

# India

FOR THE

No. 55. NEW SERIES.  
No. 149. OLD SERIES.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, JANUARY 20, 1899.

[REGISTERED AS A PRICE... 2d.  
NEWSPAPER. {By Post, 2½d.]

Notes and News .....	20	Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji at Hyde .....	35
Mr. Bose's Presidential Address .....	32	The Fourteenth Congress: Presidential Address by Mr. A. M. Bose .....	36
A Magnanimous Indian Prince, by Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P. .....	33	Public Meetings on Indian Questions: The Work of the British Committee .....	39
Chronicle of the Week .....	34	Advertisements .....	40
The Calcutta Municipal Bill: Telegram from Calcutta .....	35		

\* \* An Index, with Title-page, to Vol. IX of INDIA (January to June, 1898) is in the Press. An Index, with Title-page, to Vol. X (July to December, 1898) will be ready in a few days. Copies will be forwarded gratis and post free to Subscribers on application to the Manager.

## NOTES AND NEWS.

**S**TORM-SIGNALS in the direction of Tibet continue and multiply. The *Times* yesterday (Thursday) printed a telegram from its correspondent at Calcutta summarising a report from Captain Trench, political officer at Ladak, on Indian (? Anglo-Indian) trade *vis à vis* Kashmir with Tibet and Chinese and Russian Turkestan. The trade, we are told, is rapidly declining. It has fallen in a year from 59 lakhs to 42 lakhs. Accordingly Captain Trench, who seems to have been reading the speeches of the later Mr. Chamberlain, thinks that "it is our duty to look for a fresh field."

In my opinion this is to be found in the direction of Tibet. A commercial invasion of that country, with the rich provinces of Kansu, Szu-chuan, and Shen-si in China as the objective, would, I believe, be profitable. There are already some hopeful signs that the peasantry of Tibet are gradually losing their suspicious dislike of the trader from India. Between Ladak and Tibet the trade is busy. To the few who are allowed to cross the border surely there is much to advocate a policy which should carry trade to South China. I hope that this report will, at any rate, be the means of drawing attention to Tibet and its possible use as a trade market.

A "commercial invasion," observe. The phrase is significant in these days of wars for commerce or, in Mr. Morley's plainer English, murder for gain. What precisely Captain Trench may mean by the phrase is not clear. But, as our readers are aware, a "forward" movement towards Tibet has long been advocated by Anglo-Indian militarists on the double pretext (1) that Tibet would be a nice health-resort for languid Anglo-Indian officials, and (2) that it would offer a lucrative market. Either of these "reasons" is, no doubt, in the present condition of ruling English opinion, sufficient justification for any crime. But, if the crime is committed, its authors should at least refrain from the added meanness of charging to the Indian taxpayers the incidental expenses. This type of meanness, not once nor twice in our rough island story, has attended the spread of what it is becoming fashionable to call civilisation.

The leader of the Liberal party, in his great and memorable speech at Brechin on Tuesday night, mentioned among the prospective burdens of empire the charges which must sooner or later fall upon the British taxpayer in connexion with Anglo-India:—

There are (he said) famines and border wars in India to which there is a great disposition in this country to contribute—some wars inevitable on that frontier, and some foolish. If this were the time, I should like to say a little more about the prospects of Indian revenue and commercial prosperity.

Mr. Morley is right. There is "a great disposition in this country to contribute" to the cost of "Imperialist" operations beyond the North-West frontier of India. But it was choked by the decision of Anglo-Indian officers that it is safer to impose an unjust burden on the voteless taxpayers of India than to accept the aid, and incur the curiosity, of taxpayers who have votes at home. It is the mark of your good "Imperialist" to bully the weak and trundle to the strong.

Everyone in these latter days talk about Imperialism, and boasts his devotion to the Empire, yet the ideas that seem so gloriously potent in speeches are not always so

No. 3. V

effective in the region of practical life. Natal and Australia have been lately giving the Indians a good lesson in the value of the Imperial idea, and that great centre of Empire, the Holy Place at which its votaries were to gather, the famous Imperial Institute, blessed by princes and glorified by historians, has long been in a sad way. Several of the richest colonies have withdrawn, the place is deserted, the refreshment contractors have struck, and it is finally proposed to hand over the building to the new University of London on condition that that body assumes all liabilities. It may be taken for granted that a few rooms will be kept for "Imperial purposes," and if the refreshment difficulty remains unsolved, it will at least remind the visitors of that poor and famine-stricken portion of the Empire which is still forced to continue its subscription after many of its richer partners have sensibly retired. But seriously, is it not a scandal that India amid her financial embarrassments should have been made to subscribe heavily to this grotesque imposture and should be still subscribing even when it is an admitted failure? The *Advocate of India* claims that the building, apparently the only valuable asset, should be sold for as much as can be got, and that India should be reimbursed as far as possible from the proceeds; but it is to be feared that India will regain very little of what she has lost. At any rate the subscription should be stopped at once, if that has not already been done.

Mr. Michael Davitt has been amusing the readers of the *Paris Figaro* by his lively account of the disinterested virtues of Saint John Bull. "He governs India by taking his stand on altruistic principles, for her good and not for his own. He wants to see Egypt happy, and simply for this reason he is absolved from the dishonour of breaking his engagements to Europe, engagements by which he solemnly promised to quit the land of the Pharaohs after having made an end of the internal troubles caused by Arabi's rebellion." Mr. Davitt goes on to recount how the saint has waged war, man of peace though he be, against savage races, all for their own good and to save them from coming under the yoke of France or Germany, constraining the perverse savages by a treatment compounded of dynamite, gin and bibles. Nor does the writer forget to contrast the English protests against the concessions in Manchuria and elsewhere which Russia has wrung from China, with the opium war and the seizure of Wei-hai-Wei. In one point, indeed, the *Figaro* deceives its readers. It refers to Mr. Davitt's article as the opinion of "un Anglais." This is to confuse the lion with its prey. It is worthy of note that Mr. Davitt insists that the Americans in favour of an Anglo-American alliance are only a small, though noisy, minority.

On another page will be found our Calcutta correspondent's report of yet another popular meeting in Calcutta to protest against the Calcutta Municipality Bill. By last mail, too, we have full newspaper reports of the very important meeting on December 28, presided over by Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee. Mr. Bonnerjee declared that "he would be the first to welcome a change, if it be shown that the change would improve the position of affairs;" but he was opposed to the change proposed because "it would prove disastrous" to the town. At the same time he frankly acknowledged that the Government were actuated by good intentions, their object being to make Calcutta the first town in India in point of sanitation. They were, he thought, in error. But there was no room for blaming anybody. Nor did anybody want to be obstructive to the Government. "The Bill should always be judged on its own merits." Such was the noteworthy attitude adopted by Mr. Bonnerjee.

Addressing himself then to criticism of the measure,

Mr. Bonnerjee pointed out that it neither made the municipality a department of Government nor gave the municipality real local self government. It fell between two stools. To be sure, in these days, it would hardly be an acceptable, however intelligible, step to put the administration of Calcutta formally and exclusively into the hands of Government officials; but the objection is less popularly glaring if, as the Bill proposes, the Government officials keep the whip hand while the representative element is a mere semblance, totally devoid of initiative or of real control. If the fault of the present constitution lay in the General Committee's assumption of the whole work and consequent failure, then obviously, as Mr. Bonnerjee argued, the first thing should have been to efface the General Committee; but the Government, instead of doing this, simply set up another General Committee, just as likely to be found inefficient as the present one. Mr. Bonnerjee had no objection to European business members; on the contrary there would, he thought, perhaps be better management if there were more such members in the Corporation. But why did they not come forward? Simply because "they really had no time to give to municipal work," and because they "are mere birds of passage," with no abiding interest in the country. "What was wanted was that there should be men who had an abiding interest in the country, who had leisure, business habits, and experience;" and Mr. Bonnerjee thought that plenty of such men were to be found among the people of that country. The rupees would not tempt the Europeans; to ask them was "like a child asking for the moon."

Mr. Bonnerjee urged that, if the municipality of Calcutta was to be improved, this should be done upon some such plan as is exemplified in the municipalities of England. He explained the constitution and operation of the County Council of Croydon, where he is himself a ratepayer. Why should there not be some such system in Calcutta? And why not separate committees with chairmen and vice-chairmen? The time he hoped was near when Calcutta would be able to manage its own affairs without the executive head now considered necessary. At any rate, "he thought that it might be arranged that the official element would give effect to the proposals of the committee and the Corporation"—that the chairman should no longer originate and carry out all projects. Mr. Bonnerjee also referred to another system formulated by the majority of Commissioners appointed some time ago to enquire into certain points of Calcutta sanitation. This system involved the division of the city into various local municipalities, each managing its own affairs, the Corporation of Calcutta being the central body securing unity of action. Take one or another, or a third. But "to pass the Municipal Bill as it is would be an act of unwisdom on the part of the Government." Mr. Bonnerjee concluded with an expression of hope that Sir John Woodburn, who possessed statesmanship of a rare order, would see his way either to let things be as they are or to improve them so as to give more real self-government than now exists.

The meeting, as we have already stated, adopted a strong memorial deprecating the Bill. This should be an answer to criticisms then current. The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* says that in high official circles the speeches delivered at the meeting preceding this one were regarded as "disappointing," and that it was matter of taunt that the opponents of the Bill "have not yet submitted to Government any elaborate or well-reasoned memorial against the measure." This is not surprising; it would be surprising if it were otherwise. But as the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* goes on to remark:—

Is it really necessary to prove by facts and figures that the Municipal Bill is a most reactionary measure, and that, if passed into law, it will really be impossible for a large section of the poorer classes to reside in the town? Surely it is very difficult to convince Sir John Woodburn—honest, intelligent and sympathetic as he is—that the Bill takes away the substance and leaves only the shadow to the people. It citizens now practically control the municipal affairs of the town through their representatives. The latter fix the pay of the chairman, appoint the vice-chairman and other highly-paid officers, control big contracts and check expenditures. They have been exercising these powers for the last twenty-two years with credit to themselves and their constituents. They are now suddenly going to be deprived of all these privileges and reduced to mere dummies. Is any argument necessary to prove that this is an act of great injustice and destruction? Says Sir John Woodburn that the Bill does not interfere with the elective system. But what

is the elective system worth, if those who are elected are not vested with responsible powers?

What, indeed? We hope Sir John has not developed a blind eye to turn at will upon inconvenient facts.

The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* gives an account of the genesis of the Calcutta Municipal Bill. Sir Alexander Mackenzie, who had inherited from his guru, Sir Ashley Eden, an aversion to representative government in Indian cities, soon found himself at war with the municipal commissioners, who resented his treatment. Sir Alexander then made the discovery that Calcutta was a "den of filth and dirt." Some young doctors who knew nothing of what the city had once been, or of how great an improvement had been effected by the elected municipality, on being appointed to inspect the sanitary state of the town, found no difficulty in agreeing with the Lieutenant-Governor. And so the way was paved for the present Bill.

The *Sunday Special* hits the nail on the head in its concise remarks upon Lord Elgin's Viceroyalty: "The chorus of official praise which has followed Lord Elgin on laying down office in India is," it says, "easily explained. Lord Elgin did what the officials around him desired him to do, and men always recognise the wisdom of their own advice." Precisely.

