

India

FOR THE

No. 102. NEW SERIES.
No. 126. OLD SERIES.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1899.

[REGISTERED AS A PRICE..... 2d.
NEWSPAPER. { BY POST, 2½d.]

Notes and News	285	Lord Curzon on the Famine	292
Censoring the Teachers	288	India in the British Press	293
Disintegration or Consolidation	289	The Church Scandal	293
Notes from Bombay: Famines	290	Mr. Thorburn's Retirement	294
Past and Present	290	The Indian Social Conference	295
Indians and the Civil Service	291	Censoring of Teachers in Madras	295
Marriage of Miss N. H. Bomeroyce	291	Advertisements	296

NOTES AND NEWS.

IT is interesting to look back six months on the attitude of mind of our Imperialist brethren that rule the roost in Natal. On July 25 last, the Natal Legislative Council, by a unanimous vote, affirmed the principle of equal rights for all Europeans within the Natal borders and endorsed the action of the Imperial Government in bringing pressure in this sense upon the Government of the South African Republic. "We rejoice with pride," said the *Natal Advertiser* next morning, "at so uncompromising an adherence to a true and righteous principle." The motion, submitted by the Hon. Mr. Sutton and seconded by the Hon. Mr. Uys, "a well-known Afrikaner," ran thus:—

(a) That the Legislative Council of Natal desires to express its sympathy with, and approval of, the action of the British Government in its endeavour to secure equal rights and privileges for all Europeans in South Africa, whereby peace, prosperity, and the termination of racial animosity in this country can alone be assured.

(b) That a respectful address be presented to his Excellency the Governor praying that the above resolution be forwarded to her Majesty the Queen.

Everybody will agree with this view of the circumstances, so far as principle is concerned, whatever may be thought of the diplomatic methods.

But let us look attentively to the attitude of mind disclosed by Mr. Sutton. Mr. Sutton said:—

Every man in the [South African] Republic, particularly the older residents, felt that their independence was a very great thing, but he had yet to learn that liberality ever made a man poor, and if they would be content to share the independence they possessed on equal terms with the Uitlanders in the country, by so much would it increase the stability of their country. In his opinion, at that moment the base of their Government was too small, and they ought to widen that base by giving the franchise without restriction. They would then have friends where now they have men who, if not hostile, at least suffered from a sense of grievance, trouble, and oppression. To maintain peace and have prosperity in any country they must do away with those everlasting irritations and little worries.

Again:—

It was very difficult to get men who were brought up with entirely different ideas to look as they looked on this question, men who had been brought up to consider it right and proper for one class of the people to have rights and privileges that another class had not. It was difficult to get those men to see that the true way to strengthen their country was to grant equality.

We quite agree with Mr. Sutton's remarks. But then what follows?

This follows: That the like principle should be applied to the British Indians in Natal, as well as in other British colonies. Like Mr. Sutton, we have "yet to learn that liberality ever made a man poor"—liberality to Indians as well as to other Europeans. If the Natalians "would be content to share the independence they possess" we will not say "on equal terms" with the British Indians, but even to the extent of ordinary humane tolerance, "by so much would it increase the stability of their country." To use Mr. Sutton's own words in an obvious application, "they would then have friends where now they have men who, if not hostile, at least suffer from a sense of grievance, trouble, and oppression," which undoubtedly involves the Natalians in "everlasting irritations and little worries." Now why will not Mr. Sutton remove the beam from his eye, and recognise that it is an unworthy thing to load the British Indians with "a sense of grievance, trouble, and oppression," and a rather foolish thing to maintain "those everlasting irritations and little

worries?" Is it not that he himself has been "brought up with entirely different ideas," and so forth, and is in fact in the very position that he laments to see the Boer Government occupying? As the treasurer said in the same debate, "to obtain contentment the people must be governed justly, with an entire freedom from oppression actuated by selfishness." Exactly. Now let the Natalians take this principle home to themselves.

The night before the Legislative Council passed this effusive resolution in favour of "equal rights" for Europeans, the Legislative Assembly, which had already dealt with the same matter, discussed the question of Indian Immigration. A Mr. Sparks moved:—

That, in the opinion of this House, the immigration of Indians should not be renewed unless the Natal Government can arrange with the Indian Government for the term of indenture to commence and expire in India.

The object was to prevent the Indians from permanently settling in the Colony, a result that Mr. Sparks says "the majority of Colonists" admit to be "injurious." That is to say, when they work for a European, they are advantageous to the Colony; but, when they work for themselves, they are injurious to the Colony. This looks, to us at least, remarkably like what the treasurer called "oppression actuated by selfishness." But Mr. Sparks is frank enough. Thus:—

To say that they (the British Indians) were British subjects was begging the question, as there was a great difference between a Britisher and a British subject. They had not the same laws for Black and White, and it would never do for Zulus, Amatangas, Pondos, and Coolies to have the same rights as Europeans.

Every British Indian is, to Mr. Sparks, a "coolie," and is on the same level with the native African blacks—always excepting when his labour brings profit to his white employer! Here is a precious Imperialist, surely. Besides, nobody is asking for "the same rights as Europeans," except in so far as such rights can be safely and reasonably given. But that is a very different matter from the abominable oppression that Mr. Sparks has the impudence to advocate.

The fact is that Natal cannot get on, even yet, without the British Indian. In his airy way, Mr. Sparks appealed to the other members of the Assembly "to be patriotic and sink their personal interests for the good of the land." But the Colonial Secretary promptly told him that "this labour supply was absolutely necessary to many industries" in the colony, and that, if the resolution were passed, the Indian Government would at once stop the Indian immigration. For "the Indian Government had laid it down that their subjects were not to be forced to return." Mr. Escombe spoke in the same sense:—

The Indians came with the Colony's consent, were here under the Colony's laws, and came under requisitions from colonists themselves, and so long as colonists continued to sign requisitions for Indians, or allowed it to be done, they could not consistently assent to the resolution now before the House.

The motion was rejected, but only by 18 yeas to 15 ayes. It contrasts luridly with the motion about "equal rights."

There are two points that may be usefully recorded in this connexion. The Superintendent of Police at Durban stated in his report on August 1 that the educated Indians, "such as merchants and storekeepers," are "respectful, sober, and law-abiding." But, he went on to say, "the low, labouring class are fools and drunkards, the latter increasing out of all proportion to other persons in the borough." Happily, he advanced a reason for this deplorable state of things: "no doubt the law forcing them to drink all they require at the liquor bars tends to increase drunkenness, especially amongst Indian women." "The law!" Let the Legislative Houses address themselves to this matter: it concerns their honour and the good report of the Colony, as well as the welfare of the poor Indians.

