

THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. VI, No. 51.]

POONA—THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 1923.

{ INLAND SUBSN. RS. 6.
FOREIGN " " " 10.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	597.]
ARTICLES:—	
Mr. Das's Party ...	599
The Fiscal Commission's Report.—III. By R. M. J.	600
CONTINENTAL LETTER. By Prof. Levin L. Schücking ...	602
REVIEWS:—	
Agricultural Improvement. By S. ...	604
MISCELLANEA:—	
Mr. Sastri on Further Constitutional Advance ...	606

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

The Rape of
the Ruhr.

"BRITAIN has no undue sympathy with Germany": in these words the *British Official Wireless* of the 11th summed up the attitude of the British Government towards the French rape of the Ruhr, and the first official pronouncement on the subject by a member of the British Government (Mr. Ronald McNeill, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs) made on the 14th at Canterbury merely amplified this text. Ever since the new French invasion began, in fact, Propaganda has inundated our news columns to the same effect and most of our Anglo-Indian contemporaries, we notice, have got back to the old war-psychosis and talk hysterically about the "whining of whipped curs", "the tosh of it all", "the unspeakable Hun" and all the rest of the old *clichés*. The spectacle of a great country like Germany, which has contributed as much to the sum total of still existing civilization as any other nation, being deliberately and scientifically "disorganized" (*vide* M. Dariac's notorious report) and provoked to bring down upon itself—Samson-like—the whole fabric of its being: that spectacle, we say, is horrible enough in itself. But what are we to say to the British Die-hard mentality, which is capable of shutting up all its bowels of mercy and can bring itself to comment on such a spectacle, not only without a word of reprobation to the fiendish instigators of so Mephistophelian a plan, but can with nauseating reiteration emphasize and re-emphasize that France and Britain are quite at one in mind and only differ as to the expediency of the method selected? Signor Nitti, the great Italian ex-Premier, seems indeed to be only too right when in his latest book ("The Decadence of Europe") he observes that "the moral decline of Europe is

so great that nothing excites indignation any longer."

FORTUNATELY for the fair name of The Corrupt Bargain: England, Mr. Law's Government is not representative of public opinion in England. Official propaganda has not allowed us so far to get more than a glimpse of this: but even the terse summary of the Labour Party's impassioned protest against the British Government making itself an accessory to the outrage is sufficient to indicate that a wave of indignation is passing through Great Britain no less than through America. And even in France, to judge from the scraps of news to hand, opinion seems by no means to be solid for the dastardly plot of reducing Germany to anarchy. All the more discreditable does Mr. Law's Government emerge from this affair: for Mr. Law in the last debate of the Commons on this subject (Dec. 14th) had said quite plainly that "we cannot look with equanimity on any action" (such as contemplated by M. Poincaré) and had with equal plainness stated (1) that Germany was incapable of paying the amounts demanded, (2) that "he could not himself think that" the German bankruptcy "was deliberately brought about by Germany": for if by the inflation of its currency Germany had indeed "wiped out the internal German debt", she had only been able to do so "by destroying her entire middle class."

Yet Mr. Law's Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs can to-day tell the world that "Mr. Bonar Law was no more disposed to trust the Germans than M. Poincaré" and can pooh-pooh the idea of "talking of the injustice and brutality of the present French procedure." Whence this change? Commander Kenworthy in the Commons debate already mentioned asked pointed questions, as did Mr. Morel, "about the talk, which has been going on for months and which comes from all sorts of quarters, of a deal between our Foreign Office and the French Government, under which the French will give way to us in the New East on condition that we give way to them on the Rhine. That is the sort of corrupt bargain which discredited the old diplomacy." To which questions Mr. R. McNeill replied in such terms as "I cannot say whether there were or were not" (i. e. such negotiations) and "All I can say is I do not pretend that, up to the present, I have got such a complete grasp of all the information that it is possible to have in the great office which I have

th: honour to represent." And so whilst Mr. Law has tried to salve the British conscience by refusing to "march" alongside of M. Poincaré into the Ruhr, he has yet allowed Lord Curzon to bargain away British complicity and "Benevolent Neutrality" in this French outrage, against French support at Lausanne. With what paroxysm, we wonder, would, e. g., the *Times of India* have fulminated, if it had been "the Hun" that had committed such a piece of "Realpolitik" ?

* * *

WE have before us the recently published report of the New Capital Enquiry Committee, which was appointed to investigate the possibility of (a) economising on and (b) expediting the building of the new capital at Delhi. As was to be expected, the Committee, confronted by the fact that out of a total estimated cost of Rs. 1372 lakhs, Rs. 841 lakhs had already been spent, found itself quite unable to do anything radical in either direction. A net saving of 15 lakhs on the total estimate is, to be sure, nothing very heroic; and we are even glad the Committee resisted the temptation of spoiling the ship for a ha'porth of tar, just for the sake of seeming heroic. Meanwhiles, the country is committed to an expenditure respectively of 200, 150, 100 and 100 lakhs for the next four years, with no alternative but to grin and bear it. Even with all possible acceleration, the Secretariat is not scheduled to get into its new quarters until October 1925; and the others some time after that. And when all is ready? All plans for maintenance are based on the assumption that the grandiose New Capital is uninhabitable for five months out of twelve and as for the Legislative Chambers "three members of our Committee," we read, "are so dissatisfied with the present design that they would be glad to see the work already done abandoned." A cheerful outlook indeed!

* * *

OUR new contemporary, *The Guardian* of Calcutta, to which on its first appearance we would extend a hearty welcome, comments on a great meeting held on the 5th inst. at Calcutta on the subject of "Civic Purity." We were indeed glad to find that, after Colombo, Rangoon and Bombay, Calcutta is now also at last waking up to the scourge of prostitution, which has always made that great city rather notorious. May we, however, point out that success is only possible if attack is concentrated, not on the vice of prostitution, but on the crime of living on the prostitution of others. The law needs to be so formulated as to make it an offence—and a very heinous one at that—for anybody to derive profit from the vice of another: be that profit derived directly by brothel-keepers and *souteneurs*, or indirectly by pimps, procurers and landlords. Organized, large-scale prostitution is only possible, because it is a paying business: make that impossible by making it unprofitable, and you will have brought about the collapse of this

most infamous of all structures erected by capitalism. Enhanced penalties for solicitation for instance, as the *Guardian* suggests, seem to us utterly futile and the recent famous case of Sir Almeric Fitzroy has shown that even in a London police force the law of solicitation has only one result—viz. that of inevitably leading to the corruption of the police. That sort of thing can only be prevented by doing away altogether with this mischievous law of "Solicitation", as the *New Statesman* in the splendid campaign which it is carrying on on this subject is so rightly urging. A far greater public danger, however, lies with the hordes who are coining a mint of money out of the wretched women and who can afford to pay handsome bribes for making the law of no effect. Once a few of them have tasted the "cat" and have had their fortunes confiscated, there will be no further need to worry about the lesser fry of unfortunates who hitherto have almost exclusively drawn the glare of public enquiry upon themselves.