In his address to the Congress, Mr. Bose in reproaching the withdrawal of liberties that had once been conferred, was able to call as a witness to the impolicy of such measures one who is the editor of an organ of Conservative opinion in England. This was Sir Douglas Straight, formerly a Judge of Allahabad High Court. Sir Douglas wrote to the *Times* as follows:—

Speaking from fifteen years' residence in India, during which, I hope, I kept neither my eyes nor my ears shut, I am firmly convinced of one thing, and it is this—that while innovations and changes there should only be very gradually and cautiously introduced, a concession once made should never be withdrawn except for reasons of the most paramount and pressing emergency.

Here then we have in advance a most striking condemnation of the retrograde policy of the Government from one of their own party; for it would be hard to defend any, much less all, of its retrograde measures on the ground of "most paramount and pressing emergency." And the concessions which it was proposed to withdraw when Sir Douglas wrote were trivial by comparison with those of which India has been deprived during the last two or three years, or which are threatened at this moment.

On Saturday evening last (January 14), Professor A. F. Muriison delivered a lecture on "The Problem of India" before the Cambridge Wells Fabian Society. Remarking on the opportuneness of the occasion, he referred to the frank and considerate reception of Lord Curzon of Kedleston as Viceroy by the Indians, and to the recent meeting of the Indian National Congress. In defining his subject he quoted and dwelt on Mr. Asquith's expression of what "is or ought to be the predominant purpose" of British policy—the "slow but effective association" with the Indians, whereby we hope to aid them in "the task of working out for themselves a larger and a better political and social ideal." The slowness of such association, he thought, was more apparent than the effectiveness. Examining first the question of external defence and protection, he exposed the hopeless difficulties of a Russian attack, noted the steadfast loyalty of the Amir of Afghanistan, and condemned the policy of constant irritation of the tribes. The "Forward Policy" of the past generation was the most expensive futility in modern history. Passing to the questions of internal administration, Dr. Muriison dealt shortly with the disorders of the finances and the foolish attempt to place the currency on an artificial basis; the impolicy of additional railway, irrigation, and other public works till such time as India could pay for them out of savings; the necessity of relief to the agriculturists by well-conceived legislation as well as by more considerate administration; and the steady reduction of the Home charges, commencing with an Imperial contribution. Recalling Lord Lawrence's advice, "Be just and kind," he insisted on the absolute necessity for sympathetic treatment as well as for justice. The most fundamental of all needs was the need of knowledge—knowledge of the thought and feeling of the people; for "the loss of touch with the

people was the most perilous fact in the case. Hence the recent campaign of repression, which Dr. Murison illustrated by the Sedition laws, the cases of Mr. Tilak and the Natus, and the ridiculous Press Committees. Fortunately, the National Congress remained unsilenced, and that was a power no longer to be combated, but to be used discreetly for the guidance of the Government, if Government had only the sense to recognise its best friend. The large audience, by repeated suggestions, encouraged Dr. Murison to prolong his address to an hour and a half; and a real interest in Indian affairs was further markedly evinced by the speeches in the subsequent discussion.

It might have been thought that the Indian Government would be satisfied with the vigorous measures that have lately been taken to gag the Press in British India, and that it would not trouble about the few papers published in Native States; but this seems to be a mistake. According to the *Mahratta*, the *Gulburga Samachar*, a small paper published in the Nizam's dominions, and written partly in Urdu and partly in Marathi, has been recently suppressed at the request of the Officiating Resident, Mr. C. E. G. Crawford. On May 26 last it had the temerity to publish an article on the frequent outrages committed by Europeans on Indians, and the inadequate punishments sometimes inflicted; and for this, which the newspapers of British India have done with impunity, Mr. Crawford is said to have accused it of successfully attempting to spread ill-feeling. In the end the paper was suppressed for six months. Such is the story as given by the *Mahratta*, which also publishes a translation of the article in question, but still cherishes a hope that some other explanation of the suspension may be forthcoming.

Among many excellent persons in this country the skill and enlightenment with which India is governed has long been an article of faith. As for the criticisms of the Congress, they are a token of that monstrous ingratitude which refuses to see in the Government of India an institution as nearly perfect as the frailty of human nature allows. In one paper, surely an organ of sedition, we read:—"There is no more extraordinary feature in Indian administration than the tenacity with which blunders and mistakes are adhered to in spite of every effort on the part of responsible officials to eradicate them." The *Pioneer* is led to this outburst by the Report of the Director of Agriculture, who complains that, while in the old time collectors and magistrates loved to plant avenues of trees along the high roads, trees which yet remain to shade the traveller, now arboriculture is a lost art, and when tree-planting is attempted, the same old mistakes are continually repeated. This leads the *Pioneer* to emphasise the contrast between "the collectors of the old régime, who knew and loved their districts and carried out their ideas successfully," and their successors, who with appointments of six months on the average, neither know nor care to know their districts, and think only of getting in their revenue and making their excise settlements. The *Pioneer* is quite right. It is the ignorance of their districts and still more their estrangement from the inhabitants that renders useless or worse than useless much of the work of even the ablest officials.

Commenting on the arrest of one of the alleged murderers of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst, the *Times of India* says:—"The particulars of the murder, the trial of Tilak and the arrest of the Natus brothers in connexion with this political intrigue are too fresh to require recapitulation." Now surely this sentence is unworthy of a newspaper of repute. Mr. Tilak was not, as the context seems to imply, tried for the murder. Why the Natus were arrested has never been disclosed. It is not even known that it was for a political intrigue. Mr. Crowe, who tried the murderer who has already been convicted, found no evidence of conspiracy beyond the accused and his brother who is now at last in custody. How then can it with any fairness be alleged that the Natus were arrested in connexion with a political intrigue which had some concern with the murder? But this is only one example of the injustice done to the Natus by the silence of the Government. Our contemporary goes on to speak thus concerning the man just arrested: "Shelved by Brahminical influence, and surrounded by a large body of money, this instrument of the Government was not only not punished, but was

securely baffling the efforts of the police." It is unnecessary to refer to the bad taste of this passage. It is sufficient to point out, as the *Advocate of India* has done, that the fugitive, far from revelling in luxury supplied by Brahminical gold, seems to have suffered great hardships, while the only persons who befriended him were not Brahmins but Dacoits.

The Calcutta correspondent of the *Financial Times*, in a letter dated December 8, mentions a current report that the majority of the members of the Currency Committee "have already made up their minds," and that the further examination of witnesses "is being conducted in a most perfunctory manner."

Three weeks ago two important witnesses were up for examination, viz., Mr. Donald Graham, C.I.E., one of the largest importers of cotton goods into India, and Mr. Cheetham, of the firm of Messrs. Kilburn and Co., who are interested in various Indian industries, and particularly in the inland trade, which is so much more important than even the foreign trade. The following members of the Currency Committee, I am credibly informed, thought fit to absent themselves from that day's sitting: Sir Henry Fowler, Lord Balfour, Sir David Barbour, Mr. Hambro, and Mr. Holland. The two witnesses, I believe, were subjected to a very slight examination, and the impression upon at least one of them was that the whole thing was done for form's sake as much as anything else. Neither of the witnesses is a rabid partisan of open mints, although neither favours a gold standard.

The writer quotes the Calcutta *Englishman* as saying, "there can be little doubt that the decision of the Committee has been already arrived at."

One is not surprised to learn that there is "considerable indignation" in Calcutta at this state of affairs. The correspondent of the *Financial Times* continues:—

If the members of the Committee have made up their minds, let them say so, and leave off the further examination of witnesses. Business men cannot afford to waste their time in this sort of way. Mr. David Yule for example, I believe, again asked a few days ago by the Government if he could proceed home in February to give his evidence. He has now however rightly refused to go. Nor need the Committee now expect to obtain any Native evidence of value. The Native is generally adverse to expressing his opinions publicly should they happen to be against those of the Government, and it is clear that no Native in favour of open mints would receive much encouragement from the Committee. The feeling among a considerable section of the mercantile community is that the sooner the report is issued the better, and that the question must be further threshed out in Parliament; only the Committee must not be surprised if less value is placed on its report than would have been the case had a fairer hearing been accorded to those who are not in favour of a gold standard for India.

If these complaints are well founded, it would be interesting to know how far the shortcomings of the Committee are due to its refusal to admit the Press. There can be no doubt that so long as the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure excluded reporters, practically no interest was taken in its proceedings; but when reporters were admitted matters at once briskened up and all sorts of interesting and important witnesses came forward. The publication of newspaper reports at brief intervals keeps public interest fixed and fresh, and this in its turn reacts in a wholesome way on the proceedings of the investigating body.

A correspondent ("Medicus Indicus") requests us to give publicity to the following suggestion:—

I do not doubt the superior wisdom of my political elders, but I for one cannot exactly see how a few stray meetings, and a couple of stereotyped resolutions, are going to bring about the political emancipation of our country. I do not underrate the value of such meetings—indeed, they are the only constitutional means available for our purposes. But even our optimistic leaders must admit the absolute futility of these meetings, and I now raise a plea for a change of our tactics. I suggest that the Congress Committee, like a kindred association, might hold occasional social gatherings which from their novelty and smartness might attract the Tory editor, the Primrose dame, and even that shy personage, the Anglo-Indian nabob. And I am not altogether without hope, that under the influence of small talk and weak tea, they may yet learn the unwisdom of their ways, and extend to us their sympathy and co-operation. I know not of any objection to this suggestion except the usual financial one. But if my countrymen were to realise that this is a very safe and sound investment I have no doubt that the requisite money will be forthcoming. John Bull refuses to be drawn to our political meetings. Let us now try to tackle him in our social gatherings. I maintain that the experiment is worth trying, if only for the sake of an experiment.

Our correspondent may, we think, be assured that the British Committee of the Indian National Congress will accord to his proposal the attention it deserves. Meantime he might write a pamphlet entitled (say) "How to Save India by Smoking Concerts."

## MR. BOSE'S PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS.

THERE is no institution in India more directly the outcome of British rule and more clearly the result of contact with British ways of thought than the Indian National Congress, yet not one has been more systematically depreciated by Anglo-Indians and their friends in England. Sprung from those ideas of free speech and the supremacy of public opinion which are now everywhere accepted in English political life, and carried out by that class of educated Indians which is the special creation of British government, the Congress has yet been an object of suspicion to the English rulers of India. Men who come from another world to spend a few years in governing India, far from welcoming the information they might gain from its yearly meeting, cry out that the delegates are by their training rendered too remote from their countrymen to be really representative. They talk about the "silent masses" as if those who have been born in India and bred in an Indian family, and who share the language and religion of their people, are not much better able to interpret the wants and wishes of the "silent masses" than are those birds of passage whose dearest hopes and strongest feelings are really centred in a distant island of the West; as if this foreign education could so eradicate all the earliest and deepest impressions of the Indians as to make them strangers in the land of their birth. Indeed the effects of this education, in the opinion of the typical Anglo-Indian, seems to vary marvellously according to the temper of the moment. At one instant it is a thin veneer which leaves the recipient with all the supposed vices and weaknesses of his race in full force. At another it is so powerful as to uproot all the feelings belonging to his country, and leave him without knowledge of or sympathy with his uneducated fellow-countrymen. Such criticisms are mutually destructive. But it may be suspected that Sir Richard Garth, who once filled the high office of Chief Justice of Bengal, gave a truer account of the reasons that led so many Anglo-Indians to attack the Congress. Here are his words, as given by Mr. Bose:—

They have dared to think for themselves; and not only for themselves, but for the millions of poor ignorant people who compose our Indian empire. They have been content to sacrifice their own interests, and to brave the displeasure of Government in order to lend a helping hand to those poor people. They have had the courage and the patriotism to denounce abuses which have disgraced our Indian rule for years past, which have been condemned by public opinion in India and in England, and to which the Indian Government appear to cling with a tenacity which seems utterly inexplicable. They have dared to propose reforms which, despite the resistance of the Government, have been approved by Parliament, and to endeavour to stay that fearful amount of extravagance which has been going on in India for years past, and has been the means, as some of our best and wisest counsellors consider, of bringing our Eastern Empire to the verge of bankruptcy.

