

Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY.

VOL. VII, No. 47.]

POONA—THURSDAY, DECEMBER 25, 1924.

INDIA SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 10 s.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK -- -- --	553
ARTICLES:—	
Will Congress Reunite? By the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastry	555
Minority-Mongering <i>alias</i> Communal Representation. By S. D. Nadkarni	558
The Implications of Brotherhood—II. By Dr. H. C. E. Zacharias	561
REVIEWS:—	
The Black Republic	562
MISCELLANEA:—	
East African Problems	562

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

The Natal Ordinance.

THE Natal Boroughs Ordinance, to which the Governor General of the South African Union has given assent, deprives the Indians in Natal of the municipal franchise which they have enjoyed since 1881. In 1896, when they were deprived of the parliamentary franchise, a solemn pledge was given them that their municipal rights would not in any way be tampered with. The new Nationalist government is now keeping that pledge in its own characteristic way. The whites in South Africa, particularly the Nationalists, have of course never left any doubt about their policy towards all coloured humanity. It is one of expulsion or reduction to servility. And Indians have in addition to colour thrift and enterprise which make them altogether hateful to the whites. It is no use appealing to the white settler's sense of justice, because he has none. We have nothing to expect from that quarter. What the Conservative Government in England will do—how it will try to save the Empire from being wrecked on the rock of colour prejudice in Africa—remains to be seen, but not much hope or comfort is to be expected. Of real importance to us is the firmness of our Government. Is it going to content itself with a mere protest or take retaliatory action, however inadequate it may prove? At one time there was a fear that retaliation on our part may only make matters worse for our brethren in South Africa, but as matters cannot be made worse for them that fear need exist no more. We urge particularly the Indian members of the Government of India to insist on a strong line being taken and if their counsels do not prevail, to resign as a protest, so that the British Cabinet may realise the strength of our feeling in the matter. Meanwhile one is glad to know that the Indian community in Natal will

challenge the validity of the Ordinance in the Privy Council, which failing it will embark on passive resistance.

* * *

THE *Hindu* published recently a remarkably outspoken article by Col. Wedgwood. Therein he points out that "if Labour has done nothing for India during the past year, neither has India helped her own case." In his opinion a revision of dyarchy backwards is not an impossibility during the Conservative regime. His advice to Indians is "to stake all on the Councils." He rightly points out that what counts now is not the Congress but the Assembly and the Councils. "They are representative; they are permanent; they have the practical work to do; they have some power; and above all, they have the platform. You may call the members, if you like, a lot of place-seeking pot-hunters, but they are India—an epitome of the people. India made them whatever they are and elected them. One M. L. A. counts for more than twenty patriots on the Subjects Committee of the Congress, and he knows it, and the Viceroy knows it, and we know it, and it is time that Indian nationalists knew it and planned accordingly." He is all for educating the electorates and depending on them and against pacts and bargainings among the elected. "The Bengal log-rolling, the Bengal Pact (about jobs of course) and the Bengal refusal to take office, based on fear of responsibility, have done more to set back the cause of freedom than the massacre of Kohat or the death of Mr. Montagu, or any disillusionment about British Labour." But he sees no cause for despair. Indeed, he hates this bad habit in Indians; of sitting in silence and putting ashes on their heads instead of talking to the villain like a father; of walking out of Council Chambers and refusing to play the game. Would that be the attitude of the Labour Party in England? "We have got to wait five years, but we shall spend the time hitting hard, not in sulking." We hope his manly advice will be heeded by the Congress.

Parliament and Ordinance.

* * *

OUR appreciation of Mr. Scour for raising an adjournment debate in the House of Commons over the Bengal Ordinance is the greater on account of the fact that the Ordinance was promulgated with the approval of the Labour Cabinet. Mr. Scour gave out in his speech the charge against Mr. S. C. Bose, the Chief Executive Officer of Calcutta Corporation, that he was present at a meeting at which there was talk of criminal conspiracy. At that meeting, he said, Mr. C. R. Das was also present, but he was not ar-

rested. It is noteworthy that Earl Winterton in his reply did not deny this statement or otherwise refer to it, from which one would naturally infer that the charge was correctly mentioned. Mr. Scurr's statement does not at all bear out Lord Lytton's claim that his Government was no respecter of persons and that political considerations had no place in the business. Obviously Mr. Das has retained his freedom owing to political considerations. Mr. Scurr did well to recommend Lord Willingdon's idea of further advance towards self-government in provinces which are honestly working the reforms, as a better method of putting down terrorism than is repression. Earl Winterton's reply and the result of the debate were what they were expected to be. Like Lords Lytton and Reading, he enlarged on the importance of putting down crime, to which no one has anywhere objected, but failed to show how the abuse of the Ordinance would be prevented, or what ground there was for believing that it would succeed in its object.

No Need for the Ordinance.

WHILE the existence of terrorism and revolutionary crime is not denied, there is great difference of opinion among responsible politicians in Bengal about their extent. The Indian Association, e. g., holds that both Government and Mr. C. R. Das have greatly exaggerated their prevalence, and from a study of political cases tried under the ordinary law concludes that "in a great majority of the cases the witnesses spoke the truth and juries gave their verdicts without being influenced by fear, and that there were convictions and sentences under the ordinary law. No doubt in a few cases, the prosecution failed; but having regard to the judgments, it is difficult to believe that these were not really weak cases." In the adjournment debate already referred to, Earl Winterton relied on events that took place fifteen years ago to prove that witnesses were intimidated. The Indian Association instances the most recent half a dozen cases and from an analysis of them shows that the witnesses and juries have not allowed themselves to be influenced by fear. In two of them, including the Day murder case, the verdict of guilty was given; in one case the prosecution failed, but that was because it relied on an approver's evidence whom the jury found unreliable. The other three cases are still sub-judice, but in one of them the High Court rejected an appeal for transfer made on the ground of the jurors being likely to be intimidated. In the opinion of the Indian Association there is no need for special legislation, but if timely preventing steps are taken under the normal law, and cases are properly prepared and conducted, crimes could be adequately dealt with and convictions secured. This is the Association's reply to Lords Lytton and Reading who called for constructive suggestions.

Women in the Mines.

THE Report of the Chief Inspector of Mines in India for 1923, which has just been published, is full of interesting facts. Mr. Simpson refers to the new Mines Act, which for the first time regulates labour conditions in Mines. The Act came into force from the beginning of July last, but as to how far mine-owners have prepared themselves for these changes, the Chief Inspector says that "at a recent fatal accident inquiry it transpired that the deceased had been at work for 14 hours; the superintendent of a large group of collieries considers that the number of children underground in mines was never so large as at the close of the year"! Mr. Simpson also mentions the fact that the mine-owners are most unreasonably opposed to the proposal to limit the period of a shift to 12

hours and to take the women out of the mines. The objection to the latter reform is made to appear plausible by the plea that the present "family system" whereby the miner cuts the coal and the wife carries it to the tub is preferable to the system in which the wife stays at home and only the man works underground. Mr. Simpson, however, dryly mentions the fact that very often the carrier happens to be some one else's wife than the cutter's! "Quite apart from the humanitarian aspect of the question," adds Mr. Simpson, "the exclusion of women from the mines would speedily lead to a reduction of mining costs, and any temporary disorganisation would soon be adjusted. India is the only country in the world where women work underground in mines. Under Dr. Thompson's able guidance the Jharia Mines Board of Health is doing excellent work, as a result of which it is hoped that by 1929 all housing will have been brought up to the prescribed standard of 100 sq. ft. minimum floor space and 1,000 cubic ft. minimum air space, with doors and verandah. At the end of 1923, however, out of 46,381 houses only 7 per cent. were up to standard dimensions.

