

THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. VII. No. 33.]

POONA—THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1924.

{ INDIAN SUBS. Rs. 6
FOREIGN SUBS. 10 s.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	285
ARTICLES :—	
The Assembly and the Lee Commission Indian States and Direct Negotiations. By K. M. Panikkar	387
Opium Policy—III. By C. F. Andrews.	389
A LETTER FROM LONDON	391
REVIEW :—	
Bishop Whitehead on India. By V. V. S.	392
MISCELLANEA :—	
South Indian Floods	395

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

Capitulation.

THE change that has come over Mahatma Gandhi is as complete as it is sudden. At the time of the All-India Congress Committee meeting, not so long ago, he was all for fight—with the Swarajists: on other parties he never wasted his attentions. Now he has capitulated entirely to the Swarajists and has even begun to notice the existence of other parties. One searches in vain the pages of *Young India* for the reason of such a dramatic change. Domestic differences he has suddenly come to abhor. But it was he who in a large measure created these differences, and he never seemed to be fearful of schisms. He knew that his was a new gospel and was bound to divide the ranks of national workers. But this division, based as it was on principle, was never allowed by him to invade personal relations, and there everybody was content to leave the matter. He has, however, now, quite unaccountably, grown sick of internecine struggle and is eager to purchase peace and unity at any price. The explanation of this complete *volte face* is not apparent. One reason that he gives is not convincing. The non-co-operation movement was meant to be a non-violent force. Really, however, he says, it never became entirely non-violent. The truth is however just the other way. The movement was non-violent enough, the non-co-operation part of it never attained any appreciable strength. It is true that most non-co-operators were non-violent not as a matter of principle, but from a sense of expediency. But at least they were outwardly non-violent; but real non-co-operation, however, was never much in evidence in their conduct. All

the time people proclaimed their adherence to non-co-operation, they were co-operators at heart and in practice, and what has perhaps now induced Mahatma Gandhi to lay aside non-co-operation altogether, is, not so much the Swarajists' insincerity about non-violence, as about non-co-operation, but even of this he must have had a glimmering long, long ago. If, therefore, the process of Mahatma Gandhi's reasoning remains obscure, we only hope that hereafter at all events care will be taken to build up public life on the basis of genuine conviction instead of an camouflage.

Unity.

* * *

IT would appear that Mahatma Gandhi is keeping politics altogether out of the Congress because he finds that the present political parties are so unreal, the Swarajists professing to do in the name of non-co-operation things which are diametrically opposed to the principle they avow. But if unity is to be reached in the Congress by the exclusion of all politics from that body, the only result will be that political differences will be translated from the Congress into other bodies. Thus political disunion will still remain; there will be unity only on certain non-political matters. But if all parties are again to join the Congress, why should be excluded from it matters on which, there is almost complete unanimity? Mahatma Gandhi mentions India's demand for Swaraj: he is willing to participate in formulating a scheme for Swaraj, which on behalf of India as a whole will be presented to Parliament. In this task it will not be at all difficult to frame a scheme which will be acceptable to all parties in the country. If such an agreed scheme is possible, it would be best for the United Congress to formulate it and present it to Parliament as representative of all sections of political opinion. What will be our unity worth if we cannot utilise the Congress for sponsoring an agreed scheme? Our aim should be not to exclude all politics from the Congress, but such politics as raise serious differences. The Congress should therefore lend all the prestige it has acquired by its association with all the leaders of the country to the Bill embodying India's minimum demand.

* * *

Insistence on
Spinning.

* * *

THIS would indeed be the *raison d'être* of unity. Those who are now outside the Congress would go far

to get back into that body, provided of course they have not to sacrifice any of their vital principles, if by so doing a momentum would be given to the constitutional movement which they are already carrying on. For the rest they would be glad that non-co-operation has been suspended, but there is nothing in the programme which would otherwise be positively attractive to them. As we suggested last week, non-co-operation should not only be suspended, but definitely abandoned, and conditions regarding hand-spinning should be relaxed. These conditions are no doubt framed with a view to the valuation which Mahatma Gandhi puts upon hand-spinning. "If we are permanently to interest the masses in the national welfare of the country, the spinning wheel is the only medium. If we are to banish pauperism from the land, the spinning wheel again is the only remedy." The conditions Mahatma Gandhi proposes are lenient enough for those who assess spinning at this value, but for those who do not allow these high claims for spinning, the conditions are unreasonably stringent. When every point likely to raise a difference of opinion is being deliberately thrust aside for the sake of unity, it hardly stands to reason that Mahatma Gandhi should insist upon half an hour's daily spinning as a condition for admission to ordinary membership of the Congress. The condition is also impracticable. Its fulfilment cannot be ensured by any set of rules and it will again lead to the same cant and hypocrisy which we believe has made the Mahatma so sick of politics. We are not now considering how far those who do not believe in all the virtues claimed for the *charka* should go to meet Mahatma Gandhi for the sake of unity, but how far it would be right of Mahatma Gandhi, when devising means for unity, to impose upon all members of the Congress conditions which can be observed only by a very small section of people.

* * *

DR. BESANT has written to *Young India* to express her willingness to subscribe to Mahatma Gandhi's condition about spinning. Her opinion about spinning is just the same as ours, and if she accepts the condition it is only because, however limited may be her belief in the utility of spinning, it cannot be against her conscience to spin. The adverse judgment one may pass against the *charka* can never be raised to the dignity of a conscientious objection, and therefore, Mrs. Besant apparently feels, that her objection, such as it is, must not be allowed to stand in the way of a united Congress, if otherwise unity seems possible. What, however, Mahatma Gandhi must consider is whether it is ethically right to impose this condition upon men who openly declare that they can accept it only with a mental reserve? As Mahatma Gandhi is prepared to go into a conference convened for the purpose of formulating India's demand for Swaraj, although he himself does not see the expediency of such a step at

this time, even so Dr. Besant and some others will agree to the condition about spinning, in order to join the Congress, although in spinning they have not much faith. It is practically as inadvisable as it is morally unjustifiable. For conditions accepted with such an *arrirepensee* can never be strictly enforced and only lead to a make-believe, just the same malady from which the Congress is suffering and which Mahatma Gandhi wishes to cure. It is to be hoped therefore that Mrs. Besant's willingness to treat her objection to spinning as a minor objection will not blind Mahatma Gandhi to the cogency of the considerations advanced here. And it yet remains to be seen if the Swarajists and others will agree to do what Mrs. Besant has done, and surely Mrs. Besant's acceptance is also conditional, we suppose, upon there being a united Congress, i. e., others agreeing to that condition. We trust Mahatma Gandhi will see his way to relax this condition, to which many feel a serious objection to agree, though this objection is on a lower plane than on that of conscience.