Mr. Bose quoted these remarkable sentences in his presidential address to the Madras Congress, and of every sentence that speech was in itself a most excellent confirmation. It is true that another view was put before the people of this country. The readers of the *Times* were informed in an editorial article that "the vague and colourless character of the President's address is perhaps an indication that the movement is weakening." Happily the *Bombay Gazette*—an Anglo-Indian paper—has published that address in full, so that it is now possible to learn at first hand if it is vague and colourless. Mr. Bose, as will be seen from another part of our present issue, began, after some complimentary references, by drawing attention to the era of reaction through which the British Empire in India was now passing for the first time. Hitherto the rate of progress had been slow, but a step once gained, a liberty once conferred, had never been afterwards lost. What was given was not again withdrawn. Even the one exception to this, the Vernacular Press Act, was more apparent than real; for the Act was soon abandoned, while the Bill brought in six years ago to restrict trial by jury in Bengal was defeated and never became law. So far then with one solitary and temporary exception, self-government and freedom, in however small a measure they have been conferred, have never until the present period of reaction been afterwards taken away. But from 1896 onwards a different spirit has prevailed, distrust has taken the place of confidence, and the great work of extending English liberty to India has been exchanged for that of contracting the freedom already granted. Mr. Bose traced this out in one department of Government after another:

in education, where he found growing disabilities and exclusions, in the imprisonment of the Natus without trial, in the new law of sedition, and in the Calcutta Municipal Bill, not to speak of the Press prosecutions, the Press Committees and the Punitive Police force imposed on Poona. Then followed a protest against the policy of aggression which had led to the war beyond the frontier, and against the conduct of the Indian Government in refusing the assistance which England was ready to grant, and the loss of which had rendered all reform and all improvement more difficult than ever. Finally, he dealt with those measures which he thought most urgent, such as a reform of the executive councils and police, and the separation of judicial and executive functions, one of the marks of civilised government. It is surely difficult to see anything "vague and colourless" in a speech dealing in detail with such specific grievances and proposing such specific reforms; but it may be worth while to consider if there is anything in the treatment of each instance which can give support to the criticism of the *Times*.

Let us take for the purpose of a more detailed examination the President's treatment of the first two grievances on his list, both of which relate to education. They are less known to the readers of INDIA than the others, and they may seem less important; but no injustice, even though it only affected one man, is ever unimportant. Every unredressed injustice is a danger to the whole community. The first is that "reorganisation of the Educational Service" which was contained in the Resolution of the Government of India dated July 23, 1896. Some thirty years ago, when the higher educational service in Bengal was organised, all grades alike were thrown open to natives of India on equal terms with those born in Europe, and although subsequently the pay of Indian officials was reduced to two-thirds of that of their European fellow-subjects, the highest offices were still open to them. It was only by the Resolution of 1896 that this was changed, for not only was the pay of Indian officials in this Department fixed at about one-half of that of their English colleagues, but they were for the first time excluded from many of the highest posts, including the principalships of five of the leading colleges. In fact Indians are henceforward to be "usually" restricted to the Provincial Service, and since the date of the Resolution no Indian has been appointed to the "Indian" service which is to monopolise the higher posts. As Mr. Bose, himself a high wrangler, says:—

Natives of India, educated in the highest universities of England, possessing the same or even much higher qualifications than their English colleagues, of the same standing and doing the same work with them, are to get half or less than half of the pay of the latter, are to be excluded from the higher positions open to the latter, and may have to serve as their subordinates. I ask you, brother delegates, is a new barrier now to be erected against the people of this country? Is a new policy of reservation and exclusion based on considerations of race and colour to be now inaugurated in India after sixty years of her Gracious Majesty's beneficent reign?

The incident marks a step in that policy of restriction and exclusion which seeks to oust the Indians even from the small share they have already obtained in the administration of their country. Here then is a statement which, whatever may be the view taken of the grievance, cannot be condemned as "vague."

The President next dealt with the case of the Engineering College at Roorkee, the most important in the country, which up to the year 1897 was open to all statutory natives of India. In that year the right of entry was withdrawn from "natives of pure Asiatic descent whose parents or guardians are domiciled in Bengal, Madras and Bombay." But this is not all. Mr. Bose continues:—

But it seems there is to be wheel within wheel, exception within exception. It is only the pure natives of India of the Provinces named who are to be shut out. Children of European or Eurasian parents settled and domiciled in those Provinces may enjoy all the privileges as of old. They will continue to have the appointments from the Roorkee College still open to them, to have the advantage of selecting whichever Engineering College in India they like for their education. It is no wonder perhaps that I should have heard motives ascribed for a proceeding so extraordinary as this. I will not repeat them; I cannot and do not believe them. But allow me to point out that here before our very eyes is the creation of a new disqualification founded on considerations of race.

Now here surely is a very definite grievance, not perhaps directly affecting a great number of persons, but one which by making "pure Asiatic descent" a ground of exclusion is galling to the feelings and opens up a vast possibility of further exclusion in the presentation

of this grievance there is nothing "vague." In both these cases, which are typical of the better known ones which follow, we have exact details of the situation, the very words of the resolutions objected to, the classes affected, and the extent of the exclusions to which they give rise. How then can Mr. Bose be accused of vagueness?

But if he is not vague, much less is he colourless, unless it be colourless to be just, moderate and accurate, to be ready to recognise whatever good the Government of India has done, and to be strenuously loyal to the English connexion, for in no other sense can his address be spoken of as "colourless." Here is an example taken from his denunciation of the refusal of the Indian Government to accept a grant from the British Exchequer for the expenses of the war beyond the frontier:—

The speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer at Bristol, some little time before the opening of the Parliament, led us to hope for a contribution from the Imperial Treasury. But our own Indian Government, we are told, did not want any help. A Government that has to put off reforms that are admittedly necessary for want of money; a Government that is unable to discharge one of the elementary duties of a civilised Government by placing its administration of justice on a proper footing, on account, as it says, of want of funds; a Government against the "shearing" policy of which at every revision of Provincial contracts we have heard eloquent and vigorous protests from a late Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal and from other high authorities; a Government pressed by the heavy demands not only of war but of a combination of dire calamities unparalleled in the annals perhaps of any country in the world; a Government which is obliged to borrow; a Government which has been compelled to close its mints and to raise artificially the value of its coin to the detriment of many interests, and specially the interests of the poor, in order to avoid serious financial disaster; a Government that had the precedent before it of a similar grant on a previous occasion—such a Government declining to receive any help from the English Treasury or to be relieved of any portion of its military expenditure seems, I must confess, to our humble understandings, about the most extraordinary phenomenon one could think of.

Now how can this vigorous and decided protest be spoken of as "colourless"? Happily Mr. Bose's words are now before the public who can judge how far criticism is justified. The public has also a criterion by which to judge his other remarks on the Congress. If the weakening of that movement can be gauged by the "vague and colourless character" of the President's address, then a long and prosperous life may be anticipated for it, and the final success of its endeavours may be confidently foretold.

### A MAGNANIMOUS INDIAN PRINCE.

By SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.

I SHOULD like to call particular attention to a very interesting ceremony which recently took place at Gondal in Kathiawar; I mean the opening by his Excellency the Governor of Bombay of the Girasia College which has been founded and endowed by his Highness the Thakore Saheb of Gondal. The special objects of the institution were explained as follows by his Highness when addressing Lord Sandhurst, and asking him to declare the College open.

This College (he said) is specially founded for the sons of the land-holding class called "Girasias," who derive that name from the Sanskrit word "Grās," signifying a morsel, that is to say a small share of the produce of the country these landowners claim. These people formerly played a very important and honourable part in the administration of the country. They were noted for their mental and physical strength. Their successors, however, have undergone, and to say, a complete transformation. By a combination of circumstances they have deteriorated in every respect. A false notion of family pride has led them to be extravagant when they ought to be frugal and judicious in the use of their money, especially when the landed possessions originally inherited have been subjected by a cruel process of divisions and sub-divisions in most cases to a ruinous extent. Thus reduced to want, they often become a prey to fraudulent money-lenders, and a total neglect of education renders them incapable of defending themselves against these usurers and other artful deceivers. It is a sad spectacle to see that while other communities are prospering, this important, and once chivalrous, class is evidently retrograding. Too proud to send their sons to the ordinary schools and too poor to send them to any of the special institutions established in the province for the aristocracy, they let them remain in gross ignorance. An eastern proverb calls ignorance a perpetual childhood. The first step, therefore, towards rescuing them from this state of things is, in my opinion, to throw open to them the flood-gates of education.

The experiment is a most interesting one. But in order to realise the importance of this new educational departure, and in order properly to appreciate the magnanimity of the young prince in his present enterprise, it is necessary briefly to consider the origin and history of these Girasias

and to understand the traditional antagonism which for generations has existed between them and the ruling chiefs.

Only those who have studied the past and present history of Kathiawar can realise the complexity, and also the interest, of the questions suggested by the terms, "Talukdar," "Grās," "Mulkigiri Army," "Walker's Settlement," "Bahviwata," and "Rajasthanik Court." But I will try to give an idea of the political condition of the province before and after 1807, the date on which the British power first intervened, and established the *Pax Britannica* under the conditions of Walker's Settlement. Historical analogies are apt to be misleading, but it may be said in a general way that the condition of Kathiawar at the beginning of this century was, on a small scale, not unlike that of Europe in the Middle Ages, each State struggling with its neighbours for sovereignty, or independence, or existence. Then again, as the Capetian kings were in continual conflict with their great feudatories of Normandy, Brittany, or Aquitaine, so also the "Talukdars," or reigning chiefs, in Kathiawar had hard work to maintain order and subordination among their Girasias, whose position was in many respects analogous to that of feudal vassals. Thus it happened that up to 1807 the political condition of the province, torn and divided among contending tribes and races, was almost as unstable as a troublous sea, tossed by winds and waves; the fortunes of war deciding for each clan leader, or military adventurer, whether he was to succeed in establishing a reigning dynasty and take tribute from his neighbours, or whether he was to pay tribute to one stronger than he, or perhaps sink into the position of a Girasia as the vassal of his conqueror. To crown the confusion an over-riding claim was claimed by the great Mahratta States of the Peishwa and the Gaekwar, together with an undefined amount of tribute from each State; and to collect this tribute each year a large force, known as the Mulkigiri Army, invaded the province at harvest time, ravaging the crops, in default of payment, and burning the villages. Then, for the moment, the internal feuds were stayed, and each State stood on the defensive against the common enemy. They did not act together, but each chief, as a point of honour, refused to pay; and by way of protest stood a siege behind the ramparts of his capital, until the point of honour was satisfied by clear proof of *force majeure*. As soon as this foreign invading force had retired for the year the internal feuds were resumed with fresh energy.