More than that, it is just reported that 1,000 Indians, chiefly from the sugar estates, are being enrolled for ambulance work. Already we have had the correspondents reporting with admiration the coolness and promptitude of Indians in carrying wounded men off the field of battle under the heaviest fire. When the accounts are squared later on, this serviceable heroism, we trust, will not be forgotten—even in Natal.

The suggestion of the *Pioneer* that one regiment of British cavalry and two batteries of horse artillery might be spared—from Meerut and Ambala—to reinforce the mounted branches of the army in South Africa, may have some importance in view of the semi-official character of that journal. Already India has sent to Africa some 11,000 troops. It is noteworthy that the *Pioneer* acknowledges that, even when the additions it now suggests are sent "the British garrison would still be strong." We are very glad to find our contemporary thus lending confirmation and support to our contention that India has been maintaining an army considerably in excess of its reasonable requirements.

The Anglo-Indian conspiracy of silence on the Chupra case is breaking down. Last week we noticed the article in the *Pioneer*. This week we find one in the *Friend of India*, which has just come to hand. It is true that the *Friend of India* repudiates any part in such a conspiracy, and its past record certainly entitles its plea to consideration. Though some may have been silent because they attached "more importance to the maintenance of official prestige than to the vindication of justice," others though welcoming the judgment for its testimony to the need of reform, were reluctant to call attention to its vagaries. But is not this to prefer form to matter? the more so, as our contemporary says:—

... not only was the decision arrived at by Mr. Pennell . . . the only decision at which an upright judge could have arrived, but there is hardly in the judgment, from first to last, a reflection that can be pronounced unjust.

Again it remarks:—

The facts are as simple as they will probably be astonishing to anyone unfamiliar with the way in which officials in an Indian district are apt to play into one another's hands with a clear conscience where official interests or dignity are concerned.

Thus in the opinion of the *Friend of India* there was nothing unusual in the conduct of the officials, which though highly reprehensible should never have been reprimanded by Mr. Pennell from the Bench. He should rather, according to our contemporary, have sent a report to the proper quarter, probably to be pigeon-holed and forgotten. That, no doubt, would have been safer for himself. Would it have been so advantageous to the public?

The *Anurita Bazar Patrika* tells a curious story of the decrease of guilt in proportion to the rise in importance of the investigating authorities. A certain man named Purnick was arrested by the Satara police on a charge of attempting to wage war against the British Government. This sounded at once formidable and picturesque. But the District Magistrate only committed the prisoner on the comparatively prosaic charge of abetting dacoity; and on this charge the Court of first instance convicted him. When, however, the matter came before the Sessions Judge he acquitted the accused and ordered him to be set free.

The *Mahratta* makes merry over the prosecution of Mr. Fernandez for attempting to poison Colonel Wray by means of powdered glass, and the extraordinary fiasco in which that prosecution ended. It is true that poisoning is supposed to be a fashionable way of removing political agents, and that Mr. Fernandez had criticised Colonel Wray's plague measures. But something more was wanted:—

Colonel Wray possessed power and he used it fully against Mr. Fernandez. The wire was busy; detectives were on the scene; arrests were made; even false evidence was procured and recorded; the assistance of some of the most eminent pleaders at Kolhapur was secured; and the accused was left undefended. . . . The Magistrate alone among the whole lot seems to have preserved his senses. The prosecution was shown the fullest liberality and indulgence; yet not a bit of relevant evidence was recorded. Some of the witnesses appealed to the mercy of the court for protection against the ill-treatment of the police, and retracted their statements; and the prosecution had to be withdrawn in utter shame and disgrace.

The *Mahratta* thinks that Colonel Wray's folly in believing in this supposed plot—coming after "his childish quarrel with the local missionaries" and his expulsion of respectable citizens from Kolhapur—ought to lead to his transfer to another post, to the great advantage of the Mahārāja and people of that State.

The *Pioneer* in two lengthy articles sets itself to answer the question: Has the District Officer degenerated or developed? Admitting that the general belief is that the old school of District Officers had more personal influence, were more conversant with the language and more intimate with the people, it nevertheless finds that there is little ground for this view, which takes its rise chiefly in the common but unreasonable inclination to praise the times that are gone. It brings forward four unimpeachable witnesses—Sir John Malcolm, Bishop Heber, Mr. Shore, and Colonel Sleeman—to prove that in their day the conduct of Englishmen to Indians left much to be desired, and was in fact no better than it is now. From Sir John Malcolm's famous Instructions it draws the inference that "constant friendly and courteous intercourse with Indian gentlemen was by no means the rule" in his day. Bishop Heber declares that one of the causes of the unpopularity of our rule is "the distance and haughtiness with which a very large proportion of the civil and military servants of the Company treat the upper and middling classes of Natives;" and he contrasts the conduct of Perron and other French adventurers. Mr. Shore speaks of "haughty superciliousness, arrogance, and even insolence of behaviour," and declares that he had heard young men say that they hated Natives. He had heard more than one remark that he liked "to beat a black fellow." Sleeman regrets the prevalent ignorance of the Indian tongues.

All this, however, is hardly evidence that the District Officer has been improving. It is only negative, or if it is anything more it would seem to show that the faults complained of were rooted in Anglo-Indians, past and present alike. The *Pioneer*, it is true, attempts something further when it reminds us of the changed conditions of the times. This is not to deny but to explain the degeneration. It says:—

An ever-tightening network of subordinate officials has covered the land, and the goings in and out of his village of every person are known at will. . . . To the public it appears that an era of backbiting has come. . . . In the old days his action was remedial, it is now preventive. The man who remedies abuses on the motion of others is forgiven much; the man who of his own motion attempts to prevent abuses is forgiven nothing at all. For to prevent abuses means inquisition, and inquisition means unpopularity.

In other words the District Officer is less popular than his fore-runners because of the growing tendency to govern too much; he has less personal influence because he is more than formerly a wheel in the complicated machine of government; and he has less personal intercourse with the Natives because his time is otherwise occupied. But all this is what the *Pioneer* set out to disprove.