* * *

THE Raniganj coal-field in the Manbhum District of Bihar, which produces close on a million tons of coal a year, was on the 4th instant the scene of a mining disaster which to date has claimed 75 victims—equal to a death rate of 12.63 per thousand as calculated on the persons employed underground in the district. During 1921 25 lives were lost in all Indian collieries, yielding an average death rate of 2.18 per thousand persons employed underground in all Indian coal mines: which figure provides a startling comment on the seriousness of the Parbelia colliery explosion. What is still more disquieting is the fact that during the ten years ending 1919 the corresponding rate was only 1.74, so that the number of fatal accidents in our collieries seems to be actually on the increase. The number of deaths from accidents in British coal mines is given in a useful "Compilation of Statistics of the Coal Mining Industry of the U.K." by F. A. Gibson (Cardiff, 1922) from 1874 (which sets off with 947 deaths amongst an average of 428,611 underground workers) to 1920 (which shows 965 deaths amongst 990,359) so that the rate has gone down from 2.2 *per mille* to 1 *per mille*, although as a matter of fact the total number of fatalities has remained stationary.

* * *

IT is evident therefore that such accidents are being minimised elsewhere and if that is not the case in India, the only conclusion is that the Mines Act is not being administered with sufficient stringency. The ignorance of the miner, which is usually put forward as an adequate excuse for the prevailing state of affairs, seems to us only to point to the need of more careful instruction and to the exercise of more vigilance on the part of a supervising staff—a point to which the Chief Inspector of Mines has already drawn attention in his Report for 1921. In this connection, it is interesting to compare the average output per man per year (in tons of coal) in various countries and at different periods, which ratio may be taken as an indicator of the technical efficiency of the industry in the respective country:

	U. K.	U. S.	India.	S. Africa.	Japan.	Germany.
1889	320	421	65	71	104	276
1899	304	552	68	158	111	264
1909	262	6.7	99	285	97	236
1919	193	637	120	280	88	?

Whilst it is thus satisfactory to see the leeway that India is making in this vital industry, it is disappointing that the output for 1921 had dropped to 96 tons again. An industry where the output rate goes down and the death rate goes up, will want careful watching on the part of Government and the public alike.

IT is a well-known fact that it was Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal who

Mr. Pal's
Conversion.

first started the idea in this country that the reformed Councils should be used exclusively for the purpose of offering opposition to every measure of Government, so that, by bringing the machinery of administration to a standstill, the Montagu constitution would be subverted and a new one conferring full self-government on India would be introduced. The idea encountered the most strenuous opposition at the time at the hands, amongst others, of the late Mr. Tilak and consequently it was rejected by the Amritsar Congress, though Mr. Pal even afterwards continued to put his own interpretation on the resolution as adopted by the Congress. For a long time after that this scheme of Parliamentary obstruction seemed dead, when it was suddenly resuscitated by the Nehru section of the Civil Disobedience Committee. It was, however, taken up by this Committee after the actual work done by the Councils had made a convert of Mr. Pal, for in August last Mr. Pal had openly confessed the futility of obstructive tactics and testified to the effectiveness of Mr. Tilak's method of constitutional co-operation. So now no one is a more implacable enemy of obstruction than he. Recently he wrote as follows to the *Englishman*, exposing the sheer insanity of the programme of wholesale opposition:—

Even the Indian masses, all the teachings of our saints and sages notwithstanding, care far more for their bodies than for their souls. And if in any Provincial Legislative Council Government were to bring forward any measure reducing rents or securing greater stability to the tenure of the peasants or providing for a sufficient and continuous supply of good water in places where people have suffered from water scarcity for six months in every year, or for better medical relief or any other measure of this class and character, it is absolutely inconceivable that any electorate would tolerate a member who would oppose these, simply because they outraged his loyalty to non-co-operation. Apart from the masses even the classes are not likely to tolerate the policy of absolute obstruction proposed by Mr. Das and his friends. Suppose, for instance, that the Government of India introduced an amendment of the present Army Act proposing unrestricted admission of every class of Indians provided they are physically fit, to enter into the regular army or the territorial forces, opening the commissioned ranks in these forces to qualified Indians, placing both the officers and the men of the Indian units upon an absolute footing of equality with those of the British units, will Mr. Das and his friends in the Legislative Assembly oppose such a measure? And if they do so will they have any chance of securing the support of any class of Indian politicians? A moment's consideration reveals not only the unreason but the practical impossibility of Mr. Das's policy of unmitigated obstruction.

That the originator of this heresy has now so completely recanted it should give pause to the leaders of the newly formed party in the Congress.

MR. DAS'S PARTY.

THE formation of a new party within the Congress is in no sense the tragic event which it is made out to be in some quarters, and in certain contingencies may well be a most hopeful one. We take no malicious delight in schisms, but we see no objection either to every distinct body of opinion organising itself separately. Indeed we regard the emergence of honest parties founded upon well-defined principles as a sure sign of, and an inseparable accompaniment to, the growth of honest politics. It is common knowledge that most of the persons who have now publicly registered their protest against the Gandhian movement of non-co-operation by forming a separate party have from the first felt serious objection to those methods. But, finding themselves in a minority, they compromised their principles by professing to forward the movement, instead of ranging themselves in opposition and thus bearing witness to the faith that was in them. Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal, an intimate associate to Mr. Das, has given out what was not a close secret before, that Mr. Das was not true to himself in accepting, as he did, Mr. Gandhi's leadership at Nagpur; indeed Mr. Das was not peculiar in this "surrender"ing of his convictions; many another was similarly guilty of "defection." In these circumstances we for our part think it a distinct gain that at last there is a chance of Indian politics becoming once again related to the convictions of those who engage in them. The Congress has lost nothing by the open revolt of those whose adherence to non-co-operation was dictated by considerations of "strategy." The cause of truth will on the contrary be benefited if those who had till now subordinated their opinions to exigencies of the political situation no longer felt themselves under the necessity to do so.

The gain, however, will be considerably neutralised if the new party proclaims its faith in the principle of non-co-operation and considers itself free to shape its future policy only as conditioned by it. The party manifesto no doubt says that non-co-operation will be the key-stone of its political action, but we sincerely hope that the pronouncement is still liable to modification, and that it will in fact be modified at Bombay in the sense that the party will release itself from the initial handicap of non-co-operation. Mr. Pal also echoes this sentiment. Unless, he says, the party starts with an unequivocal repudiation of the non-co-operation policy, it will not be able to formulate its programme on any coherent principles. If it professes agreement on the main doctrine and limits its differences from the majority party in the Congress to matters of detail, then it will find considerable difficulty in justifying its separate existence. The party must declare that there is neither any occasion to launch upon non-co-operation, nor any chance for any conceivable plan of it to succeed. The machinery of the Reform Act is,

we recognise, still clogged by several restrictions. But though we are still far from having reached our goal, we are well on the way to it. If the reforms are limited, there is also the certainty that they will go on developing and broadening down into a complete apparatus of self-government. Anyway, the present generation of India is facing the future with advantages which were not at the command of past generations. And even if the existing situation were so gloomy as to justify the pessimism which sustains the present movement, surely no relief will come by throwing away the weapons that we possess and by rejecting the advantages that we enjoy. It will only leave us with the bleak alternative of a civil revolt which will never come off, for as soon as a revolt really comes about, sure enough it will cease to be civil. The formation of a new party will thus be justifiable only if the differences which divide it from the rest of the Congressmen are vital. As it is, the differences, though really fundamental, appear small, owing to the fact that the party professes to accept the principle of non-co-operation and pretends to seek only a different method of applying it.