* * *

The Boomerang. THREE years ago we characterised the celebration of the Ganapati festival in Poona as a Saturnalia of indecent songs and lectures in which the reputation of social reformers and Liberal politicians was attacked in most filthy language. This prostitution of religious festivities to political purposes and the free play given to obscenity for a fortnight have gone on unabated year after year after the death of Mr. Tilak. This year, however, the aggrieved party was not so much the Liberals as Gandhites, and not social reformers so much as the orthodox. The Swarajists employed all their powers of vituperation on non-co operators, and not much could be spared for the Liberal politicians, who till now were the sole targets of Tilakites' vile attacks. But the Tilakites themselves were this year hoisted with their own petard, for the Satyashodhak Samaj used the Ganapati festival to hold up to public opprobrium the innumerable ways in which the Brahmans exploited the ignorance and the poverty of the masses. This is a most commendable object to be sure, but the Satyashodhaks have also imitated somewhat the foul language of the Tilakites. It is no use, however, disguising the fact that this utilisation by the Satyashodhaks of the very means devised by the Swarajists for confounding the Liberals is giving some check to the orgies of the Tilakites, upon whom the moral pressure of public censure has had no effect. And, for a wonder, the Tilakites are now themselves seeing the danger of exploiting a religious festival for non-religious purposes. The Satyashodhaks are not behindhand in lathi-play either, which the Tilakites thought was their exclusive prerogative, and in Tilak's house itself, from where the spirit of the Ganapati festival radiated outside, the immediate followers of Tilak had to call in the aid of the Satanic Government's angelic police against a Satyashodhak Mela. And the *Mahratta*, this brave champion of the oppressed masses against the tyrannical Government, is so profuse in its gratitude to a European Superintendent of Police for giving prompt help to the Swarajists in putting down Satyashodhaks' activities. We must confess this is a novel way of practising non-co-operation with Government.

THE ASSEMBLY AND THE LEE COMMISSION.

THE rejection by the Assembly of Sir Alexander Muddiman's resolution on the Lee Commission's recommendations and the acceptance instead of Pandit Motilal's proposition on the subject, has been characterised by the entire Anglo-Indian and a large section of the British Press as an act of utter irresponsibility—'monkey-like' to use the elegant expression of the special correspondent of the *Times of India*. But if there has been any irresponsibility it is certainly not on the side of the non-official Indian members. The Commission was thrust upon India by a reactionary Secretary of State, in spite of the unanimous protests of its popular representatives. The Governor-General was obliged to find money for it by certification. The Commission has chosen to treat the evidence adduced before it as confidential, though there could be nothing in its nature to justify its being treated as confidential. Indeed some witnesses who wanted to give their evidence in public were not allowed to do so. If former Royal Commissions which enquired into the grievances and position of the Public Services in India could publish their evidence, why could not the present Commission do so? A spokesman of the Government of India said that the Government had accepted the recommendations of the Lee Commission without looking into evidence. That may tally with the Government of India's conception of its duty, but the representatives of the people in the Assembly cannot be blamed if they refuse to abdicate their right of independent judgment and resent being treated like little children. The Assembly would have been perfectly justified in throwing out the report on account of either of these considerations alone. But out of regard for the Labour Government in England, they have considered the recommendations on their merits. Their decision is the decision of all progressive elements in the country. It is emphatically not the outcome of obstructive tactics. Obstructive tactics were abandoned in the Assembly long ago even by the Swarajists. Before the Assembly gave its verdict the Madras, Behar and Assam Legislative Councils, knowing how difficult it would be to find funds for carrying out these recommendations—out of sheer 'irresponsibility'—had come to the same decision. Nay, from a blue book containing the opinions of Local Governments, which was circulated among the members of the Assembly late on the third day of the discussion, when they could not possibly go through the book, a member was able to point out that 'the Madras Government, the Raja Mahmudabad and the Ministers' were of the same opinion. We shall leave the question of irresponsibility at that.

The Lee Commission insist that their recommendations be accepted as a whole. The resolution put forward by Sir Alexander Muddiman was drafted in conformity with that wish. But he told the House in his speech that in addition to

modifications on three or four comparatively minor points, the Government intended to alter the basic pay of Indians. These changes are all welcome so far as they go. But however estimable the Commissioners may be, it is manifestly absurd to treat their recommendations as an inviolable whole. The Government at any rate are not treating them as *sacro sanct*. Whoever in India has bestowed any thought on the report of the Commissioners has distinguished the recommendations relating to the redress of the grievances of the present incumbents from those relating to future recruitment. Whatever misrepresentations Anglo-Indians may make and whatever misapprehensions may exist in the minds of the people in England, no one in India wants to be unjust or harsh to the Europeans who are already in service. Pandit Motilal's proposition, which has been accepted by the Assembly, suggests the examination of the grievances of the present incumbents by a small elected committee of the Assembly, who would go into the evidence given *in camera* relating to those grievances and make suitable recommendations. It is a great pity that the Home Member did not meet this proposal half way. If he had done so, if the elected representatives of the people had been given an opportunity of knowing first hand how married officers have been obliged to borrow on the pledge of their insurance policies, if sufficient confidence had been reposed in them, there is no reason to suppose that the majority of them at any rate, would not have come to the same conclusion as the Commissioners, whatever their opinion might be about the unreasonableness of the European's standard of life in the East. It would also have promoted harmony, between the Services and public men. The Government threw away a good opportunity.

On the question of recruitment the recommendations of the Commission, however satisfactory they would have been in pre-reform days, are altogether unacceptable. Indians do not want any more recruitment and control of the Services by the Secretary of State. They want the control to be transferred to the Government of India and the Local Governments, and recruitment entrusted to a permanent Public Service Commission as in England and the Dominions. It is in the first place a question of the status of our Government. What the Lee Commission have recommended in respect of Transferred Services, the public of India want in respect of Reserved Services also. One of the strongest criticisms against the Lee Commission report is that it has assumed diarchy and the present stage of constitutional development to continue for at least a generation and has taken no note of an imminent step in advance. In defence of the Commission it is argued that the Commission's terms of reference precluded it from taking such matters into consideration, and that their recommendations if given effect to need not stand in the way of further constitutional advance