Dues Nationalization Work?

THE *New Republic* of November 19th contains an extraordinarily interesting article from the pen of a Canadian Professor of social history on the results of the nationalization of 22,646 miles of railway in that Dominion. Let it be premised that Canada "did not undertake Government ownership gladly," but that the taking over in 1921 of half a dozen private companies was entirely forced upon the public by the complete collapse of the railways under the strain of war and of post-war conditions. At the time, these Companies did not even cover running costs, to the tune of sixteen million dollars—the total deficit for 1921 exceeding 80 millions. In that year the Progressive Government of the day took the plunge, and thus acquired a system slightly larger than the Canadian Pacific, which is probably the best private railway company in the world, both technically and financially. Canada, then, at present has two railway systems of almost equal size, side by side, one national, one a private concern, and therefore offers an exceptionally fruitful object for study to all interested in the nationalization of such public utility concerns. Our interest, however, is not mainly in the financial results, which are startling enough—a surplus of under 2 million dollars in 1922 and of over 20 in 1923; not only in the fact that the rates are distinctly lower than those of American lines; nor that "the improvement of service on the Canadian National has been phenomenal," it being "quite generally stated that the C. P. R., heretofore the standard of excellence, has now been outclassed." What seems to us of quite particular interest is the sense of public ownership which has been evoked by this nationalization. "Travel by the Canadian National and reduce your taxes" is the gist of a brisk advertising campaign which goes on all the time and which has created a proprietary interest of the people in their own railway. Not only so, but the personnel look upon the line as their own—with the result that "a more competent or more enthusiastic group of employees can hardly be imagined." The great lesson seems to us to be not merely that nationalization is workable, but that, if you want to ensure its successful working, you must carry the people with you and educate them to a sense of their own share in the National Service. Otherwise the thing of course will either get into the hands of a close corporation of bureaucrats or else lead to political debauchery.

WILL CONGRESS REUNITE? †

BY THE RIGHT HON. V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI.

THE Indian Press indulged in a chorus of gratulation at the end of the recent conference in Bombay held to discover how to make the Congress truly national. A common impulse caused people to hope for the best, although the only tangible ground for it was the reference of the whole question to a large committee, chosen with lack of discrimination and left to perform a supremely difficult task without guidance in the shape either of resolutions or of a thorough preliminary discussion of the issues involved. The Belgaum session is not to see a reunited Congress. It is not even to see a conjunction of parties to press the demand of the nation for Swaraj. The committee, which is to meet for the first time in the third week of January and to report before the middle of March, has to solve in this brief interval such puzzles as the Hindu-Muslim *entente* and the Brahman—Non-Brahman reconciliation, and to discover the basis of a durable understanding as to political aims and methods of work, not only among the progressive sections of our population, but among all organizations, communal, religious and sectarian, some of these with no particular views on politics and some even opposed to the idea of Indian Swaraj. On the top of all this, the committee is to draft a constitution for India, embodying principles of Swaraj not yet known even in outline. One need not be a raven to croak in the face of so many puzzles and riddles. To apprehend trouble is not, however, to make it; and though it may be a thankless task, an attempt must be made, with every desire to help to indicate some at least of the enormous difficulties which lie before the committee before it can get to the heart of the question of reunion. The attempt is made, not out of tenderness to the prejudices of the Liberal party, nor with a view to safeguard its future interests at the polls, but solely with the object of testing the proposals now before the public by principles and standards of public good which, while dear to the hearts of Liberals, are not without validity to all shades of political thought.

THE CASE FOR DOMINION STATUS.

The present creed of the Congress leaves the very nature of Swaraj a moot problem. Formerly dominion status was accepted as the goal of the constitutional political movement. It is said that, as the Indian Congress is to be all-inclusive, those who cherish absolute independence as their ideal cannot be excluded; the Britisher has a right to know the whole truth before being called upon to decide the terms on which he would keep India within the British Commonwealth. To limit the national endeavour to a lower ambition when a higher has clearly emerged above the horizon of our consciousness, is in the nature of self-inflicted humiliation; the bulk of Congressmen will reject it and rightly reject it. The bogey of humiliation need not deter one from a careful examination of

the question. Our history has for centuries been one of scorching humiliation, and we cannot turn to the right or to the left without seeing in present polity and conditions tokens of deep humiliation. But to place India alongside Canada and Australia with the potentialities of further growth involved in that status is emphatically not to subject her to humiliation. It is, if fully achieved, to endow her with equal partnership in a commonwealth of free peoples. Be it further remembered that dominion status includes the right of peaceful secession. If this right is not yet embodied in terms in any constitution or laid down in rigid text-books, it has been often asserted by men of undoubted authority both in Great Britain and overseas. One of the solid reasons for which British imperialists oppose the idea of Swaraj for India is that, the moment it was attained, her people would begin to exercise the right to secede, and Britain could not employ force of arms to keep them within her fold with any show of justice even though there were a prospect of success. In point of fact, if Great Britain conferred dominion status on India in generous response to peaceful and constitutional agitation, she could hold her for indefinite periods in bonds of loving and trusted partnership, somewhat different from those subsisting between her and the other dominions, but not less strong or durable. The forces of blind and selfish reaction in British politics may prove too strong for us; greed, arrogance and insensate folly on one side or the other may re-enact one of those tragedies of which the story of human evolution is full. But the clear duty of the Indian National Congress is resolutely to dismiss the worst possibilities from the scope of its work and order its programme so as to realise the best possibilities. How else are the European Association and the Anglo-Indian Association expected to entertain seriously the invitation extended to them to send delegates to the committee appointed the other day?

NEED FOR CHANGING THE PRESENT CREED.

To judge from certain utterances of Mr. Gandhi and other leaders who would keep the term Swaraj undefined, one might infer that, while the goal of absolute independence was not to be lost sight of, but kept as a last resort for us to fall back upon, we should at present leave no stone unturned to achieve dominion status. In other words the so-called inferior goal is to have preference and priority in our programme, but the higher goal must be in full view in the background. This opinion, however, is not universal. Those who cherish the higher aim are not willing to keep it in abeyance till the lower has been demonstrated to be impossible. According to them dominion status in the fullest sense and with its possibilities is not, in the case of India, either feasible or desirable; the wise and manly course is to strike out straight for absolute independence amongst the nations of the earth. Such is the obvious meaning of the protracted debates on the subject in the recent sessions of the Congress organisations in the United Provinces and in Andhra Desa, and Mr. Hazrat Mohani's declaration does not admit

† The following article appeared recently in the Annual Supplement of the Hindu.

of any other interpretation. But a political movement cannot mobilise all its forces or act with full vigour and continuity, if its members are divided in allegiance between two objectives which are mutually exclusive and both to be striven for immediately. How, for instance, is the first step to be taken towards the framing of a Swaraj constitution if the preliminary question of within or without the Empire is by design left undecided? Is this all-important decision to be relegated to the chances of a necessarily restricted debate in the first meetings of the committee? It would be nothing strange, indeed it would be a commendable course, for the subjects committee at Belgaum to take up the subject, and have it determined once for all one way or the other. We say one way or the other, not one way first and, failing it, the other way. The one way will have to be tried steadfastly, single-mindedly and for a long time, before it can be pronounced a failure. The means and methods to be adopted for absolute independence are so different from the means and methods to be adopted for home rule under the British flag that the same organization cannot do equally well for both. The present Congress is suited only to secure the latter. A more compact and sternly-knit body with far greater resources in men and money would be required, if the nation were to be committed to a search for her destiny outside the Britannic fold. Nothing but confusion and weakness and divided counsels would result from placing the two aims together before the country, even with the proviso that the pursuit of the one must have failed before the pursuit of the other can begin.