Our contemporary goes on to say:—

Judging from the tales that are handed down from the past it is quite conceivable that the young man of to-day has improved in politeness and decency. . . . The mere denunciations of discourtesy and misunderstanding which are now so common might be urged to support the view that a better feeling was abroad. And certainly it has so much probability in its favour that now for the first time Englishmen and Indians have the means, in Press, in Council, and in Local Government, of ascertaining one another's views.

So there is some good in elected municipalities and a free press after all. Certainly the ignorance of Indian feeling immediately before the Mutiny is far greater than can be found now. But the *Pioneer* seems to allow insufficient weight to some forces acting in the opposite direction: especially the greater ease of communication with Europe which keeps the Anglo-Indian official more in touch with his own country and more a stranger in India. The *Hindu* touches another part of the problem by pointing out that what was "considered a great condescension in those old days is not now accepted as anything more than ordinary courtesy due from one gentleman to another."

Mr. Mehta, acting on behalf of Mr. Tilak, has applied for and obtained summonses against the proprietors of the *Times of India* for publishing in that paper a cutting from the *London Globe* in which there were references to "the arch-plotter Tilak" and "the campaign of murder

which Tilak directed, if he was not its organiser." The *Times of India* appends an apology to its report of the proceedings, declaring that the cutting was inserted with others which arrived from England, and adding:—

We have no hesitation in saying that we in no degree associate ourselves with the views of the *Globe*; that if the paragraph in question had been brought to our notice it would at once have been struck out, and that we regret the insertion, through inadvertence, in our columns of statements which we regard as unwarranted and as doing a serious injustice to Mr. Tilak.

The summonses were made returnable for December 8. But a telegram from India stated a few days ago that, in view of the unqualified apology of the *Times of India*, Mr. Tilak has consented not to proceed further in the matter. When does the *Globe* propose to apologise?

Readers of INDIA will remember that the old plague regulations at Matheran, so forcibly attacked by Mr. Mehta, required all non-European visitors to report themselves daily for medical examination during ten days. The new plague regulations, which exempt those who own or rent private bungalows, but are in other respects even more severe, have, as the *Times of India* admits, "been amply tested during the past few weeks, and it must be admitted that up to the present they have answered reasonably well." Yet our contemporary is not satisfied. It has become for once a stickler for equality. It asks why, if Providence has made a man a butler, his liability to contract plague is therefore established, and so forth. It may be that it would be better to have no exemptions. But Europeans have been exempted because they are less liable to contract plague than Indians, and wealthy Indians are from their way of life less liable than their less fortunate fellows. Therefore, by the same reasoning, they also should be exempt. There is no absolute freedom from danger even among Europeans; and whether there should be exemptions or not, it is surely more logical and more just to make such exemptions as there are depend upon the way of living than upon race. If the richer Indians should show their fellow-citizens a good example by submitting to the same regulations and inconveniences, why do not the Europeans lead the way?

The Calcutta correspondent of the *Times* states that the Telegraphic Press Messages Bill will be taken up on the reassembling of the Viceroy's Legislative Council at Calcutta on December 22, and "made over to a Select Committee with a view to passing it in January." He has nothing to say on the subject of the many representations that have been made from important bodies throughout India in opposition to, or in modification of, the Bill. The practical point, on which he naturally seizes, is that "the majority of the local Government are in favour of the Bill"—although, we must say, the expression of his meaning seems not quite free from ambiguity. Anyhow, the Government seem to see their way to immediate business. The great argument that appears to have decided "the majority of the Local Government" is that "the war has shown the necessity of affording protection to such telegrams" as the Bill deals with. Well, and when the war is over, what then? If the argument is gone will the result of the argument remain? No doubt it will. For though the Government are too acute to mention it the Act will be found exceedingly handy for the purposes of telegraphic news from the House of Commons during the Session. The official story will get thirty-six hours start, and may never get overtaken.

The *Fortnightly* gives us a comprehensive review of "Russian Railway Policy in Asia," mainly in regard to those portions thereof more recently formulated. These comprise the huge scheme of a line from Saratof, on the Russian frontier proper, about 400 miles south-east of Moscow, proceeding in the same course, passing between the Caspian and the Aral Sea, through Khiva, to Teharjui on the borders of Bokhara, where it is to cross the present Trans-Caspian line, with ultimate extension further south to the Oxus. This railway of nearly 2,000 versts (1,340 miles), including the portion of the existing line from Saratof, will thus, it is claimed, "join the Trans-Caspian and Central Russian Railway system by a perfectly direct route, avoiding the passage of the Caspian, and thus bring Khuk [and therefore Afghanistan] within less than a

week's journey of Moscow." As to the "directness" of the route from Saratof to the Oxus it reminds one of the old story about the Emperor Nicholas's imperial views on railway alignment. When his consulting engineers were carefully comparing the physical obstacles to be avoided or outflanked in the plans of the first Russian line, that from St. Petersburg to Moscow, H.I.M. interrupted their tedious calculations by asking for a ruler and pencil, with which he drew a crow's line on the map between the two capitals, saying, "This is your route; so that is settled."

But in this big trans-continental project the absence of serious engineering difficulties (to speak in a very general sense) does seem to coincide with the enticing simplicity of the route, shown in the map as considered from the military and passengers' standpoint. As to the prospects of paying goods traffic and working expenses, these are very different matters; though they are not quite ignored in the elaborate calculation that is given, which brings out an admission that the actual working of the line would show an annual loss of something under half-a-million sterling. This obviously suggests that the motive and object of this project, estimated at a capital cost of ninety millions of roubles (say, ten millions sterling), must be mainly political, or imperial if you will. This is frankly avowed by the promoters. The justification of their ambitious conception and lofty disregard of the paltry consideration of spending other people's (*i.e.*, peasants') money is thus expressed: "The prospect of a yearly loss of under half-a-million [more likely a million and a-half] will not be one of those factors which will prevent the carrying out of a scheme which would exert such a tremendous influence in the balance of power in Asia, and bring the Russian armies within striking distance of the Persian, Afghan, and China frontiers a few days after leaving Moscow."