If Mr. Das and his friends swear allegiance to this principle and regulate their plan of action strictly in obedience to it, they will necessarily be led by the inexorable logic of their position to conclusions very similar to those which govern the Congress policy at present. Even where different conclusions are possible, they will be forced to sponsor a policy which cannot be acceptable to a large proportion of the workers included in the party. On the question of Council entry, for instance, the clear duty of a non-co-operator obviously is to stand aside from the elections altogether, and if a departure from this aloofness can at all be made to square with non-co-operation, it can only take one of two shapes: to win the elections and then leave the seats vacant, or to offer wholesale opposition to every proposal that may be made. It is not unlikely that the part of the Civil Disobedience Committee who recommended the latter alternative did so, not because they approved of it, but merely because in no other way could the entry into the Councils be made consistent with the principle of non-co-operation. We know, however, that some at least of those who have joined Mr. Das's party have no desire to proceed from one unreason to another, to give up boycott only to take up sabotage. But there can be no possible escape from this dilemma unless the party frankly forswears non-co-operation. Then only can it use the Parliamentary weapon with effect in its fight with the bureaucracy; then only will it have scope for constructive statesmanship, which alone will after all directly benefit the masses. If really there are any who are convinced of the superiority of obstructive methods, let them try those methods by all means. All that we plead for here is that the new party must beware of being driven, against its will and against its better judgment, into com-

mitting itself to the exercise of obstructionist tactics in Councils merely because of its profession of faith in the non-co-operation creed. Such tactics have been tried only in Ireland so far, and even there they did not take the rigid form which is prescribed here by the Nehru section of the Civil Disobedience Committee, but gave much latitude to Parnell to exercise all his consummate skill. Even so this experiment was a failure. Recently the *Times* had occasion to refer to it as follows:—

Organised obstruction to the Government of the day and a studied aggressiveness towards the Chair are new weapons for an Opposition to use. The House of Commons never had to meet a more formidable threat than the obstruction of the Irish Nationalists in the Parliament elected in 1880. That it emerged triumphantly from that terrible ordeal is now a matter of history. The Labour party will be well advised to take warning, while there is yet time, from the guerrilla tactics which Parnell and his followers employed with so much skill and so little success only forty years ago. Not only did they in the long run inflict no injury on the House of Commons, but they definitely alienated public opinion from their cause.

We hope there is yet time for the Dasite party to retrieve its initial mistake of accepting the principle of non-co-operation, which alone will enable it to produce a wisely planned and sufficiently differentiated policy for itself.

If on the question of Council entry the non-co-operation principle lands Mr. Das and his associates into a hopelessly sterile course of action, on other questions it make it impossible for them to adopt a programme which is in any way distinguishable from that of the Congress. Here again there is already a pronounced tendency to express approval of more heroic remedies than those which the Congress is prepared to apply, not because the party has a reasoned conviction of the necessity for those remedies, but only to be able to show that it has substantial points of difference from the Congress justifying the formation of a separate party. And if indeed the party believes in a programme which differs from that of the Congress in being more extremist and divorced from all idealism which to many is the principal recommendation of the Congress policy, then there is anything but a bright prospect before it. We trust that the party will yet break away from non-co-operation and revert to honest constitutional methods. It will be very regrettable if this does not happen, but still more regrettable will it be if the party only tries to cover up its many internal differences by adopting a form of words capable of two or more contrary interpretations. The temptation of deliberate ambiguity will be great, for it is the only alternative to a definite renunciation of the principle of non-co-operation and a going back upon opinions avowed so long, but we have still hopes that the party will rise superior to the temptation and adopt a clear line of policy.

THE FISCAL COMMISSION'S REPORT.—III.
THE majority Report of the Fiscal Commission recommends "that the Government of India adopt a policy of Protection to be applied with discrimi-

nation along the lines indicated in this Report". And those lines have been so laid down that a Tariff Board composed of persons, fair-minded but honestly disbelieving in protective tariffs, could, with a clear conscience, say, with respect to practically any and every claim for Protection advanced by an industry, "Conditions not satisfied: claim dismissed." Such is the nature of the conditions, as has been pointed out in the last article.*

Now, what industries do the majority contemplate as likely to benefit from this kind of Protection? Para. 101 of the Report says, "Tariff protection is not as a rule to be granted to new industries". "Not only in our view are there strong objections as a rule to granting tariff protection to new industries, but the grant of such protection is really unnecessary" (para. 102). The sole object of appointing the Fiscal Commission, and the Industrial Commission too, was to discover methods of stimulating the creation of the many new industries of a modern type which do not exist at all in the country as much as or more so than the development of those few that already exist. But the majority hold that Protection is both objectionable and unnecessary for the former purpose. Again, para. 108 of the Report lays down that protective tariffs should not be resorted to in the case of "basic industries," e. g. "iron and steel, certain chemicals and minerals and lubricating oils". "The best way of assisting a basic industry is by a bounty rather than by a protective duty." As regards machinery the conclusion of the, majority given in para. 109 is "that when a case is made out for the encouragement of the manufacture of machinery in India, such encouragement should be given by means of bounties." There may be exceptions to this rule, the majority add, e. g. in the case of machinery required in the jute-manufacturing industry, jute being a monopoly of India. So, then, the general principle is that new industries, basic industries and machinery-making industries are not to benefit by protective tariffs. Now let us for a moment look at the principal imports into this country. In 1920-21 they were :

1 Cotton manufactures	
(including twist and yarn) ...	30% of total imports
2 Iron and steel	... 8% " " "
3 Machinery	... 7% " " "
4 Sugar	... 6% " " "
5 Railway Plant	... 4% " " "
6 Hardware	... 3% " " "
7 Mineral Oil	... 2% " " "
8 Silk (raw and manufactured)	2% " " "
9 Other articles	...37% " " "

The importance of iron and steel, machinery and railway plant is quite clear from this list. Let us also remember that both our railways and the small industrial structure we have built are very artificial and precarious superstructures indeed so long as we have not developed the iron and steel, machinery and railway plant-making industries in this country. But "the Protection to be applied

* The previous article appeared in the issue of 11th January.

