

# THE Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE

Office : KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. VI, No. 41.]

POONA—THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1923.

{ INLAND SUBS. Rs. 6  
FOREIGN " " 10

## CONTENTS.

|                                                    | PAGE. |
|----------------------------------------------------|-------|
| TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...                             | 481   |
| ARTICLES:—                                         |       |
| The British Empire ...                             | 483   |
| Constitutional Reforms in Mysore. By V. V. S. ...  | 485   |
| Colour Prejudice ...                               | 487   |
| The Swarajist's Regard for Truth. By a Liberal ... | 489   |
| REVIEW:—                                           |       |
| A Freeman of the World? By Z. ...                  | 490   |

## TOPICS OF THE WEEK

A Personal  
Triumph.

ALL Indians, irrespective of party, will be filled with admiration for the valiant stand that Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru made at the Imperial Conference for equal status of Indians in the British Empire and the loyal support that Viscount Peel gave him. Opinion will perhaps be divided on the practical results achieved by the Conference, but, whether one makes a sanguine or a gloomy forecast of the final outcome of the solution proposed by Dr. Sapru and accepted by the Conference, one feels certain that Dr. Sapru did all that was humanly possible for any representative of India to do in the circumstances in which he was placed. That in spite of these circumstances he should have succeeded in changing the atmosphere so completely, as to make even South Africa now admit that Indian civilization is perhaps even superior to the white civilization of South Africa, is in itself a feat deserving of both admiration and gratitude. And another result at least we may safely put to Dr. Sapru's credit. The resolution of 1921 is now admitted to promise full citizenship to Indians in all parts of the British Empire and all British Colonies excepting South Africa are now recognised as bound in honour to grant it. In view of the tendency in some quarters to regard this resolution as a mere pious sentiment involving no sort of moral obligation on those who were parties to its adoption, it is a great gain that the Dominions have now accepted the co-operation of a committee from India for the express purpose of translating into action the principle of India's equal status with Britain herself and the Dominions.

The Prospects.

AUSTRALIA, it now appears, will offer no difficulty in the way of the grant of franchise to Indian settlers, and in Canada the Committee to be appointed will very likely serve a useful purpose in strengthening the hands of the Prime Minister, who is favourably inclined. It is not improbable therefore that in the Dominions the mode of approach suggested by Dr. Sapru will give some real help in putting into force the principle of equality laid down by the Imperial Conference in 1921. South Africa of

course continues to stand out as before. Indeed things have become worse in that Dominion, for two years ago the representatives of the Union Government expressed themselves unable to accept the resolution because of the exceptional circumstances of South Africa, but now they refuse adherence to the equality principle itself and advance a rival principle, viz. one of white supremacy which, if allowed, would mean an end of the British Empire, as we know it. As to the Crown Colonies and Protectorates, the importance of Dr. Sapru's proposal consists in the fact that the Kenya "settlement" which was declared to be final and irrevocable, has been unsettled. In assessing the value of this gain, we cannot of course lose sight of the Colonial Secretary's expression of opinion that the decisions are not likely to be modified, but that this question is at all included within the scope of inquiry and direct negotiation implies a surrender on the part of the Imperial Government. We ourselves are not very optimistic about solid results from this inquiry so far as Kenya is concerned, whilst South Africa remains as intransigent as now. For the Union Government of course has made itself the champion of all White Africa, and regards Kenya as within the "sphere of its influence." When negotiations were on foot in regard to Kenya, explicit statements were made in responsible quarters that South Africa would not permit any non-White race to be given rights of citizenship anywhere in British territory in Africa which threatened the dominance of the White race and that all such attempts to assign a political status of equality to black or brown would be resisted by South Africa by force of arms. We believe therefore that the questions of Kenya and South Africa, being at bottom the same, will be solved together and, till we get the Union Government to concede political rights to Indians, it is vain to hope for any solid results in the "last white man's country"—Kenya.

Misgivings proved  
baseless.

WE know there are some among the Liberals, who, though convinced of the utter iniquity of the Kenya decision and of the urgent need for its reversal have misgivings about the desirability of keeping up a strong agitation on the question, because they feel that the agitation will not succeed in obtaining a substantial modification of the decision and will only injure the cause of internal reform by prejudicing English public opinion against us. They are particularly against all measures savouring of retaliation against England from fear that such measures will recoil on our own heads. In fact, their attitude to the Kenya decision is identically the same as Lord Reading's protest against the decision. By all means, they say, and when a suitable opportunity offers, reopen the question; but do not imperil the success of the reformed constitution by speaking of obstruction or inflaming

the feeling of the British and the Colonials by flourishing boycotts in their face. They could no doubt claim to have Lord Reading on their side, but they will have noticed from the speeches of Viscount Peel and Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru that, although Lord Reading speaks to us in a minatory tone, he utilizes all our resolutions approving of boycotts and threatening constitutional obstruction in impressing upon the Imperial Government the urgency of revising the Kenya decision.

\* \* \*

Justice and  
Expediency.

IN his Chelmsford Club speech Lord Reading has said: "Reliance should rather be placed upon the justice of the cause and the arguments in support of it than upon a (retaliatory) course of action which would completely fail in effect." "I know my countrymen," he added, "and have no hesitation in asserting that these boycotts, whether successful or unsuccessful, will completely fail in their intended effect; but they will convey an impression which will certainly not advance the cause of India." At the Imperial Conference, however, the representatives of India acted exactly in the contrary sense. They did not seem to trust altogether "to the sense of fair-play and justice," on which the Viceroy bids us place entire reliance. They felt the necessity to reinforce the argument from justice by an argument from expediency. That is to say, they were constrained to point out the inexpediency of denying justice to Indians, which meant, to put it bluntly, that Indians would give trouble in various ways, if their just claims were not heeded. This was in fact the purport of the whole of Lord Peel's speech. India now enjoys a considerable amount of power in domestic affairs; all this power will be exercised to harass the Imperial Government if the latter is not just in its dealings with her. "We cannot disregard," he said, "the opinions of the representative bodies which we set up. And supposing they could be disregarded, how after all are you going to expect India to co-operate wholeheartedly in the great work of consolidating the Empire and how without this co-operation can the Empire attain its full measure of strength? We know, too, that economic policy is very often influenced by political considerations and I feel that both on the political and economic side, the difficulty of the task of governing India may be greatly increased." This means, in plain language, that the Indian Legislatures will exercise obstructive tactics and adopt a boycott policy if their just claims are not satisfied.

\* \* \*

Adhere to  
Boycotts.