THE ANALOGY OF NON-VIOLENCE

Let us take the analogy furnished by the prescription of non-violence in the creed of the Congress. Sacred though it be, not only as a rule of politics, but as a basic law of life, to Mr. Gandhi and his thorough-going followers, it is a well-known fact that the Ali brothers and hundreds of Congressmen have accepted non-violence only as a tentative expedient and, either expressly or by implication, reserved to themselves perfect freedom of action when it should appear that non-violence had been tried long enough and found wanting. Yet they have not insisted on their right to fall back on violence in the last resort being expressly reserved in the Congress creed. They realise like practical men that the maximum efficiency cannot be expected from non-violent methods so long as the active programme gives room to violence even as a contingent probability. When violence has to be adopted, the present Congress must be disestablished. A new league will have to be formed with a new franchise, a new membership, new ways and means, new everything; in fact Mr. Gandhi has promised at that time to take himself away altogether. Does anybody seriously doubt that complete severance of the political connection between Britain and India can be brought about only after a long course of violence? It is quixotism, pure and simple, to suppose that "peaceful and legitimate" means would be sufficient by themselves on this earth of ours to secure for In-

dia her emancipation from every form and degree of British influence.

Once Swaraj is defined as dominion status with a parliamentary form of government, there is no longer the same necessity for insisting on the restoration of the word 'constitutional' in the creed. In the new setting the words "peaceful and legitimate" will be enough to bring about a limitation of methods to those which are constitutional.

THE YARN-FRANCHISE.

Let us next take the proposed yarn-franchise for the National Congress. This is open to objection from several points of view. It has been pointed out several times before that it is based, to put it gently, on an unproven economic theory. Then its connection with political work is rather imaginary. As a condition of admission to the National Congress, it is an irrelevance so great as to be fantastic. The option provided in the case of unwilling people is not a genuine option such as a conscientious objector may avail himself of. It is almost a mockery of a man who considers a thing wrong to tell him "Never mind, you can get it done by another." Besides, it seems to violate individual freedom. A man's dress whether as to stuff, style or cut is his intimate and private concern. Nobody else can dictate to him in respect of it. Sumptuary legislation, except in the days of unchecked autocracy, has been held odious. There are people whose sense of personal independence is outraged by restrictions on dress even on occasions of court ceremonial. Nor is dress a proper sphere for the exercise of the rights of the majority over a minority. Could Hindus impose their religion on Mahomedans where the latter are in a minority? If it be answered that religious toleration is a principle of a higher order, could vegetarians, supposing they were in a majority in the Congress, forbid animal food to the rest? Could those who have invincible faith in Ayurveda, as soon as ever they had numbers on their side, banish Allopathy? Could those who preferred to squat on the ground deny chairs to others on the ground that they were an unjustifiable luxury and self-indulgence? Without a doubt there are eccentric clubs and associations for the spread of particular views or fads. There is nothing to prevent the formation of a specific board for spinning, a Khaddar association or a Charka school; but it is certainly not right to disable from membership of the Congress, and the honourable channels of public service which it affords, those patriotic citizens who cannot bring themselves to subscribe to strange notions about Khaddar. After all, is there a real majority in favour of this spinning franchise? It is a striking example of the spurious importance acquired by small groups in virtue of coalition. Two groups, each a minority in itself with no hope of ever becoming a majority, can, by combining together, impose the views of both on the general population. The Swarajist leaders want the backing of the whole Congress in their politics. Mr. Gandhi agrees to this on condition that they accept the spinning franchise. The No-changers, after

easing their consciences by open protests, acquiesce in the arrangement. The result is an over-whelming majority for the Swarajist claim and for the franchise. Very good bargaining in its way, but by no means a genuine and legitimate majority to pass sumptuary regulations in a political body, to which at the same time, by a strange lack of logic, Indians of every school and even Europeans and Anglo-Indians are invited as to an all-comprehending world-fraternity.

N.-C.-O. TO BE ABANDONED OR SUSPENDED?

One question of overwhelming consequence remains. Is non-co-operation merely to be suspended or is it to be abandoned? Seeing that, if Congress decides to abandon it, that body may still revive it at any time, some persons argue that there is no great difference between the alternative courses. But this is a superficial view. Abandonment follows a conviction in the popular mind of the impropriety, inexpediency or impracticability of a course of action. Suspension arises from a less drastic disapproval, perhaps a mere inappropriateness of agency, time or place. The former will imply necessarily a prolonged period of abstention, the latter may give little more than a short respite. Active and persistent propaganda in favour of an abandoned course may be discountenanced as tending to instability in the conduct of political work. But you cannot reasonably oppose a movement for readjusting the details of a campaign which has only been suspended, so as to facilitate a speedy resumption in more favourable circumstances. It is hardly fair to expect those who condemned non-co-operation when it was new and untried to acquiesce in its resumption when it has proved futile and even harmful. In the anguish of repentance the author of non-co-operation applied to it the epithets unnatural, sinful and vicious—a cumulative condemnation from which his most rash critics would have shrunk. The recrudescence of anarchical crime in Bengal was foretold in an early pamphlet on non-co-operation as the inevitable sequel of its inevitable failure, and the writer relied on a warning that had been uttered as the result of burning experience by so great an authority on forms of political agitation as Babu Aurobindo Ghose. Faith in non-violence is certainly weaker to-day even in the ranks of non-co-operators than it was in the beginning. Suffering and tribulation are meritorious when they are voluntarily accepted, and for that reason are attractive to fine and ardent natures. Heaven be thanked for it! But in this imperfect world virtue does sometimes look for an outside reward, and sacrifice needs to be vindicated from time to time by tangible results. No theory of life can obtain permanent ascendancy over man which asks for suffering in the beginning, suffering in the middle and suffering in the end. Mr. Gandhi certainly does not hide his thoughts. He gives ample notice of his intentions to those who agree and those who differ with him. He declared the other day that "he had not changed his view on non-co-operation, much less had he changed his views on civil disobedience, and today, if he seemed to be marking time, receding

from the position which he had always occupied, it was only seemingly so. So far as he was concerned he was always advancing as a soldier, for he claimed to be one. Let those Congressmen who invite others to come into the fold on the ground that suspension is only abandonment spelt differently, reconcile their position with Mr. Gandhi's as stated above. He is equally explicit on his own attitude and that of the Swarajist party towards the Government. Here is an extract from the same pronouncement for the length of which no apology is needed.