with discrimination" is not to touch these. And the majority are quite right in holding that protective duties will not create them, but only injure other industries depending on them. That, in fact, appears to be the attitude of the majority towards all protective duties. Only they have not the courage of their conviction openly to say so, hence they do it by a subterfuge. What they say seems to be akin to the now-dead Anglo-Persian Treaty of 1907, in which clause I. guarantees the complete independence of Persia and the succeeding clauses so effectively cut into it piece by piece that at the end only the lifeless body of that independence is left. It cannot be said either that it was in view of the overwhelming evidence before them that the majority had to pay at least that lip-homage to Protection, because in another part of the Report they have recommended the admission of Foreign Capital into India, though the minority tell us in their Minute of Dissent that "the consensus of the Indian view, as expressed by the witnesses who appeared before us, was against the introduction of foreign capital for industrial development in India" (para. 63 of the Minute of Dissent). So the Report does not claim merely to summarise the trend of evidence placed before the Commission. Again, what the Indian people are very keen on is not the protective duties but the rapid industrial development of their country on modern lines. If the majority believed that such a development could be brought about by a vigorous policy of State initiative without resorting to protective duties, they should have made out a strong case on those lines. They might, for instance, have urged the State to take over its railways for management and try and manufacture as much of the railway plant as it possibly could in its own workshops and factories. That might give a tremendous stimulus to the basic industries of iron and steel and machinery. The extra cost involved might be declared so that the public might know the price they paid for establishing the basic industries in the country. In the case of new industries, the majority might have urged the State to pioneer such industries, wherever necessary, until they reached the commercial stage when they might be handed over to private enterprise. They might have said that the Madras Government successfully tried this policy in 1910 even under Free Trade conditions and got the aluminium and chrome-tanning industries started in their Presidency when they were pulled up by the then Secretary of State. In short, if the majority wanted, they could have made out a good enough case for a policy of State initiative without protective duties. But they have not done so. They have not upheld *laissez faire* either. They mean Free Trade when they declare for Protection to be applied along their lines. If any further proof of that was needed it has freshly been adduced by Sir Montagu Webb, a member of the Commission who has signed the Report without any word of dissent. At the con.

ference of the Associated Chambers of Commerce just concluded at Calcutta, Sir Montagu moved "that, having regard to the great preponderance of the consuming classes in India on whom the cost of Protection would most heavily fall . . . the Association was of opinion that the best policy for India was one of freedom in trade matters as far as the revenue needs of the Government would permit." Some people wonder how Sir Montagu has changed his mind so soon; but then he hasn't, he has only changed his words. He understands the majority Report to mean ultimately the very same thing that he tried to express in more direct language in the above resolution which he moved. The Association finally decided that the form in which the majority Report had put it was more expedient under present circumstances.

So the minority were perfectly right in protesting against the kind of Protection recommended by the majority. The only pity of it is that the lines along which they themselves would like Protection to be applied are far from clear. They do not assist the reader in getting at their main recommendations either by a summary or marginal notes; and on wading through their Minute of Dissent, one finds therein a great deal of rhetoric but no definite suggestions on this particular subject. The minority seem to have rather too great a faith in the efficacy of protective tariffs in bringing about that industrial regeneration which they want in this country.

THE TARIFF BOARD.

Both the majority and the minority agree—"that a permanent Tariff Board be created whose duties will be, *inter alia*, to investigate the claims of particular industries to protection, to watch the operation of the Tariff, and generally to advise Government and the Legislature in carrying out the policy indicated above": the difference between majority and minority arises on the question of the composition of the Board. The majority propose that the Board should be composed of three men who should be men of ability, integrity and impartiality, blessed with a knowledge of economics and having a practical acquaintance with business affairs. They are to have the salary and status of High Court Judges. The minority propose that the Chairman of the Board should be selected from some High Court Bench; that the other two members should be elected by the non-official members of the Indian Legislature; and that there should be two assessors representing commerce and industry, to be elected by the leading Chambers and mercantile Associations in India.

Both the majority and the minority tell us that they have taken the idea of the Board from the United States and Australia. Each of the two groups further tell us that in the composition they have proposed for the Indian Tariff Board, they have improved upon the American and Australian models. The majority tell us in addition that in assigning functions to the

Board, too, they have made suitable additions, omissions and alterations. For instance, the United States Tariff Commission investigates the administration of the customs laws. It has power also to investigate preferential transportation rates. The Indian Tariff Board is not to do either of these two things (para. 307). One is not at all convinced that either of these omissions is an improvement as the Report seems to assume. If a Tariff Board of a judicial character is at all to be set up, one fails to see why it should not investigate these two very important matters. But the first question is: is it necessary to create such a Board at present? The models which this Board copies are very new creations themselves. The United States Commission was set up in 1916; the Australian Commission was instituted within the *last few months* (para. 307). The two countries have had tariffs for at least half a century. Tariff changes must all be sanctioned by the Legislature. Does anybody imagine that whatever the composition of the Tariff Board, the Legislature is going to bow down to its recommendations as the last word of wisdom on the subject? That advisory function is bound to become practically useless. Tariff-settlement and lobbying are inseparable companions all over the world. No Tariff Board can part them. As regards the collection of information for the use of the Legislature in the discussion on tariff matters, that is a departmental work for which no separate machinery needs to be created, especially when, as the Report tells us, it is bound to be an expensive affair (para. 309). Whatever the composition of the Tariff Board, it is not likely to inspire confidence either among the legislators or the public. And there is certainly no hurry about its creation, when the lines of the Fiscal Policy to be pursued are themselves not quite clear.

R. M. J.

CONTINENTAL LETTER.

BRESLAU, DEC. 22nd, 1922.

IN the good old days before the war one used to read with extreme satisfaction in the records of the past. To think that scenes like those represented in Hogarth's four stages of cruelty or in Smollett's novels or in Nettelbeck's reminiscences of the negro-trade between Africa and South America were possible less than two hundred years ago! How improbable it all seemed! What gigantic steps civilisation had made since then! How the trait of brutality had disappeared—almost disappeared—from the physiognomy of mankind—at least in Europe! Only from the Russian corner of the big European mansion you sometimes heard noises which made an uncanny impression and seemed to point to the fact that all was not as it should be there and the good European in the "highly civilised" rest of the continent thanked God, that he was not like that publican.

It needed an event like the world-war to show how little foundation this highly praised European

civilisation really possessed. The French have a proverb not very flattering for their former friends the Russians: "Scratch a Russian and out comes the Tartar." But the scratch of the war has brought out Tartar all over Europe and there is no sign of his early disappearance yet. On the contrary so much is sure that the high water mark of post-war brutality has not nearly been reached. When some days ago the new Polish State President Wojciechowski had been elected in order to fill up the position that had become vacant by the assassination of his predecessor, General Haller, one of the Fascist leaders of the Right, was greeted from several members of the Left Wing of the National Assembly with the loud cry: "When are you going to murder the new president?" Organised political murder has become quite a current method in public life, so to speak, and is evidently altogether losing its terrors with the average bourgeois elector with conservative tendencies who seems to come to look upon it more as a nuisance than a crime that is apt to undermine the safety of all state organisation.