IT is not only Lord Peel who used the boycott of Empire manufactures, etc., as a lever to obtain an improvement in the status of Indians, but Lord Reading himself. For the Government of India's telegram makes a pointed reference to the Bombay Corporation's boycott resolution and to a similar resolution passed at the Poona public meeting and appeals to the Imperial Government on that ground for a favourable consideration of India's claims. If really this retaliatory policy is futile and only capable of mischief, as Lord Reading declared on the 17th ultimo at Simla, he is surely too skilful an advocate to rest his plea for an amelioration of the condition of Indians, on the readiness of Indians to adopt reprisals. The fact is that the policy of boycotts is not so infructuous as Lord Reading tries to make out; it does tell, when it is skilfully manipulated. It is not

a light matter for any statesman with a vision to be told that if India does not enjoy equal citizenship, no help of any kind can be expected of her in any imperial schemes—schemes of defence or schemes of trade. The line of advocacy adopted by Lords Peel and Reading at the Imperial Conference furnishes, we think, a complete justification for an intensive agitation and for a retaliatory policy called for by the bulk of the Liberals along with other parties, and our duty is clear that we must pursue steadfastly and unflinchingly the path we have chosen till the principle of White domination implicit in the Kenya decision is completely overthrown. The Kenya question is no doubt to be reopened, and we should have felt it incumbent upon us to suspend further agitation about it if the Imperial Government had also forborne to give practical effect to those decisions which discriminate against Indians. Since however we are not yet sure that these decisions will be in abeyance till the inquiry to be now undertaken by a committee is completed, there is no obligation upon us to call off our agitation.

\* \* \*

MR. BALDWIN'S great Manchester speech last week may be said to set the seal on the new policy which his party has been evolving for some time past. As it means breaking Mr. Law's pledge, on the strength of which the elections were held, an early general election in England has become a necessity, in order that, if Mr. Baldwin is returned at the top of the polls, the new fiscal policy may be incorporated in the next budget. At Manchester Mr. Baldwin has placed before the English electors a concrete scheme, for which previously he had obtained the blessing of the Imperial Conference, and it is for this reason that the event is of double importance to India. It was at the Imperial Conference of 1917 that the *Round Table* vision of a self-contained unitary British Empire emerged: Mr. Baldwin to-day is convinced that "unless the Empire is bound together economically, the law of economic gravitation must draw them into a more powerful economic orbit." In this passage Mr. Baldwin is clearly referring to the menace of financial absorption of Canada by the U. S. A. and the striking success with which the latter have bought for themselves, rather than conquered, an Empire of the two Americas and of the Pacific. The Conservative Party of Britain, with a "heavy industrialist" like Mr. Baldwin as their leader, would now apparently follow this glowing example and buy for themselves the British Empire. "India", Mr. Baldwin lamented, "upon whom they had looked as a market for all time in the natural process of evolution, is now in sole control, for all practical purposes, of her fiscal system and like the rest of the world is going protectionist." Hence the adoption of Sir P. Lloyd-Greame's project of what is euphemistically called "financial assistance for orders placed in Britain" by the Imperial Economic Conference on Friday last. Into the economic aspect of this new move we propose to go at another time: to-day, with the discussion of the Imperial Conference about the status of India still ringing in our ears, we content ourselves in reminding our Imperial friends that if India is to remain a first-class market for all the goods of the Empire, the indispensable condition will be to guarantee her also first-class citizenship rights in all parts of the Empire.

\* \* \*

## THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

### I.

MR. BALDWIN, when opening the fourth Imperial Conference, ending to-day, gave his own interpretation to, what he called "The British Commonwealth" as "a world commonwealth, containing one quarter of mankind, drawn from all the continents, all their races, every kind of human society", a commonwealth, which, "embedded like a network of steel in concrete, holds more than itself together." This is a fine vision—that of a world-wide polity, which has succeeded in transcending the differences separating mankind, and which thus has proved that territorial, racial and social antagonisms are ultimately capable of harmonization. Thus the British Home Secretary on the 29th ult. could truly say that "the essential unity for attaining realisation in varying and independent methods and practices under a great variety of conditions, was a distinctive characteristic of the British Empire or Commonwealth". Mr. Bruce similarly considered it the function of the Empire to "comprehend within itself as a single unit the different ideas and elements of strength and potentialities of progress towards the common good which the Empire is happily able to draw from Eastern as well as Western sources." And not only is this conception a fine, but far-off event to strive after: it is to some extent realized already. Already there exists throughout this British Commonwealth that traditionally English policy of unity by agreeing to differ, rather than that of uniformity by relementation; there exists a deep-seated conviction that representation should go with taxation and that a man must be presumed innocent, until the contrary is proved. These principles are real, even if they are not universal; they are undoubtedly the ideals, which the best of Englishmen have had and still have for what once was in theory and in practice an Empire. But though one agrees with a writer in the *New Statesman* of the 6th ult. "that the Empire, in any intelligible sense of the word, has disappeared—not merely in speeches and writings of idealists, but actually on the Statute Book now appearing as 'the group of nations forming the British Commonwealth of Nations': it must be equally admitted that, though the Empire has ceased to be an Empire, it has not yet actually and generally become a Commonwealth of Nations.

Even to-day seven in eight of the subjects of the British Crown are subject to autocratic rule, pure and simple; whilst it is indisputable that, as the Empire came into being for the purpose of maintaining a monopoly of exploitation, so to-day still for perhaps the most clamant section of the British people, the Empire still means primarily a "market," and nothing else. At first, the Empire was synonymous with trade monopoly, as had been the previous Colonial Empires of the Dutch, the Spaniards, the Portuguese. But the advent of the

machine age, which took its birth in Great Britain, soon gave to the British Empire a new meaning. For it is the characteristic of machine production that it is capable of producing more than its local market can consume. The natural consequence is that, as machine production was perfected in Britain, the British Empire became more and more a market for the dumping of British goods. And to-day, as Sir P. Lloyd-Greame said in his opening speech at the Economic Conference, "the population in Britain [i.e. the labour force] has increased, the efficiency of methods of production [principally on account of the War] has improved. Consequently a larger volume of trade is necessary than before the war to maintain employment. For us therefore the vital problem is the problem of markets". And since the *post bellum* conditions abroad have spoiled those countries as a market for British goods, nothing remains, but to develop as such a market the British Empire for all that it is worth.