"The Swaraj party did not want to help the Government nor to lay down their arms. They wanted to do away with the system under which they had been groaning all these years, the system which he had not hesitated to describe as corrupt, as satanic, as all that could be described against that system. The more he examined that system the more he was convinced that it should be ended, if it could not be mended, without the slightest hesitation and without the slightest delay, and if there was interminable delay it was not for want of will on his part. It was purely for want of ability and if he had entered into that agreement it was for the purpose of furthering that cause."

GANDHI'S PSYCHOLOGY.

There is no need to speculate on the eventual success or failure of this inflexible campaign. The campaign itself, however non-violent in intention, aims at the destruction of this Government and therefore in effect at the destruction of government. Perhaps the simultaneous establishment of a parallel government on the Sinn Fein model is contemplated. This, however, will not reassure those who *ab initio* have dreaded non-co-operation as a highly injurious form of direct action. On the contrary, it will but confirm their worst fears and prognostications. Mr. Gandhi rightly describes himself as a soldier. With a soldier's unquestioning faith in the justness of his cause, he combines a soldier's unquestioning faith in the wisdom of his campaign. His march may be hindered and delayed, but it must be pursued relentlessly and unflinchingly. He deplors the losses and sufferings on his side and has a tear to spare for the enemy as well. He will try to minimise them to the utmost. But turn back he will not. He atones for mistakes and failures in the only way open to him by fasts, and prayer and penance. When his account with God is settled on one page, he opens a fresh one on the next. He has often called himself a scientific experimenter. It is not his fault if his tools and chemicals happen to be human. Unfortunately they feel and suffer, and the operator himself is as tender-hearted as any Sister of Mercy. But the laboratory knows no pity and needs no rest. The truth or Satya must be found. He seeks the guidance of God at every step. What could one more? He is charged with a great mission and must fulfil it.* The world must learn Satyagraha as its peril. In Germany and France, in Britain and America, in the Dominions and indeed all over the civilised world, his sayings and doings as the head of the non-co-operation movement are studied with intense interest as a new evangel for the future of mankind in the interna-

tional as well as in the national sphere. His theatre encompasses the earth. History, far-off history, is his only competent judge, after God. This, the present writer believes, is a true and just picture of the psychology of Mr. Gandhi. It is not drawn with a spirit of disrespect or with a view to pass moral judgment. But Mr. Gandhi's contemporaries, be they never so puny, have a duty to the country as well as he. They may not see clearly. They may not judge rightly. But as they see and judge, so they must act. If they believe that in the search of highly problematical good he is bringing highly probable evil on their common motherland, they are bound to oppose him all they can. It is a comfort to know that he at least will not blame them.

MINORITY-MONGERING ALIAS COMMUNAL REPRESENTATION.

THE Indian National Congress took in 1916 what in the light of later events cannot but be regarded as the first (and let us hope the last) undemocratic step in treating with a sectional body like the Muslim League to the end of concluding with it a pact, viz. the so-called "Lucknow Pact." For thereby the Congress not only sanctioned communalism as a legitimate basis to our public life, but—*pr. ma facie* from the very fact of its treating with an avowedly sectional body as on a par with itself—reduced itself from a national institution to a Hindu or rather "Non-Mahomedan" body. Of course, the optimism of some generous souls amongst the pucca nationalists of the Congress then preferred to treat the principle of communal representation as a necessary evil, to be tolerated only so long as it was indispensable. But ever since that un-national step was taken, our experience has been that the appetite for communal representation, so far from being appeased, has only been growing by what it has been feeding on. One remarkable fact about that Pact, however, may be noticed in passing. It speaks of only two communities, the Hindu and the Mussalman—as if these were the only two communities of India, and as if the Hindus were one community in the same sense in which we can perhaps speak of the Mussalmans as one community. Then the Non-Brahmins, and the Depressed, and the Backward, and the Forward, and the Intermediate were nowhere!

That was the initial false step in our public life. It was no doubt a compromise with principles under the dictation of "hard facts." That sacrifice, the Congress democrats expected, would soften those "hard facts" before long. They were even encouraged in that hope by some of the men on the other side. But what has been our experience of separate electorate and separate representation introduced as a result of that sacrifice of democratic principles at Lucknow? Far from those "hard facts" being any way softened, it is our hard-headed democrats of the Congress of those days who have softened, and have begun to play to the gallery of their communal electorates; as witness Mr. Jinnah, a super-democrat of the pre-Lucknow days and even later, now choos-

ing to come forward to declare that the Congress is "essentially a Hindu organisation,"—the context, leaving no doubt about the compliment being meant to 'boost' his own new-found love of the Muslim League as being the Muslim counterpart of the "Hindu" Congress. Of course Mr. Jinnah retains enough of his former role of a Congress democrat to say even now that our politics should have nothing to do with religion, meaning the denominational religions, otherwise called religious communities. Yet almost in the same breath he says that he would refuse to have Swaraj without "a Hindu-Muslim settlement" with regard to communal representation in the Services etc. If such has grown the attitude of a "progressive" leader, thanks to the subtle poison of communal electorates working in him, one may imagine the effect on his followers of the introduction of this caste system into our public life.

So what is the position now? Has the Pact lessened the communal and separatist spirit in our politics, or has it fostered and furthered it? The most optimistic soul amongst us, if he only watch the signs around him, is sure to be confronted with this fact, harder than any which the Pact was meant to soften,—viz. that the demand for communal representation is every day going deeper down as well as wider afield than ever! Thus, whereas originally we had the nation dichotomised into Mahomedans and Non-Mahomedans, we have now the latter again divided up in the South into Non-Brahmans and "Non-non-Brahmans" (!), and in the Punjab into Sikhs and "Non-Sikh Non-Mahomedans," with these latter in turn bidding fair in the near future to split up into Jats and "Non-Jat Non-Sikh Non-Mahomedans"! So the process may go on merrily *ad lib.* It is only the logical extension of the principle sanctioned by the Lucknow Pact, although that "Pact" was with express reference to Hindus and Muslims, and their representation in the legislative bodies only. But it could not stop there. It must also extend down. So we have had communal representation demanded and granted in respect of representation in the municipalities and the local boards, and soon after in the Public Services. Now, if communal representation may be applied to the filling of posts in the Public Services, what is there to prevent the principle being applied to the sharing on a communal basis of posts in the municipal and local services, and then of the Railway and Maritime services? And thence as a natural corollary will follow the extension of the system to the communal apportionment of the seats in educational institutions, of the beds in public hospitals, and so on; to the distribution on a communal basis of bounties to national industries; to the communal sharing of public parks, play-grounds and all other public amenities and utilities; to the regulating on communal lines of the benefits to be derived from the use of state services like the Posts and Telegraphs, the seating accommodation and transport services on the Railways, &c.—somewhat on the model of America's immigration control by fixing annual

racial quotas,—and so on *ad libitum*. That would be only the filtering down of the active principle of communalism from the Legislative Councils to the various aspects of our life out of doors!