This was the state of turmoil which was ended once and for all in 1807 by Walker's Settlement. In that year the forces of the Company and of the Gaekwar advanced into Kathiawar, and through the mediation of Colonel Walker the chiefs were induced to enter into engagements, under which they bound themselves to pay a certain fixed tribute; to keep the peace towards each other; and to maintain order within their own limits. In return they were secured from the visitations of the Mulkigiri Army, the British Government undertaking the work of collecting the tribute. In this way the unstable political condition of Kathiawar became stable; a perpetual *Treuga Dei*, enforced by irresistible power, giving permanency to the relations existing at the time when the engagements were made. It was as though the waves of a stormy polar sea had, by a sudden frost, been crystallised into mountains and valleys, permanent and immovable.

Nothing could have been better for the 187 Talukdars, great and small, who happened then to be on the crest of the wave. But imagine the position and feelings of the chivalrous and warlike Rajput Girasia, who had himself been an independent Talukdar the year before, who hoped next year, by a successful revolt, to reassert his independence, and afterwards perhaps to carve out for himself a sovereignty at the expense of his neighbours! His occupation and all his future hopes were now gone. Evidently there were here elements of grave disturbance; for it was admitted that the Girasia occupied a political position different from the ordinary subjects of the State, the cultivators and traders; and in the matter of his "Grās" or feudal holding he refused to acknowledge as final the jurisdiction of his Talukdar, whom he regarded as his adversary, directly interested in depriving him of his rights. Accordingly when a Girasia considered himself wronged by the decision of his chief, he reasserted his ancient right of private warfare, and went out as a "Bahviwata," that is, an outlaw, retiring with his

followers into the wilds, whence he struck at his adversary's richest villages, carrying off the plunder to inaccessible jungles where he could defy pursuit.

Here was a fresh difficulty for the paramount power. Having accepted responsibility for the general peace of the province, it could not allow the continuance of this open disorder, whether regarded as brigandage or as civil war. But in dealing with a Bahiviatiaw how was the British Government to know whether or not he had a real grievance? Circumstances thus placed our Government in a dilemma. If on the one hand it granted a judicial appeal to itself from the decisions of the Talukdar, it thereby undermined his authority, and prevented the orderly consolidation of his State; if, on the other hand it sought to suppress the revolt without full enquiry, it might be abetting a gross injustice, and placing itself in antagonism with the sense of right throughout the province. In this dilemma our Government adopted a middle course, and sought to deal with these Girasia complaints as "political" cases, that is, by diplomatic methods; by making informal enquiry, and tendering authoritative advice to both parties, advising the chief to reconsider any decision that seemed unsatisfactory, and warning the Girasia to refrain from taking the law into his own hands. This method had its merits, especially when worked by such a kindly and experienced officer as Colonel Lang, who for many years held the office of Political Agent in Kathiawar. But it had this one great disadvantage that there was practically no finality; cases were referred backwards and forwards, and dragged on for years, and decades of years; the authority of the Chiefs suffered; while the whole year round the aggrieved Girasias followed Colonel Lang's camp in crowds wherever he went, complaining that no redress was given to them. A considerable number also, weary of waiting, went out as Bahiviatis, and offered a fierce and sometimes successful resistance to the troops sent against them.

This sort of thing continued to go on for more than half a century; but at last it became intolerable, and eventually in 1873 the Rajasthanik Court was established, with practically the consent of all concerned, in order to deal with the difficulty. To this Court was granted, on behalf of all the chiefs, jurisdiction in Girasia cases over the whole province. It was composed of delegates from the leading States, and was presided over by a British officer, appointed and paid by the chiefs; and the general principle upon which it was constituted was, that it preserved the jurisdiction and authority of the States, while removing the complaint that the individual chief was sole judge in his own cause. During a period of years this Court has carefully enquired into the matters in dispute between chiefs and their Girasias, and has as far as possible removed the causes of future disagreements by surveying and mapping out each Girasia's estate, and by making a detailed register of both his rights and obligations. At the same time vigorous police measures have been taken against the outlaws, who have no longer an excuse for their outrages; so that now peace reigns throughout the province.

But the peace which has brought prosperity to the rest of the community has brought something like ruin to the proud and warlike Girasias, depriving them of their occupation and career. By the process of Hindu law their ancestral estates have become subdivided, so that they have been reduced to poverty, and have fallen into the hands of the money-lenders, while for want of education they have no means of restoring their fallen fortunes. Truly their case is a pitiable one; and all those who know Kathiawar must rejoice that the young chief has taken pity on them, exercising a noble revenge for past animosities by now helping them to better things.

In doing this he puts aside all mean fears, and shows a bright example of confidence in the saving efficacy of education. Poor feeble doubting Thomases, who tremble lest education should undermine our Empire, will do well to ponder the words he addressed to the Governor. Some, he said,

express a fear that as the Girasias are generally at variance with the Dabbar, and as there is a real or supposed gulf of ill-feeling between them, it is not a prudent policy on our part to open their eyes by tearing away the bandage which darkens their intellectual vision. I consider those fears to be entirely groundless. For I have implicit faith in the exalting influences of education, which seldom fail to enoble and humanise the instincts. The goodness of a good cause must assert itself soon or late, and my own belief is that a cultured

and well-informed mind will surely overcome wrong prejudices and see things in their true and proper light. It makes its possessor a loyal and useful citizen.

To these expressions Lord Sandhurst responded in the most cordial terms; and at the same time his Excellency paid a just tribute to the Chief's admirable administration, in the labours of which her Highness the Maharani takes a willing part.

This (he said) is a State which, I consider, demands much careful study. It presents, perhaps, the sole example of a chief who, with his wife, ministers daily to the requirements of his people, who are both accessible to the complaints of their people, and who both make the needs of their people their greatest care. His Highness conducts his official and his private life upon what we consider to be the best European lines. It is not too much to say that his Highness's State is admirably administered.

When pondering on this scene of friendly and fruitful co-operation of East and West, certain questions suggest themselves: Why should not our Districts be as prosperous and contented as a well ordered Native State? And, why should there be estrangement and distrust between the two great branches of the Aryan race? Their origin is the same; after long separation history has reunited them; their interests are identical; each can supplement the other; combined they represent qualities and resources which may be made all-powerful in the world for good.

## CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

THURSDAY, January 12.—The report of the disaster in Uganda to Lieutenant Hannington's detachment of the 27th Bombay Infantry was confirmed by an English traveller who had arrived at Zanzibar.—Another "mutiny" took place in Uganda in October last in the Susheli company of the Uganda Rifles. It was "promptly suppressed," and the ringleaders were sentenced to five years' imprisonment.

It was reported from Hodeida that the Turkish troops gained a victory over the Yemen insurgents on November 30. The insurgents lost 4,000 and the victors 2,000 killed and wounded. The insurrection, it was added, was far from being quelled, and numerous desertions were reported from the Turkish ranks.

A noisy discussion took place in the French Chamber on an interpellation brought by M. Millevoye in reference to the charges brought forward by M. Quesnay de Beaurepaire against the Court of Cassation. The Minister of Justice made a statement on the subject, and after speeches by M. de Cassagnac and others the Chamber passed to the order of the day.

It was announced that Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild had bequeathed to the British Museum his fine cinque-cento collection, the estimated value of which was fully £300,000.

It was reported from Washington that Sir Julian Pauncefote would hold the British Embassy for another year, partly owing to the pending negotiations in reference to the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, and partly to the general diplomatic situation following the Spanish war.

FRIDAY, January 13.—Mr. Brodrick, M.P., Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, received at the Foreign Office a deputation on the subject of slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba. Mr. J. A. Pease, M.P., and several other members of the deputation having spoken in complaint of the slow progress of emancipation under the Government decree, Mr. Brodrick, in reply, stated that over 8,000 slaves had obtained their freedom since the decree came into operation. He assured the deputation that no outside stimulus was needed to induce the Government to push forward by every means in their power what they felt they could do in the way of emancipation consistently with security, good faith, and good government.

The Filipinos at Iloilo were displaying great activity and preparing day and night for resistance; but it was reported that the Filipino Government would consent to allow the Americans to remain and establish a protectorate on condition that they promised to grant absolute independence within a stated time.

Mr. J. L. Gorst, Financial Adviser to the Khedive, who accompanied Lord Cromer to Khartum, said the great want of the country at present was population. There was no scope yet for the investment of capital, and any scheme for developing the Sudan by private enterprise would be premature. Time and immigration must first settle the labour question. When Khartum was rebuilt it would be a fine town, and would be suitable for a winter resort. Railway communication would probably be completed in a year.

It was stated that, in addition to the four battleships included in the supplementary programme of naval construction sanctioned by the House of Commons last July—two of which were to be built by the Thames Ironworks Company and one each by Messrs. Laird, of Birkenhead, and the Palmer Shipbuilding Company at Jarrow—two more battleships were to be built on the Clyde, one by the Clydebank Company, and the other by the Fairfield Company.

SATURDAY, January 14.—Count Muravieff, it was stated, had addressed a circular to the European Cabinets stating that in spite of recent events the Russian Government was still of opinion that the convocation of the Peace Congress was advisable. The place of meeting would be some capital of secondary importance, such as Brussels or Copenhagen.

Nubar Pasha, the ex-Premier of Egypt, died in Paris where he had lived in retirement for some years past. He was born in 1825.

Mr. Cecil Rhodes arrived in London from Cape Town.

MONDAY, January 16.—Colonel Pilkington (Conservative) was nominated to fill the vacancy in the representation of the Newton Division of Lancashire, created by the succession of the Hon. T. W. Legh to the peerage; and as no other candidate was nominated Colonel Pilkington was declared duly elected.

TUESDAY, January 17.—Mr. John Morley addressed the first of a series of meetings of his constituents at Brechin. In the course of a memorable speech he said that less than a year ago the Prime Minister expressed a strong belief that there was a danger of public opinion in this country undergoing a reaction from the doctrines of thirty or forty years ago, and of a belief springing up that it was our duty to take everything we could get, to fight everybody, and to make a quarrel of every dispute. Lord Salisbury described that as a very dangerous doctrine, and to that description he (Mr. Morley) assented. There was a dangerous reaction and there was a spread of a dangerous doctrine, and that doctrine and that reaction had found their way into the Liberal party. It was in these circumstances that Sir William Harcourt had thought it his duty to resign the leadership of the Liberal party. There had been cross-currents, and it was impossible, either inside the House of Commons or elsewhere, that Sir William Harcourt could speak with the authority of a united party. He refused to embark the Liberal party in any sort of competition with the Jingoism on either side, or to rival those who would influence international difficulties. No man could continue to lead a party when his authority was exposed to question—question direct and question indirect—and when it was impossible for him to refute that challenge or to deny that there was substance in that question. He (Mr. Morley) had had no share in creating the cross-currents to which he had referred. Many a time last year he stood aside in the House of Commons in order to avoid making differences with his party. His decision to stand aside was taken before Sir William Harcourt's resignation, though the grounds of his action were not substantially different from Sir William's. He had no resignation to tell them of, because he had nothing to resign, and if he now asked leave to take no longer an active and responsible part in the formal counsels of the heads of the Liberal party, he begged them to believe that that decision was not tinged with the shadow of a shade of personal feeling, nor was it associated with any ground of blame or complaint with any of his colleagues on the front Opposition bench in the House of Commons. Above all, they might be assured that just as he had been all his life a loyal and convinced and unwavering adherent of the Liberal party, so now, for whatever of public life might remain to him, he would be as zealous and as eager as he had ever been in co-operating for the advancement of every Liberal cause and the clear-sighted and vigorous application of every Liberal principle. He might be asked to define a "Jingo." He did not feel bound to do so, but he knew one when he saw him, and one thing he would not do—he would not go about the country saying fine things about Mr. Gladstone and at the same moment sponging off the slate all the lessons Mr. Gladstone taught them. They might call it Imperialism if they chose, but Imperialism brought with it militarism, and militarism meant a gigantic expenditure daily growing. It meant the increase in the Government of the power of the aristocratic and privileged classes. It meant a profusion of the taxpayer's money everywhere except in the taxpayer's own home. Militarism must mean war, and it was not the hateful demon of war but white-winged peace that had been the nurse and the guardian of freedom and justice and well-being over that great army of toilers upon whose labours, upon whose privations, and upon whose hardships, after all, the greatness and the strength of empires and of States were founded and were built up.