Some weeks ago two people were tried in Berlin because they had assisted in an attempt upon the life of Herr Maximilian Harden. Herr Harden is a remarkable sort of person. Being a journalist of high standing, he has at times exerted a considerable influence through his periodical, the *Zukunft*. He boasts himself of being the only journalist who enjoyed Bismarck's friendship after his fall and there are episodes in his life, e. g. the Eulenburg affair, in which he rendered his country a real service in proving that the immediate "entourage" of the Kaiser consisted to a great extent of most disreputable people. During the first part of the war, it is true he absolutely gave up his usual attitude which seemed to be dictated by the principle of looking at things from a standpoint directly the reverse of what was at the time public opinion and delighted the jingoes by joining the wildest annexationists. Towards the end of the war however he was clever enough to change his opinion. Since then he has expressed himself again and again in favour of pacifist and republican ideals. In this way he has drawn upon himself the hatred of those secret organisations which form a dangerous camorra in Republican Germany now. So the attempt was made to assassinate him in a most cowardly manner. So far the thing has—strange to say—nothing extraordinary in it. Also that the principal criminal, an old lieutenant of the army, made his escape quite safely and has never been discovered since, is not to be wondered at. People who assassinate Republican statesmen and politicians (especially Jewish ones) in Germany nowadays have many loopholes in which they need not fear the organs of the State. But what was quite unexpected and created a deep depression in the overwhelming majority of the German nation was the decision of the jury as to the accused accomplices. It found that they were only guilty of aiding in inflicting bodily injury. So they only

get a few years of imprisonment. And this although their behaviour in the court had been most impudent and provocative. A case like this, unimportant in itself, shows the growing barbarisation and confusion of the notions of right and wrong in a country which, whatever its political shortcomings and the excesses of its military leaders may have been, has up to now never been accused of a frivolous disregard of the elementary claims of justice in its law-courts.

In Italy the Fascists vent their rage the same time upon their socialist and communist enemies without being seriously checked. So the spirit of violence triumphs everywhere. Russia on the other hand has recently endeavoured to make a beginning with that measure without which all talks about reconstruction are sheer nonsense: it has called the Border States and Poland together to discuss the disarmament question. Its success would have meant an enormous increase of that "prestige" the Soviet Republic stands so much in need of, since it would have succeeded in performing a task which the bourgeois States in the West are so shy to attack. Unfortunately the plan miscarried. It was a characteristic feature of this disarmament conference that it seemed almost entirely to consist of military delegates. What the German pacifists said when the German government sent generals to the pre-war Peace conferences at the Hague, might have been said of this conference too: What can you expect of a conference, where the hat-makers have to decide whether the fashion of going bare-headed is to be generally introduced? Russia proposed to diminish all standing armies by 57% and herself would only keep 200,000 soldiers in arms. But the Border States led by Poland objected. In their opinion what was required was a "non-aggression treaty". All States in question should oblige themselves not to attack one another. This Russia declared to be nothing else than a new "scrap of paper". But the Border States and Poland insisted on their sabotage. Only Lithuania made an exception. Lithuania has been too cruelly treated by the Western powers to be guided any longer by directions from Paris which in the case of the other Powers seem, to say the least, to have served greatly to increase their resistance against Moscow. Poland's satisfaction about the shipwreck of the whole conference was of course quite undisguised. One can safely say that of all European States this the youngest confesses on all occasions most cynically its adherence to the creed of "Might above Right". When the Polish Constitutional Assembly passed the bill concerning the suffrage for the Sejm, Lutowski, one of the leaders of the Right, pronounced their standpoint in words which possess at least the quality of not being tainted by any political hypocrisy. "The principle of just distribution of the mandates for the Sejm", he said, "is unacceptable because it would benefit the national minorities". The national minorities are 15

ference of the Associated Chambers of Commerce just concluded at Calcutta, Sir Montagu moved "that, having regard to the great preponderance of the consuming classes in India on whom the cost of Protection would most heavily fall . . . the Association was of opinion that the best policy for India was one of freedom in trade matters as far as the revenue needs of the Government would permit." Some people wonder how Sir Montagu has changed his mind so soon; but then he hasn't, he has only changed his words. He understands the majority Report to mean ultimately the very same thing that he tried to express in more direct language in the above resolution which he moved. The Association finally decided that the form in which the majority Report had put it was more expedient under present circumstances.

So the minority were perfectly right in protesting against the kind of Protection recommended by the majority. The only pity of it is that the lines along which they themselves would like Protection to be applied are far from clear. They do not assist the reader in getting at their main recommendations either by a summary or marginal notes; and on wading through their Minute of Dissent, one finds therein a great deal of rhetoric but no definite suggestions on this particular subject. The minority seem to have rather too great a faith in the efficacy of protective tariffs in bringing about that industrial regeneration which they want in this country.

THE TARIFF BOARD.

Both the majority and the minority agree—"that a permanent Tariff Board be created whose duties will be, *inter alia*, to investigate the claims of particular industries to protection, to watch the operation of the Tariff, and generally to advise Government and the Legislature in carrying out the policy indicated above": the difference between majority and minority arises on the question of the composition of the Board. The majority propose that the Board should be composed of three men who should be men of ability, integrity and impartiality, blessed with a knowledge of economics and having a practical acquaintance with business affairs. They are to have the salary and status of High Court Judges. The minority propose that the Chairman of the Board should be selected from some High Court Bench; that the other two members should be elected by the non-official members of the Indian Legislature; and that there should be two assessors representing commerce and industry, to be elected by the leading Chambers and mercantile Associations in India.

Both the majority and the minority tell us that they have taken the idea of the Board from the United States and Australia. Each of the two groups further tell us that in the composition they have proposed for the Indian Tariff Board, they have improved upon the American and Australian models. The majority tell us in addition that in assigning functions to the

Board, too, they have made suitable additions, omissions and alterations. For instance, the United States Tariff Commission investigates the administration of the customs laws. It has power also to investigate preferential transportation rates. The Indian Tariff Board is not to do either of these two things (para. 307). One is not at all convinced that either of these omissions is an improvement as the Report seems to assume. If a Tariff Board of a judicial character is at all to be set up, one fails to see why it should not investigate these two very important matters. But the first question is: is it necessary to create such a Board at present? The models which this Board copies are very new creations themselves. The United States Commission was set up in 1916; the Australian Commission was instituted within the *last few months* (para. 307). The two countries have had tariffs for at least half a century. Tariff changes must all be sanctioned by the Legislature. Does anybody imagine that whatever the composition of the Tariff Board, the Legislature is going to bow down to its recommendations as the last word of wisdom on the subject? That advisory function is bound to become practically useless. Tariff-settlement and lobbying are inseparable companions all over the world. No Tariff Board can part them. As regards the collection of information for the use of the Legislature in the discussion on tariff matters, that is a departmental work for which no separate machinery needs to be created, especially when, as the Report tells us, it is bound to be an expensive affair (para. 309). Whatever the composition of the Tariff Board, it is not likely to inspire confidence either among the legislators or the public. And there is certainly no hurry about its creation, when the lines of the Fiscal Policy to be pursued are themselves not quite clear.