From the privileged position occupied by the Services in the constitution of India, and the claims made by them and recognised by the authorities for compensation for loss of careers, it is a bold statement to make that the recommendations regarding the proportion &c. of the I. C. S. will not affect further constitutional progress. The Indian demand is that the recruitment of ordinary men in England should cease. Sir Alexander Muddiman said that if recruitment was once stopped it could not be revived and that if fresh recruits were not enlisted a large number of the older officers would retire on proportionate pensions. We cannot believe that the effect in either case will be what Sir Alexander fears it to be. But India is quite willing to face the situation if that should arise. Indians will not dispense with the service of Europeans even under complete self-government. But they would take really capable and exceptional men on whatever terms they could get them. For the work done by the ordinary civil servant, there is sufficient talent in the country, and that talent should be given scope as it is given in the Dominions. Even if all recruitment in England is stopped at once, for a whole generation at any rate the most important posts will be held by Europeans, and what Indian, who can at all understand politics, can contemplate the continuation of this state of things for a longer period by agreeing to the recommendations of the Lee Commission? We are told that if recruitment in England be stopped there will be a fall in the efficiency of administration, and that communal quarrels will increase. As to the latter, let us not forget that the presence of a strong European element in the services at present has not prevented their occurrence. Communal consciousness may take time to disappear, but the presence of a foreign bureaucracy will only lengthen the period of its existence, for left to themselves the different communities have a quicker chance of coming to an understanding. As to loss of efficiency, it is a mere bogey. The general and technical departments of Mysore, for instance, are all manned by Indians and they can certainly compare with those of advanced British provinces. Men rise to the occasion in an unexpected manner, as Bishop Whitehead found the converts from Telugu out-castes do in the matter of Church government (vide review of his book published elsewhere). But the best thing is to let Indians see the consequences for themselves. They are surely not less interested in the welfare of their country than outsiders are. Sir Alexander said that under the Lee recommendations only 45 Europeans would be recruited annually and he asked whether that was a large number for a Government of 300 million people. May we not ask if the absence of such a small number will make a great difference?

The decision of the Assembly represents public opinion quite faithfully. The Secretary of State can no doubt overrule it. But will it be statesmanship on his part to do so? There is also

the question of funds. Will it be wise of him to require the Central and Local Governments to impose new taxes for this reason? If recruitment in England be suspended for a time at least—as Sir Sivaswami Aiyar and Sir Chimanlal Setalvad who voted with the Government on this resolution urged—the financial gain may not be great, as shown by the Finance Member, but the moral gain will be immense. There will not be serious opposition to the redress of the grievances of the present incumbents in the budget discussions. Meanwhile, steps may be taken to reduce the basic pay of Indians to a reasonable standard. If in addition the control over the services be transferred to the Government of India, the good effect on the political atmosphere in India will be incalculable.

INDIAN STATES & DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS.

THE persistent refusal of the London Cabinet to discuss with Sir Ali Imam, the Agent of His Exalted Highness the Nizam, questions relating to the rendition of the Berars which the Hyderabad Durbar has been pressing for some time, is interesting in more ways than one. The attempt of the Nizam to open direct negotiations through an accredited agent in London is in itself a departure from well-established diplomatic usage in India; and Sir Ali's efforts to get the question raised in Parliament by way of interpellations, and discussed in the press through contributions from the pen of paid journalists constitute another feature in the new diplomacy to which Indian Princes are becoming familiar. Naturally conditions of negotiations now, when Princes like the Giakwar spend most of their time in Europe and others visit London as a matter of routine, is different from the time when the Brahmin agents of Nana Farnavis in London had to be saved from starvation by the kindly intervention of Edmund Burke. But still the Government of India has sternly refused the right of Indian Princes to negotiate over its head. The jealousy is a long standing one. An agent of the King of England was at one time sent to the court of "His Majesty's Ally," Nawab Muhammad Ali of the Carnatic, but the quarrels between the Governor of Madras and the Minister plenipotentiary became so acute that he had to be recalled after a year or two of futile but honest endeavour to prevent the corrupt officials of Madras from forcibly ruining the Nawab-Anglo-Indian officialdom opposed even the mission of Raja Ram Mohan Roy, though he was deputed by no less a person than the King of Delhi. Even the petition of the Queen of Oudh who went to plead the cause of her expropriated husband was rejected on the ground that it was not humble. It is well known how strongly the Government of India opposed the claim of Amirs Abdul Rahman and Habibullah to direct representation at St. James. That Sir Ali Imam after knowing all this—and as Law Member to the Government of India he must have known all this—should have

tried to open the question in England is surprising.

Sir All Imam must also have known the famous minute of Sir Heary Maine on which was based the resolution of the Government of India declaring that principles of international law were not applicable in the relations between the paramount power and the Indian States. The attempt that he is making to put the whole matter on a legal basis is therefore untenable. The legal claim which the Nizam puts forward to the Berars is hardly worth consideration. The actual alienation of the territory took place before the mutiny, and the perpetual assignment which Mir Mahbub Ali Khan executed only legalised what was a recognised fact. What the Nizam wants is really not to undo Lord Curzon's act, but the Dalhousie settlement. If the Government of India is to-day to go into the rights and wrongs of Lord Dalhousie's actions, then it is clear that a large portion of India now directly ruled by the crown will have to revert to Indian rulers. It is true that the British title to the Berars before Lord Curzon's time was defective, but from a legal point of view the sovereignty of Britain over half the area marked red on the map is perhaps even more defective. Cyprus before the war technically belonged to Turkey. Egypt during all the days that the High Commissioner ruled it was only a province of the Ottoman Empire. Sudan still belongs to Egypt. The Sultan of Zanzibar is the nominal owner of large areas on the African Coast, where the British now rule in absolute power. The legal claim of Britain to each of these is of the most flimsy kind; but that does not mean that Britain means to hand over the administration of each of these to their owners, the moment a claim is put forward and pressed.

The attempt to reopen the Berar question on a legal basis and to negotiate it directly in London, is fraught with far reaching consequences. There are many other Princes with a claim equally valid and powerful enough to press it with the same persistency. The Maharaja Scindia's claim to a large area which was first farmed out from him by the Company and later on added to British territories, is equally valid from a legal point of view. Once the wall which prohibits them from negotiating directly with London is breached, it is not unlikely that Whitehall may be bombarded with agents of Indian Princes, all appealing to ancient treaties for restoration of territories taken away from them. It is unlikely that under these circumstances either that the London Cabinet will agree to treat direct with the Nizam, or that the Simla Government will permit the question being reopened at all.

K. M. PANIKKAR.

OPIUM POLICY.

III.

I THINK it will be of real service, at this point, to tell over again the story about Mauritius Opium.

I have told it before in the daily Press, but it did not find much recognition, and it will well bear repeating, because there is an important lesson to be drawn from it, which those who take part in Indian public affairs ought to learn by heart. The lesson is that eternal vigilance is always necessary in public work.

About 2½ years ago, I found out from Miss Ellen La Motte's first book on Indian Monopoly Opium, some of the facts about Indian opium, sent to Mauritius. They showed that since the Hague Convention had been signed in 1913, the opium despatched from India to Mauritius, for smoking purposes had not decreased as it ought to have done, but had gone on increasing by leaps and bounds, so that in six years it had multiplied itself ten-fold and had reached the appalling amount of 120 chests—that is to say, nearly 8 tons! I wrote publicly to the papers, and pointed out the enormity of such a thing, and blamed the Government of India for sending such vast quantities of Indian opium to a small island that was inhabited for the most part by Indians. Thereupon, I received an official letter telling me that the Government of India had not sent any opium to Mauritius. At that time, I fully trusted the Government of India in these official matters, as not capable of making a false or prevaricating statement. Therefore I did not realise what was implied beneath the surface by this authoritative denial. At once, I withdrew the whole of my own statement and apologised to the Government of India for having published figures that were incorrect. After this apology, I had to run the gauntlet of the Anglo-Indian papers, which made all the capital they could out of my confessed misdeed. The Government of India meanwhile remained entirely silent in the matter.