Similarly as to the spreading out of the principle. If the Mahomedans may have separate and "effective" representation, i. e. representation in excess of their due proportion in the population, because they form a "minority" compared with the "Non-Mahomedans",—what will prevent the various present divisions, the sects, subsects, castes and sub-castes of those "Non-Mahomedans",—and then of the Mahomedans themselves, each claiming a separate, "effective" and "excessive" representation for itself? For, is not each little community a minority compared with all the rest of the population taken together? And then we shall have a pretty problem indeed in meta-mathematics trying to satisfy the demand for "excessive" representation of each section, clan or tribe without dissatisfying any! And such division may go on literally *ad infinitum*, for who ever succeeded in defining and enumerating exactly all the castes and sections of the Indian social polity? At any rate, under existing conditions, or the "hard facts," as they are called in an apologetic tone by our erstwhile democrats now turned communalists, there is no reason why we should content ourselves with the dichotomy of the Indian nation into Muslims and Non-Muslims. Why lump together the "Non-Muslims", or for the matter of that, even the Hindus amongst them as one community? While Brahman-non-Brahman disputes and Vaikom Satyagrahas rage amidst them, and while the animists and aboriginals supposedly in their fold are still outside the pale of civilisation or rather on the borderline of humanity, it is absurd in the highest degree to call the Hindus one community in anything like the sense in which the Muslims, with all their Shiah-Sunni differences, can be said to be one community. Already, as I have said, out of the nebular mass of the Hindus in the South the conglomeration of communities known as Non-Brahmans has whirled itself out; and so in the North the Sikhs out of the Non-Mahomedans. If so far, why not further? If Muslims may have separate representation, why not the Parsis, the Jains, the Jews, the Buddhists, each as surely a minority as the Muslims, but now apparently unjustifiably merged in the "Non-Muslims," or seeking representation through the backdoor of Government nomination? Then the sects of the Muslims themselves,—as the Shiabs and Sunnis, then the Bohras, Khojas and Memons, and then the Sunni Bohras and Shiah Bohras, and the Ahmediyyas, Bahais and Wahabis,—may each claim separate representation. If backwardness is any consideration in the matter, surely the depressed classes and the aborigines deserve effective representation first and foremost. So the demand for communal representation is bound to extend wider a field as well as deeper down than was ever thought likely at the time when it was first mooted, unless our leaders wake up betimes and heed the warning uttered by G. K. Gokhale in the

Legislative Council of Bombay while speaking on the Mofussil Municipalities Bill:

"Then, my Lord, if different sections are to be represented, why talk of the Hindu community [or rather, "the Non-Mahomedan communities"] as a whole by itself? There are so many castes and sections of this community, and some of them stand so wide apart from one another that it will be necessary to recognise their differences. And then where are the Government going to stop?"

Where indeed? Echo answers, where! The process once started must logically end in a *reductio ad infinitum-obsurdum*.

That such apprehensions are not quite imaginary will be evident to any one who is at all alive to the signs of the time around him. Only the other day a meeting of the Mussalman residents of Thana was reported to have protested against the appointment of a particular Bohra Mussalman gentleman as an honorary magistrate of the town, because in their opinion he, being a member of the Bohra sect, was not a representative truly enough of the local Mussalmans at large who were of a different denomination; and they prayed Government to appoint one more Non-Bohra Muslim as magistrate, or at least another good Mussalman of their own denomination as magistrate in place of the Bohra! So even Justice must be tempered with communalism, as well as by mercy. That is enough to show how the communal principle can go down amongst the people creating or emphasising divisions upon divisions in fields where one would least expect them to crop up. That this fissiparous tendency we may not expect to be confined to the illiterate or the backward will be allowed when it is known that in this district of North Kanara no less a person than a Deputy Collector who happens to belong to a Lingayat caste, but who in his magisterial capacity has daily to decide cases between parties of all castes, Brahman and Non-Brahman,—is sued by some Brahman temple-managers in a Sub-Judge's court which happens to be presided over by a Brahman; and forthwith the Dy. Collector applies to the higher District Court, praying that the case be transferred from that Brahman's court to some other. The application was rejected and an appeal against that order is now lying in the High Court of Bombay. All on account of difference in the caste of two such responsible public servants as a District Deputy Collector and a Subordinate Civil Judge!

Communalism in politics was first demanded on the ground that it would secure equality of opportunity for all, in view of the great divergence in social conditions of this country. In practice, however, it may be seen how the system makes for injustice on the one hand and favouritism on the other. E. G., the Bombay Government granted to all members of the non-Brahman Maratha communities of this Presidency the privilege of free attendance at all Government schools and scholarships at aided ones, both as a reward for their "War services" and in recognition of their backwardness in education. Now it happens that a member of a very rich and educa-

tionally advanced non-Brahman Maratha family may attend free at any Government school, just because he is a non-Brahman Maratha, while a member of a poor and very backward Brahman family in an obscure village may go without any education, because he cannot afford to pay for it. But if any community as a community deserves encouragement at the hands of the State in the matter of education, surely it is the "untouchable" community and that alone. Because by their peculiar position in the social system the "untouchables" have been perforce shut out from all opportunities of civilised life and culture for generations untold, by being denied all rights of social intercourse with the rest of their fellow-beings,—but not so the Muslims or any other touchable community in India.

How even from the beginning the demand for "excessive" representation for so called minorities was rooted in essential selfishness and unjust suspicion of the other communities is now being gradually unfolded. By the Lucknow Pact the Muslims, the first vocal "minority*" in the country to demand such representation, stipulated on a reciprocal basis that whichever "community"—Muslim or Non-Muslim—was in the majority in a province should allow "excessive" representation to the minority community in that province. But now with the revival of the Muslim League we find that Muslims of the Punjab and Bengal, where they are in the majority are gradually repudiating that basis, and demand representation strictly in proportion to their numbers. In such a "Heads-I-win,-tails-you-lose" demand Mr. Jinnah, the erstwhile Congress nationalist, now pretends to see no injustice nor violation of the Lucknow Pact, while Maulana Mahomed Ali, the former Leaguer, stoutly disputes that point with him! What, indeed, is it that has made these two exchange their respective roles? It is morally certain that nothing but the communal electorate which has sent up the former to the Assembly could have done the miracle! Not content with this feat Mr. Jinnah lays the blame of the recent riots upon the Hindus having violated the Lucknow Pact in its "spirit." Oh, the thief crying: Stop thief!

So much for the *bona fides* of the demand for "excessive" representation of so-called minorities in our representative institutions like the councils and local bodies. Now let us see how far the demand for communal representation in the public services, high and low, is prompted by a sense of justice and fairplay. Everybody knows that in the Army and the Police and the Marine the Muslims happen to hold a position of marked superiority over the Non-Muslims, in numbers if not also in the importance of the posts held. (In the meat trade they practically hold the monopoly.) But what Muslim leader has so far come forward to demand that the Non-Muslims

* Not a minority really; for judging from their cohesiveness one must say that they are in their numbers the strongest community of a kind in India by far,—even if we take only the Sunni Hanafi sect (by far the greatest Muslim sect) by itself for comparison with all other communities.

shall as a matter of justice be allowed their due share of these services, as they themselves are demanding in the other services? The truth about the matter is, as a writer in the press has put it, that each gets what he is fit for. "The argument that representation in public services should be proportionate to population is in itself preposterous, but apart from that, is the proportion to be found from the total population including males, females and minors, or only from the educated adults qualified for efficient service? The fact that Mahomedans are over-represented in the market and slaughterhouse departments (and it may be added, in the army, police and marine) shows that each gets what he is fit for." (An "Anti-Humbug" in the *Times of India*, 4-9-24.)