The writer of this review, Mr. R. E. C. Long, must not be regarded as responsible for this sort of spread-eagle imperial engineering. His article, so far as it concerns railway engineers, is mainly an exposition of an elaborate treatise entitled "The Shortest Railway Route from Central Europe to Central Asia," compiled apparently under official sanction by a committee of specialists at St. Petersburg. They have, as Mr. Long says, "set forth with great acumen and evidently local (*i.e.*, Asiatic) knowledge" the political, strategical and commercial advantages of their comprehensive scheme. And, certainly, they ought to feel under great obligation to their British expositor for having made the very best of it, though without the tone of an advocate. The skill with which this vast, complicated, not to say sprawling subject is condensed in this review of a dozen pages (including the map), and the discrimination with which its salient disputable aspects are selected, may be regarded as a piece of excellent workmanship. But the brief touches that illustrate the international dreams and jealousies that cluster around all those schemes of Central Asian expansion must attract current attention.

Mr. Long knocks together, so to speak, the skulls of the Russian Anglophobes and the British Russophobes. To the latter it may possibly be some sort of satisfaction to know that Russia "of late years, whether with cause or not, has been much more frightened of English schemes than England has ever been of Russian." We are told by this close and dispassionate observer that "to Russian publicists, England is a very able, very unscrupulous, and utterly insatiable Power;" and "to justify these apprehensions the Press quote Lord Curzon and the panic threats of the English Press." Thus are we permitted to see ourselves as others see us—Lord Lytton's dream of "bequeathing to India the supremacy of Central Asia," and seed from the sowing of the Hon. George Curzon's political wild oats. And in his concluding sentence Mr. Long tells us: "The stock epithets of the English Russophobe translated into Russian are purely those which Russian Anglophobes employ, with equal sincerity, to express their detestation of England." We have been hearing much from Bombay about Russian designs on the Persian Gulf; but the St. Petersburg alarmists are tearing their hair in dread that our line to Quetta will be carried through Beluchistan, and so on to join German railways in Asia Minor.

COERCING THE TEACHERS.

STEP by step the rulers of India are proceeding in their policy of reaction. Arbitrary arrest under an almost obsolete Regulation and legislation against the freedom of the Press have been followed by attacks on the popular election of municipalities; and now, in the peaceful province of Madras, an attempt is being made to take away from the managers and teachers of all schools receiving a grant-in-aid that liberty to take part in public affairs which they have so long enjoyed. On October 31 certain changes in the Educational Rules and the Grant-in-Aid Code were made public. They are to come into operation on April 1 next. And they will, if they remain without modification, entirely alter the position not only of the teachers but even of the managers of the schools. Here are the words added to the Educational Rules:—

No member of the staff or the establishment of an institution under public management shall be permitted to take part either directly or indirectly in political movements or agitation, or to attend a political meeting where the fact of his presence is likely to be misconstrued or to impair his usefulness as a public servant. In cases of doubt a reference should be made to the director.

By an addition to the Grant-in-Aid Code the manager of a school has to undertake:—

That the manager and teachers of the Institution will not take part either directly or indirectly in political movements or agitation, and that they will not attend political meetings without the previous consent of the director.

Should this undertaking be broken, grants may be withheld or reduced. Salary grants also may be taken away from the teachers to the extent of Rs. 30 per month, and as the monthly pay is often no more than Rs. 90 or Rs. 120, the teacher would lose from one-fourth to one-third of his salary. Moreover, the Director now obtains power to suspend or cancel the certificate of any teacher, after hearing his defence, if his "character, conduct or attention to duty is unsatisfactory"; and a breach of the new rule requiring abstention from politics may, by a reactionary official, be held to constitute unsatisfactory conduct. This power, too, refers not only to "aided" but to all "recognised" schools.

But it is when we consider the definition of manager given in the Grant-in-Aid Code that the full scope of the new additions are seen. It is provided in the Code that:—

Every institution on behalf of which aid is sought shall be under the management of one or more persons recognised by the department, who, in the capacity of proprietors, or of trustees, or of members of a local board or members of a committee elected by the society or association by which the school is maintained, shall undertake, etc.

So that any member of a municipality or any trustee recognised as one of the managers of a school must undertake for himself and the teachers that they will abstain from all political action, and will not even attend political meetings without the consent of the Director. And it must be remembered that these managers are unpaid, are men voluntarily devoting their time to the performance of public duties, and yet as a consequence bound to silence on all political questions. It is, indeed, difficult to see how the rule can be carried out. Some of the schools are under the control of municipalities and therefore under the management of municipal commissioners. Are these men to ask permission of the Director of Education before they can attend the meeting of the Municipal Council; or are they to withdraw from the Council Chamber whenever a topic "directly or indirectly" connected with politics comes upon the agenda? If in their capacity of councillors they take part in a protest against some of those municipal reforms that are now so fashionable—if they defend the rights of those who have elected them—will they thereby imperil the financial position of their school? Or take the case of the Senate of the University, which is empowered to elect a member of the Provincial Council. The meeting at which the election is made is surely a political meeting. Is it proposed, then, that those members of the Senate of the University who happen to be managers or teachers of schools receiving a Government grant are in the future to abstain from exercising this franchise, or are they only to perform this important duty after previously obtaining the sanction of the Director of Education?

It is generally supposed that these innovations are directed against the Congress, which has received no slight support from teachers and others interested in education. But it might almost be suspected that the Government was bent on injuring education itself; for it would be difficult

to imagine any legislation more certain to be detrimental to educational progress. Such progress depends above everything on the zeal and capacity of the teachers, and therefore anything which makes the office of teacher less desirable or which lowers it in the public estimation is an evil; and that is the necessary effect of all such restrictions. A profession in which men must ever keep a bridle on their tongue and never act as citizens is not one to attract the more public-spirited and zealous Indians. It will fall into the hands of those who are willing to sell their birth-right for a mess of pottage, and to treat a high and sacred calling solely as a means of gaining an ignoble livelihood. In many countries civil officials have been forbidden to take part in parliamentary life. Here, not civil servants who may have to serve various political parties, but teachers are forbidden, and forbidden not to become members of Council but even to attend political meetings. They may not speak, or even listen, when public affairs are discussed. They are not merely required to keep politics out of their schools. They are not allowed to interest themselves in the affairs of their country during their leisure. And it is not only the teachers, who are at least paid officials, who come under this prohibition. It applies to managers also—persons who have been guilty of the crime of giving their unpaid services to the cause of education, and who are, therefore, to be deprived of one of the chief civic liberties they possess. Is this a course that will stimulate the public zeal for education? Is this policy of prohibition the way to make public-spirited men interest themselves in the well-being of the schools? The Government's prohibition is a declaration of war against the schools, however far such an intention may have been from its thoughts. It is its policy to make public spirit penal and to exact penalties from those who would found schools or promote learning.