WEDNESDAY, January 18.—Sir W. Harcourt, in a letter to the editor of *Young Wales*, said he noted the misgivings and alarm at a turning aside of a section of the Liberal party to dance to the strains of jingoism, and the fear lest the prevalence of this unhappy spirit should again, as it had so often before, obstruct progress and paralyse reform. It gave him, however, lively satisfaction to know that *Young Wales* was not impregnated and leavened with the mesmeric influences of jingoism.

Mr. John Morley, speaking at a meeting at Ayr on the connexion with the national memorial to Mr. Gladstone said such an occasion as that on which they were met showed that after all, whatever differences might divide us, we were a united nation; and it was a good thing for each one of them to know that the character of feeling reverence and admiration for a high character when such a character presented itself.

## THE CALCUTTA MUNICIPAL BILL.

### ANOTHER PUBLIC PROTEST.

#### IMPORTANT MEETING OF MERCHANTS AND OTHER RATEPAYERS.

[BY CABLE, FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.]

CALCUTTA, January 17.

A further meeting to protest against the Calcutta Municipal Bill has been held here at the mansion of Rájá Rajendra Mallick.

Mr. Lal Mohan Ghose, barrister-at-law, who presided, said that the Bill was uncalled for, mischievous and reactionary; that it was unworthy of the best traditions of Anglo-Indian government, and an illustration of the tendency to reverse the beneficent policy of trust and confidence in the people.

Mr. Avetoom, barrister-at-law, in seconding, and influential Indian ratepayers in supporting, the memorial expressed the view that the best men, with self-respect, were not likely to come forward for municipal administration under the Bill.

Nearly 2,000 people were present, including many Indian merchants.—*By Indo-European Telegraph.*

The following letter (dated January 11) from Mr. Ramesh Dutt appeared in the *Times* of Friday last, January 13:—

I have read with much interest your article on this subject in the *Times* of this morning, and your remarks about having a strong executive in Indian municipalities, and reserving in the central Government stringent powers of control. I have myself been an executive officer in India all through my official life, and I entirely agree with you on both these points. To have a weak executive or to reserve no powers of control in the central Government would be ruin to progress in India.

What my countrymen urge is that both these objects could be secured without absolutely destroying the representative system as the Calcutta Municipal Bill proposes to do. The framers of the present Bill have, perhaps unconsciously, gone too far; and my countrymen demand that the Bill may be so modified as to secure the needed reforms without destroying self-government in Calcutta.

In Bombay eight members out of twelve in the executive committee are elected by the people's representatives. In Calcutta it is proposed to allow the people's representatives to elect only four members out of twelve in the executive committee. To give the people two votes out of three in the executive committee is reasonable. To give them one vote out of three, as is proposed in Calcutta, is to reduce the representative institution into a farce. Calcutta has done rather better than worse than Bombay in the past; why preserve the representative institution in Bombay and virtually abolish it in Calcutta?

Surely it is not too late yet to come to a reasonable compromise. The new Viceroy and the present Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal do not wish to alienate the people who have done good work during twenty-two years, and worked loyally and zealously during the late plague scare in Calcutta; and I venture to hope that they will adopt some method which will secure the objects of the present Bill without destroying the representative institution. If the people's representatives were permitted to elect eight members including a certain number of Mahometan members, and if the European merchants elected four members, and if the Government appointed the chairman and also reserved sufficient powers of control, all objects would be gained.

#### MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI IN THE NORTH OF ENGLAND.

##### MEETING AT HYDE.

[FROM A SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT.]

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji was the principal speaker at a meeting held on Tuesday, the 17th inst., at the Wesleyan Jubilee Schools, Hyde, Cheshire, under the chairmanship of the Rev. H. Enfield Dowson.

Mr. NAOROJI said he had a deep sense of the necessity of cultivating good relations between England and India, and especially between Lancashire and India. It was Lancashire that ought to take the lead and to understand her duty first, and if Lancashire made up her mind to do what was right and what it was her duty to do he had not the least doubt that England would follow. There were precedents for that, and to find one he need go no further back than the abolition

of the Corn Laws. When Lancashire put down her foot the Corn Laws disappeared, and if Lancashire would make up her mind to understand the real Indian problem and do her duty as well as consult her own selfishness he was quite sure it would be good both for India and England. (Hear, hear.) He had some relations with Lancashire. He had been connected with that county for more than twenty-six years as a man in business, and he had had the opportunity of knowing Englishmen generally and Lancashire men particularly, and why it was that the relations between England and India were not such as they ought to be. In the course of a short but interesting sketch of how the relations had arisen and what they had been from the beginning of the connexion between India and Britain, he said it was a misfortune that the commencement of those relations was unfortunate and that the evils sown at the commencement of that connexion continued to the present day. He had faith in the British public, however, and he believed if they were once roused and would only understand their duty and position in the matter their conscience would prick them, and they would give the Indian people redress. That faith, which he first expressed as far back as 1853, when they started the Bombay Association, had remained with him, and the longer he had lived in this country—since 1855—the more he was satisfied that if he could only succeed in satisfying the British people that they were on the wrong track and that they had been going entirely upon wrong lines, they would turn round and come upon the right lines. In the early days of our rule in India the oppression and corruption of the Anglo-Indians were, he said, notorious, and there were men, even Anglo-Indians themselves, like Sir Thomas Munro, Elphinstone, Lord William Bentinck, and many others, who denounced the whole policy. The matter was taken up in the most serious and thorough English manner, and the result was the Act of 1833. That great emancipation and Reform Bill of 1833 was intended to rectify the mischief which had been caused by the existing system of rule. The object of that Bill was to treat the Indian people as fellow citizens instead of as slaves or helots. This was considered by the Indian people as their greatest charter, and as far more important to them than the Reform Bill was to the people of England, because it was a declaration of policy by the British people that the Indian people were to be treated as true British subjects without distinction of creed or colour. What more could they want? Had that Act of Parliament been honourably and faithfully adhered to by those in whose hands the government was placed, he would have addressed that meeting in far different language than that which he was now obliged to use. But it was of no use crying over spilt milk. The past was past, and the responsibility lay upon the heads of the English people to understand the present and guide the future. Though the Court of Directors sent a despatch saying that the only thing that was longer any white caste, and that the whole spirit of government should be based upon the principle of righteousness and equality between one British subject and another, it was all to no purpose. The British public laid down the policy, but they did not take care to see that their servants carried it out. Thus the canker remained, and the Act of 1833 was a dead letter. Twenty years passed away, and the mistakes of Indian administration came under the notice of Mr. John Bright and others of his mind. (Applause.) He was glad to hear that cheer, for the name of Bright was engrafted in the hearts of the Indian people and they never forgot it. Mr. Bright espoused their cause and pressed it energetically, but all to no purpose. Then came the Mutiny, and the British public were again roused. The misfortune of India was that the British people were only roused up when some catastrophe took place. (Hear, hear.) They never looked before them, and they never considered the fact that nearly one-fifth of the human life of the world was under their control, and that they had the responsibility of governing these people in a way which should redound to their credit and their profit at the same time. What they in India had to ask was whether the British people should look into the matter themselves, because, as the Chairman had very truly said, the problem of India was our greatest problem. If India was lost, Britain was lost in insignificance, and Lord Curzon in one of his speeches on India admitted that fact in the strongest language possible. It was not the time for him to go into the causes of the Mutiny. The great proclamation which followed was even a greater charter for the people of India than the Act of 1833, because it gave them to understand, in far more emphatic language, that the principles of Government in India should be those of righteousness and security. But had that promise been fulfilled? Let the British people ask themselves. No pledge could be more sacred or more binding, but it has been utterly disregarded. Sir Stafford Northcote, in 1867, took a more enlightened view of the matter, but without avail. There were many men who had seen that the whole thing was rotten, and amongst others who knew best was Lord Salisbury. He had the candour to write deliberately, as Secretary of State for India, in a minute written in cold blood, and to acknowledge that the principle upon which the whole system of Indian Government was based was simply, "India must be bled." That was the truth, the reality. The romance was that India was benefited, blessed, and made prosperous by British rule. The reality was as Lord Salisbury said that "India must be bled." That was at the bottom of the whole rule, and the drain which took place inflicted upon the country the most terrible misery. Lord Lytton acknowledged, in distinct terms, that the conduct of the Government in both countries had been full of deliberate and transparent subterfuges. He (Mr. Nacroji) asked whether the British people were satisfied with the condition of things? (Cries of "No.") Did they really mean that "India must be bled"? Some of the leading statesmen of to-day—Lord Rosebery, Mr. Asquith, Lord Salisbury, had proclaimed that wherever Englishmen went their object was to raise the people who came under their sway. That was the wish of the British people, but it was a pious wish—(laughter)—their servants did not give effect to it. Lord Curzon had very properly said that if India was lost the sun of this British empire would set. He (Mr. Nacroji) asked those people of this country to ask themselves whether they really meant to benefit mankind and those who came under their rule, or simply to use them for

their own blind and selfish purposes? Lancashire at least must stand up and proclaim that India should be governed on the lines which had been already laid down during the last sixty-five years. He wished to point out as a peculiar circumstance that India wished to be under British guidance and British supremacy, so that she might learn the new political lesson of British citizenship, that the people were not for the king, but that the king was for the people. (Hear, hear.) And to that end there had been established that institution which was called the Indian National Congress. That was a unique phenomenon. It brought together different creeds, colours, and nationalities—as they were so called, though in India there was only one nationality—who discussed questions in the English language and like an English institute. (Hear, hear.) If there was one thing more than another which would tend to strengthen the bonds between the Indian and the British people, instead of leaving the former to become our opponents, it was the Indian National Congress. But Anglo-Indians were blind in every respect, and now that they had created this power they thought it would be a very good thing to repeal it, and they minimised it and laughed at it. Never was anything more suicidal. Great Britain had ruled in India for the past 150 years or nearly 200 years, and what had been the result of it in the shape of special benefit to them? In India there were 300,000,000 with whom they had the most perfect free trade; and what was the result? How much British produce went to India? They exported altogether to the whole world something like £300,000,000 worth of British produce. One would suppose that India, being under their own charge and influence, where they could make their own laws and where they were believers in free trade—as he believed in it—they would do a trade with the 300,000,000 people of India compared with which their trade with the whole world would be insignificant. (Hear, hear.) And what was the reason it was not so? Out of that £300,000,000 worth of produce which they sent to the people of the whole world they sent to India, with its 300,000,000 people, hardly £25,000,000 or £30,000,000 worth, and all the increases of trade that were being continually dinned into their ears. That was about a shilling per head per annum. Were they satisfied with that result from their own selfish point of view? Ought that to be the result of their rule of 150 years? The reason for that state of things was that they bled and drained the Indian people of their wealth, and they had nothing wherewith to pay for British produce, and the result was that one section of the British people was impoverished, while the whole of the British people whose benefit lay in trade, did not derive the benefit to which they were entitled. (Hear, hear.) Supposing the policy were changed, and the policy which had been laid down were carried into effect. He was not asking for any new policy. He was asking only that the promises and pledges which they had given by Acts of Parliament should be carried out. If that could be done what would be the result? If they were released from that abominable policy of draining and bleeding, the people of India would prosper as much as the people of Great Britain prospered. Sir John Lawrence had laid it down that the British people were only roused when a great famine took place. But did they know that year after year scores of millions of people went on insufficient food and that when a drought came they were swept off by millions? The blood of that famine lay upon the heads of the people who bled and drained them, because, in consequence, they had nothing to fall back upon. If the conditions were changed and the people allowed to prosper, then, if Great Britain could export goods to India in the proportion of £1 per head per annum, what would that mean? It would mean that they would send as much produce to India as they were now sending to the entire world. He asked them to think of these things. They might be selfish, but they should be intelligently selfish. At present they were simply destroying the bird that laid the golden egg, and which they might make lay ten golden eggs, if they would only nourish it. Let them fulfil their promises like honest Englishmen, and they would immensely benefit not only the people of India but the people also of this country. (Applause.) A resolution was unanimously adopted which deplored that the Governments of the United Kingdom and India had not faithfully and honourably carried out the wishes of the British people towards their fellow subjects the people of India, in violating the engagements made by Act and Resolution of Parliament; and considered it unworthy of this nation that the Indian people should be called upon to bear all expenditure incurred for purposes in which both countries were interested.

## THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

### FOURTEENTH SESSION.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT, MR. A. M. BOSE.

"We give below a full report of the first part of the address delivered by Mr. A. M. Bose at Madras on December 29 last, as President of the 14th Indian National Congress. We shall take another opportunity of printing the concluding portion of Mr. Bose's Address. He said:—

"I, the President, Ladies and Gentlemen,—When the heart is full, fewest and simplest words are the best. Let me therefore only say I thank you most sincerely for the honour you have done me by electing me as your President—one so unworthy of the honour, so conscious of his deficiencies. Permit me to ask for your good wishes that I may not wholly fail to discharge the arduous duties to which your voice has called me, that still not fully recovered from the effects of a recent illness, strength may be given me to be not wholly inadequate to the responsibilities that devolve on me. It is to your indulgence, to your kindness and your sympathy, that I look for that help which I need to enable me to preside over your deliberations in the Session now opening before us, and I am sure I do not ask for this in vain.

MR. GLADSTONE.

Brother Delegates, as I rise to address you my right goes to

that dear land with which it has pleased Providence in its kindness to link the destinies of this great and ancient country. Ladies and Gentlemen, then, I believe is the first meeting of the Congress, since its birth, from which no message of congratulation on his returning birthday will go the great Englishman—the greatest of his age—whose earthly career came to its end on the Ascension Day of the year now about to close. On every 28th of December, as it came back, it was the privilege of the President of the Indian National Congress to ask for your authority—and that authority was given with glad enthusiasm—to send a telegram of felicitation to Mr. Gladstone. That privilege will not be mine. That duty henceforth will remain unperformed. The saintly statesman to whom—as to Savonarola of old, the fourth centenary of whose martyrdom too falls on this year—politics was a part of his religion; the Christian warrior who fought the fight of freedom for England and not for England alone; whom Bulgaria and Greece, whom Armenia and Italy, yea even distant India, mourns no less than his own country; the friend of the weak and the helpless in whatever tongues their wails might be uttered; the “bravest of the brave” in every good cause however hopeless, as Lord Rosebery described him in that oration in the House of Lords which will live, has gone to his rest amid the tears of a united nation. Never was the strife of parties so hushed, the deepest love of the country so drawn, its noblest feelings so stirred, as when that great soul departed this life. “In the use of all his gifts,” said the Archbishop of Canterbury at St. Paul’s, “there was ever the high purpose, ever the determination, to the utmost of his knowledge and power, to obey the law of God.” It was my privilege to visit in humble reverence the room in Liverpool where Mr. Gladstone first saw the light. I lived for a few days opposite to that room as the guest of one of the dearest friends I made in England. It was my privilege to stand beside his grave in the Abbey, which is the last resting place of the greatest of that land, and to take part with Englishmen of all parties in many demonstrations in his honour. And if it is not my privilege to-day, standing in this place, to send any earthly wire to Mr. Gladstone, let us all in this great gathering—the greatest and the highest that educated India knows—with bowed heads, take to heart his great memory, cherish with affection the lessons of his noble life, and send our spirits’ growth of love and reverence to him in that world which he has now entered, and where perchance affection’s messages are not wholly lost.

#### THE NEW VICEROY.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I should have liked to dwell on some of the lessons of that life—lessons of special import to us, and not to us only but to those also in whose hands God has entrusted the government of this country, and the fate for weal or woe of its vast population. But from the great Englishman who has passed away, let us turn to another Englishman—the greatest by virtue of his position during his stay amongst us, the august representative of our beloved Sovereign—who in a few days will land on India’s shores. I am sure, brother delegates, I give expression to your unanimous feeling when on your behalf I tender our cordial welcome to Lord Curzon. There is no higher wish I can express for him than that when the time comes for him to step down from his exalted office, he may carry with him from the people of this country some portion of that blessing and that love which have followed Mr. Gladstone on quitting the scene of his earthly labours from many nations and many lands, that he may find a place in their hearts by the justice and the righteousness of his rule, and reign there when the external emblems and pomp of power—how temporary after all—will have been laid aside. I know of no higher or more unique responsibility than that which appertains to the office of the Viceroy of India, called upon to bear the burden of guiding the destinies for happiness or misery of nearly three hundred millions of fellow-beings in a distant and an unfamiliar land. It is a responsibility which might tax the powers of the greatest and the most gifted and the most capable of men, which requires for its fulfilment the highest qualities not only of the head, but also of the heart; the cool head and the sober informed judgment, the administrative skill and ripe experience, no less than the precious gift of sympathy with those who have no vote or voice, the divine gift of the insight of the spirit which can see, can enter into and realise, the feelings of an unfamiliar people. His lordship’s recent utterances fill us with hope. To exhibit British power inspired by the ideal of Christ, based therefore, may we not say, on the Law of Love and the Golden Rule, to treat the men of the East as if they were of like composition with the men of the West, to be fired with sympathy with all races, to be guided by Her Majesty’s motto, is to give to a basic statesmanship and a standard of success worthy of the high office to which his lordship has been called. May He who is the Common Father of us all, and to whom all nations are as one, give to our coming Viceroy strength and guidance and grace to carry out this ideal and fulfil these hopes. To Lord Curzon will fall the honour of carrying for the first time British administration of a united India into a new century. May that century open in sunshine and brightness and hope, free from the shadows which linger over the land not only from the calamities of nature, but also from the weaknesses of man.

#### AN ERA OF DOMESTIC REFORM.

The new Viceroy will take charge of affairs at a time not devoid of anxiety. I will not refer here to questions of frontier policy. They have been discussed during the year both in England and India. Lord Curzon has been credited with “advanced” views on the frontier question. But as the result of that discussion, by the light of further experience since the statesmanlike policy of Lord Lawrence and the distinguished men who followed him has been reversed, and on a nearer study of the financial and other urgent and pressing needs of the Empire entrusted to his care, all India, irrespective of

as an invulnerable barrier against any foreign foe who may be misguided enough to assail India’s peace or threaten India’s frontier.

#### A VITAL PROBLEM.

But if I will not refer to questions of external policy, as such, let me refer to an unhappy, and if not checked, even disastrous tendency which has within the last few years manifested itself in regard to questions of internal policy, and which deserves far more attention than it has yet received. So vitally important to the welfare of India and to the honour and interest of England do I consider this matter to be, so essential to the clearing of misapprehensions and to mutual understanding, to the restoration and growth of that feeling of sympathy, love and confidence between the rulers and the ruled, which is the basis of good government, that with your permission, brother delegates, I shall make this my main theme to-day, and devote the principal part of the time at my disposal to an examination of the facts which show the existence of this tendency and its vigorous growth, of the consequences of its existence, of its remedy, and some subjects intimately connected with it. In the present crisis I feel, and I am sure you will agree with me, we cannot attempt to do a greater service to the cause of good government than to draw attention to this important problem.

#### THE DARK TIME OF REACTION.

Ladies and gentlemen, it has sometimes been a question in the past, as no doubt it will be some day in the future, as to the rate of progress in the concession of the elementary rights of citizenship to the people of this country. But slow and cautious, to many minds even too tardy, as the advance has been, an advance once made has never been retraced, a concession to freedom once granted has never been withdrawn, progress and not retrogression, growing confidence and not unworthy reaction, nearer approach and not wider separation, attempt at fulfilment of pledges solemnly and sacredly given and not their practical cancellation, has been so long the usual order of things in the British administration of India. This is the foundation on which all the best statesmen of the past, all the noblest Englishmen whose privilege has been to take part in the government of this country, and of whose memory England is proud to-day, have built up the splendid fabric of the Indian Empire. Once indeed, exactly twenty years ago, a reactionary piece of legislation found its way into the Statute Book. I refer, I need hardly say, to the Vernacular Press Act of Lord Lytton. But the potent voice of the great English people made itself heard, and it was not allowed long to stay there. It was soon withdrawn and the speedy reversal of that retrograde legislation served only still more to emphasise and to confirm the permanent policy of steady advance to which I have referred, a policy so worthy of the honour, of the glorious traditions and the best interests of the country with which Providence has linked our fate. Some of us might in the dark days of that happy retrograde period of reaction, and I vividly remember the perils and the difficulties amid which we fought. Let me ask you, brother delegates, to take to heart the agony afforded by that reversal, and to feel assured that if only we are earnest, if only we do our duty and labour on and faint not, the innate sense of justice of the British people will not long allow the darker tide of the present day to roll on.

#### REORGANIZATION OF THE EDUCATIONAL SERVICE.

I have charged the Government with reaction, with reversing the wise and beneficent policy of the past. I confess it is a heavy indictment to bring. I should be happy indeed—none happier—if I could think or find that I am mistaken in the view I have taken. But, ladies and gentlemen, I cannot shut out from my view showing the facts which crowd around me. Let me place before you a few of those facts—they are only a sample—taken from the history of the last two years in proof of this charge, which is no pleasure but deep pain to bring.