Now to conclude. How will communal representation in the services and even in the elected bodies affect the state and its administration? What really is the psychology behind and beneath this political phenomenon, unique perhaps in all the world? The answers to these questions cannot be given better than in the words of the editor of the *I. S. Reformer*. The note he wrote on the subject in a recent issue of the paper is marked by insight as well as lucidity of exposition, and deserves the widest publicity of all recent writings on the question:

"That is no real Hindu-Muslim unity which rests upon a share basis of representation and public offices. Suppose there are one hundred offices to be shared and two hundred seats to be filled, and that the Mahomedan share is fixed at 40 of the former and 80 of the latter. If there are 50 competent Mahomedans for the offices and 120 able Islamic candidates for the latter, the system of shares means that the country must be obliged to choose ten incompetent non-Mahomedans and forty incapable non-Mahomedan candidates. Or there may be more capable non-Mahomedans than the number allotted, and incompetent Mahomedans will have to be preferred to them. Does any community gain by this sort of thing? To our mind, there is no meaning in speaking of Hindu-Mahomedan unity so long as Hindus and Mahomedans believe—which belief is at the root of the demand for shares—that a Mahomedan will not do justice to a Hindu or a Hindu to a Mahomedan. We would direct our efforts first to induce confidence among the several communities, and meanwhile talk little of Swaraj which in the present feeling of mutual distrust is a hollow mockery. The Unity Conference (in Delhi) wisely excluded the question of offices and seats in the Legislative Councils from its deliberations, concentrating its attention upon the adjustment of religious differences which occasionally lead to sanguinary conflicts...It was a wise saying of the Great Protector (Oliver Cromwell) that the State cannot take note of men's religious beliefs."

Well, is there really no remedy for the "hard facts,"—the undoubted, though deplorable, existence of the communal sense in our body politic today? I think there is one, so far as representation in representative bodies is concerned. Let us do away with separate electorates and even reserved seats, and in their place introduce the system of voting known as Proportional Representation by the single transferable vote. It is on this system that elections to the Dail in the Irish Free State are conducted; in Great Britain it is prescribed for the

University constituencies in elections to Parliament; and in India it has already been in use for the Council of State elections. In my humble opinion, this system will secure the object, without engendering the harm, of separate communal electorates and even of reserved seats. Let us try it.

S. D. NADKARNI.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF BROTHERHOOD IN THE RACIAL SPHERE.

ADDRESS BY DR. H. C. E. ZACHARIAS TO THE
Bombay International Fellowship,
delivered at Juhu, Dec. 6th.

II.

"BROTHERHOOD'S" first implication then is, that to be a brother postulates a living, conscious, rational being and, if so, a being existing *per se*. The next implication is that there cannot be only one such mind existing *per se*, but many: since, if there was only one, he could not possibly be his own brother. Identity and brotherhood being mutually exclusive terms we must, since we accept brotherhood, also accept the separateness of the brother minds. But how far does that separateness go? Certainly not as far as independence: for in that case, if each mind moved independently in its own plane,—which most patently he does not—brotherhood again would be impossible. Brotherhood implies a similarity: but since we are all not only similar, but different, the similarity can obviously not arise out of the relationship of brother to brother, but out of a relationship to a third.

What is that *tertium quid*—a World Soul, of which each individual mind forms a component part? Perhaps: but if there is such a composite World Soul, it certainly cannot account for its own composition. For if the composition is fortuitous, we can only speak of a mob of individual minds, whose concurrence, so far from explaining the individual, can only be explained by him; and if not fortuitous, then we must go back one step further to a First who caused the composition, i. e. God, and in that case we need no "World Soul." If then minds are existing *per se*, but yet related; different, and yet similar; above all, if they are in a relationship of brotherhood to each other, it can only be because of their relationship to a common father, who must be God. For similarity alone does not constitute brotherhood: brotherhood can only arise out of fatherhood. But if brotherhood implies that God is our Father, the strict meaning of that can only be that mind, though immortal, is not eternal; and that mind, though existing *per se*, is not existing *a se*, but is created at a definite point in time: else we would get back to the already disproved "World Soul."

Now is that in accordance with the facts? Since we have already disposed of the Idealist theory of a "World Soul," the only other theory contrary to ours remaining is that of Materialism, which would spontaneously develop mind out of sense, and sense out of life, and life out of non-life. Now for that we must remark that there is not a scrap of evidence. Never yet has it been observed that inanimate matter has spontaneously arranged itself so as to become self-determined, or living matter so as to become conscious and rational—any more than it has ever been observed that the fortuitous scattering of the letters of the alphabet will spell out some such great and new truth, as, say, the Beatitudes. It is not, as if the ordinary laws of chemistry and mechanics were done away with in matter, when it is said to be living: these laws re-

main; but they are arranged in a manner transcending physics and chemistry. A living body is like a motor car: to say that it has been started by a *chauffeur* does not imply that motor cars can run without electricity or the explosion of petrol-gas—but it does imply, that the motorcar could never have produced the *chauffeur*, whilst the *chauffeur* may very well have produced the motor car. The higher can always explain the lower and the lower can always explain itself, but never can the lower explain the higher; mechanics cannot explain self-determination, nor the life of sense the life of reason. Materialism, indeed, not only has never been able to prove its assumption, but all the facts on the contrary disprove the possibility, let alone probability, of that assumption.

If then neither the Idealist nor the Materialist explanation holds good, it is the Realist explanation which alone can be true, viz., that mind, though incorporeal, is created. But then the question remains, at what point in time exactly was each individual mind created? It is here that we meet with the idea of Reincarnation.

Reincarnation bases its argument on two groups of facts—the "recollection" of previous lives and the precocity of certain infants. As regards the latter the denial of reincarnation of course does not necessarily imply denial that minds at birth are differing in capacity. Since we know of no natural object whatsoever identically alike to any other, it is *a priori* very unlikely that all souls should be created exactly alike, as if turned out by machinery for mass production. Minds do differ—and there is nothing to make us believe that some at least of this difference is not inherent in the very capacity with which these souls are endowed at their creation. There are plates, big and small, deep and shallow: they all are meant to hold our food, but different plates are useful for soup, for bread, for fruit. This I think illustrates, what Germans call *anlagen* and which may perhaps be translated as the original capacity with which a mind starts at birth. But how far precocity in infants and divergence in their subsequent mental development are due to such *anlagen*, is at present not ascertainable. Child Psychology is a very young discipline and sufficient data are not yet available, to pass a final judgment on this question:—on the other hand, enough material has been collected to make it very clear that the manner in which the mind of the infant is developed, interested and fatigued, and in which association of ideas, inhibitions and character complexes are produced, circumscribes the extent of these original capacities much more than our previous ignorance of the subject would have led us to believe.

"Anlage", in any case, does not necessitate as sole explanation the one put forward by Reincarnation. Still less does Reincarnation give a reasonable explanation of what are called "recollections of a previous existence." This phenomenon is well known to Mental Pathology, not as one of memory, but of forgetfulness: the patient remembering only certain facts, but having forgotten the circumstances connected with them. If on the other hand these "recollections" go beyond what seem momentary glimpses and swell to regular fairy tales, the explanation is very obviously one of suggestion and auto-suggestion working upon the products of a lively imagination: and if that sounds unsympathetic, I would ask whether any such "recollection" (any more than Spiritism) have ever produced any fresh historical detail not already in the mental make-up of the age.