But when I wrote to Miss La Motte about it, she answered me that she was perfectly certain that her figures were correct. I had no means in India of finding out the exact truth and naturally accepted at its face value the Government of India's declaration. Yet all the while my mistake was a very minor one, and not a major one at all.

For what I had not realised was that the opium to Mauritius was despatched from Calcutta, by private firms, although at the same time the opium thus sent (with the knowledge of the Government) was Indian monopoly opium. As far as I can gather, the Government of India by its blank denial only meant that as a Government it had not sent this opium to Mauritius. I did not, as I have said, realise this subtle distinction between the Government's sending Indian opium and private dealers' sending Indian opium prepared by Government. I only faced the one simple fact that tons of Indian monopoly opium prepared by the Government had reached Mauritius.

Later on, during a short stay in London in 1923, I made careful inquiries at the Colonial office. There I found that the figures I had quoted were

absolutely correct. It was only after puzzling my head and racking my brain for a long time that I saw at last this subtle distinction I have mentioned between Government sending Indian opium and private Indian dealers sending it. I saw also that I had been induced to make a far more extensive apology than was actually needed.

But in addition to finding out these mortifying things, I found out also some further interesting details about Mauritius itself, which compensated me for all the trouble. As I expected, the revenue had not decreased but increased enormously during the five years after the Hague Convention,—and this in spite of the promise given to the world to restrict opium.

To give some significant figures, in 1913-14, (the year after the Hague convention) the opium revenue of Mauritius was only Rs. 19,988. But within five years, this revenue had increased to Rs. 4,81,483. That is to say, the British colony of Mauritius had signed an agreement at the Hague Convention in the year 1913 to *restrict* opium imports, and yet within five years this very same colony had increased its opium revenue by about 2,500 per cent. This is a strange way of keeping promises, and observing the terms of the Hague Convention.

I found out some even more interesting facts. On July the 28th, 1913, Governor E. Bathfield signed an Ordinance, which was passed by his council, accepting the actual principle of opium restriction laid down by the Hague Convention. This Ordinance decreed that "in fulfilment of the resolution passed at the Hague Convention, the prohibition of opium into Mauritius shall come into effect on the 1st of January, 1914." So far all went well. The Governor appeared honestly determined to carry out the resolutions of the Hague Convention.

But on December 23rd, 1913, Governor J. R. Chancellor signed another Ordinance, which amended the previous one of July 29th, 1913. This new Ordinance declared, that the prohibition of opium into Mauritius would not take place from the 1st. of January 1914, (as contemplated) but would only take place after the issue, at some future date not specified, of a special proclamation.

Let us try to interpret facts. It appears to me, that the first Governor acted honourably and immediately on the Hague Convention resolution. **But in doing so**, he went further than the Colonial Office **wished**. Therefore the Colonial Office (which had to deal with Singapore and Hongkong, as well as Mauritius) sent the Governor an order to cancel the Ordinance. It seemed that an ingenious method had been found by which the lucrative profits of the opium traffic could be preserved for the different colonies, while at the same time a profession might be made to keep the terms of the Hague Convention. The hint had been given to the Secretary of State, that they need not be in such a violent hurry, in the different colonies, to

prohibit opium, because the Hague Convention did not fix any time limit, but only said that prepared opium should be restricted 'as soon as possible'! The Colonial Office, having to meet deficits in different colonial budgets, only too gladly fell in with the view of delaying to the utmost the date when opium should be restricted. In the interval, it is clear that in Mauritius at least the Revenue Department had determined to make as much money as possible. They increased their opium revenue from 20 thousand rupees to 482 thousand in less than five years. We may perhaps admire the business capacity of the revenue officers in Mauritius, but we can hardly congratulate either the Colonial Office or the India Office on the morality of their joint performance. It was not for this purpose they joined in signing the Hague Convention Resolutions.

There is such a thing under the Law as compounding a felony. I very much doubt whether in a court of equity the offence of the Indian Government in allowing such a vast amount of opium to be sent out to Mauritius from India was less than that of the Colonial Office in cancelling the Mauritius Ordinance prohibiting opium, and then importing into Mauritius ten times more Indian opium than before. Even yet I have not finished with this interesting narrative. A new light was thrown upon it by an educated Indian gentleman from Mauritius, who went over the facts with me only the other day. He states positively that this vast quantity of 120 chests of opium was never used for opium smoking in Mauritius at all, and that he did not notice any excessive drug addiction during the years 1914-18.

On the other hand, these were the very years of the rapid increase of morphia injections in North China. They marked the height of the contraband trade in morphia between China and Japan. I have very little doubt, therefore, that this Indian opium, which was sent out in such large quantities to Mauritius, was taken not for legitimate purposes at all, or even for semi-legitimate purposes. It was most probably smuggled from this out-of-the-way island either to Japan or to some other place where morphia can be manufactured and then used in this poison traffic.

We have recently had news of the intricate and world-wide organisation of the white slave traffic and every decent nation has now joined hands in trying to get rid of it. We know now the infamous gangs of world financiers who take part in it because of its fabulous profits. It needs to be understood that there is a traffic, hardly less infamous, whose profits are hardly less enormous, which will do anything and run any risk in order to stimulate the pernicious use of poisonous drugs among the races of mankind. It is time that all the decent nations of the world joined hands over the extirpation of this wickedness, just as they have joined hands over the prevention of kidnapping young girls for purposes of prostitution. There are many signs, that the same group are engaged

in exploiting both forms of vice. With opium and cocaine there is only one method of final prevention of the evil. It is to limit strictly the cultivation itself. For it is quite certain that whatever opium or cocaine, beyond the medical supply, is placed upon the market it will be used somehow or other for vice.