The first perhaps in point of time is what is euphemistically known as the “Reorganisation of the Educational Services in India” contained in the resolution of the Government of India in the Home Department, dated July 23, 1896, but which came into effect later on. I cannot enter into the details of the matter, but let me briefly present the salient features of the situation. The dates I shall give relate to Bengal. Probably the same dates apply to the other Provinces also. There are three stages in the history of this matter showing the course of the backward march. The first was when the Higher Educational Service of the country was organised and the Graded System, introduced now a little more than thirty years ago. The gracious promises and the noble words of her Majesty the Queen on the assumption of the direct Government of India, which will ever live in our hearts and will form the charter of our rights, were then fresh in the people’s minds and had not been forgotten; and to the highest grades of that Educational Service, natives of India were then admitted on exactly the same footing as their English fellow-subjects. There was no difference either in position or in pay based on race or nationality, but merit had its own recognition in wages. On this of the Queen’s subjects—Indian or English, it was found. This policy of the “open door” was not merely on paper and in profession, but was invariably carried out, a great many natives of India actually rising to the highest and other grades in the service and receiving the same pay as their English brethren in those grades. Then came the second stage. This in Bengal was about twenty years ago. The highest appointments in the Education Department still remained, as of old, freely open to the natives of India, but it was ruled that they were to receive only two-thirds of the pay of their English colleagues doing the same work. And now in 1896 came the last stage of all. The status of Indian members in the higher ranks was still further lowered, their pay was still further reduced to one-third, to virtually one-half of their English colleagues; and sadder still, they were now for the first time excluded from certain of the higher appointments in the Department. In Bengal for instance principalships of five of the leading colleges, besides several other appointments, are henceforth to be reserved for members of what is to be known as the “Indian Service,” so called apparently because under the new scheme there are practically to be

no Indians in that Service. There is the word "usually" in the sentence which restricts natives of India to the Provincial Service; but as we know, in spite of every effort and repeated application, no Indian has yet been appointed by the Secretary of State in England. Natives of India educated in the highest universities of England, possessing the same or even much higher qualifications than their English colleagues of the same standing, and doing the same work with them, are to get half, or less than half, of the pay of the latter, and are to be excluded from the higher positions open to the latter, and may have to serve as their subordinates. I ask you brother delegates is a new barrier now to be erected against the people of this country? Is a new policy of reservation and exclusion, based on considerations of race and colour, to be now inaugurated in India after sixty years of her Gracious Majesty's beneficent reign? Is the stream of liberty for the people of India to be a broadening, widening, deepening stream, or is it to be a narrowing, dwindling, vanishing channel like some sacred rivers of old lost in the sands? Is this the way in which effect is to be given to the gracious promises of our noble Queen, to the solemn pledges of the British Parliament to the repeated assurances of our rulers? The worst of it is that so far as we can judge from the resolution—and it is a lengthy document—this aspect of the question does not appear to have been even considered by the Government of India. To tell you the truth, I would give a great deal to have the opportunity of a face-to-face discussion with the authors of the scheme, so indefensible is the measure and so strong are the facts of the case. May we not hope that Lord Curzon will some day find time to look into the matter for himself and redress the wrong that has been perpetrated?

#### EXCLUSION FROM ROORKEE.

My next sample will also relate to matters educational. I purposely select them for they at any rate cannot have any mysterious political reasons to influence their decision.

Will it be believed—a distinguished Anglo-Indian gentleman before whom I mentioned it in England would not believe it—that the privilege of admission to the Engineering Class at Roorkee, the most important in India, and of competition for its guaranteed appointments which was freely open to all statutory natives of India till the year 1896, is no longer so open. From the year which of all others ought to have been the gladdest of years to us—the year to which we had looked forwards with longing hope for fresh privileges and added rights—the year of her Gracious Majesty's Diamond Jubilee—from that year this privilege has been withdrawn from "Natives of pure Asiatic descent whose parents or guardians are domiciled in Bengal, Madras, and Bombay." I cannot congratulate the Government on this further carrying out of the policy of exclusion, of the policy of treating natives of India as the outcasts of the "open door." But it seems there is to be wheel within wheel, exception within exception. It is only the pure natives of India of the Provinces named who are to be shut out. Children of European or Eurasian parents settled and domiciled in those provinces may enjoy all the privileges as of old. They will continue to have the appointments from the Roorkee College still open to them, to have the advantage of selecting whichever Engineering College in India they like for their education. It is no wonder perhaps that I should have heard motives ascribed for a proceeding so extraordinary as this.

I do not repeat them. I cannot and do not believe them. But allow me to point out that here before our very eyes is the creation of a new disqualification founded on considerations of race. If this is not a reversal of the policy of the past, which recognised no distinction of race, colour, or creed, at any rate at Roorkee, will any of our Anglo-Indian friends kindly tell us what reversal means; and if this is not going backward, then what the definition of that process may be? May we respectfully ask how long is this process to continue? Is a ukase to issue, shutting say the doors of the Presidency College or the University at Calcutta against the people of the N.W. Provinces or the Punjab, against the students of Madras or of Bombay on the ground that they have Universities of their own? Or why confine ourselves to India? I could sooner imagine my sister going to the bowels of the earth than of my own University of Cambridge or of my own college of Christ's, with its bright memories of kindness which I can never forget, shutting its doors or refusing its prizes to the natives of India over whom they be guilty of being of "pure Asiatic descent." The Bombay Presidency Association, the Indian Association of Calcutta, and I believe other associations sent memorials to the Government of India against this exclusion, rendered not more palatable or more justifiable by reason of its invidious character, but to no avail. The Government see no reason, the memorialists are informed, only in July last, "at present to re-open the matter." May we be permitted to think that in the words "at present" there is some door yet left for hope?

#### IMPRISONMENT IN BRITISH INDIA WITHOUT TRIAL.

Let me now come to the matter of the brothers Natus, two prominent citizens of Poona, imprisoned without trial, detained in gaol without charge, without even any knowledge on their part as to what they were suspected of having done, in spite of repeated request for such information, denied all access to their legal advisers, deprived of all liberty for an indefinite period depending on the pleasure of the authorities, by virtue of an administrative order. Is it necessary to point out that imprisonment without trial is repugnant to the most elementary principles of British justice? Into the melancholy history of the shifting accounts which were allowed to leak out as to what these unfortunate people were suspected to have done, it is not necessary for me to enter in any detail. Suffice it to say that we were first told, on high authority, that the result of their arrest would be to unravel a plot. Nearly eighteen months have passed. May we ask if that plot has yet been unravelled and what the particular plot was? We have not the slightest sympathy with the Natus if they have done anything wrong. But the plot theory, the stern logic of facts had soon to be given up. We were then told on the same high authority, that one or both of the Natus, it is not quite clear which was meant, had been guilty of playing some tricks. He or they had threatened a midwife by writing a letter to

her, and had attempted to corrupt or pervert a policeman. The most diligent enquiry has hitherto failed to elicit any information as to who this threatened midwife and this incorruptible policeman could be, or anything as to this mysterious letter and its writing. Is it necessary to mention the famous Pigott case to show the danger of a *post mortem* investigation?—an investigation there has been, any investigation at all in the present case—even when it is conducted with the highest skill and the greatest sense of responsibility? What the next version of this affair may be we cannot yet say. If indeed no trial could be held, if indeed there be no provision for these "tricks" in our Penal Code, the most drastic in the world, the most easily changeable at the will, and to suit the will, of the authorities, as we know to our cost, is there any reason why there could not at least be a departmental enquiry in the presence of the victims of this arbitrary order in which they could be told of their offence, confronted with their now anonymous accusers, and asked for their defence? Englishmen point, and justly point, the finger of scorn at Russia for her arrests by administrative order and detentions without trial. I presume these are authorised by the laws of that empire, but in England, irrespective of party or class, yea the whole civilised world outside France, has denounced in the strongest terms the condemnation of Dreyfus; because, though he knew what the charges were which he had to meet, though he was put on his trial and defended by counsel, though witnesses against him were examined in his presence and cross-examined by that counsel, though he had every opportunity to put forward his defence, yet there was *one* document shown to the judges who condemned him which was not shown to him or his advocate—and that on the ground that the divulging of that document was fraught, in the opinion of the responsible ministers of France, with grave political danger to the country, involving the risk of war with a neighbouring Power. I will not, please, ladies and gentlemen, to compare, to present in sad contrast, the circumstances of that case which has been so universally denounced by all Englishmen, with the circumstances of the case of the Natus.

It may be said, I have heard it said, that after all it is a question affecting two men out of the many millions of India, with regard to whom Government may possibly have made a mistake; and this need, not have any very disturbing effect. Are they who say this aware, is the Government aware, of the sense of insecurity, of the breach in that sense of absolute confidence in the majesty of law and the security of person which is the greatest glory of British rule, yea of mankind and even terrifying influence over many minds, produced by these proceedings? Whose turn will come next, on whom and at what moment may this sword of Damocles fall, is a question which has been asked by many amongst not the least notable of our land. I am glad however, ladies and gentlemen, to inform you that the humble individual who is now addressing you has an unknown Lancashire working-man protector for himself. I may tell you the little story. The incident may interest you, as it interested and even touched me at the time. At the conclusion of a meeting, I think it was at Oldham, in which I had taken part, several of the audience came up to speak to me; and I happened to mention that should it please the Government so to act, which I trusted it would not, there was nothing to prevent their dealing with me on my return to India as they had dealt with the Natus. I shall not easily forget the scene that followed. One of my hearers, a working-man, I believe, with indignation and excitement depicted on his face, told me—"We know you, sir. Should the Government turn you in this way, Lancashire men will know the reason why." I am sorry to say, ladies and gentlemen, I forgot to ask his name, or to note down his address. But as I told him, I trust his interference on my behalf will not be needed.

#### THE NEW LAW OF SEDITION.

I shall not dwell on the next sample I have to present of the reactionary policy of the last two years—the recent amendments in the law of sedition and in the Criminal Procedure Code. These will no doubt, form the subject of a specific resolution to be submitted at the Congress. Let me only observe in passing, that to make more Draconian a law which in every case in which it had been tried of late had proved only too effective, and to class speakers on public platforms and editors of papers with rogues and vagabonds and notorious bad characters who are liable to be called upon to furnish security for good behaviour, and to be sent in default to gaol, is not the part of wisdom or statesmanship; that to add to the judicial powers of the executive officers of the Government instead of curtailing and withdrawing them, is straining against the light, is proceeding against a principle which had obtained the fullest recognition in the highest quarters, including the two last Secretaries of State for India, Lord Kimberley and Lord Cross. Cases of alleged sedition so long triable only by a purely judicial officer with the help of jury or assessors may now, for the first time in the history of British India, be tried by the district magistrate, who is the head of the police, and head executive or administrative officer of the Government in the district, and that too without such help. Is it any wonder that a measure whose character I have but briefly indicated above has met with an amount of opposition, irrespective of race or party, in India and out of India—and perhaps in this connexion I may be permitted to specify the names of the name of Mr. Maclean, the Conservative member for Cardiff—which I believe is absolutely unique in the history of Indian legislation?

#### OTHER REACTIONARY MEASURES.

Brother delegates, I might go on with the story of reaction—it has been a plentiful crop these two years—but I will not do so. I shall not dwell on the story of the imposition of a punitive police force on a whole city, impoverished and plague-stricken, for the guilt of one man; of the series of Press prosecutions; of the institution of that new thing in India, known I believe as Press history our friend Mr. Chambers, whom we we eloquently told before many English audiences; of provisions, euphemistically called amendments, legislative enactments, and of many other matters occur to your minds.