(To be continued)

REVIEWS.

THE BLACK REPUBLIC. By H. F. REEVE, C.M.G.

WITH an introduction by Sir Alfred Sharpe,
K. C. M. G., C. B. (H. F. & G. Witherby, London.)
1923. pp. 203. 8×5. 10s. 6d.

THIS book deals with the social and political conditions of Liberia as they are today. It is a strong indictment of the administration of the country and a plea for the assumption by the Powers of the control of the Republic in the interests of the people of the soil; by the Powers to whose recognition the Republic owes its existence, but which recognition was given on the understanding that no difference would be made by the Government between the American negroes and the indigenous population, and that the standard of administration would be that of a civilised government. There is abundant evidence in the book to show that the Republican Government is anything but efficient, that corruption is rife in every department (not less in the judicial than in others), that the treasury is bankrupt and salaries of officials in great arrears, that such common amenities of life as roads and railways are altogether lacking, that the Americo-Liberian, who has received a certain amount of education, considers himself a "white man," despises manual work, lives on imported tinned foods, treats the native as of an inferior race and preys upon him, that consequently there is no love lost between the two, and that law and order is scarcely enforced beyond a depth of 25 miles from the coast. Supposing things are as bad as they are represented by the author, can the assumption of government by an inter-national board or a mandatory power be recommended as a proper remedy? Friendly advice coupled with financial aid, particularly from the U. S. A., would appear to be all that is necessary. The reader, however, hesitates to believe that the state of affairs can be as bad as depicted in the book, because it is written more in the spirit of a pamphleteer than in that of an unprejudiced observer and very little is mentioned to represent the other side. It is a posthumous publication and no doubt the author would have improved its literary form if he had himself put it through the press. As it is, it partakes very much of the character of a collection of scrappy notes. It, however, deals with a little known subject and though the author's proposal, which is also strongly supported by Sir Alfred Sharpe in the introduction, may not be approved, it serves the purpose of drawing public attention to the state of things in the small Republic,

V. V. S.

MISCELLANEA.

EAST AFRICAN PROBLEMS.

(BY THE LATE BISHOP OF ZANZIBAR.)

Kenya Colony is the centre of the federation party. Known until recently as British East Africa, and lately notorious for its Indian controversy, Kenya is the most advertised of all our African colonies. Its settlers are in a great hurry to develop the land, and never tire of singing the praises of their climate, their soil and their hunting-grounds. Of the beauty and promise of Kenya Colony there can be no two opinions. But of the wisdom of the recent policy of speedy development there is room for much question, as many ruined ex-officers can testify. In fact, Kenya needs many more labourers to place on its settlers' farms an a great deal more money for rail-roads, without which the settlers cannot grow rich. Tanganyika can supply the labourers, Zanzibar has the money. And, incidentally, the customs could be made uniform, and

other vexatious differences removed. The Governor of Kenya with his Council of officials and settlers, would be free to impose the wishes of Kenya upon the less important, because less Europeanised, parts of the federation. Such is the scheme in brief. Its authors have their own ways of stating it; they will not accept mine. For example. When they point out that a federated Government will have a greater power of borrowing they neglect to say also that they of Kenya will not have to repay Zanzibar a small sum of £ 200,000!

But apart from these little matters, there are several serious objections to Kenya's plan. First the settlers of Kenya want home rule. They do not disguise the fact that in spite of the Colonial Office's recent ruling that Kenya is to be governed for the African, the Britisher is to have the paramount position in the colony. The African will not be given more room for self-development than is consistent with the white settler's welfare. The white man is to be first and foremost in the colony. Later on, he means to have an unofficial majority in the Council. The federation will, therefore, be of no use to the settler unless the interests of the Africans can be subordinated to those of the European population. The whole force of British influence will be directed to extending the power of Kenya within the whole federation. This, to any one who knows local policies, is beyond question. The British people must think several times before giving such a position of power and influence to a body of home-rulers who have already shown their temper when up against their King's Ministers. Men who could persuade themselves that it was right to warn their Sovereign of their intention to rebel if their opinion on Indian policy was not accepted, are hardly fit to receive the first position in a federation of Governments. At any moment they may declare war on the Sovereign, and remove his officers, in order to further some policy which, to their mind, is essential to the Empire's welfare. That the settlers had a good case against the Indian claims, I admit: what I deny is that men who calmly prepare for war against their King are to be trusted to lead in a federation of young colonies, the chief problems of which are concerned with the rival claims of English, Indian, and African.

Secondly, there is the objection from the standpoint of administration. At present the Administrations of Zanzibar and Tanganyika have at heart the development of the native of the country. Not very much is done for him it is true; but as funds permit more is being done each year. His rulers in these two countries are alive to his existence as a person on whose health and prosperity everything depends. In Kenya, on the other hand, the African is valued chiefly as far as he can take the place of the Asiatic clerk and tradesman, and can till up the plantations of the white men. Kenya, as a whole, does not wish to see African farmers. The keenest settlers look forward to seeing thousands more white men in the colony, and talk of enforced labour as a quite natural policy.

Candid settlers admit that the present system of taxation in Kenya does, in fact, force the African out of his reserves into their plantations, and that the interests of the natives and the settlers are not compatible. A case can, of course, be made out for the settlers' claims; but it is more honest to admit that it cannot be established without the complete subordination of the African. This is not merely a question of white and black. It is one of rival and rival in the matter of money. It is a war of capital and labour, with the added trouble of the racial problem. Kenya sees in its Africans its necessary employes, while conscious that its European blood gives it, of divine right, a permanent position of superiority over them. Is it fair, then, that Kenya should be given chief power in a federation of African countries?

We shall be told that the interests of the Africans are safe in the hands of the Colonial Office. I can only reply that, unless the Colonial Office keeps the power in its own hands, the security is not good enough. No sane man will pretend that Downing Street can guarantee to the Africans of Kenya their rights. It is being squeezed by the settlers, little by little, into giving them what they want. Compromise is the order of the day. And compromise will not do if one

the federation be allowed. Kenya must be tested over a long term of years before it is given any more power over Africans.

I do not labour these points, however, for it is not possible to federate Zanzibar with Kenya unless finally we rob the Sultan of the kingdom we have promised to secure to his house for ever. Is it too much to hope that, when Britain hears what has been discussed in her name, she will put a stop to the plannings of her representatives? It is shame enough for England that the Arabs know we have even discussed such a plan; it will be a disgrace if the plan matures.

Why does Kenya desire Zanzibar? The Sultan's dominion, small as it is now, is rich in cloves and coconuts and enjoys a good, steady revenue. The federated Government will be able to take a substantial sum from the islands each year, and by means of starving the islands a little, divert to the mainland a very useful sum of money. In fact, quite a large loan could be floated on the security of the Zanzibar local revenue. Unless Great Britain awakens to the danger, our good name in Zanzibar, resting on the reputations of men like Sir John Kirk and Sir Rennell Rodd, Sir Lloyd Matthews and Mr. Basil Cave, will be sacrificed in order that Kenya may have a few more rail-roads and some other such aids to white settlement. Sir Arther Hardinge was a great power in Zanzibar and his name is held in high respect. He made us respected; will he not help us to retrieve our good fame?