C. F. ANDREWS.

A LETTER FROM LONDON.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

LONDON, AUGUST 28

THE Irish question is just now quiescent, but it threatens to resume its old active virulence within the next three weeks. Mr. Thomas feels that he cannot remain more than a few days in South Africa where he now is, since the news that he has received from London is not encouraging. He had hoped, before he left, to be informed that the Conservative leaders had succeeded in making their influence felt sufficiently to be able to give an assurance that the Ulster Government would not actively oppose steps to be taken for the appointment of a Commissioner to represent the Northern area on the Boundary Commission. Mr. Baldwin went over to see Sir James Craig but apparently without much substantial result. He was followed a few days later by Sir Laming Worthington Evans, one of the signatories of the Irish Treaty. He, too, seems to have fared no better, for immediately afterwards it became semi-officially known that the Northern Government did not intend to make any change in its plans. The fact is that Ulster is obdurate and will resist by force any attempt to impose a Boundary that does more than provide for the exchange of pockets of Nationalists and Orangemen on either side of the present boundary. Whether this is all that lies within the competence of the Commissioners is a matter for their own interpretation. Sir James Craig and his colleagues appear to be convinced that they must inevitably suffer under the decision of the Commissioners, whatever their interpretation may be. Whether this indicates what in common parlance is known as a guilty conscience or whether it is in the nature and make up of the Ulsterman to deny ordinary honesty and reasonable intelligence to non-Ulsterman none can say. But the fact is that suspicion is ingrained, with the result that Ulster will not consent to nominate a Commissioner nor will she, if she can help it, enable His Majesty's Government to nominate one on her behalf, in order to give effect to the clear meaning and purpose of Article 12 of the treaty.

Whether the House of Lords will be so ill-advised as to throw out the Government Bill when it is introduced at the beginning of next session is a matter for the gods. It is impossible to say whether the Lords will try to commit suicide so foolishly and thus provide the other side with invaluable ammunition. If the Government were forced to go to the country on the Irish-cum-House of

Lords issue, as would probably well be the case, it is more than likely that the Conservative Party would be rent asunder, for the Tory leaders realise that they could not have a worse case to fight upon than this and most of them, at any rate, are not at all enamoured of the attitude of Ulster. If the Bill is ultimately passed and then Ulster refuses to recognise an Act of the Imperial Parliament, this would, it has been said, be regarded by the Tory leaders as tantamount to an act of rebellion, which they could not possibly condone, for obvious reasons. Personally, I don't think that the Lords will throw out the Bill, but what will come after is still to be revealed. Meanwhile, Mr. E. J. Duggan, one of the Irish leaders who signed the Treaty, has been putting forward in forcible language the Free State viewpoint, and has made it clear that the Free State does not consider that Northern Ireland is entitled to take advantage of one part of Article 12 and defy public opinion on the other part. It cannot contract itself out of a united Ireland and then refuse to appoint a member of the Boundary Commission that must in that event be set up. If the one then the other; if not the other, then not the first.

The French Parliament has now approved the London Agreement, after a heavy defeat of the Poincarists by the Government. M. Herriot's convincing eloquence has carried all before it, and his policy of conciliation, making a new era in French diplomacy, has been well backed by public opinion. Had France really been behind M. Poincaré there is not the slightest doubt that there would have been a speedy change of Prime Ministers after M. Herriot's return to Paris, where, in fact, he had a magnificent public reception. In Berlin, things have not gone so well, for obvious reasons. Dr. Marx had the difficult task of expounding an unpopular Agreement. He and his Ministerial colleagues have undoubtedly put up a splendid fight. I learn that they did everything possible to concede to France, when in London, in the hope of a satisfactory decision on the question of the Ruhr. That they did not altogether succeed we know, but the fact has not tended to diminish the difficulties that the Chancellor has had to face in inducing the Reichstag to accept his interpretation of the situation. The Nationalists, who have little in the nature of good leadership, have stated their declaration to refuse their assent to the Agreement, and at the moment of writing it is still uncertain whether the Government will obtain the necessary two-thirds majority for the Bills that they have introduced in order to give effect to the Agreement, which, in anticipation, they have declared their intention to sign on the 30th. One news-agency states that all the Bills have received the two-thirds majority except the Railway Bill. Unless the Government gets its way, the President, Herbert, will dissolve the Reichstag in the hope of better things from the next one. The Nationalists pretend to think that if they cause

the rejection of the Bills or any important one^s among them they can force better terms from France and the other Allies. This is highly problematical, and the alternative is a still darker one for Germany.

Meanwhile, many interests are waking up to the possibilities of economic peril to this country from a fulfilment by Germany of the Dawes plan. People are beginning to ask themselves whether we can in fact afford to accept reparations from Germany and if so what kind, and what will be the effect upon British industry of German reparations in kind, such as coal, to other countries. Since the Ruhr invasion and the consequent stoppage of German coal export from that area, there has been a considerable increase in the British coal export trade, especially from South Wales. Now the Miners' Federation have announced their determination to prevent the political considerations of any party from taking action that would result in economic disadvantage to its members, and it has called upon the Prime Minister to receive a deputation to place its views before him. This he cannot now do until after his return from Geneva, where he is attending the Assembly of the League. The episode is, however, significant of internal instability in the Labour Party. Another evidence of this instability lies in the fact that the Free Trade Chancellor of the Exchequer has discovered an important and powerful Protectionist section in the party. These phenomena may mean a great deal in the eventual re-alignment of parties which most people regard as inevitable, having regard to the peculiarities of British political temperament. The recently advertised differences between Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Snowden are, so a well-informed friend tells me, greatly exaggerated as are the so-called differences of the Clydeside section of the Party with the less progressive elements. This may be so, but there are deeper possibilities of fissiparous tendencies, and it may well be that when the Government chooses or is forced to consider the prospects of a general election, it may not feel it to be desirable to resume office, without a united Party behind it.

There is one other matter, besides the Irish trouble, that may result in a General Election. The Russian Agreement may be very popular in the Labour Party, and also in certain Radical circles, but in financial circles it appears to be getting increasingly unpopular. The bankers have since the commencement looked askance at the proposed Guaranteed loan. Now it is stated that a number of their important clients have intimated to them that if they invest in the loan, these clients will withdraw their deposits. If this statement be accurate, there is no doubt that the loan will be a failure, and the Labour Government, in that event, will have a very awkward situation to face, and the House of Commons, with a combination of Tories and Liberals may compel a General Election within the next few weeks. In anticipation, I understand, the party headquarters through

out the country have been warned to be ready for an election in December.

The Government will not be able to disregard easily the opposition that has been gathering around the Russian Treaty, of the genesis of which "Forward" gives us a shrewd idea from the pen of Mr. E. D. Morel. He states that after Mr. Ponsonby had officially declared that the negotiations had resulted in failure, he and some other private members, including Mr. Purcell, the Chairman of the Trade Union Congress Executive Committee, and Mr. Wallhead, sought to bring about a further conference between the two parties upon the basis of a mutually acceptable formula. This was eventually discovered, but it is added, it was not until some of the left-wing private members had threatened to resign unless the Government signed a Treaty with the Soviet representatives that a Treaty was eventually forthcoming, which, if true, may account for M. Rakovsky's claim, upon his return to Moscow, that there would have been no Treaty but for the intervention of the British proletariat. The Government are bound to be closely questioned on these allegations, and it is doubtful whether explanations to be rendered will satisfy public opinion to the extent of enabling the Government to guarantee the loan to Soviet Russia.