## THE CALCUTTA MUNICIPAL BILL.

But permit me to take up a little of your time by referring to a measure of retrogression which is still on the legislative anvil. I mean the Calcutta Municipal Bill. I do so to illustrate how the tide of reaction of which I have spoken is still flowing, and because though this is a local measure, if it is carried, if the metropolis of India is deprived of the power of local self-government which it has enjoyed so long and with such marked success, a precedent will have been created—and a blow will have been struck at a cause on which rest all hopes of India's future progress—the effect of which will be felt far and wide. The privilege of municipal self-government, of control by the ratepayers over municipal administration through their elected representatives which Calcutta now enjoys and has enjoyed for twenty years, was granted under Conservative auspices. Sir Richard Temple—a name remembered with gratitude in Bengal—who was our ruler then, and who resigned a Governorship to become a Conservative member of Parliament, was its author, and the present Prime Minister of England was Secretary of State for India at the time. The great and numerous improvements carried out by the Corporation, and the zeal and devotion of the Commissioners have been acknowledged by the Government time after time in official resolutions, and in other ways. If there are any insupportable conditions there is the amplest power in the hands of the Government under the existing law, and expressly introduced in that behalf, to cause their removal. And yet it is now proposed to make a radical and a revolutionary change in the law, to deprive the Corporation of almost every real power and to vest it in a chairman, who is an official and a nominee of the Government, and a committee in which the ratepayers will be represented by a mere third of its members. I venture to hope that the popular and esteemed ruler of Bengal, who is not responsible for the introduction of the present Bill, will yet see his way at least to largely modify this revolutionary proposal and not allow his name to be associated with a scheme which makes, not for progress but for retrogression, which will undo the work of the past, fatally arrest the hopeful and promising growth of civic life, destroy the very principle of local self-government, weaken and impair the cause of municipal administration, and leave memories of bitterness behind. And may I not in this connexion make a very special appeal to our coming Viceroy. He comes out to India as the representative of an administration whose most glorious and memorable achievement—an achievement which will live in the golden pages of history and shed lustre on that administration—has been the granting of local self-government to the people of Ireland, granting I amid many difficulties and against much opposition, and at the very time when faction fights and armed conflicts were going on in the streets of Belfast. And indeed, so convinced were the Government of the need for this liberal measure of self-government as a cure for the evils which afflict that country and for the growth of a healthy public life, that they did not hesitate to make a magnificent grant of, I believe, about seven hundred thousand pounds, or more than a crore of rupees, per annum to Ireland from the Imperial Treasury, to enable the provisions of this measure to be carried out properly and without friction or jar amongst conflicting interests and classes of the community. We ask for no funds. We ask for no extension of Calcutta's municipal rights. But we implore that the rights, circumscribed and safeguarded as they are, which have so long been enjoyed, may not be taken away. Is that too much to ask? Too much even to ask that we let at least an enquiry be held, a representative Commission be appointed and the Corporation heard in its defence before this blow is struck, and a clearly cherished right which was granted in 1873, which after experience of its working and full discussion of its merits was confirmed in 1888, may not now be suddenly snatched away from a subject and a patient population.

## IMPOLICY OF WITHDRAWING PRIVILEGES ONCE GRANTED.

Brother delegates, I have been urging the unwisdom of a retrograde policy, of a policy of withdrawing concessions and privileges once granted. The proposition is so obvious that I do not know that any authorities are needed in support of it. Yet I will quote one, and I will select that one because it will answer a double purpose. Sir Douglas Straight, as we all know, was an eminent judge of the Allahabad High Court. And perhaps he is even better known in England than in India, and is, I believe, the editor of one of the most influential and powerful organs of Conservative opinion in England. Writing to the *Times* he said as follows: "Speaking from thirteen years' residence in India, during which, I hope, I kept neither my eyes nor ears shut, I am firmly convinced of one thing, and it is this—that while innovations and changes there should only be very gradually and cautiously introduced, a concession once made should never be withdrawn except for reasons of the most paramount and pressing emergency."

## DEFEAT OF PREVIOUS REACTIONARY ATTEMPT—THE JULY NOTIFICATION.

Ladies and gentlemen, no comments of mine are needed on this passage. I said I have selected this for a double purpose. I will explain what I mean. I have already referred to the one instance of retrograde legislation in the past, before the present wave of reaction set in, and to the early and unlamented fate that overtook it. The passage which I have quoted was written in connexion with the one instance of retrograde administrative proceeding in the past that I can call to mind, and in my province—a proceeding which too like its legislative predecessor, was however long withdrawn. Six years ago, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, with the previous sanction, and it would seem at the instance, of the Government of India, issued a Notification seriously curtailing the very limited concessional trial by jury which Bengal had previously enjoyed. As usual, all that was matured in the dark, without giving any opportunity to the people vitally concerned to know anything, or to be heard or make any representation, in regard to the matter. And the Government of India, with contemptuous indifference to the opinions and feelings of the people of India, set about to take steps for enlarging the area of retrogression, for curtailing and withdrawing the privilege of trial by jury from some other provinces also. In fact, I believe the Notification in regard to the Province of Assam had already been issued before

the course of the Government was arrested. But happily the agitation that followed on the promulgation of the order reached the shores of England; and it was on that occasion, strongly condemning this order, that Sir Douglas Straight wrote to the *Times*. I will quote one more passage from that letter. Referring to the jury Notification he observes: "It would be absurd to suppose that the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal cannot make a plausible case in support of his new departure; but the question to my mind is not so much whether the operation of the jury system has exhibited some defects, as to whether the mischief likely to result from its continuance promised to be so grave as to make it his imperative duty to intervene."

It only remains for me, ladies and gentlemen, to state the happy conclusion. At the instance of the Secretary of State, a Commission was appointed to enquire into the matter; and, as the result of that enquiry, the "plausible case" set up by the Government of Bengal and which had met with the approval of the Government of India—alas, how easily can plausible cases be set up, especially when they are one-sided productions—was completely brushed aside and Indian opinion completely vindicated. And in consequence of the report of that Commission the jury Notification was withdrawn by the Government, and the jury system which had been threatened with extinction has now instead been further extended in the province. I need hardly add that the Notification for Assam too followed suit. May I not say, happy omen once again in our present trials?

## COST OF THE FRONTIER WAR—REVERSAL OF THE POLICY OF THE PAST.

Brother delegates, I have said I will not discuss the question of Frontier Policy. But there is one aspect of that question, one sequel to it which has a most important bearing not only on questions of domestic reform, but on this matter of retrograde policy which we are considering. Who, might I ask, pays the costs of that policy, begun more than twenty years ago, ordered out from England and by a British Cabinet against the remonstrances of a Viceroy who resigned rather than be an instrument of carrying out that policy, which has brought wars in its train, which has set on conflagration the frontier, which, besides sucking its scores of millions at recurrent periods from the taxation drawn from one of the poorest populations on the face of the earth, has made a heavy permanent addition to the military charges of India, which has laid its fatal and blighting fingers on almost every work of internal reform—for they need money—for the promotion of the urgently-needed cause of technical education, on the industrial and commercial development of the country which would have blessed and added to the resources of millions not only in this country but amongst the working-men of England. All that has been done in pursuance of this new frontier and forward policy which reversed all the traditions of the past may have been necessary for the safety of the Indian Empire from the risk of external aggression. I am not arguing that question now. But may I ask if England, Imperial England, has any interest of her own in the safety of the Indian Empire? Has England no stake, no grave and momentous stake, yes, I ask, no vital interest in that safety? Is she quite sure that she would not suffer in her honour and prestige, in her commerce, in employment for her capital, and for her people, in the loss of many of the millions that make up that precious item called the "Home Charges," if India's safety is imperilled and she is lost to the British Crown? And has England or her Government no moral responsibility for the consequences of a policy which she dictates, which the people of India, if they had the faintest whisper of a voice in controlling their own affairs, yes, which the non-official English community resident in India and even the bulk, I believe, of the official community would condemn almost to a man? Ladies and gentlemen, much as I believe in the principle of division of labour, I do not believe in that division which, in these Imperial matters, would make England decide the policy, and India bear the cost. We are unable to look upon that as a particularly happy, or a particularly just arrangement. Brother delegates, it is not as a mere dole, but as a claim of absolute justice that we ask that the costs which have been incurred by the adoption of what has been known as the Forward policy on the Indian frontier question, and of the consequences which have followed from that adoption, should be distributed in some equitable proportion between England and India.

## PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

## THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

Elsewhere in the present issue of INDIA will be found a report of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's speech at Hyde on Tuesday last (January 17). Mr. Naoroji has during the week addressed three other meetings in the North of England.

Mr. Romesh C. Dutt, C.I.E., will deliver an address on "British Rule in India" at the Upper Brook Street Free Church, Manchester, on Sunday, January 22.

On January 29 Mr. Dutt will deliver an address at Lewisham, Speaking at Devonport Liberal Club on "Current Politics," on January 9, Miss Alison Garland dealt largely with the aspect of affairs in India. There was a large audience and a good discussion.

On January 11 a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee gave a lecture at Torquay, illustrated with lime-light views, on "India and its people." There was a crowded attendance. Councillor Croker presided.

On January 13 Miss Alison Garland lectured at the Liberal Club, Plymouth, on "Can Russia invade India?" There was a prolonged discussion in which every speaker condemned the "Forward" policy.

A lecturer on behalf of the British Committee writes (Jan. 18): "The lantern lectures are taking extraordinarily well. I have had crowded audiences at every one."

JUST PUBLISHED.

*With Maps, Plans, Portraits, and Illustrations, 8vo, 8/6 net.*

## THE CAMPAIGN IN TIRAH 1897-98.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE EXPEDITION AGAINST THE  
ORAKZAIS AND AFRIDIS UNDER GENERAL SIR  
WILLIAM LOCKHART, G.C.B., K.C.S.I.

*Based (by permission) on Letters contributed to the TIMES,*

By COLONEL H. D. HUTCHINSON,  
Director of Military Education in India.

*DAILY CHRONICLE.*—"We are not sure that his very carefully compiled and very well written work will not ultimately rank as the best account of this our finest instance of mountain warfare. . . . Must be a real pleasure to all students of military history."

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED, LONDON.

NOW READY.

Price One Shilling and Sixpence, net. In India, 1 Rupee.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOK: No. 2.

## ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE. EVIDENCE-IN-CHIEF OF THE FIVE INDIAN WITNESSES.

*Large foolscap, 116 pp.*

Published by the

BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,  
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

This Volume may be also obtained from the Secretaries of the Standing Congress Committees at Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras. Remittances should accompany application.

N.B.—The postage of each copy is 4d., in addition to the price stated above.

JUST PUBLISHED. Crown 8vo, 5s.

## RĀMAKRISHNA HIS LIFE AND SAYINGS.

By THE RIGHT HON. F. MAX MÜLLER, K.M.,  
*Foreign Member of the French Institute; Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford.*

*\* \* Rāmākṛishna, whose life is described and whose sayings have been collected in this volume, was one of those Indian ascetics and sages who are known under different names, as Sannyāsins, Mahātmas, or Yogins. He was born in 1833, and died in 1886.*

LONDON: LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.

## LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq., PRESIDENT.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England. Gentlemen will be met at London, Edinburgh, Oxford, or Cambridge stations on giving fortnight's notice.

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,

SORO SQUARE, NATIONAL HOSPITAL, LONDON, W.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

## PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Whooping Cough, Bronchitis, Fire Throat.

Dr. W. VENABLE says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1888.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT.

## TOOTH-ACHE

CURED INSTANTLY BY

**BUNTER'S NERVINE**  
Prevents Dizziness, Sore Extraction, Sleepless Nights, Headache, etc.  
Neuralgia, Headaches and All Nerve Pains removed by BUNTER'S NERVINE. All Chemists, 1s. 1d.



is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER**,  
and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Chills, etc.

I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER known.  
C. S. KRISHNIA, Chairman.  
"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.  
G. L. NARASINGA ROW.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Council's Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your 'Omum-Carpoor' was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans. Rs. 1/8 Rs. 2/12 Rs. and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.



## NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

THE MANAGER,  
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,  
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOOK, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.