R. M. J.

CONTINENTAL LETTER.

BRESLAU, DEC. 22nd, 1922.

IN the good old days before the war one used to read with extreme satisfaction in the records of the past. To think that scenes like those represented in Hogarth's four stages of cruelty or in Smollett's novels or in Nettelbeck's reminiscences of the negro-trade between Africa and South America were possible less than two hundred years ago! How improbable it all seemed! What gigantic steps civilisation had made since then! How the trait of brutality had disappeared—almost disappeared—from the physiognomy of mankind—at least in Europe! Only from the Russian corner of the big European mansion you sometimes heard noises which made an uncanny impression and seemed to point to the fact that all was not as it should be there and the good European in the "highly civilised" rest of the continent thanked God, that he was not like that publican.

It needed an event like the world-war to show how little foundation this highly praised European

civilisation really possessed. The French have a proverb not very flattering for their former friends the Russians: "Scratch a Russian and out comes the Tartar." But the scratch of the war has brought out Tartar all over Europe and there is no sign of his early disappearance yet. On the contrary so much is sure that the high water mark of post-war brutality has not nearly been reached. When some days ago the new Polish State President Wojciechowski had been elected in order to fill up the position that had become vacant by the assassination of his predecessor, General Haller, one of the Fascist leaders of the Right, was greeted from several members of the Left Wing of the National Assembly with the loud cry: "When are you going to murder the new president?" Organised political murder has become quite a current method in public life, so to speak, and is evidently altogether losing its terrors with the average bourgeois elector with conservative tendencies who seems to come to look upon it more as a nuisance than a crime that is apt to undermine the safety of all state organisation.

Some weeks ago two people were tried in Berlin because they had assisted in an attempt upon the life of Herr Maximilian Harden. Herr Harden is a remarkable sort of person. Being a journalist of high standing, he has at times exerted a considerable influence through his periodical, the *Zukunft*. He boasts himself of being the only journalist who enjoyed Bismarck's friendship after his fall and there are episodes in his life, e. g. the Eulenburg affair, in which he rendered his country a real service in proving that the immediate "entourage" of the Kaiser consisted to a great extent of most disreputable people. During the first part of the war, it is true he absolutely gave up his usual attitude which seemed to be dictated by the principle of looking at things from a standpoint directly the reverse of what was at the time public opinion and delighted the jingoes by joining the wildest annexationists. Towards the end of the war however he was clever enough to change his opinion. Since then he has expressed himself again and again in favour of pacifist and republican ideals. In this way he has drawn upon himself the hatred of those secret organisations which form a dangerous camorra in Republican Germany now. So the attempt was made to assassinate him in a most dastardly manner. So far the thing has—strange to say—nothing extraordinary in it. Also that the principal criminal, an old lieutenant of the army, made his escape quite safely and has never been discovered since, is not to be wondered at. People who assassinate Republican statesmen and politicians (especially Jewish ones) in Germany nowadays have many loopholes in which they need not fear the organs of the State. But what was quite unexpected and created a deep depression in the overwhelming majority of the German nation was the decision of the jury as to the accused accomplices. It found that they were only guilty of aiding in inflicting bodily injury. So they only

get a few years of imprisonment. And this although their behaviour in the court had been most impudent and provocative. A case like this, unimportant in itself, shows the growing barbarisation and confusion of the notions of right and wrong in a country which, whatever its political shortcomings and the excesses of its military leaders may have been, has up to now never been accused of a frivolous disregard of the elementary claims of justice in its law-courts.

In Italy the Fascists vent their rage the same time upon their socialist and communist enemies without being seriously checked. So the spirit of violence triumphs everywhere. Russia on the other hand has recently endeavoured to make a beginning with that measure without which all talks about reconstruction are sheer nonsense: it has called the Border States and Poland together to discuss the disarmament question. Its success would have meant an enormous increase of that "prestige" the Soviet Republic stands so much in need of, since it would have succeeded in performing a task which the bourgeois States in the West are so shy to attack. Unfortunately the plan miscarried. It was a characteristic feature of this disarmament conference that it seemed almost entirely to consist of military delegates. What the German pacifists said when the German government sent generals to the pre-war Peace conferences at the Hague, might have been said of this conference too: What can you expect of a conference, where the hat-makers have to decide whether the fashion of going bare-headed is to be generally introduced? Russia proposed to diminish all standing armies by 57% and herself would only keep 200,000 soldiers in arms. But the Border States led by Poland objected. In their opinion what was required was a "non-aggression treaty". All States in question should oblige themselves not to attack one another. This Russia declared to be nothing else than a new "scrap of paper". But the Border States and Poland insisted on their sabotage. Only Lithuania made an exception. Lithuania has been too cruelly treated by the Western powers to be guided any longer by directions from Paris which in the case of the other Powers seem, to say the least, to have served greatly to increase their resistance against Moscow. Poland's satisfaction about the shipwreck of the whole conference was of course quite undisguised. One can safely say that of all European States this the youngest confesses on all occasions most cynically its adherence to the creed of "Might above Right". When the Polish Constitutional Assembly passed the bill concerning the suffrage for the Sejm, Lutowski, one of the leaders of the Right, pronounced their standpoint in words which possess at least the quality of not being tainted by any political hypocrisy. "The principle of just distribution of the mandates for the Sejm", he said, "is unacceptable because it would benefit the national minorities". The national minorities are 15

of agriculture. They will proceed without delay with afforestation, with great irrigation, drainage and land reclamation works. They will get more hydro-electric stations. And at the same time they will so organise their family life that the population does not tend to increase more than, say, one million a year, so that it shall not be necessary for death in the shape of "fevers" and other horrible diseases to slaughter them."

Since all these suggestions come from an impartial student of Indian conditions, they deserve to be seriously considered both by the Indian Government and the people. If India is guided by knowledge it will surely be happy.

S.

MISCELLANEA.

MR. SASTRI ON FURTHER CONSTITUTIONAL ADVANCE.

SPEAKING at Madras on the 12th inst. at the 1921 Club, Mr. Srinivasa Sastri said as follows on the method of achieving the next constitutional step:--

THE NEXT STEP.

What is to be our next step and how should we encompass it, are questions that I ask myself continually and which I always attempt to answer in any statement of the kind I am making now. I am one of those who think that it is through the present Councils, through the Constitution that we have obtained so far, that we must rise to the full height of our political ambition. It is necessary for us to show to those in England and elsewhere who watch the political movement in India that our object is not to scrap whatever stands now, a not to destroy the present Constitution and build another new one upon it, that our desire is not to make as it were a great momentous experiment in Constitution-building at which no doubt theorists and idealists of various sorts can show various degrees of skill, but our object is to prove that we can rise from good to better, that we can rise from the less perfect to more perfect, that we can use what we have to get more and to get better. In my view of things, therefore, there is no need for the best minds of India to sit together, call the experience of the past to aid and explore every avenue, tried and untried, of Constitution-making in order to devise a brand new Constitution for India. That is by no means our object. That should by no means be our object. But our object should be to ask for a full consummation of our present constitution, for it contains everything in it, the consummation of our present Constitution in as short and quick a time as possible. I am not one of those who think that amongst the *débris* of the Constitutions in India which are imperfectly worked up, there is sufficient hopeful and definite material to guide us in the work of adapting the western constitutions to our needs. Moreover, I am unwilling to give the critical western a handle he knows how to use to make the remark that he would be justified in making if we go on asking for newer and newer constitutions. He would also be quite justified in saying that Indian people are lovers of ideas and ideals, that the Constitution that the British Nation gave to India through Parliament two years ago the Indians are tired of already, that Indians have not worked it half enough, that in fact some Indians tried to wreck the Councils, that the poor legislatures have had no chance, thanks to the Non-Co-Operators on the one hand and financial bankruptcy on the other, and yet before they have had three years with it, they want to put it away on the shelf and try another Constitution with all sorts of ideas worked in with consequences of which the world has no experience. I do not want to give our friends in Parliament the occasion for defending this position or seeming to play into the hands of our eternal critics, who would give us nothing if they possibly could help it. It appears to me that the prudent course is to work our

present Constitution further and further still and to have it widened until we get provincial autonomy and the control of almost all subjects in the Central Government except the military for which we are not yet prepared, thanks to the slow move of the Government and thanks to the unwilling military authority in England. It appears to me that our endeavour should be to obtain, as expeditiously as we can, all that we can bring under our control and then when we have established our title to be treated as a Dominion in point of fact and not merely to be acclaimed and accosted as a Dominion on ceremonial occasions as is the case now. When we have established Dominion status in India, so far as it is capable of being established without the control of the military, and when we have done that and allow a few months or years to run on that footing, recognised and admitted as a people with every right to govern themselves, it would be quite wise ourselves to try and change that Constitution as Indian conditions seem to point to as necessary. No Constitution in the world is fixed and immutable for ever. You can change it. However difficult the American Constitution is supposed to be to change, it has changed wonderfully in the past and it continues to change to-day. So will our Constitution. When we have established our Constitution on well-laid lines, on the lines justified of human experience, on the lines in perfect consonance with its present situation, then let us bend our wisest heads together and make such changes as time and circumstance may dictate; but before we have established ourselves as a Dominion, I am strongly of opinion that it would be unsafe, that it would be imprudent and that it would be risking further progress to make the world understand and the English Parliament apprehend that what we desire is a brand new Constitution with everything revised and recast and with India written on every line of the new Constitution.

SELF-DETERMINATION.

There is a point of departure which perhaps it is worth while examining, for I have seen a great many influential writers in the press and elsewhere giving utterance to the contrary proposition that the time is now come for us to ask that the full doctrine of self-determination should be applied to India. I am not against the doctrine of self-determination as applied to India, but self-determination to India now can only mean that which is wrought through the legislatures. You cannot go to the people with a wide and universal cry with any hope of getting an answer which is coherent or translatable intelligently into action. That kind of wide definition seems to be fraught with enormous risks that I am quite unwilling that India should face at this stage. Another point of departure I shall mention for criticism, and that is also of the utmost consequence. Shall we or shall we not make attempts in India to supply those correctives to democracy which experience has taught in other parts of the world? This is an extremely interesting point which, put in its academic aspect, could be discussed in school and college to great advantage. I would therefore offer it as a most useful bit of dialectic upon which mature minds may well spend themselves. It is a question whether India is not the country of all the countries of the world in which before we start full-fledged democracy it would be just as well to try and apply those palliatives and correctives which the experience of America, for instance, or of France has absolutely made clear the necessity of. If any of you have read a critical review of democracy, you will know how democratic institutions have, for example in Australia, thrown into the hands of labour, which is after all one interest in a vast polity, so much political power that all other interests have suffered under the tyranny of labour—I am using the word 'tyranny' in the ordinary sense without criminal implication. That is a kind of remark that is certain to be made, whether you study democracy in America, in Australia, in Canada, or elsewhere. Everywhere democracy, when allowed to run wild, has committed excesses, and unfortunately for humanity we have also been taught the most disastrous lesson that democracy cannot.

even be trusted to perform that elementary duty which we all thought at one time it would be most ready and sure to perform to the completest satisfaction, namely, the duty of preventing war. On the other hand, some of the recent instances have been striking to the effect that when democracy chooses it can without the very slightest cause make war without regard to the interest of posterity. The faults of democracy are many and they are serious. Wise people have already declared it as their deliberate judgment that while there may be something in every institution, something inherent in nature to benefit people, it is after all the character of the people that run the institution, it is their ideals, it is their practical common-sense as distinguished from a disposition to try untried ideals, it is the power of give and take, the power of accommodation, and compromise which we often admire in a wise Government of heeding the word of the Opposition, it is this prevailing good sense and love of harmony and harmonious progress that is an essential thing and not altogether the character of the constitution that we enjoy. I think that there is no wiser observation that could be made, and while I will not minimise the efforts made to perfect our constitution at every stage I will ask everybody to bear in mind that a merely idealistic pursuit of a constitution is not immediately related with philanthropic endeavour or patriotic effort, not by any means. Therefore it is that I would relegate this most interesting and absorbing topic, first of all, to a discussion in school magazines and college periodicals, in high class magazines where people have to write in leisure and men have time to read. That must precede an endeavour on the part of new people like us to live under a full-fledged constitution. That must precede our efforts to supply correctives to democracy. Some of you may be much more ambitious than I am, but still I am bound to supply what seems to be a necessary caution that if we endeavour to lay the foundations of our work in the immediate future on so broad a foundation and tell the people of the world, "Look here we are . . ." (At this stage the electric switch was turned down and the hall thrown into darkness and the lecturer continued speaking in darkness.) After about five minutes the switch was turned on and the lecturer continuing said: We should be firmly established as a self-governing people, before we try our own experiment in constitution-making. I have I think endeavoured to make these two points of departure clear so that criticism may converge on those two topics, for I am one of those who think that when the Delhi Conference summoned by Dr. Besant meets, a Conference to which she has taken care to invite people who love constitutional work and believe in ordered progress, the air should be clear and the ground should not be covered with purely academic discussion, but that the assembled wisdom of India there should address itself without delay and embarrassment to the task of preparing our next momentous step in constitutional advance.—
New India.

ARMY EXPENDITURE.

DESCRIBING the work for last year of the Standing Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament on Indian Affairs, a *Times of India* correspondent says as follows:—

There were several divisions on the draft of the report on the cost of the maintenance of British troops in India. Lord Sydenham was supported only by Mr. Ormsby-Gore and Sir Charles Yate in his desire to expunge the subparagraph pointing out that the increases in pay were adopted by the War Office without any formal consultation either with the India Office or with the authorities in India. These objectors were joined by Sir Henry Craik and Major Glynn in an effort to leave out the paragraph calling attention to the great increases in staff at A. H. Q. and suggesting that they are capable of reduction without disadvantage. Finally the draft was agreed to by twelve votes to two, the minority comprising Lord Sydenham and Sir Charles Yate.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- From G. P. Dutton & Co., New York.
 KEYSER, CASSIUS J.: MATHEMATICAL PHILOSOPHY. A Study of Fate and Freedom. Lectures for Educated Laymen: 8x5½. pp. xiv & 466. New York. 1922. \$ 4.70.
 From Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
 CAMPAGNAC, E. T.: SOCIETY AND SOLITUDE. 7x5. pp. xix & 227. Cambridge. 1922. 8s. 6d.
 ESSAYS ON THE DEPOPULATION OF MELANESIA. Edited by W. H. R. Rivers. With a Preface by Sir Everard Im Thurn. 8x5. pp. xxviii & 116. Cambridge. 1922. 6s.

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

SIR M. VISVESVARAYA'S lament at the Indian Science Congress, which was held last week at Lucknow, that "India's contribution to the world's progress in these days was practically negligible"—is one of special poignancy, because one fears that it will find an echo in the hearts of but few. If only this great engineer had said that India was leading all nations in scientific progress; that she, having the wisdom of the ages, had nothing further to learn: how those dicta would have been quoted and re-quoted everywhere! That they contained obvious falsehoods, would have been deemed quite irrelevant—for were they not beautifully patriotic? But when somebody really qualified to judge dares to get up and proclaims that, "in respect of intellectual equipment, India was today the poorest of all civilized countries", we are afraid all fervid "patriots" will unite in an endeavour of stifling such clarion call by a conspiracy of silence. On our own part we heartily endorse Sir M. Visvesvaraya's remarks, but we venture to doubt whether the remedy is really to be found in concentration on *Applied Science*, as he seems to believe. *Applied Science*, is only an incidental reward which comes through the cultivation of *Pure Science*: those that devote themselves to science to make a fat thing out of it, are least likely to make great discoveries. What is wanted in India is, as we have so often emphasized, the fostering of learning for its own sake, of the spirit of research and investigation—not in order to pass examinations, nor to get up a rung or two nor to make paying and patentable discoveries: but out of a burning devotion to truth, out of an overmastering passion to find out, to understand. But where, in all India to-day, are the seats of such learning?

THE Hon'ble Lala Sukhbir Sinha, member of the Council of State, who recently called the attention of Government to the advertising of intoxicating liquors in books of postage stamps, has received an official letter from the Government stating that no such advertisements will be accepted in the future for insertion in any publication of the Post Office. Friends of temperance throughout India will be grateful for this prompt and wise decision. The publication of the advertisements was a mistake, made probably without the knowledge of any high official of the Post Office Department and the Government have done well to give a positive assurance that the mistake will not be repeated. Appreciation of the Hon'ble Mr. Sinha's part in securing this pronouncement will be widespread and hearty.

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

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

These books can be had of :—

1. The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City.

BEST REMEDY

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

G. R. KHORANA,
LYALLPUR.

CUT ME OUT

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

I will bring you, per V. P. P., one **COSSI SILK SUN** 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.....

A Special Offer.

Don't Lose This Opportunity.

Bhagavad Gita.—Text in Devanagari with a preface and translation in English by Dr. Annie Besant. Pocket edition at As. 4. For orders for 50 copies or more a discount of 12½% will be allowed.

**The Theosophical Publishing House,
Adyar, Madras.**

AND
INDIAN BOOK SHOP
55 Meadows Street. Fort, BOMBAY.

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
Servants of India Society
PAMPHLETS.**

1. Self-Government for India under the British Flag— by the Rt. Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, President, Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. pp. 91.	0-8-
2. The Public Services in India— by Mr. Hirday Nath Kunzru, Senior Member Upper India Branch, Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. pp. 175.	0-10-
3. The Congress-League Scheme: An exposition— by the Rt. Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, President, Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. pp. 66.	0-6-0
4. The Co-operative Movement— by Mr. V. Venkatasubbaiya, Member, Servants of India Society and Mr. V. L. Metha, Manager, Bombay Central Co-operative Bank Ltd. Bombay. Crown 16 mo. pp. 191.	1-0-0
5. The Medical Services in India— by an I. M. S. Officer. Crown 16 mo. pp. 58.	9-8-0
6. Trade Union Legislation— by A Labour Advocate. Crown 16 mo. pp. 32.	0-4-0
7. The Conscience Clause for Indians in Indian Education Codes (With a reply to certain Criticisms)— by The Rt. Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, President, Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. pp. 67.	0-8-0

These books can be had of :—

1 The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City.

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

Books of the Day.

Writings & Speeches:	5-0-0
Of the late Hon. R. B. Ganesh Venkatesh Joshi, B. A. Demi. 8vo. pp. 1300. Cloth Bound.	
Aryabhushan School Dictionary:	3-0-0
(Marathi-English) By S. G. Vaze Esq., B. A. Demi, 8vo, pp. 600. Cloth Bound.	
Writings & Speeches:	2-8-0
Of Dr. Sir Narayan Ganesh Chandawarkar. Demi. 8vo. pp. 660. Cloth Bound.	
A Gist of late Mr. Tilak's Gitarahasya:	0-8-0
By Prof. Vaman Malhar Joshi, M. A. (2nd Edition) Foolscap 16 mo. pp. 80.	
Native States and Post-War Reforms:	1-0-0
By G. R. Abhyankar Esq., B. A., LL. B. Pleader, Sangli. Demi. 8vo. pp. 110.	
Life of late Mr. G. K. Gokhale:	0-4-0
By Hon. Dr. R. P. Paranjpye M. A. (Cantab), B. Sc. (Bom.) with nine fine illustrations and facsimile of Gokhale's handwriting. Crown 16 mo. pp. 88.	
Life of Prof. D. K. Karve:	0-4-0
By the Hon. Dr. R. P. Paranjpye, M. A. (Cantab), B. Sc. (Bom) with six fine illustrations. Crown 16 mo. pp. 73.	

These books can be had of :—

1 THE ARYABHUSHAN PRESS, POONA CITY.

HINDU LAW IN THE NEW ERA

BY

K. K. GOKHALE,

Sub-Judge Jath State.

Crown 16 mo. pp. 80 Paper cover.
Price Annas Ten. Postage Extra.

Can be had of :—

The 'Aryabhushan Press,' Poona City.