REVIEW.

BRITISH WHITEHEAD ON INDIA

INDIAN PROBLEMS IN RELIGION, EDUCATION, POLITICS. BY THE RT. REV. HENRY WHITEHEAD, D. D., FORMERLY BISHOP OF MADRAS. (Constable and Co., London.) 1924. pp. 335. 12s.

BISHOP WHITEHEAD'S views are entitled to respectful consideration from British and Indian public alike, whether one agrees with him or not. In his long service of forty years in India, everyone who came in contact with him recognised in him a true servant of Jesus. Free from race prejudice, he sought opportunities of mixing with all classes of Indians. He thought and felt in terms of humanity rather than of nationality. He appreciated good and condemned evil fearlessly whether in Indians or Europeans. And the value of the present book is therefore very great, containing as it does his mature views on the subjects dealt with by him.

The book is in four parts, the first of which is comparatively unimportant, being devoted to a brief description of the non-Christian religions of India and intended only to give to the British reader an idea of the intensely religious atmosphere in which the daily life of the Indian is cast. Naturally enough the Bishop's conclusions are coloured by his love of Christianity. No Hindu will admit for instance, that "in the matter of moral reform Hinduism is paralysed by the fact that neither the many deities of the multitude nor the Supreme Being of

the philosophers are necessarily moral." Nor will any Muhammadan admit that 'dark fatalism' 'makes all Muhammadan nations decay' or that 'there is no hope for India in the spread and influence of Muhammadanism.' It is science and the scientific spirit of enquiry that have caused modern progress in Europe, and they have caused it in spite of Christianity. That is what will happen elsewhere also.

Part II, which deals with Christianity, is of special interest. It discusses some important problems which are engaging the attention of missionaries and the Christian population of India. No one is more competent to deal with them than Bishop Whitehead, with his long experience of the Church and his wide sympathies. A brief account of the Syrian and Roman Catholic Churches is a feature of this part. There is a useful chapter on Anglo-Indians, whom he advises "to get their roots in the soil and identify their interests with those of the people of the land." He does not approve of their present exclusiveness in the matter of education. He says: "In Ceylon, I am informed, there are no special grants for European schools, so that the Burghers, who correspond to the Anglo-Indians, are educated with the rest of the natives of Ceylon, and as a result occupy a better position in the island and exercise more influence on public affairs than the Anglo-Indians do in India." The chapter on outcastes is of absorbing interest. Among them is done the most valuable and enduring work of the missionaries. Every week some 2000 outcastes are swept into the Church. The Bishop concedes that the movement is more social than religious. But a strong spiritual side is also present. The converts generally undergo a good deal of persecution. Even martyrs are not wanting. A convert in the Telugu country was called upon to renounce Christianity on pain of having his right hand thrust in boiling oil. He stood firm, the threat was carried out and he went to the missionary "with his right hand charred and withered and utterly useless." Does not the admission of large numbers of outcastes into the Christian fold make mission work among caste Hindus well nigh impossible, and does it not also lower the intellectual and moral standard of the Christian community? The Bishop's answer to both questions is in the negative. In villages where work among the outcastes has been most successful the higher castes also are seeking Christianity. Moreover, the aspect of Christianity that most impresses the high caste Hindu is the absence of the caste spirit in it and the work of elevation that is undertaken among the most degraded section of the community. These alone will draw him to Christianity, if at all, for otherwise he prefers the philosophy and the fundamental religious ideas of Hinduism to those of Christianity. The Bishop is perfectly right in this. Then with regard to the fear that the intellectual and moral standard of the Christian community will be lowered, he says that if only proper education is given to the children of

the converts, no such lowering will take place. The children of illiterate and degraded outcastes, when brought up in boarding houses have proved the equals of Brahmin children in Government examinations and in manners and behaviour. We are glad to have this testimony from Bishop Whitehead, for a contrary view is widely held. A very interesting experiment in Church government initiated by Bishop Azariah, the first and we believe the only Indian Bishop, in his diocese in the Telugu country, shows the surprising moral capacity of the people.

"During the time that I was in charge of this area as Bishop of Madras, the administration of the ten districts was entirely in the hands of European missionaries. A benevolent autocracy seemed to be the only possible form of government. When the diocese of Dornakal was formed Bishop Azariah tried a bold experiment. He divided up the ten districts and put the administration in the hands of Indian councils, presided over by Indian priests, all of outcaste origin, with the European missionaries in the background, no longer as autocrats but as advisers. The experiment so far has been a striking success. Both the Indian clergy and the Indian councils have risen to the occasion, and shown unsuspected powers of initiative and management. It would naturally have been thought that, however necessary a step like this might be, the first result would be a great slump in efficiency. But that has not been the case. In many districts there has been quite a remarkable advance in the number of converts and in the contribution of the people towards the support of their clergy and schools." (p. 79).

The success of this experiment is a lesson not only in Church government but in politics, though the latter does not seem to have struck Bishop Whitehead. Other important problems dealt with in this part are the independence of the Anglican Church from State support and control, and Church unity or the formation of an Indian Church. Towards both these movements, which are the result of a growing sense of national consciousness among Indian Christians, the Bishop's attitude is one of sympathy and support.

II.

In Part III, which deals with education, the Bishop is very critical of Government policy. He blames the Government for making English the medium of instruction for higher education instead of the vernaculars, for establishing non-residential examining universities and for making village education subsidiary to higher education instead of making it practical and self-sufficient. Behind all this criticism, there is in the Bishop's mind the uneasy feeling that the educated Indian is far too much interested in politics and far too little in social and religious reform. Fifty years ago there was little political discontent and the best Indian minds were directed to religious and social reform. Why is the case just the reverse now? The system of education must be radically wrong! But how can a subject people, thwarted in every reform movement by an alien bureaucracy, not be keenly interested in politics? Moreover, it is not true that the educated Indian is less interested at present in social and

religious reform than formerly. In social matters there is now no need for talking and demonstration as before. Orthodox prejudice is rapidly yielding and much unostentatious progress is being achieved.

When the Bishop blames the East India Company for yielding to the 'influence' of Raja Ram Mohun Roy and to the brilliant rhetoric of Lord Macaulay, in adopting the present education policy as against that advocated by the Orientalists, he labours under a misapprehension. He says: "The question at issue was not whether the English language should or should not be taught, but whether English or the vernaculars should be the medium of instruction. On that question I believe that the Orientalists were right and Macaulay was wrong." But the question at issue was not at all what the Bishop has supposed it to be.

"The controversy between the Angloists and Orientals was simply whether the English language and European learning, or the Sanskrit, Arabic and Persian languages and Asiatic learning, should be the subject matter of higher education in India. Both parties admitted that the ultimate medium of instruction for the Natives should be their vernacular languages; but as the vernacular literature was extremely barren, the question was what was to be the classical language, and from what source were the vernaculars to be enriched." [Education in British India Prior to 1854 and in 1870-71. By Arthur Howell.]