It would be incredible to me that such proposals were on foot did I not know of them from sources that are beyond suspicion. I try to find comfort in the supposition that those responsible for the plans have not read the treaties. But this only serves me in my most optimistic moments. For it is hardly likely that men in a position to unmake Sovereigns under our protection are ignorant of our obligations towards them and their subjects. So that in my more pessimistic moods I cannot but reflect on the surrender of our country to the lust for riches, at the cost of national honour.

Tanganyika Territory we hold from the League of Nations in trust for the native population. To this we are pledged by Mr. Lloyd George and others. Great Britain declared she would not take German East Africa as her own, but would hold it in trust for the Africans if so requested by the new League. The Mandate of the League was issued to us. We undertook the task. And we have done very good work towards the fulfilment of our promise. Money is too scarce for all we ought to do, but Sir Horace Byatt and his staff are doing excellent work, and, given time they will accomplish the task set them. It is a very long way we have to go, but our faces are in the right direction. The Africans in the territory can call their souls their own. And, with the exception of the official African class, and the casual labourers in the coast towns, they are thankful to be rid of the Germans. The official African class is not pleased. It has no longer the power of oppressing the natives which the Germans allowed, and trade is so dull that money cannot be picked up in the coast towns as in the pre-war days. It is also true that some Germans who have come back, in spite of their military service against us, and some Englishmen who regret the loss of German forced labour, stir up a certain enthusiasm for "the good and old German days." For the rest, the whole country is glad to be under British rule. I admit that not all English ways appeal to African minds. I know that English laws of evidence puzzle men who are accustomed to more rough and ready ways of settling troubles. But, after a large experience of natives, in a very wide area, I do not hesitate to say that Tanganyika Territory is being governed on lines such as the League approves, and such as the Africans appreciate. If these lines continue to be followed for a few generations the territory will flourish in a manner that will astonish our critics of to-day.

But Kenya wants our labourers. It desires to take in more white men than it can find workers for, and it will need labour from outside. Hence Tanganyika must be sacrificed. The fact that Tanganyika is not British property does not come into consideration. Kenya needs it, just as it needs Zanzibar. As Zanzibar can be taken from its Sultan, so Tanganyika can

be got out of the hands of the League of Nations. Who is to stop Great Britain? There is no Power in a position to step in and prevent the annexation of the two countries. And in any case, it can all be done under the guise of a federation of Government, without actual annexation. On paper, the present position can be maintained. But, in fact all become British, and Kenya will be senior trustee in Britain's name.

Has the League nothing to say? Truly, it is a mad world in which we lecture Italy on her duty to the League, while our Colonial leaders conspire with settlers to repudiate a mandate and annex a territory in the face of our national pledge. And all because it will pay us better to do so! Rightly or wrongly, we have taken our responsibility for Tanganyika Territory. We must see our task out, to the bitter end. And our immediate duty is, as a nation, to repudiate those who propose to federate Tanganyika with Kenya Colony. It remains to examine the case for some measure of common government for the five countries named in the course of this discussion. For there must be some truth in a contention that moves our Colonial Office to consider, even for a moment, a policy which, to us on the spot, looks like sheer robbery.

No doubt what I have written may seem to show a lack of sympathy with settlers. In fact, I have a real sympathy with them and recognize that without them Africa cannot develop. They are needed, but they must not be allowed to ignore the just claims of the country. Two chief principles must be laid down by the British Government, and taken as guides by the local authorities. The first is, that land must not be alienated to settlers that will ever be needed by the natives. Nor must more settlers be admitted to any one district than the local labour market can supply. The second is that the white employers of labour must never be given political power over their work people. The Government must remain in the hands of the Imperial Cabinet and as far as possible, Africans must be obtained to fill the subordinate positions.

No doubt, wiser men will see a better way of meeting our needs. I did not sit down to draw up a better plan for the ruling of Africa. What I have said in the way of suggestion is meant to show that I am not blind to the danger we are in of betraying the Sultan of Zanzibar; and of sacrificing the natives of Tanganyika Territory to the needs of Kenya Colony. I call upon all Britons to see that this scheme of federation is dropped, and to encourage the Cabinet to make better arrangements for the supervision of the East African colonies. In conclusion, I wish to suggest that the present policy of speed-up the development of East Africa is not, from the Imperialist view, at all a wise one. It can only be carried out by drawing the natives of Africa away from their homes and tribes, with the consequent spread of venereal disease and the lowering of the birth rate. This has already gone too far. A wise rule would shut out settlers from any district that could not show a sufficient supply of local labour, while the true Imperialist would fill up Canada and Australia before alienating Africans land to settlers from home. I look forward to the day when Great Britain will tell her sons that, until they have filled up the vacant spaces of our "white colonies," there will be adopted in East Africa a policy of restricting settlement.

To the East African settlers this will read as sheer heresy. In fact, it is the most straight orthodoxy. For, indeed, it is no good service to the Empire to sacrifice the health and social life of the Africans to a few thousand Englishmen who find land-owning cheaper in Africa than in England and less exhausting than in Canada or Australia. Settlers are needed in Africa: but in small numbers, and of picked character. To open Africa to all comers, irrespective of the needs of the rest of the Empire, is to shorten the Empire's existence. Great Britain is at the bar of judgment. As she treats Zanzibar and Tanganyika so will she be measured by the Arabs and Africans of East Africa.

T. S. ANNUAL CONVENTION SALES

A Grand Opportunity

FOR STUDENTS—WORKERS, LIBRARIES
AND THE YOUTH

Important and Useful Books and Pamphlets at
HALF PRICES AND UNDER

Available for one month only from
December 15th, 1924 to January 15th, 1925

By ANNIE BESANT, D. L., P. T. S.

	Original Price		Reduced Price	
	Rs.	A.	Rs.	A.
Birth of New India ...	1	0	0	8
The East and the West ...	0	2	0	1
England and India ...	0	2	0	1
The Future of Indian Politics ...	3	8	2	8
How India Wrought for Freedom	3	0	1	8
India and the Empire ...	0	8	0	4
Indian Nation ...	0	1	0	$\frac{1}{2}$
India's Awakening ...	0	1	0	$\frac{1}{2}$
Means of India's Regeneration	0	2	0	1
The Place of Politics in the Life of a Nation ...	0	2	0	1
The Census of India. By M. S. KAMATH ...	0	12	Free if bought in a lot.	
Total ...	9	6	5	1

[All the eleven books in a lot, Rs. 4]

The Theosophical Publishing House,
Adyar Madras.

THE INDIAN BOOK SHOP
NEW INDIA OFFICE.

George Town, Madras.

Railways and the Budget

BY
"ECONOMY"

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

(Crown 16mo. size. pp. 80)

Price **As. 8 net**

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

Books can be had from—

THE ARYABHUSHAN PRESS,
BUDHWAR PETH, POONA.

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,

LUCKNOW UNIVERSITY, }
LUCKNOW, } Business Manager.
Lucknow University Journal.

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.

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. Crows, 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.