etc. Rome had not become a sink of iniquity, the possibility of theoretically divorcing politics from ethics would not have been thought of. But that the Reformation, for all the stupidity and wickedness it contained, was only the reflex action caused by the stupidity and wickedness of the Papal Church: of that of course not a hint is to be found in this *Essay*. On the contrary, on p. 175 we are treated to a Utopia of what Europe would be like to-day, if only there had been no Reformation: an absurdity which leaves entirely out of account the fact that countries, where, as in Spain and Austria until recent times, not to mention the Papal States, the sovereign sway of the Papal Church had remained unimpaired, in no way differed in their capitalistic exploitation and socialistic protest from those other parts of Europe which were groaning under the domination of Protestantism. The very fact that in Latin countries the Labour Movement is so largely tinged with Atheism is proof that it was not the Church of these countries which hungered after social justice and economic righteousness. If the God of the Church had nothing to say to child labour, to sweating, to rack-renting: is it a wonder that the masses turned their backs on God altogether? Dr. O'Brien labours to show that perfect institutions in themselves do not guarantee the perfecting of man: that everybody would easily grant. But the point is not, that good housing, eight-hour day, etc. are ethically to be insisted upon, because they will bring about the millenium, but because failure so to insist is conniving at and aiding the monstrous injustice of the exploiters. But that the Roman Catholic Church has until not so long ago shared in that culpable connivance, is a fact patent to all eyes, however much Dr. O'Brien may turn his own blind eye upon it. He ends, by saying that "there is one institution and one institution alone (the Papal Church) which is capable of supplying and enforcing the social ethic that is needed to revivify the world": quite oblivious that it is the apostasy of that institution from her own principles of Catholicism, which is responsible for the present need for a revivification of the world. For the greatest tragedy of all has ever been that Catholicism is discredited by nothing so much as by the Catholic Church.

JUST RECEIVED.

JUST RECEIVED.

**Two Important Books on India.**

Rs. a.

**The Political Future of India.** By Lajpat Rai. Deals authoritatively with the various problems confronting the nation to-day, such as the Public Services in India, The Indian Army and Navy, India's Claim to Fiscal Autonomy etc., etc., are exhaustively dealt with. ... 5 4

**The Defence of India.** India of To-day Series. No. 2. By "Arthur Vincent". Contents: Part I. Maritime Defences. 2. The Northern and North-Eastern Frontiers and Burma. Part II. 3. The Birth and Growth of the Present Frontier. 4. The Border Countries. 5. Frontier Policy. 6. The Frontier Army. 7. The Russian Menace. Part III. Future Days. 8. A Look to the Future. ... 2 0

**A Book of Interest To Lovers of Oriental Art.**

**Raja Ravi Varma.** Being an Original Research on the Art of Ravi Varma, and an Introduction to his Art. By C. R. Ramanujacharya. With a Beautiful Coloured Picture of Hamsa Damayanti. Price. ... 1 8

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. R. KHORANA, LYALLPUR

**Railways and the Budget**

BY  
"ECONOMY"

A Collection of articles published in the  
"Servant of India,"

(Crown 16mo. size. pp. 80)

Price Rs. 8 net.

The book exposes the happy-go-lucky system of the work of the Railway Board and the distribution and management of railway finance. It demonstrates how, instead of managing the Railways as a business and conserving and improving them as a valuable national asset, the Board and the Government of India have been only muddling through at the expense of the travelling public and the general tax-payer.

Books can be had from—

THE ARYABHUSHAN PRESS, BUDHWAR PETH,  
POONA CITY

**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	10s.
For all others	Rs. 4 0	4 8	

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, }  
LUCKNOW, }  
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.

**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, POONATAKI

**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 GUSSE 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 \_\_\_\_\_