Other authorities could be cited but we think them unnecessary.

Missionary education among Hindus and Muhammadans and the introduction of a conscience clause are other educational questions considered by the Bishop. He admits the force of the demand for a conscience clause and advises missionaries to introduce it voluntarily in areas which are not served by other schools. He is not in favour of mission funds being spent on the secular education of Hindus and Muhammadans. Conscience clause or no conscience clause, he would like the educational activities of missionaries to be confined to Indian Christians, of whom 83 per cent. are already illiterate and whose numbers are daily increasing by the conversion of illiterate outcasts from Hinduism, and to Anglo-Indians who are bound to lose in the near future the special treatment that they have been enjoying at the hands of Government. Hindus and Muhammadans should welcome this policy as it will train them to be more self-reliant and self-respecting.

III

The last and most important part of the book deals with the current political problems of India. In writing about these the Bishop is actuated by the noble idea of reconciling the West to the East, the British to the Indians, the mission of a true servant of the Son of Man. He draws prominent attention to the continuance of the spirit of racial arrogance in the British, which found such naked and ugly expression in the agitation over the Ilbert Bill. It was not this spirit that actuated Munro, Elphinstone and other statesmen of the East India

Company days, who considered it their mission and the mission of British rule in India to prepare her for self-government. After them the spirit of racial arrogance possessed the rulers of India and alienated the affections of Indians. Observe the difference between the speeches of Munro and those of Lord Curzon, under whom the Congress and any aspiration on the part of Indians for self-government were characterised as disloyal by all sections of the European community. A change for the better was made by Lord Morley and more completely by Mr. Montagu, but it was forty years too late. Outside official relations, the spirit of racial arrogance is undiminished. It has made social relations between Indians and Europeans well nigh impossible. In South Africa and Kenya it is asserting itself increasingly against the Indians, causing the deepest resentment in their hearts. If it does not disappear, if there be no drawing together of the hearts of the different races in the British Empire, the Empire will not endure and will have contributed nothing to the progress of mankind. The Bishop, however, has faith in the British nation and believes it will ultimately do the right thing. Only let it do the right thing before it is too late.

This is his dominant note. The individual essays are full of interest. There is an excellent one on Kenya in which he whole-heartedly espouses the Indian cause and refutes every contention of the white settlers. Another is devoted to Mr. Gaudhi who was the Bishop's guest in Madras for about a week. He sums up his impression of him as follows:

"He struck me as being a man tremendously in earnest, absolutely sincere, inspired by a lofty idealism, grasping firmly one or two great moral principles and prepared to undergo any amount of suffering or brave any amount of unpopularity for what he believed to be right; but at the same time extraordinarily narrow in his outlook, blind to the complexity of human life, almost deliberately shutting his eyes to concrete realities and living in a world of abstractions; a splendid prophet of neglected aspects of moral truth, but not a thinker or a statesman."

We believe most Indians would agree with this estimate. Another chapter is devoted to the events that culminated in the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh. In the Bishop's opinion the Rowlatt legislation was necessary and the agitation against it quite unjustifiable. The more weighty therefore becomes his condemnation of General Dyer and the support that was given him by the Government of India and the British public. "In public affairs there are often blunders which in their ultimate results are worse than crimes. And this was one of them." He says further:

"And I have good authority for saying that if the matter had been left to the military authorities at Simla to settle at once, their decision would have been that General Dyer, placed in a difficult situation, did not behave with the discretion that an officer of his rank is expected to show. He would then have been relieved of his command.

the Government would have expressed their disapproval of his conduct and so far as they were concerned the incident would have closed. As it was, General Dyer was promoted to a higher command in the ordinary course of events before the Committee made their report and it appeared to the Indian public that he was being rewarded for his conduct at Amritsar. And then the extraordinarily unwise resolution of the House of Lords at a later stage and the public subscription of £20,000 as a compensation to General Dyer, for his compulsory retirement completed the tragedy of errors."

Not yet, my lord. There was the O'Dwyer-Nair suit to follow. He refers to an interesting conversation he had with M. Clemenceau who with an impressive gesture said, "But there must be no more Amritsars, you cannot rule India like that."

On the question of further constitutional reforms which is now agitating India, the Bishop is a stickler for the letter of the 1917 announcement: gradual and steady progress. But it is too much to expect that the arrogance which he condemns so severely in officials will be removed and the ill-will it engenders in its turn in the Indians will be replaced by friendship, till Indians are masters of their own household.

V. V. S.

MSICELLANEA.

SOUTH INDIAN FLOOD RELIEF CENTRAL FUND, BOMBAY. APPEAL FOR FUNDS.

THE recent unprecedented floods in the Madras Presidency have very seriously affected the districts of Tanjore, Trichinopoly, Coimbatore, Ma'abar, South Kanara and parts of Salem, North Arcot, Madura and Tinnevely and the Indian States of Mysore, Travancore, and Cochin. Information available so far shows that over 50,000 houses in Malabar, 6,000 in Coimbatore, 6,000 in Tanjore and 2,000 in Trichinopoly have been washed away rendering more than 3,00,000 of people homeless and destitute. Full particulars of the exact nature and extent of the devastation in the interior of the districts affected are not yet available and our fear is that the damage done to property must necessarily be much greater than what is estimated at present. The miseries of the people are really beyond description and the stories that reach us here are heart-rending. Devastation on a similar scale has been caused in the above-mentioned Indian States of Mysore, Travancore and Cochin, full details of which are now coming to light. They too are harrowing. The people that have terribly suffered are from the Depressed Classes who have generally to live on low lands. Thousands of people are thus without proper food and shelter. They have no cloth even to carry the doles distributed by humanitarian agencies. Many of them have to sleep on mats of coconut leaves spread on damp floor and "rain-soaked and oozing beds of sand." We are told thousands are at present living in the open without roofs over their heads. Thus their miseries can better be imagined than described.

The standing crops in the fields have been completely destroyed. New crops cannot be raised soon as the fields are silted up with sand and mud, and hence the prospect before the people is extremely appalling. Destruction of or damage to roads, Railway lines, and bridges in several parts of the flooded area has considerably paralysed communications and trade. Prices of food-stuffs have, therefore, inevitably gone up and labour, which was hitherto without much demand, is gradually finding occupation and in several parts of the flooded area profiteering is rampant.

Government, Railways and Local bodies are working hard for reconstruction, repair, and restoration through their officials. Still to relieve the suffering of the poor and the middle class, supplementary help from non-official humanitarian agencies is very badly needed. Estimates of relief required received from our workers, who are touring in the whole of the flooded area, and who have not been able yet to explore the whole of the interior, amount to several lakhs of rupees and the need for relief is prompt and urgent. Besides, in the Madras Presidency, the South East Monsoons generally begin in October and cover almost the whole of the flooded parts. The reconstruction of houses must, therefore, be finished before the South East Monsoons overtake the already suffering, homeless, and destitute people to whose needs along with those of the widows and the orphans the Committee is paying its special attention.