Here, then, we have the two strands of Empire sentiment, the idealist and the materialist. The remarkable thing about the latest Imperial Conference is the realization that the material advantages henceforth are unobtainable without giving full play to the ideals on which this nascent British Commonwealth is urged to develop: and the problem which has, more than any other, brought about this realization, is the status of Indians in this British Commonwealth. The Viscount Peel, in what easily must rank as the best speech of the momentous discussion said: "Unless we settle this question, there will be no real unity of Empire. If the unity and strength of the Empire are to be maintained and preserved, we must remove the disability under which our fellow-subjects in India labour and which they regard as a brand of social inferiority." Why? Because of the "prominent part played by India in all situations of Imperial activity"—notably in respect of Imperial Defence and Imperial Trade. Lord Peel had no need to elaborate in detail the significance of the points he was making. Later in the day, Mr. Bruce indeed put it more bluntly, when he hoped "that in its hour of need the Empire may rely on India as a strength and support instead of being a source of weakness. It is not pleasant, perhaps, to dwell on these contingencies, but it is very clear that the statesmen assembled in London at least fully realized that in another world war the difference between getting a million men from India and having to send a million men to India to keep her down and, say, the French and Japanese, out, would spell the difference between winning and losing the war. If India is treated as racially inferior by a British White Empire, it would indeed be curious if in such a war her sympathies would not rather be with a French Empire which makes no distinctions between whites and blacks. And if India, in questions of Empire def-

ence, can no longer be treated as inert still less so is that possible in questions of Empire trade. The crores of India form indeed a magnificent market: but no longer can British industrialists take it for granted, that this market will be a close preserve for them. On the contrary, Mr. Innes on behalf of India has stated very clearly that India has no use for Imperial preference. As a matter of fact, India has now gone even further and, since the Kenya decision was given out, is very clearly bent on giving her preference rather to foreign goods than to those of people who treat Indians as racially inferior. The clause to this effect henceforth appearing on all tenders invited by the Bombay Corporation is an indication that India can no longer be driven economically any more than militarily.

But, if the British ideals are as stated above, how is it that there should have intruded at all this question of racial inferiority? One can understand that capitalism should have tried to get the last ounce out of its Imperial traffic: but who has ever heard of a trader insulting a person whom he desires to turn into or keep as a customer? The thing is absurd: and indeed it is easily proved that, until 1910, racial inferiority was officially unknown anywhere within the British Empire. It is in that year, with the admission of the Union of South Africa, that the British Empire entered upon the slippery slope of officially discriminating between subjects of the Empire according to race: a discrimination, which was not merely one administratively tolerated or overlooked, but one laid down starkly and uncompromisingly in the very constitution of the old Boer republics—"There shall be no equality of White and Black in State or Church." Mr. Smuts in his speech on the 29th indeed denied that South African discrimination against Indians was based on colour. Yet in the same breath he went on to say that "we have in the Union a majority of blacks and if there is to be equal manhood suffrage over the Union, the whites would be swamped by the blacks all over South Africa and the whole position for which we have striven for 200 years or more now would be given up." And what is that position? It is that of "a few small white communities in a continent inhabited by 100 million blacks, settled down as pioneers of a European civilization. These very small communities in South Africa and Central Africa are there to foster their own Western civilization." Yet Mr. Smuts denies that this is discrimination based on colour and is indignant that "Mr. Sastri in one of his somewhat outrageous statements referred to this as a Boer Empire, an Empire which is swamped by Boer ideals!" It would be sheer waste of time to follow Mr. Smuts in these, shall we say, inconsistencies. He knows as well as we do, that if a Negro, born and bred in "Western civilization," tried to claim equality in his own native South Africa with White upholders of that same "White civilization," his claim would not

be accepted—not because he failed in any test regarding that civilization, but because of his colour. That is exactly where the old British ideal and the old Boer ideal differ: the one discriminates according to civilization, not according to colour; the other according to colour, not according to civilization. Hence the Boer ideal (which knows of only one civilization and wishes to maintain it as a White aristocracy ruling over a Black labour empire) is diametrically opposed to the British Commonwealth concept of many diverse civilizations and races, uniting on a status of equality in a common effort towards common ideals: a concept, on the strength of which British pioneers in Africa would be considered trustees for the native African, whose interests are paramount; a concept, in strict accordance with which, for instance, British West Africa is actually being developed.

It is proverbially unfruitful to cry over spilt milk: there is no point therefore in considering at this hour of our Imperial day the shortsightedness or otherwise of ever admitting the Boers into the Empire on any other terms than those of equality for all civilized persons. The fact is that the Boer ideal has been given asylum in our Empire; another fact is that India refuses to remain any longer in an Empire, where this Boer ideal is countenanced. This is the problem which was before the present Imperial Conference. What solutions were attempted?

## II.

Mr. Bruce strictly confined himself to the position in Australia, which admittedly is fair. Mr. Massey on behalf of New Zealand emphasized that there was no colour bar in that Dominion, where Maori and Anglo-Saxon have always enjoyed identical rights and where to-day Indians enjoy these identical rights too. He therefore naturally hoped "that the same thing may be said of the residents in other parts of the Empire" and that India be given "all the privileges that British citizens in other parts of the Empire enjoy." Mr. Warren of Newfoundland expressed himself in similar terms, whilst Mr. Fitzgerald for the Irish Free State assured Indians how his country "who had suffered a good deal in the past from being treated as an inferior race, sympathized wholeheartedly with the Indians both in their protest against their inferior race treatment, and in their feelings as to the freedom of their country." But Mr. Fitzgerald also stressed the fact which to him seemed supreme, viz. that "the Dominions are independent sovereign countries" and that therefore "we really have no right to interfere there." Canada's Prime Minister took up a similar attitude of non-interference; but went beyond the purely negative one taken by Ireland, by suggesting as a solution the adoption of the principle of reciprocity in inter-Imperial relations. "So far as Canada is concerned," he continued, "we would not ask for our citizens resident in India any right which we are not prepared equally to