Nor can the effect on politics be much happier. To exclude the teachers from the political arena will not put an end to political action, whatever the Government may hope. A teacher is presumably a man of respectability and education. His position is, at least, some guarantee of moderation. How will it serve the purpose of the authorities to replace him by men who are less well-informed, whose character is unknown, and who, as they hold nothing at the hands of Government, have so much the less to restrain them? If public opinion is to act at all, it must have guides and mouthpieces. Is there anything in the work of a teacher to unfit him for such a function? It is one of the peculiarities of the Government in India, that the men it most fears are those who are especially its own creation. It is, according to its own confession, a Frankenstein perpetually creating monsters which it tries in vain to slay. It has with great labour introduced the learning of the West into India, and it is the Indian educated according to Western methods that is now its special object of fear. It has created, slowly and sluggishly it may be, but still of its own initiative, a system of popular education, partly at the expense of the State, and now it proposes to visit those who teach in its schools with special disabilities. What an abandonment of the hopes entertained by Anglo-Indian statesmen in the past! What a want of foresight in the heaven-sent rulers of India! What a confession of utter failure!

It is but a small addition to this wrong that it has been carried out in defiance of a recommendation of the Education Commission, which suggested that the Grant-in-Aid Rules should be revised in consultation with the managers of schools. All enquiries at the Legislative Council as to the causes of the change or the correspondence which had passed on the subject have been met by a refusal of information. The most that could be obtained was a promise to give careful consideration to any representation made on the subject. That representations adverse to the new rule will be made is not doubtful. Already a large, influential and enthusiastic meeting of protest has been held in the capital of the province. All parties and circles seem to be united in opposition. Missionaries and Municipal Councillors, Indians and Europeans are for once agreed. The Indian journals, the *Hindu* and the *Madras Standard*, are not more outspoken than the Anglo-Indian, the *Madras Mail* and the *Madras Times*. The Government have against them the whole public opinion of the province.

And this measure is introduced in a part of India noted for its loyalty, in a part where Indian and European have

lived in greater amity than anywhere else in the country. It is apparently intended to deprive the Congress of the active support of an influential profession. It is certain to make that class a hundred times more discontented than it has ever been before. It takes away rights that have been enjoyed in Madras for generations. And while the Government promises to consider any representations made to it on the subject, it carefully veils the reasons that have prompted its action. It has done much to forfeit the confidence of its subjects and to injure the cause of education. It has united all classes against itself. It has threatened some of its foremost citizens with a gross injustice. But it refuses to inform the public of the advantages it expects to gain in order to outweigh these evils. Nor have its best friends, its most strenuous supporters in the Press and among the public, been able to suggest that there is any reason for its conduct save a wish to weaken the National Congress—a policy more worthy of some party intriguer or Parliamentary hack than of the great and powerful Government of an Indian Province.

DISINTEGRATION? OR CONSOLIDATION?

THE other week we referred incidentally to the Mahometan meeting held at Lucknow to dissociate certain persons, or a certain group, from the aims and methods of the Indian National Congress. We then took the opportunity of suggesting that the resolutions of that meeting appeared to fail in grasping the facts against which they were directed; and it may be useful to recur now at more length to the points that are said to have been brought into special prominence on the occasion. There is, indeed, not the smallest ground for surprise that such a repudiation of the Congress should have been made. On the contrary, it would have been astonishing if some such protest had not at this season of the year been put forward. A small sectional demonstration of the kind is a regularly recurrent phenomenon of the political year in India—very much like the giant gooseberry or the sea-serpent of our own “silly season.” It is to the activity of the *Times*’ Calcutta correspondent—who does not always hasten to report matters of very much higher political and social importance, say the foul homicide of Dr. Sircar, or the disgusting injustice and oppression of the Chupra case—that we owe our first knowledge of the facts of this interesting, though insignificant, meeting. And, of course, the Imperial-minded opponents of the Congress in England are prompt enough to take up the old—and exploded—tale, and to embellish it in their own unique fashion. The promoters, “the leading Mahometans” of Lucknow, we are told from Calcutta, repudiated “the claim of the Congress to represent the views of the people of Lucknow.” We do not know that the Congress ever made any such claim; what the Congress claims is to represent the views of the educated Indians, and thereby to represent the views of the people of India. We decline to accept the libel on the intelligence of the people of Lucknow implied in the alleged resolution of the Mahometan meeting; and we believe that the Congress, though it does not expressly claim to represent the views of any one particular city or locality, does, in fact, represent the views even of “the people of Lucknow.” But the London *Globe* improves upon the Calcutta correspondent. “The resolutions,” says its adventurous writer, “undoubtedly embody the best Native opinion in India, and not of Mahometans alone.” Thus it is that the British public mind comes to be abused by the party prejudice and irresponsible ignorance of writers that glory in the name of Imperialism.

“It is only in England,” says the *Globe*, “that people with any pretensions to be listened to are inclined to take the Congress seriously.” Indeed! Ask those same “leading Mahometans” at Lucknow. Ask the official hierarchy, from Lord Curzon downwards. Ask any Governor-General that has ruled India since Lord Dufferin made the specific suggestion that determined the form the Congress has assumed and maintained. Ask any Secretary of State for India that has held office during the past fifteen years, and ask the members of his India Council in Whitehall. With all possible respect for our contemporary, we must say that its writer has permitted himself to commit to print unmitigated nonsense—none the less mischievous for its ignorance and foolishness. Be the Congress what it may—an

admirably beneficent organisation, or, if you will, “a mischievous institution”—it has got to be “taken seriously.” And, of course, it is taken seriously—that is to say, by every responsible person whose duty makes him acquainted with the conditions of India and with the constitution and methods of the Congress; and it will be a good day for this country when the people generally awaken to the facts. It is just such people as the *Globe* scribe that foster the dangerous and perverse attitude of opposition to the Congress established and kept up by a resentful officialdom. We invite the libellers of the Congress to recall what Sir Richard Garth, ex-Chief Justice of Bengal, wrote in 1895:—

Of all the many acts of injustice which have marked the conduct of the Government of India of late years, there is none, in my opinion, which can at all compare with their insolent treatment of the Indian National Congress. There is no subject, I consider, upon which the English Press and the English public have been so cruelly and persistently misled by the Government party.

Sir Richard Garth, we take it, knows what he is talking about, and is in a position to speak with full knowledge both of India and of the Congress, and with all the responsibility of an eminent official position. A like witness of distinction is Sir William Hunter, whose historical calmness may be matched with Sir Richard Garth’s judicial temper of mind. Sir William, some ten years ago, pointed out the historical inevitableness of the rise of the Congress and the supreme importance of the movement. He said this:—

I have been referred to as a moderate man. I am a moderate man. . . . The history of India has yet to be written, and when it is truly written Englishmen will learn that the present movement is the inevitable result of causes which we ourselves have set in motion. Those who misrepresent us speak of our movement as isolated, dangerous, unimportant. But I believe this political movement in India is an indestructible part of that great awakening in India which is showing itself not only in the intellectual progress of the Indian people, but in India’s commercial development, and in many signs of a new national life. We have got a great force to deal with, a force which must be powerful either for the disintegration of our Indian Empire or for the consolidation of our Indian Empire; and, therefore, as an old official, I say it is our duty to use it as a consolidating and not as a disintegrating force.

When men of the experience and capacity of Sir Richard Garth and Sir William Hunter give public expression to such clear and emphatic views, one may well be amazed at the infatuated audacity of Imperialistic writers who tell the public that a movement carrying with it the fate of India—and indeed of the British Empire—is not to be taken seriously.

As yet, of course, we are without the information necessary to gauge exactly the magnitude and importance of the Mahometan meeting at Lucknow. There is, undoubtedly, a strong nucleus of Mahometans in that city, and it is strongly supported in the surrounding districts; and we are free to acknowledge that its views will be approved by many Mahometans in all parts of India. Moreover, we do not doubt that the opinions expressed are quite honestly entertained. It is no part of political wisdom to underestimate opposition or to attribute to opponents merely factitious perversity. But, on the very face of the situation, it is entirely out of the question for this meeting, on the fullest admission of its strength and character, to speak in the name of “the people of Lucknow.” The Mahometans generally are in a great minority—say, one to five or six. They naturally feel that the representative principle bears pretty hard upon them. They have, unfortunately, been very backward in availing themselves of the opening opportunities of keeping themselves abreast with the other communities in the educational advantages offered through Western influences; though it is but fair to acknowledge—and we acknowledge it with real satisfaction—that for some time past they have been showing honourable efforts to make up their lee-way. In consequence of this educational backwardness, and also, perhaps, of a traditional pride in their more warlike temper, which under the *pax Britannica* cannot help to advance their political position, the Mahometans have been drawn to a somewhat ostentatious sympathy with the ruling authorities—a course of action that has tended, far more than the action of the Congress to create division in the country. Yet not by any means all Mahometans have been led into this unfortunate course. There are many Mahometans in the Congress camp, and not a few “leading Mahometans” too, men of light and leading in their respective spheres, from whom the Congress has sometimes chosen its President. The anti-Congress Mahometans are fully entitled

to their own opinions; there is no compulsion to approve of the Congress, though the Congress door stands open to receive them, as Indians, whenever they see fit to join. Besides, the Congress men have markedly shown their equitable feeling in view of the minority constituted by the Mahometan population. A notable example has always been furnished in the practical apportionment of representation on the Calcutta Corporation.

The Mahometan section that throw in their lot with the active opponents of the Congress must be left to the natural operation of political forces. Their opposition makes no real practical difference to the Congress movement. Whether it will issue in a difference of ultimate advantage to themselves and to the Mahometan community as a whole, remains to be seen. But they ought to be astute enough to understand that their futile resolutions are too far removed from the facts to weigh with the Government, though the Government may use them as good sticks enough to beat the Congress dog with. If "the propaganda of the Congress" can be truly said to cause "discontent and unrest," it is in the same way that the physician's medicine or the surgeon's knife causes discomfort to the patient. The real cause is the action, or the inaction, of Government; if there were no grounds for dissatisfaction with the administration, not all the Congresses that ever did or could exist would succeed in causing "discontent and unrest." If the Congress expends energy and thought and "wastes large sums of money in the fruitless task of adumbrating political changes for which the country is not prepared," it is not the energy and thought and money of the malcontent Mahometans, but of the Congress supporters, who, unlike their critics, labour earnestly to point out the true advantage of the country and to prepare a united country for fresh advances in self-government and prosperity. The dissenting Mahometans ought to know that the Congress is ardent for "the material and moral improvement of the communities composing the population of the Indian Empire," and does not need or deserve their remonstrances on the point; and that, if the Congress has little to say about "internal reform of the social fabric," it is because this department of the national movement is deliberately left to the Indian Social Conference, with which the Congress acts in consistent harmony. The Congress has strong reason to complain that such a misrepresentation should have been permitted to find a place in the Mahometan resolutions. The promoters of the meeting ought to know that the Congress does not "gloss over social evils," but, on the contrary, sympathises deeply with the movement to remedy them, and lends it all possible aid and encouragement. Again what says Sir Richard Garth? This:—

I will tell you what they (the Congress men) have done. 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 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 Councillors consider, of bringing our Eastern Empire to the verge of bankruptcy. This is what these good men have done to deserve the taunts and insults of the member for Oxford City (the late General Sir George Chesney) and the relentless persecution of the Government.

Now what, we ask, have our friends, the "leading Mahometans" of Lucknow, done to compare with that? The "daily widening gulf between rulers and ruled" we admit and deplore, but we hold firmly and decidedly that the responsibility for it lies with the rulers, and not with the ruled, nor with the Congress. To affirm that the Congress "has impeded the true political and moral progress of the country" is too ridiculous for argument in the face of the actual outcome of the labours of the Congress. But, after all, the question works round to the alternative set out by Sir William Hunter: Disintegration or Consolidation. And it is lamentable to think that the "leading Mahometans" of Lucknow should deliberately pronounce for Disintegration, and that they should be applauded by men at home who boast of "Imperialism."

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

FAMINES—PAST AND PRESENT.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, November 24.

During the week the Viceroy has been busy visiting Nagpur and Jubbulpore, the two most unfortunate towns in the Central Provinces, which were so hard hit during the famine of 1896-97. Their sufferings supplied the occasion of scathing criticism at the time in the Indian Press—criticism which was amply vindicated by the Lyall Commission. The unpreparedness of the responsible officials in those provinces and their strange reluctance to recognise the severe famine which overtook the people there till the appalling, yet unprecedented mortality, first revealed by Mr. Goodridge in the columns of the *Indian Statesman*, brought home the mournful fact to the governing authorities at Calcutta, were most grievous. It is a happy circumstance that no such unpreparedness and no such reluctance have been discernible during the present famine. The Viceroy was able to congratulate himself at Jubbulpore on the unremitting and sympathetic efforts of the State to relieve the prevailing distress in those provinces. But, it is to be feared, very few will agree with Lord Curzon in the high falutin' into which he allowed himself to be betrayed in that otherwise admirable address. To have extolled the disinterested and enlightened philanthropy of the British Government in India was not unnatural. But it was neither fair nor historical to compare it with past Native Governments, with which there can be no analogy. None has denied the efforts which the Indian Government has continued to put forth to alleviate the dire distress of famine, from the days of the Orissa famine of unhappy memory (1866) and the severer famine which followed ten years later. The Government has every time earnestly tried to profit by experience. Since the famine of 1896-7 it has become fully alive to its serious responsibility as an enlightened and Christian State. But that is no reason for decrying past Governments; and that for at least two considerations. First, neither the indigenous Governments nor the Government of the Mogul emperors could be compared with the present Government of British India in point of civilisation. Nay, it may be reasonably asked whether Governments in Europe which were contemporary with those of Akbar, and earlier ones which were the contemporaries of the Indian dynasties in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, would have acted or purposes of famine relief and established organisations of the kind with which only the last fifty years have made us familiar. Would Queen Elizabeth, for example, have organised famine relief on the lines that the Indian Government has now adopted if there had been a famine during her long reign? To compare the civilisation and ideas of philanthropy of one age with those of another, and draw favourable or unfavourable inferences to suit one's object is unfair. It was therefore unfair on Lord Curzon's part to institute comparisons with past Governments. Then civilisation was entirely different. Moreover, even at the risk of ungraciousness, one must remind the present rulers of India that their own famine policy, about which so much tall talk is indulged in by the distinguished service and its admirers in exalted places, was not such as to bear favourable criticism even within the last twenty years. Was Lord Curzon oblivious of the appalling mortality wrought in the Central Provinces only three years ago through sheer administrative incapacity of a most culpable character?

Again, it was historically inaccurate for Lord Curzon to refer to past Governments as if they had done nothing. His statement betrays woeful ignorance of the economic history of India in the time of the Moguls and their predecessors. The feeling of charity and philanthropy is implanted in the Hindu and the Mahometan from ages past. It is part of their religion. It is part of their daily domestic economy. To feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to give water to the thirsty, is not a trait peculiar to Christianity. It existed in India long before Christ was born. It is to be found in our sacred texts, as Oriental scholars are aware. Moreover, the excellence of such philanthropy was that people supported their own starving fellow-men without any such new-fangled adjuncts of modern civilisation as Famine Codes. The Code was the human nature of the Indian and the ancestral environment inherited by him. There are traces in old wells, tanks, reservoirs,

dharmasalas, and so forth of the piety and charity of the Hindus towards the famishing and the houseless, scattered all over the broad expanse of the Peninsula, of which antiquarians from Dr. Wilson to Mr. Grierson have given accounts.

More than that, it is well known that the economic condition of India under the rule of the predecessors of the British Government was not so dismal as the condition which has been witnessed for the last hundred years. No ghost is required to demonstrate, despite the India Office and the contradictions of officials, that the present condition of pauperisation, annually increasing, is to be connected with British rule. There was formerly plenty in the land—aye and a surplus stored in granaries and pits to meet the wants of a rainy day. Again, the older rulers had none of the system of land revenue paid in cash, with rigid dates of payment which have been one of the primary causes of peasant indebtedness. Also, there was no drain of the national wealth annually to foreign lands, without any return. However rapacious the officials and however tyrannical the rulers, as depicted by modern British chroniclers whose statements are all tinged with prejudice, the money extorted from the people remained in the country. So that famines were never of so disastrous a character in those olden days as they have been in recent times under British rule. There is no desire to disparage British rule or to under-rate its beneficence. But when men in exalted places speak in high-flown rhetoric, as Lord Curzon did the other day at Jabalpur, it becomes necessary to give the other side of the picture. There are many fallacies in which it is the practice of the distinguished service to indulge. But the time has come when they should be mercilessly exposed if the real truth, and not official romance, about India is to be propagated for the enlightenment of the still ignorant British public. A volume could be compiled to expose those fallacies, supported by facts and figures. It is much to be wished that some patriotic Indian, with ample leisure, would undertake that pressing duty. Meanwhile, exalted authorities would do well, when they make speeches for "home consumption," to verify their statements.

The famine, I repeat, is now well established in the land. Already over one and a-half crores of the starving are on relief works, and one would not be surprised if before February next the number not only doubled itself but mounted up to well nigh four crores—that is two crores in excess of the number originally estimated by the officials at Simla in October last. For the failure of the second monsoon in Madras Presidency will lead to a partial famine there. That Presidency has a population of nearly four crores; and it may be estimated that at least one fourth will have to go on relief as the summer season advances. Then part of the North-West Provinces will demand relief, while Rajputana is daily growing worse. It will never do to minimise or suppress ugly facts. They never remain concealed. Far better to look the dismal situation squarely in the face and try to cope with it manfully. There is a vicious tendency unduly to keep down the cost of famine. Famine expenses are, it is to be feared, controlled more by the condition of the Exchequer at the moment than by the actual requirements for famine relief. There has never been a public enquiry into the expenditure on famine, nor any investigation into suspensions and remissions of land revenue. It would not be amiss if an independent Commission, presided over by an able man like the late Sir James Caird, were to look into these questions. Then we might see a better famine administration. But will such a Commission be granted? Would the Indian Government and the India Office tolerate it? Or will it not rather be deprecated in the choicest terms which the "courtier" Press has at its command? If there is a bright side to the famine administration, English people should not forget that there is a dark side too. But, woe unto those who venture to depict the latter. Criticism must be all kisses and rosewater—that is the order of the day.

INDIANS AND THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Once again a Mahometan candidate heads the list at the Final Examination for the Indian Civil Service. This is the second time that the credit of such an achievement belongs to the Mahometan community. Some years ago, Mr. Tsyabi, the worthy son of a worthy father, stood first at the Final Examination for the Indian Civil Service. Let it be noted that no Hindu, not even Mr. Atul Chunder Chatterjee, has ever achieved this distinction. After this, why should our Mahometan fellow-subjects despair of their educa-

tional future or fight shy of competitive examinations? The cry against competitive examinations does not, however, come from them, but from some of their so-called leaders, who, remembering the arts by which they have risen, would fain wish the rising generation to follow them. They ignore the mental calibre and the moral stamina of the great community to which they belong, and would wish to perpetuate the practices which have secured to them the positions which they enjoy. A community which has no confidence in itself cannot hope to fulfil its destinies.

There will be now thirty-four Indians in the Covenanted Civil Service out of a total of over nine hundred civilians. This furnishes subject for congratulation to a contemporary. We cannot, however, rejoice at the fact. The figures afford the most striking evidence of the ostracism of a whole community from the higher appointments in the service of their own country. The Public Service Commission recommended, and the Government of India accepted the recommendation, that one sixth of the appointments in the Covenanted Service should be held by Natives of India. Under that recommendation at least one hundred and fifty appointments in the Covenanted Service should be held by Indians. They hold, however, only thirty-four of these appointments. Nearly fourteen years have elapsed since the Commission made its recommendations, and it was expected that they would be given effect to in the life-time of a generation or 33 years. We have nearly gone through half the period, but we are yet very far from filling half the appointments recommended by the Commission. Instead of forty-four, at least seventy-five of the appointments in the Covenanted Civil Service ought to be filled by Natives of India. Our rulers are ready enough to make promises, but in their case between promise and performance there is a difference wide as the poles asunder.—*The League.*

The *Lahore Tribune* writes:—The fact of seven out of sixty-three passed candidates for the Indian Civil Service this year being Indians has been widely commented on in the Anglo-Indian Press. A Mahometan name heads the list with more than 100 marks in excess of the second man. The local daily evidently regards it as a "most remarkable" thing; we do not know why. As we have often pointed out the vast bulk of the Muslim community is the same in blood and race as the Hindu, and there is no reason why there should be any difference in physical or intellectual characteristics between them. The *Civil and Military Gazette* would be glad to see more Mahometan and Sikh names in the Civil Service, and fewer Bengalis; not, of course, because our contemporary does not like the people of the Lower Provinces, but because the "people of the Punjab, Oudh, Deccan and other parts of India do feel themselves the physical and moral superiors of the Bengali." Do they? We remember in the early seventies there were over 500 Bengalis in Lahore, and they held the highest positions open to Natives then. In all the frontier towns there were colonies of Bengalis. It is now held that the Head Clerk of the District Office should be a European; as the post requires some firmness and administrative capacity. Well, for over thirty years, the Head Clerk at *Peshawar*, as at Multan and several other places, was a Bengali. For several decades the most influential and respected Durbars in Kashmir, as in Patiala, was a Bengali. In the days of the Punjab Frontier Force the Adjutant's right-hand man was always a Bengali! On the breaking out of the mutiny a Bengali Civil Surgeon of Gurgaon converted the District gaol into a fort and kept the rebels at bay. No one had more real influence in the Doabs, the heart of the Punjab, for well-nigh fifty years than a Bengali gentleman. Of course, there is a good deal of inter-provincial jealousy just as there is, say, between Scotchmen and Englishmen. But, knowing intimately as we do, not only our own Province of the Punjab but the whole of Upper India, we cannot say that there is any ground for the sweeping assertion of the local daily. It is not for the Government to make any distinction between the various sections of the Native community. What we Indians of every class and creed want at the hands of our rulers is—"Fair Field and no Favour."

MARRIAGE OF MISS N. H. BONNERJEE.

We take the following from the *Bradford Observer* of Saturday last, December 9:—The marriage of Mr. George Alexander Blair, son of Mr. Alexander Blair, one of the partners in the firm of Law, Russell and Co., stuff merchants, Bradford, with Miss N. H. Bonnerjee, eldest daughter of Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, barrister, of Calcutta and Croydon, took place yesterday at the Trinity Congregational Church, Croydon. The bride wore a white figured gown, the train of which was borne by a little boy—Kew Bonnerjee—the son of the bride's eldest brother, Mr. Shelley Bonnerjee. The bridesmaids were the Misses Bonnerjee (the bride's three sisters) and Miss Rotah Blair, the sister of the bridegroom. They were dressed alike in yellow, with black velvet hats trimmed with black ostrich plumes, and presented a most picturesque appearance, with their handsome bouquets of daffodils and lilies of the valley. The bride's shower bouquet consisted of choice white hothouse blooms. The bridegroom is a barrister in practice at Liverpool and on the Northern Circuit. His best man was Mr. Percy W. Addleshaw, a fellow-barrister on the Northern Circuit. The crowded congregation was an evidence of the respect in which Mr. Bonnerjee and his family are held in the neighbourhood. The service was conducted by the Rev. A. Holborn, and the organist and choir rendered hymns at the beginning and at the close of the ceremony. The bridegroom presented the bride with a ring and each of the bridesmaids with a silver shoe buckle. The bride's father gave the bride a cheque, as did also the bridegroom's father. The bridegroom's mother gave the bride a case of cutlery, and the bride's parents presented her with a silver-and-gold worked tea caddy. Amongst the numerous presents were a very large number from Croydon and Indian friends of the bride's family, and from the individual members of the Bonnerjee and Blair families. Amongst the Yorkshire friends represented were Mrs. Law (Bolton House), silver centrepiece; Mrs. Wales (Rawdon), silver card-case; Mr. and Mrs. Duncan Law (Bradford), silver candlesticks; Mr. and Mrs. Harold

Maynard (Bradford), silver butter-dish; Mr. and Mrs. James Askroyd (Bradford Moor), silver fish carvers; Miss Wales, silver serviette ring; Mrs. Claridge and Mrs. Weber, flower vases; Mr. Arthur Burrell, timepiece; Mr. James Barker, silver salts; Mrs. Lord, silver teapot; Miss McDonald, picture; Mr. D. M. Hertz, picture; Mr. D. Harker, doyleys; Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Boothroyd, gold embossed fruit dish. A very pretty wrought iron and copper five o'clock tea table, complete with copper kettle, teapot, etc., accompanied with a dumb waiter of the same materials, was very much admired. This was the gift of Mrs. Bonnerjee. