

THE Servant of India

Editor: V. VENKATA SUBBAIYA.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. VII. No. 5.]

POONA—THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 1924.

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

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	49
ARTICLES:—	
Lord Olivier's Statement. ...	52
Emigration. By C. F. Andrews. ...	53
The Indian Budget for 1924-25. By C. S. Deole ...	54
Fiscal Autonomy for Railways.—II. By Economy. ...	55
THE DELHI SESSION. By Our Parliamentary Correspondent	57
CORRESPONDENCE.	
The Berar Retrocession. ...	-9
SUPPLEMENT.—	
Africa or India? Speech by the Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P. C.	

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

The Budget. SIR Basil Blackett's second budget has been universally well received—as indeed it deserves to. The falling short of the salt tax by three crores certainly shows that the panacea of last year is not quite the magic wand that Sir Basil then wished people to believe it was. There is no doubt that this coming financial year the tax should be not merely reduced to Rs. 2, as the official proposal now is, but that it must revert right back to Rs. 1-4. The Finance Member is agreeable to that: but then, he tells us, you cannot reduce the Provincial contributions. The dilemma to us does not ring true, as much further retrenchment is possible—as Sir Basil himself admits. The budget is only meant to carry on, pending a complete overhauling of the incidence of taxation which one ardently hopes will be the result of the Taxation Committee's Report: one therefore does not wish to say much on the balancing of current expenditure by the inclusion of non-recurrent windfalls of "revenue", such as profits from the control of enemy ships, which should by rights go to debt redemption and nowhere else. The separation of the Railway from General Finance will be altogether admirable, if it does not mean greater withdrawal from popular control: and we recommend to our readers close study of the two articles on this subject by "Economy" published by us this week and last. Finally, the indication that a policy of internal, rather than external, loans is being adopted, is altogether commendable. On the whole, we repeat, the Budget is one deserving every support.

Exit Khalifah. OUR heartiest congratulations to the Turkish nation and its President for having at last grappled with the nettle of the Khalifat, and shown the wisdom and courage of separating definitively State and Church. It is now three years that we have taken the very attitude which Ghazi Kemal Pasha now adopts, viz. that "the Khalifate's existence is unjustifiable either on religious or historical grounds, and therefore should be abolished." Of late it seemed, as if the temptation of keeping a Khalifah for furthering Turkish diplomatic ends abroad was proving too strong: all the more pleased are we that the Turkish Progressives, after a year's careful consideration, have come to the right conclusion, viz. that it is more trouble, than it is worth. Certainly since two can play the game of intrigue, the khaliphate—in the words of the Angora communiqué—"constitutes a peril to the Republic": as it would to any modern democracy. As for the closing words of the despatch "There is no question of making anyone else Khalif and no attention will be paid to the opinions of any other country, Moslem or otherwise"—they are so unmistakably directed to our Moslem follow-countrymen, that one only hopes, they may be accepted by them as the epitaph of a political movement which has now been authoritatively declared to be as inimical to Islam, as it has always been to India.

Observations. THE English by-election at Burnley on the 23th ult. is of the very greatest importance in more ways than one. For one thing, Mr. Arthur Henderson's majority of 7037 votes in a straight fight against a non-Labour opponent is just about as clear a verdict as a poll can give. And more: we believe, it indicates that the 58% of votes which were cast for Mr. Henderson represent a general swing of the English electorate towards "Labour". At the last election, many people voted "Labour", because they thought, that even if that party got into power, they could not do worse than the quondam protagonists of wizardry, tranquillity and honesty. To-day, after only a month's work in office, the party has convinced the hitherto undecided British public, that not only is it no worse, but that it is actually "delivering the goods" in a new spirit and by novel methods of its own. Mr. Garvin's latest article in the *Observer* certainly draws that conclusion and this acute observer indeed has no hesitation in go-

ing so far as to say that "Ishabod" is written, not only over the Liberal Party, but even over present day Conservatism.

"Mr. MacDonald", says Mr. Garvin, "in a few weeks has become in the popular mind a great national figure. If a plebiscite were taken, he would top the poll. The Government's popularity is spreading to a remarkable extent. The Ministers are handling the larger issues with breadth and grip and in other ways doing little things that ought to have been done long ago. The result is that there is creeping gradually into the British mind a retrospective resentment against the older parties and their leaders. If there is another election the Government would return stronger."

(May we, by the way, congratulate our new contemporary, the *Indian Daily Mail*, on the excellent cable service from Major Graham Pole, for which it has arranged and from which we quote?) And Mr. Henderson did not whittle down his principles in addressing his electors. On the contrary, he stood for every word of the December Election Programme, and indeed said far more, than as a Cabinet Minister, he was supposed to say, e. g. on foreign affairs. Whereby, we think, hangs a little lesson for us in India.

* * *

By way of Analogy. Mr. HENDERSON is supposed to have said in one of his election campaign speeches, (*pace* the egregious Mr. Ronald McNeill who, thank God, no longer mismanages as Lord Curzon's understudy the foreign affairs of the Empire) that "the Versailles Treaty must be revised, if further economic ruin is to be prevented." Heckled in the House (on the eve of the election) on this pronouncement, Mr. MacDonald stated that the speech was "not an expression of the Government's policy which had been defined by him at the opening of Parliament" and that "Mr. Henderson had apparently been under the impression that as a Minister he could speak as a private citizen." Mr. MacDonald did not say, that he himself did not believe in the necessity of revising the Versailles Treaty: he insisted that such revision was not in the Government programme. Everybody knows that this monstrous treaty will eventually have to be superseded: but to achieve the end, "a journey has to be undertaken", to employ the Premier's metaphor used on another occasion. Meanwhile nothing is gained, but much can be lost, try talking about the goal, instead of walking in that direction. As Gambetta once put it, "to think of it—ever; to talk of it—never." The application of Mr. MacDonald's attitude in the case of revising the war treaties to his alone possible attitude in the case of India, seems to us obvious. The full I. L. P. programme for India's future stands: but it is not, as yet, "an expression of policy of His Majesty's Government." Meanwhile, "a journey has to be undertaken". Throwing oneself on the floor, screaming and kicking, like a naughty child, will certainly not materialize the magic carpet, which is to save one all the drudgery of trudging.

* * *

"It is as if there were the glimmer of dawn even in the black night of misery in Europe": thus ends Mrs. W. Paton an arresting article of personal appreciation on "J. Ramsay MacDonald" in the *Guardian* of February 28th. One is reminded of this saying, when one reads an account of Margaret Bondfield's first attendance at a meeting of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office at Geneva, within a week of her appointment as Parliamentary Secretary of the Ministry of Labour. Two sittings of the Governing Body were devoted to the non-ratification of the Eight Hour Day Convention. The French employers' delegate started off with the payment of "Reparations" and observed that Germany apparently was now quite willing to pay them: would it then be right, he piously concluded, "to forbid the German people to work one or two extra hours"? The German Government representative quite endorsed that view, and so—of course!—did the German employers' spokesman. Observe the combination and the crushing power of this international conspiracy, to reintroduce the 54 hour week! Significantly enough, French Workers and German Workers with equal unity and firmness stood out against this outrageous proposal. Herr Leipart refused to acknowledge the justice of the attempt of "placing the whole burden of reparations on the shoulders of the German workers" and Monsieur Jouhaux insisted that "prolongation of hours of labour did not imply an increase in production": yet what force would these lonely voices crying in a Capitalist wilderness have yielded, if the British Government delegate had, as hitherto, sided against rigorous adherence to the Eight Hour Day? But this time "our Maggie" Bondfield was present and with one stroke the whole atmosphere and prospect were changed. Instead of aiding to stultify the International Labour Office, she not only pledged the support of her own government in the opposite direction, but also announced that they were going to work for the simultaneous ratification of the Washington Convention (for an Eight Hour Day) by all governments who were still standing out: the first *amende honorable* on the part of Britain, since she sabotaged the Convention by refusing to ratify it—she, the world's premier industrial nation! And so, instead of German slaves being made to work 9 hours to produce illusory reparations; and English and French and Belgian workers, to compete with the "long hours worked by Germans"; and Germans therupon again being goaded by hunger to work 10 hours, in order to be able to compete with production elsewhere and thus effect a "surplus" for the payment of reparations—and so on, *ad infinitum*: a definite break is at last made in the intolerable chain of greed and unreason, and a clear-eyed little woman, speaking not only for the workers of the world, but also for the Government of the world's greatest empire, says: Thus far and no further—shadows of the night, begone!

Mr. Theunis' Fall. THE defeat of the Belgian Cabinet on February 27th has not yet resulted in the announcement of Mr. Vandervelde (the Belgian MacDonald) being entrusted with the formation of a new one. The rejection of the Franco-Belgian Economic Convention (sealing Belgium's fate as vassal of France) anyhow seems irrevocable and is another indication of the speed with which Mr. Poincaré's sands are running out. If the new government should be composed of the Flemish and Socialist parties in the Chamber, the isolation of France will indeed have become complete; and no longer will it be England's representative on the "Inter-Allied" Commissions who will be steadily outvoted, but France's. No wonder Mr. Poincaré is suddenly discovering the advantages of "strengthening and magnifying the role of the League of Nations".

Brutally Frank. "MY department", said Sir Malcolm Hailey the other day (February 18th), "may have many faults, but it does not produce the *Bombay Chronicle*". That organ is indeed unique—fortunately. In its issue of the 1st it has now come out as *jeune ingénu* in the question of the retrocession of the Berars. "We have so far received from Berar nothing but opinions favourable to the Hyderabad proposal", it exclaims, apropos of an article by Mr. G. R. Abhyankar, who naturally takes it for granted—as everybody except our Moslem stalwart of course does—that the Beraris, if consulted, would naturally vote for British rule. Now we, strange to say, have received from Berar nothing but opinions unfavourable to the Hyderabad proposal—and one of these, from Mr. Kanitkar, we publish today, by way of example, on another page. Again, Mr. Raghavendra Rao Sharma, late of Hyderabad, who is now in Akola trying to organize opinion there, somehow is also unaccountably taking it for granted that the Beraris prefer British rule to Mughalrai. We have made quite a nice little collection of press opinion throughout India on this subject and hope to publish this presently: and, amazed as our ingenious contemporary will be to hear it, there is actually not one Indian paper outside Meadows Street, that does not take it for granted, that Beraris are unfavourable to the Nizam's proposal. On the very day that our young innocent published its unblushing little leader, there was held a public meeting at Yeotmal which carried a resolution, as amended by the Swraj party (1), to the effect that "the Nizam should redeem his promises in his own dominions, before expecting any change of allegiance on the part of the people of Berar." Brutally frank, that, is it not?

The Bengal Budget. WHILE congratulating the Finance Member of the Bengal Government for presenting a surplus budget, the first since the inauguration of the Reforms, one can not fail to

appreciate the justice of the criticism made by the non-official members of the Council. The Finance Member is to hold the financial balance impartially between the transferred and the reserved departments; but it is notorious that the balance under the Diarchical law of gravitation always dips to the side of the reserved department. If the Finance Member fails to maintain his balance in the financial rope dance one can only sympathise with him, for he is the victim of a faulty system. In one of its pious moments the Bengal Government resolved "Let us be spendthrift no more" and forthwith appointed a retrenchment committee which amongst others recommended a cut of 26 lacs in the Police expenditure. But a retrenchment committee is only a "Father Confessor" for an extravagant Government to unburden its guilty conscience to. The Government, instead of effecting any cut, has added the trifling sum of 9 lacs and 44 thousands, making the total 1,84,68,000. The way in which the Bengal Government patronises the Anglo-Indian education, is scandalous even for that Government. The grant of Rs. 50,000 for anti-malarial measures is almost a waste of public money—for no effective measure can be undertaken with that hopelessly inadequate sum. The government can not be charged with ignorance of this fact, for on a single item of anti-malarial measure for the Police mosquito nets, it has allotted Rs. 100,000. The grant of Rs. 83,000 for supplying drinking water in the rural areas, with a population of nearly 40 millions, is also insufficient. Instead of exhorting an illiterate population through printed circulars that muddy water is dangerous to drink, when want of drinking water leads to outbreak of cholera, it will be more sensible to provide good drinking water and prevent outbreaks of epidemics. The financial condition of the Calcutta University is no longer a secret even to a school boy in Bengal, but the government, thrifty as it is, has made a saving by non-repetition of the grant of Rs. 3 lacs and also by making retrenchment in government secondary and primary schools. As for agricultural training, Bengal being an agricultural province, the government thinks it unnecessary and wisely leaves the task to the law of heredity. The estimated revenue from the sale of quinine is over 5 lacs and there is no reason why this sum should not be earmarked for antimalarial measures. The Bengal Council is fortunate in having two ex-Ministers as its members, who however were returned by special constituencies. During the debate on the Budget they spoke hard words against the financial allotments. The ex-Education Minister indulged in a confession when he said that the present expenditure of the government for primary education was a crying shame and that, when he was a member of the government, he protested against it but his was a cry in the wilderness. Certainly they do not seem satisfied with Diarchy!

LORD OLIVIER'S STATEMENT.

THE first report of the new Secretary of State's speech on India in the House of Lords on February 26th came to his friends in this country as an icy cold blast, killing in the bud all the hopes that the change of Cabinet in England had called forth, and to his enemies as a welcome gale fanning into flame the smouldering embers of discontent and distrust. A verbatim report which soon followed, has distinctly tempered on both sides the original impression, and it is now with such second thoughts that Indian opinion is wrestling. What then are the facts?

Tracing the history of the "very great anxiety which affairs in India are giving H. M.'s Government," Lord Olivier started with the Declaration of 1917 and, passing to the Government of India Act of 1919, came to the Swarajist election programme of last October, which declared that this Party believed 'that the guiding motive of the British in governing India is to serve the selfish interests of their own country and that the so-called reforms are a mere blind.' He then proceeded to give four reasons which were advanced for this feeling of mistrust—the Dyer resolution in the House of Lords, Mr. George's "steel frame" speech, the certification of the salt-tax last year, and Kenya. Of General Dyer Lord Olivier said that, if he had been "an officer of my own, his immediate suspension from duty would have followed." As regards Mr. George, Lord Olivier called his speech one couched in "injurious language" and "directly contrary to the 1917 declaration." The certification policy of Lord Reading, Lord Olivier said, had "produced a real popular feeling against the Viceroy's overriding the first principles of the new constitution". Finally, "the Kenya business" Lord Olivier analysed as "discrimination between one race and another on the ground of colour and not on the ground of qualification," a principle, which "I have held all my life is the way to break up the British Empire." On all four points it is thus clear beyond all cavil, that Lord Olivier takes a point of view, than which no other could be taken by any Indian, whatever his party. Add to this that later on Lord Olivier stigmatized the imprisonment of Mr. Gandhi as "repugnant to human feeling in that a man of his character should be treated as a criminal": and one is surely compelled to admit that if ever evidence of a "change of heart" was forthcoming, it is in such declarations as these being made by a Secretary of State for India.

Looking thus at the whole Indian problem without a trace of colour bias, Lord Olivier seems to have some difficulty in realizing that when the Swarajya party made their bid for the votes of the electorate last October, the scene at Whitehall was far otherwise. An admittedly "die-hard" Cabinet was in power and enjoyed the confidence of an overwhelming majority in Parliament. On all

sides the policy was "Full speed astern"—whether economically or politically or internationally. On Lord Olivier's own showing, the vote of confidence in Dyerism, the subordination of the needs of India to the needs of the I. C. S., the unashamed rule by certification and the reduction of Indians to second class citizenship in the Empire: could but prove, even to those with the best will in the world for faith, hope and charity, that the worst fears were justified and that the English Government were deliberately going back on all their 1917 promises and declarations, as far as was at all possible without violating the letter of the Government of India Act.

There is another point which Lord Olivier does not seem to be aware of, but which certainly has played an even greater role in spreading universal mistrust in British protestations. That point is the fact—known to all who had a hand in the working of the Government of India Act—that, whilst for the first half of the life of the first legislatures the Act was being administered in the spirit of the Act, in the latter half the very opposite took place. It is common knowledge that Sir T. B. Sapru for instance, at one time the *confidant* of the Viceroy, subsequently discovered that a new favourite had got the viceregal ear and considered it wisest to resign from a position which had become one of utter stultification. Mr. C. Y. Chintamani's resignation in the U. P. is another example of the same tendency, which showed itself as clearly in the Provinces as at the centre, and which made the conclusion inevitable that here one had got to do, not with an unfortunate accident or two, but with a deliberate policy.

That being the position last Autumn, is it really reasonable to reproach any section of the Indian public, for having had then no faith in the British intentions? Is it not a fact that even of the Moderates, who had started with enthusiastic energy to work the Reforms, not a few were then losing their faith? Could anybody have expected that within four months the Chairman of the Independent Labour Party would sit installed as Prime Minister at No. 10 Downing St.? But if not, why should Lord Olivier be so pained at the mistrust shown, when he has just himself given four quite adequate reasons for it already?

Lord Olivier stresses again and again, that the way to advance is to work in the Councils, "to show that you and your constituents are fit members, and not to take offence and say, we will not play." We need not protest that this has been our view all along. We have never once wavered in our settled conviction that the best way of getting an improved instrument, is to make all the use possible of the instrument one has got. But if Lord Olivier can sympathize with and understand as well as he does the four heads of offence enumerated by him, he surely can have no difficulty in realizing also that the resultant distrust in India was after all quite a natural consequence. A country shocked by a Jallianwala Bagh massacre, and outraged by

a refusal of the Government to admit the guilt of the officers implicated, is surely and very naturally not in a temper to trust. Hence we are sorry and somewhat surprised that Lord Olivier should make so much of the generally prevalent feeling of distrust and of a programme—six months old—"for administrative sabotage and political acerbation." We are all the more surprised, since Lord Olivier towards the end of his statement frankly acknowledges that "H. M.'s Government have not only been impressed by the atmosphere of mistrust and intransigence," but also more recently by "*the appreciable modification of that hostile and intransigent attitude.*" From that it surely ought to have been clear to him that once despairing Swarajists and despondent Moderates alike have not hardened their heart for good, whatever the British Government might be or do, but are still ready to respond to any genuine sign of sympathy and understanding.

Lord Olivier avows that his "government have the same ultimate aim, as the Indian Swaraj Party"; but he pleads for some patience meanwhile, since "it has been impossible (for him) to explore all factors of difficulty in the present Indian political atmosphere." Lord Olivier is fully entitled to that patience on our part and we hope he will get it—and a generous measure of it at that. At the same time we think we are entitled to ask him also to have equal patience with us here in India: even with the antics of some of our extremist friends in that warpaint, which has become a second nature to them, and to put it down to the effects of a bad, a really very bad, past, effects which persist though the original cause is, as we devoutly hope and believe, really past and gone now. Our Swarajist friends on the one hand we certainly would implore, not to persist in an attitude of obstruction, when a true change of heart has been manifested; and our friends in the Cabinet, not to be obsessed with the dangers which, as in the case of South Africa, of Ireland, of Egypt, all the old women of both sexes always predict, whenever the principle of self-determination has to be translated from theory into practice.

Of course Lord Olivier and the Cabinet cannot move, unless they carry with them, not merely their own party supporters, but Parliament as a whole. Hence they wisely refuse to bring in Amendment Acts to the Government of India Act which they would never be able to carry, nor can one wonder that they will not consider brand-new *swadeshi* Constitutions. But we repeat, that it is quite possible and open to them, within the four corners of the Reform Act, to make administratively such constitutional advances, as would ensure full responsible government in everything but name: but that of course again depends entirely on an *ex animo* abandonment of non-co-operation on the part of our own people. The whole situation threatens to develop into a regular deadlock: the Cabinet will not

move because the Swarajists obstruct; and the Swarajists obstruct, because the Cabinet will not move! Whatever happens, that deadlock certainly must be avoided. And avoided it can be, we are sure, by frank personal exchange of views. Since a Round Table Conference is not possible, why should not the two chambers of the Central Legislature appoint, before the session ends, a delegation, to wait upon the new Cabinet and thus to establish, in Lord Olivier's own words, "that closer contact which is so manifestly desirable and which, H. M.'s Government are convinced, must be sought?"

INDIAN EMIGRATION.

BY C. F. ANDREWS.

I.

THE time has fully come when an attempt should be made to study the whole question of Indian Emigration in its widest form, and to lead up from the general considerations concerning India and her needs to the particular modes of supplying those needs by means of this outlet of emigration. In my own life experience, I have now traced the subject backwards and forwards: starting with some tentative ideas, and considering emigration to be the most important of all questions affecting India in the not remote future, I have put those tentative theories which I originally held to the hardest tests of practical life. Thus I have found out by hard practical experience the dangers and difficulties, which are involved in hasty and imprudent emigration schemes, whose object is more to enrich the colonies abroad than to help the conditions of India at home. I have had to lay aside these schemes one by one in order to reach the truth.

After very many travels in distant parts of the world, I am more convinced than ever that emigration is necessary for India, with her present congested population; but I would rather, a thousand times, have no emigration of Indian labour at all than allow the old bad system of indentured Indian labour to be revived. Let me repeat this in another form, the problem of India today is not at all how to stop emigration, or how to make emigration difficult, but how to find a truly scientific basis for it which shall be free from serious moral evils,—how, in fact, to make the conditions of Indian immigration into the colonies and other parts of the world correspond with the best principles laid down and worked out by the successful colonising nations. In this series of articles, I shall try to sketch out what some of these conditions are and how they may be carried out.

But first, it is necessary to convince many Indians that emigration itself is wholesome, and that India will not suffer loss by the free adventurous travels and journeys and exploits and settlements abroad of her children. For there is a form of the old 'kala pani' doctrine still surviving, however irrationally and illogically. There is a strong

conservative instinct against foreign travel common among caste-Hindus which is distinctly opposed to the thought of free and healthy movement on the part of Indians to distant lands. I find it very hard to trace out the real origin of such doctrines and instincts. I have been told that all this opposition to the idea of going abroad is an outcome of the growing rigour of caste, and that the *prayaschitta* to be performed on return from foreign lands became more and more a religious deterrent, until it was almost an instinct in the blood. Hindu friends have told me how very deep this instinct is even in themselves, and how, even when they have argued it right away, it will return to the mind and obscure with prejudice a clear judgment. I have very often noticed how the mere mention of Indian emigration roused opposition in many parts of India; and as I do not in the least share this instinct, it is not easy for me always to be fair to it and give it a due place in the scheme of things.

I have been struck, also, quite recently by the implications of 'Swadeshi', and how quickly the principle of 'Swadeshi' is attached to what appears to me a narrow local patriotism, involving, unless very great care is taken, a repetition of the worst forms that nationalism has taken in the West. Here again, having personally discarded 'nationalism' long ago, and having been a conscientious objector in the War on international grounds, as well as on the grounds of Ahimsa, I find it very hard to get into the frame of mind that would narrowly localise itself and regard all the rest of the world as 'bideshi'. Only yesterday I was reading through a book written with great fervour of spirit, with which I profoundly disagreed. It was called the 'Gospel of Swadeshi'. This book appeared to make it a sin,—a moral lapse from virtue,—to purchase things from a distant country which might be purchased (however inferior) near at hand. The book preached this "Gospel" to such an extent, that the very meaning of virtue appeared to depend on an accident of geography, and man seemed to be made the slave of the place where he was born, a serf, not by cruelty of man, but by his own acceptance of what was declared to be the purpose and will of God. We have a proverb in English, which I have always detested,—"Charity begins at home". But this 'Gospel of Swadeshi' would almost make charity end there also.

No doubt, in what I have written, I have exaggerated and overstated the main implications of this book. The author, whom I know and love, did not of course intend to drive his logic to such an extreme as I have pointed out. But it will easily be seen, that if any such narrow theory of Swadeshi is held with religious conviction, it becomes very hard to accommodate in the mind the contrary conception of 'emigration'. There is hardly any idea, in such a frame of mind, that the whole world is our mother country and the whole human race our mother nation. Yet

the international position is never wholly safe until this larger conception is grasped.

To sum up, then, all that I have tried to express in this first article on Emigration:—there can be no doubt, I am afraid, that it is necessary in India to get rid altogether of many irrational ideas, associated with the growth of the caste system, which still enchain and enthrall the mind. In the relaxation of the caste system, which is now taking place on all sides, it must not be forgotten, that here also, in the 'kala pani' doctrine, there is need not only of a relaxation altogether of the so-called 'prayaschitta' imposed; but also the transformation of the whole doctrine itself into one of encouragement to face bravely the 'kala pani' and go out into the wide world. In my next article I shall show, conclusively, as I hope, that this narrow doctrine of the 'kala pani' was never held in Ancient India at all. For India, at the height of her spiritual greatness, colonised and civilised large areas of the surface of the globe, and brought blessing upon millions of the human race, raising them from savagery and barbarism to a life of humane ideas and noble arts.

C. F. ANDREWS.

THE INDIAN BUDGET FOR 1924-25.

THERE is nothing very striking in the Budget proposals submitted to the Assembly by Sir Basil Blackett on February, 29th, last. The Finance Member seems to have worked with the one idea of showing a balanced budget. It is this idea that urged him to recommend the certification of the salt tax last year. The over-anxiety to balance the budget naturally led him, maybe unconsciously, to overestimate the revenue last year. Therefore in the revised estimates for the current year, there is a heavy deterioration in revenue of Rs. 538 lakhs. This has been met by a net saving in expenditure of Rs. 419 lakhs under minor heads such as saving in interest chargeable to Post and Telegraphs, saving in exchange and sinking funds, etc. This together with the budgetted surplus of Rs. 81 lakhs has left a deficit of Rs. 38 lakhs. This shows that the Trade and the Financial conditions in the country were not sufficiently grasped by the Government so as to make their anticipations realised in practice.

The above deficit of Rs. 38 lakhs in ordinary revenue, though small, is proposed to be wiped off with the help of an extraordinary revenue amounting to Rs. 4.73 crores which has come to India as representing profits from the control of enemy ships. Out of this sum, Rs. 25 lakhs were to be paid as ex-gratia grants to private individuals who have suffered through enemy action. If the whole of this amount is credited to the revenue of 1923-24, after allowing for the deficit of Rs. 38 lakhs, there would remain a surplus of over 4 crores. Of these 4 crores, about Rs. 2 crores are to be kept in suspense for payment to the Railways of customs duty on imported Railway materials, if the case

goes against the Government of India in the Privy Council. The balance of about Rs. 244 lakhs is to be applied towards the avoidance of new borrowings. The Finance Member himself admits that the use of such extraordinary revenue for meeting expenditure normally chargeable against ordinary revenue is highly objectionable and still he proposes it. It is such actions on the part of Government that show the feebleness of public opinion.

The Debt position has been very lucidly dealt with in the budget statement. The total debt on 31st March 1924 will amount to Rs. 917.53 crores excluding Rs. 49.65 crores held in the Paper Currency Reserve. The floating debt has been reduced almost to nothing, the outstandings on 31st March being only Rs. 2.13 crores. Of this total of Rs. 917.53 crores, 98.81 crores represents debt incurred on behalf of the Provincial Governments and Rs. 11.88 crores represents discount on past loans, leaving a net total of 806.84 crores of which 578.39 is productive and the balance of Rs. 228.45 crores is unproductive debt. After distinguishing between productive and unproductive debts, the Finance Member makes a Sinking Fund provision of four crores only. As the Government securities have improved in value he thinks it also unnecessary to make a provision of Rs. 80 lakhs which was necessary for maintaining the 5 p. c. loans. The Finance Member's way of looking at the debt position is not objectionable, though in the light of further experience the provision for debt redemption may have to be increased.

We are entirely in agreement with the separation of the Railway Finance from the Central Budget. By the separation Railway finances will be continuous from year to year and will not be liable to lapse every March. The Central Budget also must not be in doubt as to what it will get from the railways. As the railway has been built with capital raised by the Government, they must provide the Government with interest on that capital. Next they must provide them with a regular fixed dividend on the money which the state has put into the railways and finally, if there still remain any surplus profits, they are to pay a share of that surplus also to the Central Budget. But the Assembly should never lose sight of the fact that the main concern of railways should be the convenience of the people. We are glad to know that the Assembly have appointed a Committee of the House to go into the whole question. The practice of studying things in a committee is very helpful. In fact we are of opinion that the whole budget should, after the general discussion which should not take much time, be discussed in a Committee of the whole house, the general debate being only in the nature of a "grievance" motion in the House of Commons.

Before presenting estimates for 1924-25 the Finance Member elucidated two things: first, whether Government stores are to be admitted duty free, and secondly, on what average rate of ex-

change the forecast is to be based. With regard to the first they have decided to treat Government stores for customs purposes like any other imports and with regard to the second the forecasts are to be framed on the average rate for the year of 1s. 4¾ d. The former decision will bring in 11 lakhs as revenue in 1924-25. But it is doubtful whether the latter decision regarding the rate of exchange will be realised in practice. During the last fortnight the rate has been falling and it has fallen more than a halfpenny. It is not always possible for Government to manipulate things in such a way as to take advantage of the best rate for remittance purposes and the Finance Member may find his calculation upset next year.

On the basis of existing taxation the Finance Member budgets for a revenue of Rs. 107.93 and an expenditure of Rs. 104.57 crores. No tariff changes are proposed except small ones with regard to the reduction of excise duty on motor spirit to 4¼ as. per gallon and the imposition of specific duties on empty match boxes and splints. The main heads of revenue, viz. Customs and Income Tax, are estimated to bring in Rs. 45.02 and 18.22 crores respectively and the main item of expenditure, viz. military estimates will absorb Rs. 60.25 crores. Railways will bring in a fixed contribution of 4.27 crores. The other items of revenue and expenditure will almost be the same as those in the current year. The surplus of 3.36 crores is proposed to be divided between the reduction of the salt tax from Rs. 2-8-0 to 2-0-0 and the reduction of provincial contributions. Reduction of the salt tax to Rs. 2/- per maund will involve a reduction in revenue of Rs. 1.82 crores and the balance of 1.50 crores is to be applied towards reducing the provincial contributions of Madras, U. P., the Punjab and Burma. But this proposal is not final and choice is left to the Assembly either to accept the proposal of the Government or to reduce the salt tax from Rs. 2-8-0 to Rs. 1-4-0. It is very difficult to anticipate the decision of the Assembly as the provinces are set against one another but personally we hope that the Assembly will leave the provincial contributions alone and reduce the salt tax from Rs. 2-8-0 to 1-4-0.

C. S. DEOLE.

FISCAL AUTONOMY FOR RAILWAYS.

II.

THE complaint about inadequacy of funds has reference to the amounts required for carrying out additional works and works involving betterment on existing railways to deal satisfactorily with the traffic offering and for the construction of new lines or extensions of existing railways. The term "inadequacy" can only exist with reference to some definite goal under each of the two above-mentioned requirements. But, so far as the public are aware, no such goal exists. That the railways are insufficiently equipped with traffic facilities is an age-long complaint. This may be due to in-

efficiency of the funds or inefficiency of our railway administrators. The disclosure made by the Indian Retrenchment Committee of 1922-23 gives room for suspicion that the latter element is not entirely inoperative. Similarly, in para. 26 of its report, the Indian Railway Committee of 1920-21 says that on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway "Inwards traffic from the East India; Bengal and Nagpur; Bombay, Baroda and Central India; Madras and Southern Mahratta; Nizam's Guaranteed State; and other railways is restricted at 15 junctions to from 600 to 30 wagons daily." This state of affairs could not have come about without material help from inefficiency. Obviously there has been no goal and if at all there was any goal before the minds of our railway administrators at any time, there has been a serious lack of co-ordination in the development of the different parts of the State-owned railway system and a lack of balance between the track facilities provided and the rolling stock additions on the group in charge of each railway administration, or between one class of rolling stock and another. The excuse of inadequacy of funds is clearly being overworked in so far as existing lines of railway are concerned. As regards new railways, here also there has been no goal, nor apparently is there any now. For a long time 20 000 miles was the height of ambition of the Government of India. This figure was reached during the viceroyalty of Lord Elgin. During the vigorous administration of Lord Curzon the new lines constructed and opened amounted to the unprecedented figure of 6,255 miles while the total mileage now open amounts to no less than 37,000 miles. The thirst of our rulers for new railroads is insatiable. We do not know what mileage our administrators have in view for construction and with this conveniently indeterminate ultimate mileage the complaint of inadequate funds is immortal.

As regards the complaint that the supply of funds for railway works chargeable wholly or partly to capital varies from year to year, there can be no denying the fact that the existing defects in the equipment of railways are to a large extent, though not wholly, the inevitable result of a system of railway capital finance which forces a continuous, growing, expanding concern like the railways to conform to a one-year basis; and a big step forward in the right direction has been taken by the Legislative Assembly in guaranteeing a supply of Rs. 150 crores on the basis of a quinquennium ending 1926-27, with its corollary of the abolition of the system of annual lapses, and thus practically separating the railway capital finance from the general finance of the Central Government and thus placing the Railway Board for the first time in a position to plan ahead and to carry out their schemes of improvement.

The evils arising out of the dependence on railway capital grants on the fluctuating finances of the Central Government have been met by the system now in force of quinquennial guarantee of

funds for railway capital works. The difficulty in respect of revenue grants, however, still remains to be overcome. Railway revenue expenditure may for our present purposes be divided into three main classes:—

- 1 Ordinary working expenses;
- 2 Expenditure on normal renewals or replacements; and
- 3 Expenditure on special renewals or replacements.

Ordinary working expenditure under class 1 above includes salaries, coal and other consumable stores, day-to-day repairs and maintenance, necessary to earn the revenue budgeted for. It will be seen from paragraph 53 of the report of the Indian Railway Committee of 1920-21 that it has no complaint to make regarding the provision of funds for expenditure of this class. Expenditure under class 2 relates to replacement of items of railway property not capable of further service by those of equal or superior efficiency and durability. The difficulty at present existing of financing this class of expenditure does not directly arise out of the dependence of railway finance on the general finances of the Central Government. It is due, as explained in paragraph 68 of the report of the Indian Railway Committee of 1920-1921, to the unwise methods of the past in the Government having formed no replacement fund. The real position is clearly and *agreeably* described in paragraph 5 at pages 4 and 5 of the Railway Administration Report for 1921-22 thus:—

"As was explained in the last administration report, an ordinary commercial concern provides for depreciation of its property by setting aside annually a certain portion of the profits for credit to a depreciation fund which is charged with renewals as they are made. It has been hitherto held to be inconsistent with the ordinary scheme of Government finance to set aside for the future money not actually required for the current year's expenses. No provision, is, therefore, made for depreciation and the expense of renewals of worn-out plant is not a part of the ordinary annual working expenses. The result is obviously to make this vital matter of renewals dependent, as used to be the case in respect to capital, on the state of Government of India ordinary finance."

The Railway Finance Committee has recommended the formation of a depreciation fund in order that funds for this class of expenditure may be provided for automatically. When this depreciation fund is fully formed, the present difficulty will disappear irrespective of whether the railway finance is or is not separated from the central finance of the Central Government. Expenditure under class (3) relates to premature renewal of items (i. e., before they have given their full amount of services) which have to be undertaken, e. g., on account of increased efficiency and economy obtainable from the reconstruction of works to improved designs or from substitution of machinery, plant, rolling stock, etc., of new or im-

proved design. In the absence of a proper depreciation fund, financial provision for this class of expenditure is dependent entirely on the fluctuating condition of the general finances of the Central Government from year to year. The formation of a depreciation fund will only lessen this dependence but not remove it. It is obvious that this distance between lessened dependence and its complete removal must be covered by a special fund. But the probable nature of such premature renewals, their probable extent, the probable time of their occurrence, and the probable total liability on railway revenue are all necessarily so indeterminate, that it is impossible to create a fund with a reasonable promise of being adequate without being one of extravagant dimensions. The choice there lies between having no fund at all or having one without the certainty of its being reasonably adequate. Common sense suggests that if you cannot go the furthest length, do not stop where you are but go as far as you can. Our railway administrators have no less than 75 years' experience behind them and we have no doubt that with this experience and past records they will be able to arrive at a tentative standard for a special fund out of which to meet the revenue liability on account of premature renewals.

The conclusions which emerge from the consideration which we have so far given to the subject are

- (i) that the one-year basis for financing railway works involving a charge to capital must be given up permanently in favour of a basis covering a series of years ;
- (ii) that the one-year basis for financing works involving a charge to revenue must also be abandoned in favour of the setting up of a Depreciation Fund and a Special Renewal Fund ; and
- (iii) that there is no necessity to disturb the present one-year basis for financing Ordinary Working Expenses.

The adoption of these measures should provide a reasonably substantial guarantee that under normal circumstances, funds for railway works would be forthcoming as and when required. The proposals in paragraphs 74 and 75 of the report of the Indian Railway Committee of 1920-21, however, go much further than a guaranteed supply of funds, although all the deficiencies in railway equipment are attributed primarily to the absence of a guaranteed supply of funds. The central proposal of the Committee is that the net profits earned by railways which at present accrue to the general Exchequer should as a normal procedure be surrendered to the Railway Department and that the latter should be free to devote them to new capital purposes or to reserves or to dissipate them in the form either of reduction of rates or improvement of services. The Committee has advanced no reasons whatever in support of a proposal so drastic both in its nature and in its extent. This proposal involves questions of great

importance and far-reaching character touching the principles and policy to be adopted in the future administration of the railways. We shall suggest only a few of the questions to which satisfactory answers will have to be found, viz.—

Is it safe to place so much discretionary power into the hands of our unnational railway administrators? The experience of the working of the old machinery has been disappointing, while the new machinery has yet to be fully installed and its working tested!

Is it wise to abandon the present policy of administering the railways so as to produce a profit to the *general tax payer* who has borne heavy burdens in the past and who, as the owner of the railways, will have to bear ultimate liability for possible economic failure of the railways?

Is it in the interest of the nation that *revenue* funds should be spent for *capital* purposes, irrespective of the other needs of the country of equal or even greater importance?

Is it wise to give the Executive unrestrained power to dissipate railway profits in the form either of reduction of rates or improvement of services? It must be remembered that the Legislature itself has no statutory power of any kind in the matter of rates and fares and that the manipulation of rates and fares by the Executive and the distribution of improvement in service has in the past not been above serious suspicion either from the national or even from the commercial point of view.

Is it politic to grant all this measure of fiscal autonomy to an Executive which has yet to fall in line with the desire of the country for universal State management of Indian railways?

ECONOMY.

THE DELHI SESSION.

(BY OUR PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.)

DELHI, 1st MARCH 1924.

THE Parliamentary week opened under the shadow of the Jaito tragedy in the Nabha State. Immediately after question time, Pandit Malaviya moved an adjournment of the House to consider the Jaito shooting and supported his motion on the ground that British Indian subjects were killed and wounded at Jaito, which, though it was in an Indian State, was at the time governed by the Government of India through one of their own officers, the Administrator. Sir Malcolm Hailey, while deploring the incident and not shirking the discussion of the affair, pointed out that under the Standing Orders no matter concerning the administration of the Indian States—and the Standing Orders do not distinguish ordinary from extraordinary matters—could be discussed in the House: a point of order, which the President, after further hearing what the Pandit had to say in support of his motion, upheld, much to the disappointment of a large section of the House. This verdict of the chair was however anticipated by the Nationalists

party who had, therefore, decided the night before that they had no reason to protest against the ruling. But Pandit Malaviya who was away from Delhi the weekend, was unaware of this decision and gave undignified vent to his disappointment by stalking out of the Chamber. Some Swarajists who followed him did so at his request and to take counsel as to what to do next, and not in protest against the ruling of the Chair.

In fairness to Sir Malcolm, it must be said that he did not wish to shut out discussion of the Jaito affair, because, when the next day the Pandit let himself go on this very subject when speaking on Sirdar Gulab Singh's resolution comprehending all the grievances of the Sikhs, Sir Malcolm threw no obstacles in his way. It is, however, regrettable that the Pandit should repeat in the House the most shocking rumours about the conduct of the Administrator, professing all the while that he was thereby only giving the Government an opportunity to deny them and yet, without waiting for government's reply, draw conclusions and hurl accusations as if he had profound faith in these rumours.

Sirdar Gulab Singh's resolution recommended a committee to enquire into all the grievances of the Sikh community, which the Punjab Government has so far failed to redress satisfactorily. He contended that the troubles between the Government and the Sikhs were entirely due to the unsympathetic conduct of the former towards the latter, in the matter of the control of the Gurudwaras and the carrying of the Kripans or swords. Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal observed that while the Akalis professed that they were merely engaged in a purely religious enterprise and the Government in merely maintaining law and order, political motives were playing a prominent part in these conflicts. Finally it was agreed on all hands, including the Government, that the Sikhs had some real grievances, that the Punjab Government had so far failed in redressing them and that there was justification for an outside body to intervene to bring about a settlement; the difference lay in that the non-officials wanted a committee of the Assembly to go into the matter, while the Government, while not accepting this proposal, had not yet decided on the alternative.

Next followed two motions for the release of Sirdar Kharak Singh, President of the Shromani Gurudwara Prabhandak Committee, and of Mr. Hazrat Mohani. The former was convicted on charges of manufacturing kripans, of making a seditious speech in which he is reported to have wished the British to be "slaves" or as Pandit Malaviya would have it, "servants" of the Indians, and for refusing to give up the black turban of the Akalis which he was wearing unmolested in the jail for some months. Government promised to consider the case afresh and there seems to be little doubt that Sirdar Kharak Singh will soon be released, for one could not miss the sincerity in the tone of Sir Malcolm Hailey as he assured the

Sikhs that the hand of friendship was held out and that he looked forward to the complete restoration of trust and co-operation as of old. And in a few weeks Sir Malcolm will be taking over the Governorship of the Punjab.

Sir Malcolm was obdurate to the plea for the release of Mr. Hazrat Mohani, who has already served out his term for the original offence and is now serving out the sentence for attempting to corrupt the jail staff. Sir Malcolm had respect for those who go to prison for the sake of their conscience but none for those who, finding themselves in jail for conscience sake, chafe at the jail regulations and circumvent them by attempts to corrupt the jail officials. All the three questions were made party questions by the Nationalist party and merrily the steam roller rolled, the Government not challenging a division on any of these motions, though they opposed them all.

After Jaito, the next great feature of the Parliamentary week, though indirectly as far as the Delhi Parliament was concerned, was the statement of Lord Olivier in the House of Lords on Tuesday last, reports of which reached Delhi in tantalising dribblets on Wednesday and Thursday. The full text was received here only on Friday and opinion has not yet crystallised itself. The Nationalist party is expected to meet on Sunday to decide on their policy, and individual members are not eager to express their opinions until then. It, however, appears that the Swarajists consider the statement as mere camouflage, that nothing material has come out of it to justify their revising their obstructive programme. The Liberals and the erstwhile Liberals seem to think that, though nothing substantial has been given, the door has not been banged in their face and that spirit and attitude are not antagonist to Indian demands; at any rate, that there is nothing to justify the throwing out of the Budget and such tactics. They are disposed to give the Labour Government the time they desire to make up their mind and consider that an immediate deputation to England will greatly help the Government to make up its mind aright.

To return to the Indian Legislature. The Assembly spent the best part of two days raising the age under which the Law affords protection to minor girls against some sexual dangers they are exposed to. The first step, taken at the instance of Mr. Joshi, to raise the age by the new Act XX of 1923 from 16 to 18 has now caught on and there is a general move to raise the age to the same extent in all related legislation. The age in Secs. 372 and 373 of the Indian Penal Code has now been raised to 18. Dr. Gour moved an amendment that the age should be raised to the same level in sec. 361 (relating to kidnapping), as first proposed by Government, but thrown out by the select committee. The amendment was opposed by the orthodox Mr. Rangachariar, who averred

that the proposal would unduly interfere with the liberty of a girl between 16 and 18, who in India was certainly capable of taking care of herself, (1) to change her religion, a very innocent and honourable purpose; or to seek shelter in the home of a sympathetic sister from the persecutions of a cruel mother-in-law. The equally orthodox Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, however, supported the amendment, hoping thereby to restrict the field for the proselytising zeal of a religious enthusiast or for an alluring lover belonging to another religion. Mr. Abdul Hays protested that the amendment would infringe the personal law of the Muhammadans and if it were carried, he would offer civil disobedience to the law—a sentiment which received the hearty approval of Mr. Patel—and a situation might arise before he left Delhi. The House was duly impressed with the awful threat and laughed heartily. Sir Malcolm pointed out that the real point at issue was whether the House proposed to sentence a person to seven years imprisonment, who took away a person between 16 and 18 from lawful custody for a perfectly lawful, honest and honourable purpose and he further reminded the House that the offence could be constructive also without being physical. By 16 votes to 61 the House rejected the amendment. The Home Member promised to bring in special legislation to put down the system of 'bardafarosh'. In this connection there occurred one of the most curious anomalies of the Swarajist position. Communal loyalty got the better of Party loyalty and Swarajist policy. The Muhammadans, Swarajist or not Swarajist, with one or two exceptions, voted against the amendment, and had perforce to walk into the Government lobby. So had some other non-Muslim Swarajists, who were opposed to the amendment on its merits. When Dr. Gour accused Sir Malcolm of illogicality in retaining 16 years in Sec. 361, while agreeing to 18 in all other sections, Sir Malcolm smilingly observed that his illogicality brought him new friends! And if illogicality was the condition for retaining his new friends, he would try it again. It was a hit and it went home.

Dr. Gour, who was accused of believing himself an Avatar, ambitious of superseding the Code of Manu by his own, was responsible for as many as four bills this week. He successfully referred to a select committee his bill to amend Sec. 375 of the I. P.C. The bill is intended to penalise the consummation of marriage below the age of 14, and it received very influential support from all quarters, including the European non-officials. Early marriage was bad and sapping the manhood and womanhood of India and the success of the recent Baby Week showed that public opinion was moving fast in the matter and the bill was timely. It was, however, pointed out pertinently that the provisions of the present Act had so far not been availed of and that there were not many cases on record. What was the good of legislation which remains a dead letter? To which the reply is,

that such legislation, though remaining unused, is not without educative influence.

Dr. Gour also carried his motion to circulate for public opinion his bill for the better management of Hindu religious trusts. The bill is on the lines of the Wakf Act passed by the last Assembly.

On Friday, Sir Basil Blackett introduced the Budget for the year 1924-25. His speech was received quietly by the House. There was no ready appreciation of the splendid retrenchments effected by the Finance Minister nor of the prospect of seeing the end of deficit budgets, nor of the Government proposal to reduce the salt tax to Rs. 2 per maund, nor of the decision that the rate of salt tax and the disposal of the surplus will be left entirely in the hands of the Assembly. The sole problem for the Swarajists seems to be, not the merits of the budget, but whether Lord Olivier's speech justifies a rejection of the budget or not. Among the Independents there is a desire that the salt tax should be reduced to Rs. 1/4/-.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE BERAR RETROCESSION.

TO THE EDITOR THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR:—The letter addressed by H. E. H. the Nizam to the Viceroy of India and recently published in the papers has set the public in Berar thinking about their own position.

The territory known as Berar is a part of Southern India and has varying boundaries in its old history. Lying as it does on the main road from the North to the South, it has been the fighting ground for many dynastic quarrels in past centuries and may be appropriately compared to Belgium in Europe.

It has known Hindu, Muslim and dual control also. The land being fertile and the people docile, its past has been full of change of masters. Its very fertility has been its misfortune and it is to be seen whether it does not prove its ruin in future also.

Whatever the past may have been, it is evident that its present position is peculiar. H. E. H. the Nizam is its nominal master while the Government of India is the actual one. Its day-to-day administration is being carried on by the Local Government in C. P. This peculiar position was explained to the late Secretary of State for India by a deputation headed by the late Rao Bahadur R. N. Mudholkar when Mr. Montagu visited India in 1917-18 for studying the political condition here. Opinion was then expressed that Berar deserved separate treatment but no thought seems to have been given to the question of its retrocession.

Under devolution rules framed under the Government of India Act of 1919, Rule 14 (2) provides that the revenues of Berar shall be allocated to the Local Government of C. P. as a source of provincial revenue and that the Local Government of C. P. shall be responsible for the administration of Berar.

Thus the existence of the C. P. administration as a separate Government depends upon Berar contributing its revenues to that Government and the question of retrocession of Berar will involve the breaking up of the C. P. administration as a separate unit and therefore the Government of India is not likely to take up the question in great haste.

However, as the question has been moved by H. E. H. the Nizam, it is necessary for the public in Berar to give outspoken expression to their feelings in the matter. Even a cursory survey of public opinion will disclose that Beraris do not desire to go under the autocratic rule of H. E. H. the Nizam

but want to carve out their destinies in an administration in which person does not count and in which progress may be slow but is sure and is likely to be accelerated as opinion develops and takes shape.

The present dominions of H. E. H. the Nizam have been promised representative Government by H. E. H. the Nizam recently but no steps are being taken to show that such Government is coming into existence in the near future. The sources of agitation in favour of securing early fulfilment of the above mentioned promise are rigidly controlled and the plant of public life may be said to find no congenial soil to flourish in. With this instance before them, Beraris are not likely to be attracted by the proposal of full autonomy which appears like a bait.

No leader of public opinion is likely to support the proposal and if the retrocession is to be worth the consent of the people of Berar, it is not likely that such consent will be given.

If the proposal takes form as a matter of immediate action, Beraris will raise up a huge agitation and make their will heard so that it may not proceed further.

Buldana,
BERAR.

I AM, SIR,
Yours faithfully,
R. S. KANITKAR.

Useful Books On The Topics Of The Day LABOUR.

- | | Rs. | A. |
|---|-----|------|
| 1. Communism. By Eden and Cedar Paul. | 0 | 7 |
| 2. The Control of Industry. By Margaret I. Cole. | ... | 0 7 |
| 3. Factory Echoes and Other Sketches. By R. M. Fox. | ... | 1 4 |
| 4. The Government of Ireland. By Mrs. J. R. Green. Foreword by George Russell. | 0 | 7 |
| 5. Guilds and the Salary Earner. By J. Henry Lloyd. | ... | 0 7 |
| 6. Guild Socialism Re-Stated. By G. D. H. Cole. | ... | 4 14 |
| 7. Guild Socialism. An historical and critical analysis. By Niles Carpenter, Ph. D. | ... | 8 9 |
| 8. The Guild State. Its Principles and possibilities. By G. R. Stirling Taylor. | 3 | 11 |
| 9. A History of Trades Councils 1860-1875. By Cicely Richards. With an introduction by G. D. H. Cole. | ... | 0 13 |
| 10. An Introduction to Trade Unionism. Being a short study of the present position of Trade Unionism in Great Britain prepared for the Trade Union Survey of The Fabian Research Department. By G. D. H. Cole. | ... | 4 |
| 11. Labour in the Commonwealth. By G. D. H. Cole. Deals with the humanity of labour and the claim to democratic control in industry following upon its recognition. | ... | 2 14 |

The Theosophical Publishing House,
Adyar. adras

INDIAN BOOK SHOP
George Town, Madras.

North-Western Railway

NOTICE.

Sealed Tenders are invited by the Agent North Western Railway, Lahore, for making garments and articles in cloth as required in the North-Western Railway Clothing Factory, Moghalpura, during the period April 1924 to March 1925. All material will be supplied free of charge and a certain number of machines both sewing and button holding will be loaned free of charge and upkeep by the Controller of Stores, North-Western Railway.

Tenders which will be available for issue on 27th February 1924 must be submitted on the prescribed forms obtainable from and on payment of Rs. 5/- per copy to the Undersigned, and must reach the Agent's Office not later than 2 P. M. on Monday the 17th March 1924.

The Agent of the North-Western Railway reserves to himself the right to reject any, any part of, or all of the Tenders received in answer to this Advertisement without assigning any reason for such rejection.

Office of the Controller } C. F. LANGER.
of Stores Moghalpura } Controller of Stores.
(Lahore)

Dated 20-2-24. N. W. RAILWAY.

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 length for Rs. 12 only. These pieces are conomical, hard wear and handsome ever made.

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

Name.....
Address.....

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 Aryabhusan Press, Poona City.

AFRICA OR INDIA ?

ADDRESS BY

THE RT. HON'BLE V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI, P. C.

Delivered at a meeting of the Criterion Club, S. Stephen's College, Delhi, held on February 24th 1924.

The title of my subject today is "Africa or India?" It seems to be an alternative which it is hard to present to anybody. I have not invented it in order to attract a crowd of listeners. But the alternative, will the British Government care for Africa or for India more?, was presented in a somewhat acute form to the British Cabinet during the progress of this Kenya difficulty. You know Kenya is only a part of British East Africa. But the white people in Kenya are drawn to a considerable extent from South Africa. In fact our countrymen allege that while, before the advent of these South African whites, everything was smooth sailing, after they came and settled there, the trouble of the Indian community began. But it is not a trouble between whites and Indians in Kenya alone. It is unfortunately largely aggravated by the circumstance that the South African whites have openly declared themselves to be in sympathy with the whites in Kenya.

The great man who rules over the destinies of South Africa, General Smuts, lent the weight of his authority to the agitation of the white community in Kenya. He backed them to the utmost of his power and I heard at the India Office that he sent many a long cablegram to the British Cabinet, advising them, threatening them, and generally warning them that the British Cabinet were not dealing with Kenya only, but with the whole of Africa, meaning the whole of white Africa; and in the course of the discussions it became evident the question would be, will the Indian case prevail or the African case prevail? I have not told you in detail the way in which the cause of the whites in Kenya and the cause of the whites in South Africa became identical. It is not necessary to our purpose; but it was they who presented to the British Cabinet this alternative. "If you are going to redress the so-called grievances of the Indian community, you would be driving us out of the Empire. The Indians tell you for their part that if you were going to decide the issues in our favour, India would have to go out."

Now, the British Cabinet was obliged in some way to settle the question as though it were a case between Africa and India. I will only mention in passing that one time the propaganda of the whites reached such proportions that it looked likely that it would be a case not only of Africa versus India, but of the whole of the Dominions and Crown Colonies versus India. Luckily, the dominions were too sensible and too aware of

the magnitude of the difficulties of the Empire that they refused to throw in their lot with Africa. So it shrank somewhat into the dimensions of a struggle between India and Africa.

Ladies and gentlemen, when a question assumes that importance, we must extend our sympathy to those that have to deal with it on that footing. So we who went to England on this Kenya mission always asked ourselves, what should we do, if we were in the position of the British Cabinet. I am afraid the persons who came over to plead for the cause of the Kenya whites failed to rise to the height of the occasion and did not look at the problem from the point of view of the British cabinet charged with the maintenance of a world-wide empire, but were too full of their own little troubles. Now, you might ask me "Why is Africa pitted against India in this matter?" Now it is alleged it is not only a question of economical interests, but it is a question of two cultures and two civilisations struggling to occupy the same ground. That is how they put it: not that we wish our culture and our civilisation to be planted in Africa to the detriment of anybody, but they always put the case, as though India were behind this movement and were struggling to obtain a large and secure foothold on the continent of Africa, so that she may thrust her hungry millions on the soil of Africa and thus not only dispossess the whites, but in course of time dispossess the natives of Africa also. Now in South Africa there is a very peculiar constitution which I think the English people did not fully understand when they annexed South Africa, or they would have tried to establish some sort of compromise; because the ideal which the South Africans have is injurious and diametrically opposed to the ideals of the British Empire. British Empire ideals are well known. Happily, the British Cabinet, low as they have fallen in their power to maintain those ideals, have not yet repudiated them. Those ideals, as you are aware, are justice all round, equality all round and brotherhood between all peoples composing the commonwealth. In South Africa the *grandvet* or fundamental law includes the declaration, "There shall be no equality between white and coloured persons in church or state." For long decades the South African white who is the Boer predominantly, has had to struggle with the blacks of Africa, and therefore has from his very upbringing the notion that the black man is unequal to the white, that he is born only to serve the white, and that if he will not

serve the white he should be compelled to do so or killed off as soon as possible. Between the white and black therefore, they will never grant equality, and they conceive that the black man of Africa is the proto-type to which the Indian also must be consigned, and they treat the Indian really the same way. Well, it may be right or it may be wrong—I am not here to argue the case either for or against the South African Boer. But the Boer is there, every moment thinking of this ideal of the white man's natural and inherent superiority over the coloured person. He is taught every minute of his life that that is the true doctrine. No use quarreling with him. When therefore the British Empire annexed South Africa with this ideal which runs clean against their own cherished ideal. British statesmen undertook a serious responsibility and they must have vowed to themselves that, if they found it necessary to annex South Africa with this degrading doctrine, running counter even to Christianity, they at least were under a moral obligation to see that this degrading ideal never travelled beyond South Africa, that it was confined to this primitive population of Boers. They might have hoped that some day, some bold, some enthusiastic, some pious missionary might go and convert them to a decent form of Christianity; but in the meanwhile they must have vowed to themselves "We will never allow this doctrine to spread beyond South Africa".

But what happened in the case of Kenya? White people from South Africa went there, carried their doctrine and reversed the current which Kenya affairs had run for a long time; for an Indian aspect had been given to the progress of affairs in Kenya, which now the Boer was determined to check with a view, first of all, to restricting the immigration of the Indians and afterwards in course of time, as his power grew, finally to close the doors of East Africa to Indians altogether.

Now, lest you should think that I am overstating the case, I have brought you a memorandum which General Smuts presented to the Imperial Conference. Gen. Smuts at that conference made himself the spokesman not only of the Kenya whites but generally of Africa. He presented their case and you may remember it was mentioned in the paper at the time that his principal desire was to get repealed that resolution of 1921 of the Imperial Conference which recommended that Indians everywhere in the Empire should be granted equal rights of citizenship with any other class of His Majesty's subjects. Now, let me tell you at once that, although General Smuts at the 1921 session of the Imperial Conference was no party to this resolution, and even expressly dissociated himself from it, as a person who was present at it, I can tell you this much that it was quite open to General Smuts to take his stand on the understanding that no resolution should be passed which was not unanimous and he could

therefore well have said at the time "As I am not a consenting party to this resolution I will not allow you to pass it." But, ladies and gentlemen, allow me to tell you that, far from taking that position, which he was entitled to take, General Smuts was so impressed with the Indian case, with the difficulties which the Empire was experiencing in holding together, that he actually said "Although it is not possible for me to join, my sympathy is with Mr. Sastri; let this resolution go; I do not mind; provided it does not bind me." I am mentioning that in prominence because it has been lost sight of and something hangs on that little point, trifling as it may appear to you.

Gen. Smuts comes forward in 1923 and tells the Conference "It was a mistake of yours to have passed that resolution; you ought now to repeal it"; and he puts it on the express ground that equality, fancy, ladies and gentlemen, is an idea foreign to the Empire. Whoever thought of equality between people and people in the Empire? He says so openly; and it is worth while for me to read that to you. The whole of his memorandum is very interesting reading and I would like you to read it at leisure some day. It is a short document, but I shall read only the relevant portion.

"There is no equal British citizenship in the Empire, and it is quite wrong (this is the point) for a British subject to claim equality of rights in any part of the Empire to which he has migrated or where he happens to be living. There is no indignity at all or affront in the denial of such equality. Once this is clearly recognised the stigma above referred to falls away."

There is no equality—so we will treat Indians as our inferiors, but there is no stigma in it and Indians have no right to feel it at all. That is the kind of argument that Gen. Smuts addressed to the Conference. But of course he went further. Instead of confining himself to a mere statement of that sort, being the general that he is, and accustomed to carry the war into the enemy's territory, he has given a paragraph to an attack on me; and for what reason? above everything else, that I had decided to tour through the dominions and speak of equality, and he says that by so doing I have not advanced my cause even a bit; and certainly in South Africa the feeling against Indians is now much more bitter than before. Certainly it would be; whoever denied it? If you went and claimed equality with a proud and arrogant people of that kind, no doubt they would be opposed to you; but would you expect me, would any intelligent Indian expect me or any other spokesman to shrink back from expressing the idea of equality merely because it might offend the white people in this part or in that part of the Empire? That was my sin, and this is how General Smuts describes the thing:—

"This latter change is in some measure due to the Sastri mission. Mr. Sastri by his mission and his speeches has undoubtedly made matters worse; he has for instance never failed whenever an opportunity presented itself to attack the Indian policy of South Africa and thereby has greatly exasperated public opinion in that dominion, already very sensitive on this issue. In other dominions he has made people alive to the issue—(Great sin on my part, isn't it?)—indeed he has largely created it. The claim he has everywhere vigorously pressed for equal franchise and rights for Indians over the whole Empire has not only gone further than the local claims of the Indians themselves—(I will recur to this point a little later)—but has tended to raise opposition in quarters where it did not exist before. It is because I foresaw this development that I did not invite Mr. Sastri to include South Africa in his tours." (Loud Laughter).

Now, a statement of that kind coming from him, ladies and gentlemen, you will allow me to produce before you as emphatic and conclusive testimony that my mission was not a failure. I have roused opinion in these parts. I have told these people that the Indians claim equality and have disturbed the equanimity of Gen. Smuts and his Boer followers. It is something to have done. I was very much concerned the other day to read in a paper that our honoured friend Lala Lajpat Rai quoted Gen. Smuts' testimony as to the failure of my mission. This is not failure as I read it. It means that I presented my case as you would have had me present it, and that it brought me the measure of success which it was possible to attain in all the circumstances. Now, ladies and gentlemen, I come to another part of Gen. Smuts' memorandum.

The other day in our legislative house, I mean our legislative house, the Council of State (laughter) we passed, the Government of India remaining ostentatiously neutral, a reciprocity measure which Dr. Gour had persuaded the Assembly to pass last session. It was feared by some of our timid friends in the house, and perhaps also government shared the fear, that if we enacted a reciprocity measure, that is to say, if we returned blow for blow to the whites in the dominions, they would be greatly incensed and they would do much more harm and we should be seriously injuring our position. I told them "I have known Gen. Ian Smuts; Gen. Smuts is certainly not a timid or a vacillating exponent of white opinion. I have met him before and he has told me personally that if we used our reciprocity power he would never take it ill at all: in fact he expressed surprise that we had not done it already in 1921." Here is what he says:—"India should be free to deal with nationals of the dominions on a basis of reciprocal treatment and neither on her part nor on the part of the dominions concerned should there be any resentment or ill-feeling in the matter."

So we have done nothing wrong. General Smuts should say "Well done, India", and I am sure he does. But you may ask "Very well, you have done it; where shall we be next?" Ladies and gentlemen, permit me to tell you one thing: that we were not the first people to throw a stone at our neighbours in the Empire. We had never done it before: we had suffered; we had been humiliated; we had been deeply pained; but we never hit back, hoping by our patience, by our resignation, by our Christian virtue of submission, to convince the white tyrant that he was continually mis-behaving against the law of God and man. It did not pay us. At last we have taken one puny step of what is called euphemistically reciprocity. I had to explain one thing to my colleagues the other day, the difference between reciprocity and retaliation. It is a curious Empire, it is a curious political organisation, this British Commonwealth. Curiously are we, heterogeneous people, mixed up together in this wonderful unit, that instead of exchanging amenities and expressions of good will and preferential duties and so forth, we should be engaged in the task of exchanging blows and taunts of retaliation instead of returning and reciprocating kindness. We did not make this Empire. Those that made it and those that keep it in such a condition ought to be ashamed of it. We need not hang down our heads; we are trying everything, let me tell you, to keep this Empire together; it is the European, the white man in the dominions and in places like South Africa and East Africa, who will not tolerate another people in his household, except they be serfs and slaves and helots—it is he that is the danger to the Empire. He is the wrecker; we, if anything, are preservers of the Empire.

Then, ladies and gentlemen, General Smuts has made another statement which is exceedingly interesting. He says "What are these Indian people asking? They forget the essence, the first things, the A. B. C. of politics." What is that, pray? It would appear that we are not an independent government like Japan or China, and yet this is what he says:—"Neither Japanese nor the Chinese people have claimed what these Indian people claim." Now, as an assertion it is emphatically untrue. Only a Boer could put it forward, because the Japanese and the Chinese feel their exclusion from citizenship rights, the same as we, and being stronger and backed up by an independent government their protests are much more vehement and they get, let me tell you now, being backed up by their own government, they get more humane and better treatment from these Colonials than we do.

Let that pass. But then, is it just to maintain that we who belong to this Empire, who own the same allegiance and salute the same Union Jack as much as any white man, is it right that we, who fought for the Empire and saved these very white people from extinction (Applause), is it right that we should be told that we have no more right to

demand equality than the Chinese or the Japanese people? What, then, is the inducement to remain within this Empire, if there is no difference between one who belongs to the Empire and one who is outside the Empire? Is there no difference between the German whom we had to fight in time of war and us in time of peace? If we are to be treated worse than the Austrian and the German, what place have we within this Empire? And yet General Smuts puts us this question. He says:—"The Indian Government should not claim from other Empire Governments what the friendly Governments of Japan and China would not claim, and the fact is"—as I have told you, it is not a fact,—“that with neither of these Governments have we any difficulties in the Dominions, while the difficulties with India are notorious and growing”.

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, I must ask you to listen to me with some patience and give me a little time, for this is a very important and large subject. It concerns our honour. If I therefore keep you a little longer than the customary lecture period, do not blame me. Now they say, after returning from the Kenya mission, I am a changed man. I do not take it ill at all. I am not at all inclined to think that is an ill compliment. If there is any Indian who can go through the experiences through which I went in connection with this Kenya mission, if there is any Indian who could have seen the things that I saw who could have heard the sentiments which I was compelled to hear, who could have experienced the utter lack of responsibility that it was my misfortune to encounter in London during a few weeks of bitter sorrow and suffering: if there is any such Indian, I think, Ladies and Gentlemen, most of us should disown him. I have changed. Any Indian would have changed. General Smuts in another part of his speech blamed me for using a harsh expression and stigmatising this Empire as a Boer Empire. It strikes me as extraordinary that General Smuts should be ashamed of it. He should be rather proud of it. If I said that he was able to spread his doctrines and impose his ideals on the whole of the Commonwealth, why does he not take it as a compliment? Evidently, he felt that he was in an uncomfortable position, because I was drawing prominent attention to the fact that the Kenya decision was calculated and intended to please the Boer. He took that very ill, and he blamed me for it, but so long, Ladies and Gentlemen, as there is a colour bar, so long as there is a first class citizenship and a second class citizenship created in response to the demand of either the Boer or the Britisher, who is not ashamed to follow the Boer, so long as that is the case within the Empire, I am fully justified in using the expression which I did, and discarding the expression, the British Commonwealth.

There are many people who think that I was quite wrong in stating that the Kenya decision was based on a certain amount of fear of the

whites in Kenya who threatened to rebel. Now that is quite true. It could be proved at any time. In fact the white Kenyan was rather proud of it. He came and said 'We are going to fight the British Empire.' Well, they talked about it all over the place, the newspapers were full of articles on that subject, and even a magazine like the *Nineteenth Century and After*, was quite willing to admit an article in which it was openly stated that the white men in Kenya had arranged everything for a rebellion. Well, I am not going to detain you by trying to prove these facts. But there is a point in it. There are a number of innocent people here, Englishmen, English women, Britishers of all shades, quite innocent people—I do not blame them at all—who tell me, 'What? Do you want us seriously to believe that the British Cabinet was afraid of a few thousand whites in Kenya and therefore gave an unjust decision? Oh no, it is impossible. We who put down the Germans at a tremendous cost, do you mean we are going to be afraid of the white Kenyans?' But what is the logical inference of such a claim? If you say and if people believe, as I am afraid there are a few ignorant people in the Government of India, who believe, that the British Cabinet did not give this unjust decision out of fear of a very tiresome rebellion, what, then, led them to give us this palpably unrighteous decision, which disgraces the Empire and which blackens the name of the British nation? Why did they give this decision, then, if not out of fear? Are these innocent people prepared to say that the British Cabinet was inherently vicious, loved injustice more than justice, did not care for the long course of pledges and promises to people and brushed aside wantonly their own ideals which they had held out to other people? Oh, I prefer the other alternative, because I know it is in accordance with the facts of British history, especially of recent British history. Let us believe it, and I would ask you to believe it; if you are lovers of the British name, as I am, in spite of my great resentment and vexation, if you are lovers of the British name, never come and tell me that they were not afraid, but loved injustice for its own sake. Lord Olivier, who criticised the Kenya decision the other day, showed a much firmer grasp of the reality. Lord Peel—I must speak of his lordship with great consideration, specially because he is no longer in the India Office now,—Lord Peel, when I was there, specially told me, 'Now, Mr. Sastri, do please moderate your language; do not let your mastery of English lead you to a fall; do not generalise. Especially, do not mention the words 'equal citizenship,' 'equality' and things like that. They won't go down. English people don't love these abstract expressions.' Now I owe to Lord Peel many kindnesses. I received much assistance from him. But he took too much on himself to advise me that way, and I never forgot, in spite of his lordship, that the British people are lovers of justice and equality all over the world.

In his lordship's speech at the Imperial Conference, I find, however, the word 'equality' appearing more than three times. Between the time, therefore, that I left London and the time that this Conference met, a great change had come over Lord Peel. He had become somewhat of a lover of abstractions.

Now Ladies and Gentlemen, I wish to say one word about the mission that is proceeding in the course of the next two weeks, if possible, to set this wrong righted, and I will only permit myself one remark that amongst them there is one, His Highness the Prince Aga Khan, who appreciates the real nature of these wrongs. In my frequent talks to him, I remember one expression coming from His Highness again and again. He was referring particularly to our franchise rights and immigration rights, and he said, "Whatever we surrender, whatever we might have to compromise, we cannot compromise on these two fundamental rights. We have no right to compromise on these two things, because they do not belong to us or to the Indians resident in Kenya; they belong to the Indian nation; they belong to our children and our children's children; we have no right to disgrace posterity within the British Empire. Whatever you yield, Mr. Sastri, do not yield on this immigration question". I am glad His Highness has accepted a place on this Kenya mission, and while he is there I will continue to hope that he will exert his utmost to press our demand. Because even when we were in London, good friends at the India Office used to tell us frequently, "It is all very well for you three fellows of the Indian Legislature to come up and say 'Oh, we will wreck the Empire and we will do this and that', but pray, don't you think of the good of the Indians resident in Kenya? Would they like you to use these harsh words? If the Kenya whites are wrong, you must not be equally wrong on the other side. Your mission, as we understand it, is to try and do what little good you can to your countrymen in Kenya. Go down on your knees, surrender, compromise and abandon anything, if you can get them a little good; no matter what happens to the Indian name—but benefit your countrymen in Kenya." Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is, in many cases, well-meant advice. In other cases, however, it is not well-meant. They always tell us who are struggling for large liberties "We will give you some little, be quiet", and so they silence generation after generation. If we are looking always for the praise of the powers that be, if we are desirous of getting a pat on the back, why blame them for bribing us with little gifts so that we may forget, like children, the big things that India is hungry for and that she must get if she is to take her place among the nations of world? Sir Malcolm Hailey put a question at the last session "What would your countrymen say there? Do they want you to retaliate and hit back and enter on a franchise war with us there? Won't they suffer much? After all,

you can hit only one white man or two; they can hit lakhs of your people at one stroke". Yes, I have asked many Kenya Indians what they would want. We had a very strong deputation of the leaders of Kenya Indians working with us. I told them particularly: 'Now this is primarily your matter; we have come here to assist; do tell us what you would like; would you accept the crumbs that offer and ask us to lay down arms?' 'No', to a man they said. 'We come from a numerous African Congress. We are resolved to fight this battle to the bitter end. Do not surrender. It is not we who are concerned. It is India's honour we are concerned to maintain. We would rather be killed by the rebellious whites in the streets of Nairobi and Mombasa than that India yielded a jot of her honour and self-respect.' (Hear, Hear). Well, what are they doing there today? History is repeating itself. Just as when in the bitter years before 1911, longer than I care to recollect, Mr. Gandhi and his brave South Africans undertook a campaign, in the face of terrible odds, of passive resistance, just as when our Bengali countrymen, sore at the partition, declared a boycott of British goods finding that everything else failed, just as on those two occasions we Moderates and Extremists, title hunters and revolutionaries, all of us joined together and said: "We will stand by these countrymen of ours. It is true they have taken a strong step, but what could the poor men do?" So have we now to stand by our Kenya brethren in their sore hour of trial. After trying every attempt at pacification, the Congress there has declared non-payment of the poll tax which they consider unjust and inequitable. What are we going to do? Are we going to say to Kenya Indians, 'We cannot support you in this extreme measure'? I hope we shall rise, even as we rose on the two memorable occasions I have named, I hope we shall rise to the full height of our nationhood and support our Kenya Indians in their hour of bitter, alas, it may be today, losing struggle. Lord Hardings once said to the British Empire "What could the poor Indians do in South Africa? They are perfectly justified in inaugurating passive resistance. May we expect Lord Reading or the Honourable Sir Narasimha Sarma to declare some day before the session closes: "What could the Kenya Indians do; we are behind them in their refusal to pay the poll tax?" And now, you may say that some of us in arguing this question are going a little beyond the proper limits when we say 'Oh! if we were a Dominion, if only we were a Dominion!' and then our critics, not altogether white critics, I mean some Indians too, they say: "You must be utterly foolish to talk like that. How could it benefit you if you were a Dominion in the struggle against a white people? Even if you were completely independent like China and Japan, you could do nothing." I do not say we could despatch our army; I do not say we could fight these people on their own ground; but I do say this, that

our case would be advocated on the highest ground; that the Government of India would not be afraid to stand out and say, we are altogether and completely for the Indian case. What do you find on the other side? The Government of Kenya is entirely at the disposal of the whites of Kenya. The whites of Kenya rule the province. The Government are doing everything that the whites of Kenya ask them to do. The Government of India here put their finger on their lips and say, "Don't say that, lest you displease the other side." And is it likely that we shall go to the wall or that we shall come triumphant out of the struggle in which the people on the one side have a Government which is constantly afraid of the other side, or a Government which completely identifies itself with its own people and comes forward and puts the case of the whites against the black, Africa versus India? Will Government say in its turn "India, not Africa"? I ask you, if we have no such Government, don't we stand certainly to lose in this struggle? That is the difficulty. If we had a Dominion Government, the Viceroy would speak as we wish him to speak to the outer world. Instead, the Viceroy speaks to us as he is bidden to speak by Lord Peel with the British Cabinet behind him. Well, that is why we ask for Dominion status. We find that, pitted as we are against a people who have a Government solidly behind them, proud to stand up for their subjects and not afraid of the British Cabinet, we have a Government that go a certain distance—I am not denying it—but then are prevented by the constitution, by the fact that they are agents of the Secretary of State and of the British Cabinet, from going as far as they should. That is the chief difficulty.

I have mentioned only one general consideration. Shall I mention to you two points in respect of which our not being a Dominion is a severe handicap in this struggle? Do not misunderstand me. I am not quarrelling with individuals, but I am bound to draw your attention to this, unpleasing as it may seem, oh, mightily distasteful as it would be to the British Government here. We are going to send a delegation to fight our case with the Colonial office. Mind you, you must dismiss all prepossessions from your mind, and tell me whether you would allow that delegation to be headed by an Englishman, by a white man? He may be the noblest, the most philanthropic, he most pious Christian; he may completely identify himself with our case. But do you expect him to forget that there are certain things that he cannot say and that we should say? For example when driven to the wall, we should say to the British Cabinet and to the Colonial Office, 'How dare you expect after this decision that we should remain in the Empire?' Do you expect such a good man,—even as Lord Willingdon—to say that for you? There is almost nothing, I know, that Lord Willingdon would not do to uplift and to raise India's name. If you do not expect him to

say that, it is hard to find any Englishman for that position. I go so far as to say that it is an Indian case, the bitterest feelings are entertained by the Indian people. It is they, then, that should present this case before our adversaries. Why, have we not got men here who can do that? Have we not got men whose loyalty, whose empire patriotism are unquestioned? It is a very difficult office for an Englishman. It is an office which we should naturally and properly and rightfully hold. Assume now we are a Dominion for one minute, assume that everybody in the Assembly and in the Council of State was in a position to exercise power, the usual legislative power over the Cabinet: would they dare go and ask an Englishman, merely because he had administered a province, to head such a delegation?

There is another question. You all know that the British Cabinet has decided that Kenya should be administered for the benefit of the African native and not for the benefit of either the white man or the Indian. As you know, we accepted that decision with enthusiasm. We said that is the right and the only proper view to take of the case. Only we begged the British Cabinet to see actually carried out any policy and any measure which would protect the African native. But they have now ruled that our immigration should be controlled. We will pass by the plausible fallacy, the misleading sophism that they employ in describing it. They do not say the Indians should not come; all that they say is that people who follow this profession and that profession and the other profession (only Indians follow these profession) should not come or that they would be prevented from coming in. So while on paper it does not look like racial discrimination it is intended to be and it is going to operate as a racial discrimination.

Now, let us assume that in the interests of the African native it was necessary to control immigration. I will convince any impartial man that far greater danger to the African native comes from the British immigrant than from the Indian immigrant. The unhappy Indian immigrant is weak; they will not protect him; he is only an economic competitor. The African native himself could crowd him out or he may be told to clear out, unless he means to make trouble and shed blood and do a hundred other things which I will not mention. But you read history. You have read about the way in which the white man, when he comes to live amongst black populations, among uncivilised peoples, uses his power, his superior civilisation, his superior command of fighting materials, his superior command of the destructive weapons of human warfare. Lynching is not an Indian word, is it? Well, flogging comes easily to the white man. Why, the other day, some Kenya white, it seems, was shocked at the idea of anybody preventing him from flogging the African native. "What is the African native for and what am I here for?" That is the way he thinks. I ask you in all honesty, from whom does

the African native stand to lose more? From the Indian who is only a competitor at the most, who may be told to go any moment, or from the white man who goes and stays and tyrannises and exploits and steals land and limbs and liberties and refuses to yield them up? Is he an easy man to deal with? Let India answer. Only the other day we made a national demand for our liberties, and what answer did we get? When the Englishman is enthroned in power, when he commands the purse, when he controls the political liberties of another people, when he is established in economic ascendancy over another people, he does not let go easily. When he does wrong, none of his compatriots will say so, while he is alive. Sometime after perhaps, a historian professing to ransack old libraries and the India Office records might say "Oh, he might have done better", but as a rule the white man, especially in power over coloured populations, is hard to displace. If the British Cabinet desired to become trustees of the African native and therefore wanted people of certain kinds not to come into his country; if there were a bonafide disposition to find the people really harmful, really dangerous to the colony and keep them out, I should say every time, keep out the white man. Well, even some of you may think it is an astonishing doctrine for me to propound to you. Perhaps some of you wonder, uneasily, why you ever came here. But that is the honest truth. If we were a dominion government and our principal spokesmen went to England, they would not hesitate to say, "If you want to protect the African native, keep the white man out." And yet, what did the British Cabinet tell us? "No, no. We are not going to restrict you by mentioning you as a race; but we will carefully enumerate all the occupations that you follow in East Africa and we shall say 'men following these occupations shall not come'. And yet the Government of India write a serious communique to the press and say, "It is a great thing gained that Indians are not going to be excluded as a race by legislation," as if it matters anything to us whether we are going to be excluded as a race or as the followers of our own peculiar occupations; whether we are going to be excluded by legislation or by an ordinance which is derived from the law of the land, what does it matter? We are to be excluded one way or another.

Now, there is only one more word which I shall say before I conclude. In following controversies of this nature you would be sometimes impressed by the fact that there are a great number of Anglo-Indian newspapers here who have the fairness to allow that the Indian case is good and sound and who sometimes go further and blame the white people of Kenya for their un-Imperial narrow outlook; and perhaps you will think that it is a very satisfactory state of things. I dare say we must be thankful for small mercies in this world; it is a very good thing and I am willing to acknowledge assistance and sympathy from what-

ever quarter it comes. But allow me to say that I have noticed another thing also and we must put the two things together. I went through the dominions and as I described the transitional stage in which our government stands, how there are still large departments of administration to accrue to our people, how we are still suffering from bad law, from ill-understood conditions, they said: "How tiresome of these English folk! They have long held India; they always say they are there only for the good of the Indian people; why don't they give you self-government and quietly go back?" Now, the white people abroad are quite willing to give you sympathy when you fight the British people here; and these British people here are quite willing to give you their sympathy when you fight their white kinsmen abroad. So we have sympathy exactly from the quarter which is unable to translate that sympathy into anything like practice. Like sensible people we ought to take notice of this: the colonial white man, not interested in maintaining his ascendancy in India, thinks that the Britisher here is wrong; and the white man here, who is not interested in Kenya personally, thinks that his white kinsman there is wrong. Our deduction is that both are wrong. But whether here or there, the white man teaches us how to maintain our ground; the white man teaches us how to defend our liberties and our rights. The moment he is offended, he does not pause to consider, "What will this man say and what will that man say and what will my government say?" He hits you straight in the eye, straight; that is what he did when he had a quarrel with poor President Kruger; he did not wait to convince the world. Those that have power are not restrained in their use of it, while we, that have not the power, try to deceive ourselves that this world is governed entirely by reason and by justice. There is a certain scope for argument, for reason, for adjustment. But there are stern limits to the operation of these enlightening influences. Beyond that limit our operations have to change and assume a new phase. Now, ladies and gentlemen let me not allow you to misunderstand me. I will declare exactly what I mean. The time for argument, for cool presentation of a case is there. But there is also a time when you are expected in this world to use such power, as you have, honourably and, let me add, constitutionally. It is those that shrink from using even that power, lest it should displease the powers that be, who write themselves down in history as people that do not deserve any power. That is my reading of the situation. I wish this were a different world. I wish the war had really taught us the lessons that we thought we had all learnt. I wish the British Empire really stood for those principles of justice and fair play and human brotherhood of which we dreamt a little while ago. Those principles and ideals are still there, and perhaps the next generation of Indians will live in a time when it is suffi-

cient to show, that our cause is just, for it to prevail. I am painfully driven to the conclusion that that time is still to come. In the meantime we cannot afford to lose the battle in Kenya or anywhere in the Empire. But if occasionally you hear from me advocacy of some measure that may seem to be of a combative character, be sure it is not actual fighting, for we have not the fighting strength. We are essentially non-violent. But such as we have, such means as we have of ensuring our self-respect, it is not only weakness, but it is treason to our people, it is betrayal of our children not to exercise with due restraint, with due submission to the Almighty who knows how to judge the right from the wrong and can pull down the mighty from their seats, with due submission to Him, but with a clear consciousness that in the prosecution of our own right, the exercise of lawful means, peaceful pressure, constitutional power, is not only rightful but dutiful. In that consciousness we have to fight our battles. (Loud Appluse)

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—W. Burrige, M. A., M.B., B.Ch., L.M.S., S.A., and N. K. Siddhanta, M. A.,—supported by a strong Consultative Board representative of all the Departments in the University.

Special Features.

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

Annual Subscription.

	Town.	Mofussil.	Foreign.	
For Students of the University,	Rs. 2 0	2 8		} 10s
For all others	Rs. 4 0	4 8		

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

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

M. B. REHMAN,
Business Manager.
Lucknow University Journal
LUCKNOW UNIVERSITY, }
LUCKNOW. }
LUCKNOW: UPPER INDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, Ltd., 41
Aminabad Park.

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

Malabar Tenancy Problem

BY

P. KODANDA RAO,
Servants of India Society.

An impartial study of the Complex Subject.
Price Annas eight only (Postage extra).

Apply to:

The SECRETARY,
Servants of India Society
Royapettah (MADRAS).

The Book For You!

—0—

IF you want a treatise noted for clearness and conciseness, a treatise that within a limited space will teach you the principles of clinical medicine, better than most books of double the size and double the price, then buy

An Introduction to Clinical Medicine

PART I

BY

DR. A. J. NORONHA, M. D.

The book is illustrated most profusely with actual photographs from Indian experience. You have the very example, the actual typical clinical picture before your very eyes. Purchase the book to-day and it will bring it home to you that we are speaking the truth !!

To convince you still further we need only mention that the book is recommended to all the Civil Hospitals and Dispensaries all over the Bombay Presidency, Aden and the Persian Gulf by the Surgeon-General with the Government of Bombay. Besides it is spoken of in the highest terms by leading teachers of Medicine in India. *It is the book for the Student.*

The book for the Practitioner.

Price Rs. 12-8. Postage Extra.

For Copies Apply of —

The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City.

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 to 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,
Budhawar Peth, POONA CITY.

FOR terms of Advertisement, please apply to the Manager, SERVANT OF INDIA,
Kibe Wada, Bhudhwar Peth, POONA CITY.

Printed at the Aryabhushan Press, Poona
by A. V. Patwardhan.