concede to Indian residents in Canada." One of the resolutions advocating strict reciprocity therefore, recently passed here as a protest against the Kenya decision, so far from endangering the Empire, as some of our critics were fearful, is actually thus advocated by Canada as the best way of preserving the Empire! Mr. Smuts also agreed "that an Australian, for instance, could not come to South Africa and claim franchise there as a matter of course": but then, he drew a curious (Dr. Sapru called it "subtle", South Africans we believe would call it "slim") distinction between "British citizenship and rights of franchise." Still more curiously, Mr. Smuts, in a memorandum to the Conference had previously denied the "equality of British citizenship throughout the Empire. British citizenship is bound to be even more variable in the future than in the past. Each constituent part of the Empire would settle for itself the nature of its citizenship. Hence Indians going to Canada would not be entitled to claim equal political rights with other citizens of Canada, any more than Canadians going to India or Australia could claim equal political rights." Yet when he realized that such procedure would retain not even the semblance of a united Empire, he distinguished "British citizenship" (which he evacuates of all meaning) from "rights of franchise" (the issue at stake), hoping by such transparent subterfuge to preserve inter-Imperial relations as "those of friendly sovereign states towards each other." One understands their sovereignty in that case, certainly, but where could possibly their friendliness be sought? No, the gallant (and slim) general's distinction cannot be taken seriously; it must rank with his assertion that Indians in South Africa are in no way of inferior status, except as regards the franchise: an assertion, which conveniently forgot those "specific grievances relating to residence, acquisition of land and trading licences", of which Dr. Sapru was not slow to remind him. What however is perhaps more serious is that the British Home Secretary should have made these very sentiments his own and should have deprecated "the ambiguous use of 'citizenship' as though it were synonymous with the imperial conception of nationality", and should also have distinguished between "imperial nationality and local citizenship, imperial unity and local autonomy." But, like Gen. Smuts, he unfortunately omitted to say what right exactly such "imperial nationality" still covered, if it does not cover local citizenship; or whether any such right, which it still covered, made it worth India's while to stay in an Empire, which demanded her economic and military help, but which in return would offer nothing but an empty word—*vox, praeterea nil*.

The broad fact emerges that the only solution acceptable to Mr. Smuts would be the adoption of the principle of White ascendancy by the Empire, failing which we presume he would advocate secession of South Africa from the Empire, as he al-

ready once, and not obscurely, has hinted. White ascendancy is certainly an impossible principle for India to submit to—and on this point India is but the spokesman for all the coloured races throughout the world. "Putting the white people on one side and the coloured races on the other", as Sir T. B. Sapru remarked, "means trouble not only in South Africa, but throughout the world." Besides, "how are you going to keep Indians or for that matter all other coloured races within the Empire? Force? Never." As Lord Peel in a phrase which deserves to become classic has put it: "Justice and expediency make India's appeal irresistible." Mr. Baldwin echoed Dr. Sapru's sentiment that "India is the one country which makes the British Empire truly imperial." He, perhaps unlike Mr. Smuts, realizes "the magnitude of her share in our common partnership" and the growing sense of "India's value to the Empire and the Empire's value to India," and therefore pleads for a growing sense of "partnership among all the many peoples and races who owe common allegiance to the Crown."

The only solution then proposed at the Conference is that of each part of the Empire fending for itself irrespective of the rest—a solution which cannot possibly provide any further bond of union, than does already exist between sovereign states outside the Empire. If Great Britain and the Dominions desire to retain India's economic and military partnership, they certainly will not achieve that end by what Gen. Smuts understands by "friendliness"—a term which really means relegating Indians to permanent "second class citizenship" in the Empire. The strength of feeling in India over this question has now been realized in London: thanks to the policy of reprisals which is being pressed as a result of the Kenya decision, and thanks to the able manner in which Lord Peel and Dr. Sapru have presented India's case at the Conference. Sir T. B. Sapru has undoubtedly gained much in gaining at least respite at so fateful an hour when the very continuation of the British Empire is at stake. If shattered it is to be, it is well that everybody concerned should at least approach that event with eyes fully open. But let there be no mistake about it: the respite gained by Dr. Sapru is a respite, not for India, but for the Empire. Let the Empire use it wisely.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL REFORMS IN MYSORE

THE scheme of constitutional reforms for Mysore—outlined by the Dewan, Mr. A. R. Banerji, in October last year, was, in its final form, announced by him on the 27th of October this year in the Representative Assembly. Readers of the SERVANT OF INDIA have already been made familiar with the principal features of the original outline and also with the chief recommendations as to the details thereof made by a mixed committee presided over by Dr. Seal, the Vice-Chancellor of the

Mysore University. In presenting the scheme as finally sanctioned to the Assembly, Mr. Banerji took occasion to remind critics that the reforms are really a gift voluntarily given by Government rather than a concession forced out of their hands by an irresistible popular clamour. He said: "When making the announcement, Government were not persuaded by any insistent demand from the people. The developments contemplated were in keeping with past policy and with the past constitutional progress in Mysore." This is perfectly true, and it ought to give a little pause to those who would belittle the scheme as inadequate and disappointing. As to its merits, Mr. Banerji himself does not pretend that it is ideal and could satisfy all parties.

The constitutional documents which promulgate the new changes are three: (1) the Royal Proclamation, (2) a Regulation to give a statutory basis to the Representative Assembly and (3) a Regulation to enlarge the Legislative Council and extend its powers. Supplementary to these is a Government Order setting forth the details of the changes and their meaning. The Proclamation must be a little disappointing to those who expect a document of that description to embody a heart-to-heart talk from the Sovereign to his people. It is formal in its tone and structure, and gives no evidence of that personal love for his people which everybody in Mysore knows to be the characteristic of her present ruler. In cases like the present a Royal Proclamation is used properly to convey to the public something that cannot be conveyed by a legal enactment. It is meant to communicate a generous assurance and a wholesome exhortation which have no place amidst the strict provisions of a law. It ought to be an offer of goodwill and a plea for good-hearted endeavour, not a cold summary of what is to be enforced by formal laws. The proclamations issued in the names of Queen Victoria, King Edward and King George—the last in connection with the British Indian Reforms Acts of 1919—fully support the view we hold as to the proper purpose of a Royal proclamation, and we wish therefore that the Mysore Proclamation had been less conventional and more human.

The Regulations also bear traces of hasty drafting. It is a great pity that the Representative Assembly and the Legislative Council were given no opportunity to discuss and perfect these two regulations. Especially as their main contents had been incorporated in the Royal Proclamation, there was no need whatsoever for passing them in the manner of emergency measures and placing them above criticism. There is an obvious irony in the circumstance that constitutional progress is made to have its beginning in an unconstitutional proceeding. It is quite conceivable that if the popular representatives had had a chance, the Regulations would have been materially amended and added to on some vital points such as qualifications for the right of franchise and the

privileges of members of constitutional bodies.