Our workers who are in charge of investigation, organization, and supervision of supplementary relief are giving it on a thoroughly non-sectarian basis and have been co-operating with organizations or committees already working in the field or wherever there is need, are setting up small non-official committees with the help of the officials as well. They are also taking advantage of the Co-operative Department and the Societies to secure relief to the sufferers of the better class in a variety of ways. Broadly speaking, the need of the hour is threefold (1) free grants for housing (2) free or cheap grain (3) free cloth. Thus money is very urgently needed, though grain and cloth are quite welcome and old clothes may prove useful. One of our workers writes, "Dhotis and Sarees will certainly be welcome."

In the name of our Committee that is issuing this appeal to the public, all those who can spare something even out of their small resources for this humanitarian cause are requested to send the same to Mr. G. K. Devadhar, M. A., Honorary General Secretary and Treasurer, South Indian Flood Relief Central Fund, Bombay, C/o. Servants of India Society, Sandhurst Road, Girgaum, Bombay.

At a meeting of the residents of Bombay called on the 7th August last at the Servants of India Society a Committee with power given to the Working Committee to add to their number was formed to collect funds, to organize relief and to take all steps necessary for the promotion of the objects of this Fund. The following are the office-bearers of the Working Committee:—

President:

Sir Jamshedjee Jeejeebhoy, Bart.

Vice-Presidents:

Sir Gcoudas K. Parekh, Kt.

Mr. S. T. Sheppard.

Mr. M. R. Jayakar.

Mrs. Sarojini Naidu.

Mr. V. J. Patel.

Sir Purushotamdas Thakurdas, Kt.

Mr. J. B. Petit.

Chairman of the Working Committee:

Mr. K. Natarajan.

Honorary General Secretary & Treasurer:

Mr. G. K. Devadhar.

Honorary Treasurer

Sheth Madhowjee Damodher Thackersey.

THE KENYA PROBLEM.

A Selection from the Speeches and Writings of the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastrl, P. C.

A vigorous and lucid exposition of the Indian point of view. Contains also the full text of the Cabinet decision.

Pages 147. Price Rs. 12.

Apply to:

*The Aryabhushan Press,
Budhwar Peth,
POONA CITY.*

MUSIC AND ART.

- | | Rs. as. |
|--|---------|
| 1. Music and Listeners. By Sybil Marguerite Warner, I. R. A. M., T. Cert. I, L. A. M. With a foreword by C. Jinarajadasa, M. A. (Cantab). ... | 1 10 |
| 2. Art and the Emotions. By C. Jinarajadasa, M. A. (Cantab). ... | 1 14 |
| 3. An Introduction to Indian Art. By Dr. Ananda K. Coomaraswami. With numerous plates. Cloth ... | 3 8 |
| Boards ... | 3 0 |
| 4. Indian Art and Art-Crafts. By Stella Kramrisch, Ph. D., R. Srinivasan, M. A., T. G. Krishnaswami Pillai and W. D. S. Brown. ... | 2 0 |
| 5. Album of Seven Songs, Chester Series | 6 2 |
| 6. Beauty in the Light of Theosophy. By Anna Kamensky. ... | 0 2 |
| 7. Art as a Factor in the Soul's Evolution. By C. Jinarajadasa, M. A. (Cantab.) ... | 0 2 |
| 8. The International Union of Arts and Crafts. Part I. By A. L. Pogosky. ... | 0 2 |
| 9. The International Union of Arts and Crafts. Part II. By A. L. Pogosky. ... | 0 2 |

The Theosophical Publishing House,
Adyar Madras.

THE INDIAN BOOK SHOP
NEW INDIA OFFICE
George Town, Madras.

THE
PROGRESS OF EDUCATION.
A Journal devoted to the Cause of Education
(To be published six times a year.)
Royal 8 vo. pp. 64.
Subscription Rs. 6 per year, Postage Extra.
Editorial Committee.

- Prof. V. B. NAIK, M. A. (Fergusson College).
" M. R. PARANJPE, M. A., B. Sc. (New Poona College).
" N. G. DAMLE, M. A. (Fergusson College).
" N. G. NARALKAR, M. A., L. T. (New Poona College).

Will contain articles on educational subjects, educational news, notes on current topics, notices and reviews of educational publications, extracts from contemporary journals, pedagogical discussion on school-craft, notes on lessons &c.

The rates of advertisements are as under:—

	One issue	Three issues	Yearly
Full page	Rs. 12	30	50
Half page	7	18	30
Quarter page	5	10	18

Contract rates for advertisements will be settled by correspondence or personal interview.

Apply to:—The Manager 'The Progress of Education.'
C/o Arya-Bhushan Press,
POONA CITY.

THE LUCKNOW UNIVERSITY JOURNAL.

A high class University Journal for the promotion of original research.

Four issues will be published during each academic year, viz., in September, December, February, and May.

Editor—W. Burridge, 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 ...	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: UPPER INDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, Ltd., 42,
Aminabad Park.

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

DEAFNESS CAN BE CURED.

Deafness, Noises in the Head and
Nasal Catarrh.

THE NEW CONTINENTAL REMEDY CALLED
"LARMALENE" (Regd.)

Is a simple harmless home-treatment which absolutely cures deafness, noises in the head, etc. NO EXPENSIVE APPLIANCES NEEDED for this new Ointment, instantly operates upon the affected parts with complete and permanent success. SCORES OF WONDERFUL CURES REPORTED.

Reliable Testimony.

Mrs. K. Wilkinson, of Slad Road, Stroud, writes:—
"Please could I trouble you to send me another box of the Ointment. It is not for myself, but for a friend of mine who is as bad as I was, and cannot get any rest for the noises in the head. I feel a new woman, and can go to bed now and get a good night's rest, which I had not been able to do for many months. It is a wonderful remedy and am most delighted to recommend it."

Mrs. E. Crowe, of Whitehorse Road, Croydon, writes:—
"I am pleased to tell you that the small tin of ointment you sent to me at Ventnor, has proved a complete success, my hearing is now quite normal, and the horrible head noises have ceased. The action of this new remedy must be very remarkable, for I have been troubled with these complaints for nearly ten years, and have had some of the very best medical advice together with other expensive ear instruments, all to no purpose. I need hardly say how very grateful I am, for my life has undergone an entire change."

Try one box to-day, which can be forwarded to any address on receipt of money order for Rs. 4 THERE IS NOTHING BETTER AT ANY PRICE.

Address orders to:—

HENRY THOMAS ("Larmalene" Co.),
The "Woodlands,"
BEAN, DARTFORD, KENT,