But notwithstanding all that can be said against the manner of the promulgation of these reforms and against their scope and tendency, it must be admitted that the present instalment of changes means a substantial gain from the point of view of the sober reformer. The advance is mainly in four directions: (1) The Representative Assembly, by being invested with powers of voting and dividing, acquires a corporate character which it hitherto lacked. Till now it was simply a gathering of unorganised individuals, each working on his own hook. Hereafter the Assembly will speak with one authoritative voice and therein will be the source of its strength and influence. Its field of operations is also extended so as to include legislation and taxation and its responsibilities have been enhanced though its voice is not to be decisive or compelling immediately. (2) The Legislative Council will have some more formal and more effective share, than the Assembly in the power of the purse which of course will include taxation. Its numerical strength is augmented, which means that the Government will have to stand a great deal more of heckling. (3) There will be opportunities for members of the two houses, through Standing Committees, to acquaint themselves at first hand with the problems and the difficulties of practical administration. The insight which is thus to be acquired is an essential qualification for non-officials who would hold places in the Executive Council. Incidentally, the Committees may also serve to enable popular representatives to influence the course of daily administration. (4) The local bodies will have more work for their hands and more power to their elbows. It is a truism now-a-days that in institutions of local self-government lie the roots of a healthy and growing democracy; and the emancipation of our municipalities from official leading-strings should, therefore, be hailed as the opening of a great opportunity for the development of genuine public spirit. Such is the import of the reforms announced by Mr. Banerji; and it need scarcely be said that his scheme is not meant to last for ever. How soon it will change for the better will necessarily depend upon how well the people will utilize its present provisions. In planning these changes, the Government of Mysore appear to have been guided more by the State's political experience of the past as well as the present condition of public spirit in the State than by external analogies and *a priori* arguments. The question has been asked in some quarters why there should be a Representative Assembly at all and why, if it should be, it should not have a non-official president. The answer is that the Assembly has been performing some important extra-constitutional functions and that the admixture in its composition like the flexibility of its methods of procedure is a useful feature of that body. Besides acting as a critic of Government and an ex-

ponent of the popular mind in regard to legislation and other formal business of administration, it has been a kind of intermediary between the Government and the subject. It acquaints the Government with the everyday grievances and wants of the people and tries to secure their redress in an informal way. If the Dewan or the head of the administration is there as its President, the members will have the advantage of meeting the Government face to face and bringing home the people's difficulties to its mind. The heads of Government Departments could study the people's mind at first hand and secure for themselves much useful information by questions and cross-questions put to members. Forty years' experience has proved that the arrangement is valuable from the view-points of both Government and the people; and many concrete problems of administration are being easily disposed of year after year by means of such quasi-formal conversations held in the Assembly. Mother of all popular institutions in the State, its privileges and conventions are of no less use to the people than the more formal powers and the stricter proceedings of the Legislative Council. It is well said that the worth of a scheme of political reforms will depend not upon its theoretical conformity to an accepted ideal, but upon the practical good sense and alertness of the people who will have to work it. It will be in the power of a wise and energetic public to extract much that is good from even small reforms, whereas an ignorant and apathetic public will not be able to benefit appreciably even from very liberal reforms. It will be for public men in Mysore to use to the full all the powers and opportunities that the new constitution will allow and to justify the demand for more. Where public opinion is well-informed and vigilant, the people will not long have to wait for political power.

V. V. S.

### COLOUR PREJUDICE.

*The following are extracts from a very thoughtful article on Colour Prejudice contributed to the October number of the Contemporary Review by Sir Sidney Olivier, K. C. M. G., C. B. :-*

#### COLOUR LABOUR PREJUDICE IN NORTHERN EUROPE DUE TO SLAVE TRADE.

I am aware of no moral ingredient in colour-prejudice which is not, or has not been, displayed in race prejudice between races of common colour, or between tribes of the same race, families of the same tribe or even individuals of the same family. Colour prejudice in the common sense of the term, is in fact essentially a modern phenomenon dating largely from the rise of the Bristol slave-trade and our assumption of military supremacy in India and is a complex of many reactions of slave holding and Asiatic domination, as will be recognised if one compares the character of inter-racial feeling at different periods. The comparative superficiality

is indicated by the fact that inter-sexual attraction overrides it, coloured women being conjugally agreeable to white men, whilst the socially unavowable fact that coloured men are the like to white women is one of the strongest provocatives to the killing and burning of negroes to the United States as it was to the frequent assaults on coloured soldiers who came to England or visited English cities during the war, until English leave was withheld from them.

#### RACE PREJUDICE MORE DEEP-SEATED.

Race prejudice is a much more ancient, widespread and deep-seated phenomenon and in so far as skin and hair are an ensign and advertisement of race and are interpreted as a docket of the qualities inductively attributed to race, colour prejudice is merely a reflex of race prejudice. It is obvious that many Englishmen and women are capable of as strong a prejudice against Welshmen, Jews or Germans as a West Indian white woman has against black people; also that many men have a quite analogous prejudice against all the race of Women and many women against the whole race of Men. As to the Germans, it is hardly a generation ago that we were proud to share with them the prestige of representing the great Nordic Teutonic dominant race, as against the blackvised negroid Latin and the perilous Japanese. During the war we suddenly discovered that they were Huns, Mongolians, which happened, as regarded the old Prussian nobility, to be ethnologically more correct, and most opportunely enabled us to hate and despise them with all the enthusiasm of racial prejudice. Bismarck's skull and jowl we recognised on our ancient Chinese vases, and on his polished scalp the degenerate but imperishable rudiments of a pig-tail.

#### SEX PREJUDICE SIMILAR TO COLOUR AND RACE PREJUDICE.

Sex prejudice arises from factors closely analogous to those of race prejudice; lack of sympathy with certain differences in average character arising from or aggravated by physical and environmental conditions of evolution. Generalisation of these moral differences has even led to speaking of masculine and feminine races. The mutual contempt of the patriarchalist and feminist is identical in its sources and justifications with the mutual contempt of "tough" and "tender" races. Like colour prejudice and other racial prejudices, sex prejudice too, is annulled or rather, I should perhaps say, inhibited or suspended by sex-attraction.

#### PIGMENTATION OF SKIN DUE TO SUN'S RAYS AND HAS NO MORAL SIGNIFICANCE.

It is now accepted that Man in Europe, using implements and having artistic faculty, antedated and survived at least four major and two minor glacial ages and their intervals, during a period which must be computed as running into hundreds and thousands of years, whilst all that time man was civilising and humanising himself in the more habitable parts of the earth, Upper

Egypt, Arabia, Mesopotamia, in which neighbourhood somewhat old-fashionedly, it is now increasingly held that he had his human origin, thence to spread in successive migrations. He thus had, it is now recognised, a practically unlimited allowance of time to get himself (to speak of colour only) protectively shaded against equatorial sun rays, browned in the Mediterranean, bleached in the foggy forests and sunless winters of Northern Europe, and yellowed, to the colour of goggle-glass, in the draughty glare of the Steppes. These hues of the skin have no moral significance. They are all physical adaptations to modify the subcutaneous action of sunlight on the nervous and lymphatic system.

#### EVIDENCES FOR THE COMMON ORIGIN OF MAN.

The evidence pointing to a common origin (of man) has accumulated and has been reinforced, whilst the theory of diverse origin, devised to account for the wide apparent difference between the principal races as they were then classified, and popularly welcomed as a vindication of slavery and Imperialism, has remained an unsupported hypothesis. The presumption of a common origin has been strengthened by inductions on evidence, such as the distribution of indestructible or fortunately preserved implements; and the conservative evolution of primitive artistic inventions along the practicable routes of migration and over defined stretches of country is as good evidence as is the paper in a paper-chase of hares having passed that way, more especially when at the end of diverging tracks we actually find surviving the recognisable remnants of the types whose course we have traced, in the Tasmanian and Australian blackfellows, the Bushmen, or the Eskimo.

In the caves of the red cliffs of Grimaldi, the first buttresses of the Italian coast beyond the frontier at Menton, skeletons were found of palæolithic man of the splendid European race commonly called the Cro-Magnon, one of which might very well have passed for the relics of Mr. Gladstone. In adjacent caves were found other skeletons of apparently similar period, of that small early negroid type which survived till recently in the Bushman, which is credited with having invented the bow and from it the harp... There are indications elsewhere of similar overlapping and inter-mixture of small negroid and big European early races...

#### MODERN EUROPEAN CIVILISATION NOT EVOLVED IN ISOLATION.

[ It is a common but altogether fallacious habit to suppose that the Northern European races have been evolved in continuous isolation since the first appearance of Man on the earth; that modern European civilisation is the evolved product of the Cave Man and his environment. Nothing of the sort. ] There were not many caves and those that were must have been appropriated by the strongest and most independent families. In any case the European cave-dweller and the

whole of the Nordic peoples are parvenus—recent settlers, remote descendants of the adventurers and hooligans who swarmed off out of the central breeding grounds and nurseries of humanity in the warmer middle world above the equator, and only after the last retreat of the ice were able to get permanently settled in Northern Europe at all.

They certainly became in this pilgrimage less civilised and less humane than were the people they left behind. The amenities and courtesies of life became less and less possible for them and when the older civilisations had supplied them with bronze for their weapons they came back upon the middle world equipped with a style of behaviour which Dr. Scott Elliott thinks it fittest to illustrate by a picture of a raiding charge of Masai spearmen. Before the acquisition of metal weapons by the fair-skinned Northern races who had had for thousands of years to train their fighting qualities in conflict with nature and beasts, there was nothing, he (Dr. Elliott) thinks, that could be properly called war and no general enslavement of one people by another; there could not be. Moreover, to say nothing of agriculture, arts and civilisation which in however modest degree were arising and making progress in the middle world whilst forest Europe north of the mountains was wholly savage, the humanity of this middle world became better mannered, more sympathetic, more free from race or colour prejudice than the world of Nordic man; and this distinction not only still persists in Europe, Asia, and Africa, but is easily discernible to anyone who knows the English people and can recognise their various types, Mediterranean, Celtic, or Nordic, among ourselves every day.

#### NORDIC MAN'S DEFICIENCY IN SOME ESSENTIALS.

Christianity is not a product of Nordic man and he has not yet by any means assimilated it. Broadly speaking, when the fair-skinned man broke back from his forests and cattle-runs into renewed contact with the world of his unbleached cousins, he was, with many superiorities, distinctly inferior to brown Mediterraneans, black Africans, and yellow Chinese in some of the most essential and desirable ingredients of complete human character, and to this day, notwithstanding what he has learnt from them, he largely remains so. The Chinaman who calls him a Devil merely formulates the common judgment on his behaviour towards other races which their understanding of human quality inherits from the older civilisations from which his forefathers fled. When the European Allies sacked the Summer Palace at Peking it was, even in our own day, an instance of a lower civilisation destroying a higher whose arts it could neither attain to nor appreciate.

#### LACKING IN SENSE OF JUSTICE.

Nordic man is satisfied that he has a natural sense of justice. He has never succeeded in



being just even to his own women, although he has recognised that that alien race has itself a very imperfect sense of justice or honour. Our highest British Court of Justice could only decide that if the soil of Mashonaland did not belong to a British Company it must belong to King George, and that, whoever else it might belong to, it certainly did not belong to its own natives. Our Government and our nation accept that and similar impudences as just. White men are, doubtless, intellectually and morally capable of the most exalted equity: but as a race they have not always such a well-organised sense of justice as has the Chinaman or the Negro, whilst the Semite against whom the Nordic has prejudices as strong as any colour prejudice, has repeatedly been his teacher in justice, mercy, medicine, mathematics, religions and artistic inspiration.

Colour prejudice, let me repeat, as colour prejudice, is a very superficial affliction; merely a common form of provincialism. Race prejudice is the substance underlying it. Race prejudice between competitive races is intelligible enough, but it is a product of war, of the bronze and iron ages. Race prejudice in a dominant race is self-justificatory arrogance. Men hate whom they have injured, despise him for his subjection, and blacken his character in order to justify his oppression. Having enslaved, they complain of servile qualities—whether in subject races or women—and say these are unfit to govern themselves. If they struggle, the master calls them savages and viragoes; if they argue, he imprisons their speakers and writers; if they ignore or disobey outrageous demands, he accuses them of rebellion, exiles a Prempeh, bombs a Hottentot village, sends survivors to penal servitude. He demands acquiescence in pillage and burglary as a first condition of clemency to the vanquished.

The sciences, arts and devices by which the weaker races are overborne are within the capacity of their human character and intelligence to acquire, a few of them at first, but steadily more and more—we need not deceive ourselves. We have had to give in to our women, and at any rate allow them to try; they have not yet finished with us. The coloured races all over the world are now thinking and aiming exactly as our women have done. The presumption that they are incapable of succeeding is no stronger than the presumption against women was confidently asserted to be two generations ago. Their intellectual leaders are no more convinced than were the women's leaders of the impossibility of their aims. They are trying, they are going to go on trying, to undeceive us. If things are to go smoothly we must see clearly; and to see clearly it is essential to purge our hearts of racial and colour prejudices which at present mischievously distort our vision and judgment.

### THE SWARAJISTS' REGARD FOR FACTS.

IMITATION is the sincerest form of flattery. The Swarajist has flattered the Liberals by adopting their method of issuing leaflets for the education of the electorate. A specimen of a such a leaflet—bulletin No. 3—is before us. It is styled "Beware of the Moderates", again a compliment in return for their "Beware of the New Friends."

Let us now see how the Swarajist goes about his task. He states in the very first line that "an applicant for office is careful not to expose his faults and weaknesses and failures." Quite right. Is not the Swarajist himself an instance in point? He boycotted the Councils three years ago. He is now anxious to be returned to these "temples of Maya"; and, in order to commend himself to the notice of his electors he is practising the old game of *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi*. Having nothing to tell the electorate about his work in the past except failure, discomfiture and disappointment, he makes abundant and glowing promises for the future. The Swarajist says that the Moderates don't stick to facts and truth. Every one knows how facts and fiction fare as between the Swarajist and the Liberal. Let us now examine the new facts the Swarajist thinks he has brought to light—in the new leaflet-bulletin No. 3 he has issued. He gives them *seriatim* and we will sift them accordingly.

*Fact No. 1.*—40,000 men in prison because of repression, and the Moderates have not resigned as a protest. May we ask the Swarajist when and where the Moderates had given an undertaking that they would resign? What penance, in sackcloth and ashes, have the Swarajists done for sending so many persons to jail as the result of their law-breaking campaign? How did they help these misguided persons? Who incited them to break the law? Did the Moderates advise them to do so? How are they, then, to be held responsible? It was the Moderates that raised in the Councils the question of incarceration. How would their resignation have helped the prisoners better?

*Fact No. 2.*—Incarceration of Mr. Gandhi. What did the Swarajists themselves do by way of protest or in order to liberate him? According to their own view of it—they may change now—the Councils are no good for that or any other purpose. Certainly, where non-co-operation failed, resignation would not have helped.

*Fact No. 3.*—Wasting lakhs of rupees on the British Empire Exhibition in the face of the starving poor. The Swarajists *cum* Non-co-operators wasted a crore of rupees and more of people's money without bringing Swaraj a day nearer for the poor taxpayer. Where has their compassion for the starving millions taken them? The Empire Exhibition may at least do some good. The Swarajist has not a shred of evidence to prove that his activities have improved the lot of the starving millions by a bit. On the other hand, he has subjected them to untold misery by spreading among

them a spirit of hatred, violence, mischief and misguided activity. Witness the Swaraj in Moplah country. What about the Malegaon riots, the tragedy at Chauri Chaura and the terrorist régime in Bombay, Madras and Calcutta, with all that it has cost in the destruction of property, loss of life, in mutual suspicion, jealousy, division and fanatical intolerance. These are the fruits of the Swarajist's use of a crore of rupees in his agitation for Swaraj. What compassion for the starving poor, what anxiety for their weal! Compared to the money misused by the Swarajist, India's contribution to the Empire Exhibition is a bagatelle and is, besides, far from being wasted.

*Fact No. 4.*—Doubling of the salt duty. The Moderates had absolutely no hand in the matter. They voted against it. They threw it out, along with their friends, thrice in the Assembly. We wonder what the Swarajists would have done in the matter. Let them tell us *how* they would have prevented it. Empty boast is useless. What have they done now, with all their fanfaronading about a no-tax campaign and civil disobedience? Have they forced the Government to take off the duty?

*Fact No. 5.*—Mr. Horniman's return. The Councils and Moderates have nothing to do in the matter. Let the Swarajists tell us what they have been doing to get him back and how they have succeeded. It is no use making base insinuations against individuals. Let the Swarajist produce facts in support of his charge. Resignation is a species of non-co-operation. Non-co-operation on a large scale has failed miserably. The change of front on the part of the Swarajist proves it. Where then is the use of resignation for every little thing in the world? The Moderates have no reason to look upon Mr. Horniman as a god. They never worshipped at his shrine. If still they have taken up his cause it is only because it is a cause of personal freedom, a fight against executive tyranny. They have never professed to believe Mr. Horniman as either indispensable or immaculate.

*Fact No. 6.*—Approving and supporting repression. The Moderates have neither approved nor supported repression. As a result of their work, the bulk of repressive legislation has been removed from the statute book. It is the excesses of the Non-co-operators *cum* Swarajists that made it impossible for the Government to do away with the whole of it. In the face of a direct challenge to law and order no other course was open. It is the non-co-operators that invited and encouraged what they chose to call repression. They had been long dreaming of shooting and gunpowder. They were anxious to fill the jails with prisoners. They misled the ignorant, exploited the gundas and the budmashees, lent themselves to violence and prolonged the reign of repression which would have certainly ended if Non-co-operation had been non-existent.

*Fact No. 7.*—Opposition to the release of political prisoners. If any one has at all spoken for the better treatment and release of political

prisoners it is the Moderates and their friends in the Councils. And their advocacy has certainly been of some use. As witness what has been done in the Panjab, the C. P. and the U. P. And why should the Swarajists, doing no expiation themselves, make the Moderates the scape-goat of the sins they have committed?

*Fact No. 8.*—No resistance offered to the welcome given to the Duke of Connaught and the Prince of Wales. The policy of resistance has been proved by events to have been altogether misguided and mischievous. The noisy agitator may say that popular opinion was behind him. He has proved it, if at all, at a tremendous cost to the country in riot, bloodshed, imprisonment and the terror of mob-law. The Swarajist may say anything he chooses. But we have reason to know what he feels in his heart. Anyway, good sense was, in that matter, with the Moderates. And if the Moderates erred, they erred in good company, as can be easily proved.

*Fact No. 9.*—Sacrificing the interest of the cotton industry in yielding to the non-increase of import duty from 11 to 15 p. c., etc. We have yet to know what better things the Swarajists could have done. They have not shown the courage to follow up the no-tax campaign. The cotton and mill-interests were well represented in the Councils. The retention of import duty at 11 p. c. had their support. With all their tall talk, the Swarajists have not succeeded, by a jot or tittle, in paralysing the Government or crippling its resources. It does not lie in their mouth, therefore, to condemn others when they have not shown even a hundredth part of the practical work accomplished by others in the Central Legislatures in reducing expenditure, withdrawing demands for grants and proposals for additional taxes and bringing the Government to see eye to eye with them in many a complicated matter of taxation and finance.

We have seen the facts adduced by the Swarajist to damn the Liberals in the eyes of the electors. And not a single one of them has stood the test of truth. A writer described tragedy as theory killed by fact. The Swarajist is a mighty hero of such a tragedy. Every theory he puts forward to thrust himself on the attention of the elector proves no better than fiction. In the nick of time the fact fails his theories. Let him content himself by building castles in the air. For he is the veritable King of La Mancha.

A LIBERAL.

## REVIEW.

### A FREEMAN OF THE WORLD?

TATCHELL, FRANK: THE HAPPY TRAVELLER: A BOOK FOR POOR MEN. London. 1923. 8x5. pp. xii and 271. (Methuen & Co. 7s. 6d.)

This is without a doubt a remarkable book and one is not surprised that its first edition was exhausted.

within six weeks of its publication. One only wishes that it might meet with equal popularity in India: for if there is one thing, which Indian youth needs to learn, it is the philosophy and art of travelling of which Mr. Tatchell is a past master. Travelling, that is not in one's own country, but abroad; not for a fixed, circumscribed purpose, but for the fun of it; not carrying with one intact all one's customs, habits and manners of life, but rather trying to escape from them. Few of us venture outside of India unless for some narrow "study purpose" or because possessed of exceptional wealth. Yet "the true fun in life consists in doing things, not in having them; indeed the success of your journey depends less on the heaviness of your purse than on your lightness of heart. Life is short and the world is wide, but, moving thus about the countries as a freeman of the world, the time seems endless" (p. 11). Our author writes for poor travellers, who "leave the night's shelter to chance; it is more easily obtained than you would imagine" (p. 17); who realise that "the fun of travel consists largely in chance encounters and unpremeditated moves; so leave the details of your journey entirely in the hands of fate" (p. 9); who are ready to be "enticed from the beaten track and helped to lead a wild, worth having youth" (p. 3). How we need this spirit of adventure, and the knowledge of the world that is born of it!

Indeed, what better post-graduate education for an Indian youth than to find himself flung alone into one of the Mediterranean countries; plunged into a culture alien alike to Indian and English ways of life; forced to adapt himself hourly to the novel requirements of the moment and to re-think every single one of his preconceived notions! Indeed the Mediterranean countries will be best for such a one to start on: for after all, India has more in common with them than with all the rest of the West. For one thing, they are warm; for another they are poor. "The Latin countries of Europe are paradises for the poor traveller" (p. 52). And "poor countries have the pleasantest people; thus all the travellers are struck with the charm and friendliness of the men and women of Spain" (p. 78). Hence, "in spite of their poverty, the Spaniards are a happy people with a real delight in living" (p. 79). So, why not get out of the steamer from Bombay at Gibraltar, young India, and start tramping through Latindom from there? Spain, Portugal, Spain again, Southern France, Italy... Especially Italy; and the further south, the better, and the more it is summer the better too. The English from their foggy isles may find it too hot then; no Southerner need mind a summer in Sicily. Our author agrees: "an Italian summer is delightful; the weather is superb, life a constant picnic, the sea-bathing is unequalled and there are no tourists" (p. 53). (Similarly, Mr. Tatchell thinks that winter is the time to go to Russia (p. 132): which just proves how uncommonly shrewd a traveller he is.) Italy will specially appeal to the vegetarian amongst us, since *minestra* (a vegetable group), bread and *vermicelli* dishes are obtainable everywhere. Not, as if I would advocate, as regards diet, any other traveller's maxim but that "the happiest quali-

fication of a poor traveller is the ability to eat with enjoyment all the common dishes of the country which he is in" (p. 190); and with our author I would say: "It should be your aim to live like the inhabitants, eat and drink as they do, smoke their tobacco, and read their newspapers" (p. 8). But Italy will certainly make the first application of this principle easiest.

Mr. Tatchell mentions of other Mediterranean countries only Greece and Egypt: Greece especially one ardently wishes that more countrymen of ours would make the goal of their explorations. I much regret though that the book before us has nothing to say of Algeria and Tunisia, of Syria and Turkey, nor of Yugoslavia, except its Dalmatian coast. But the author of course would be horrified at the idea of writing a book of systematic travel, *à la* Bædeker. He tells us where he has been and where he has enjoyed himself best. These countries are those of the Mediterranean; Japan, Burma, Ceylon and the South Sea Islands. He has been elsewhere; but one can tell at once that these countries did not appeal to him. Amongst the latter India is clearly marked—India, to which, out of his 300 pages he devotes two! For to enjoy real travelling, one must, as our author himself is never tired of saying, identify oneself with the people amongst whom one finds oneself. Yet—in the Tropics—that is exactly what Mr. Tatchell fails to do; and fails for the most absurd and superficial of prejudices, those of a "White man" against "natives". It is truly amazing that one so given to unconventional ways as Mr. Tatchell, should be so incapable of piercing through the imaginary world which "White" mentality has constructed, to the real, human one behind it. Mr. Tatchell gravely believes "that a white man is a 'big chief' in the East. Keep your dignity, and, especially, never shake hands with a native" (p. 21); to him India's "outstanding wonder is that these teeming millions are governed by a handful of white men" (p. 167); he applauds that in the Dutch Indies "no native may learn or speak Dutch, nor may a Chinaman, however rich, live outside the local Chinatown or employ a white servant" (p. 169); he deplores that in the British West Indies "the Negroes are unpleasantly familiar and cheeky" (p. 251); "indeed the impudence of all the natives of Jamaica is astonishing to a traveller used to the respect shown to a white man in tropical countries" (p. 248). Thus Mr. Tatchell unfortunately proves that even wide travelling does not necessarily remove a man's narrowness; and shows how thick a smoke screen White ascendancy has placed between itself and the bulk of the human race, that even an uncommon traveller of our author's calibre is completely baffled by it.

Yet, "the East" is fortunately just the part about which our own would-be travellers need no enlightenment from Westerners. They will therefore do well, to pass over these remarks and concentrate on those pages of the book, in which the author is at his best and has truly caught the spirit of the poor traveller and world's freeman—as no doubt he has eminently succeeded in doing, as regards the Latin countries of Europe.

The book is by no means free from mistakes—as e. g. the confusion between S. W. and N. E. monsoon on p. 137. "Palenkan" on p. 188 presumably is Palembang; and on p. 178 the word "lekas" is successively spelt "La casse" and "lakkass."

JUST RECEIVED.

JUST RECEIVED.

## TWO IMPORTANT BOOKS ON INDIA.

- 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. 1. Maritime Defence. 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

## HINDU LAW.

(3rd Edition.)

BY

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

High Court Vakil, Bombay.

Price Rupees Ten, Postage Extra.

Copies can be had at:—

The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City.

## 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.

## 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, POONACITY

## CUT ME OUT

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

I will bring you, per V. P. P., one COSSI SILK SUIT  
enough 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 \_\_\_\_\_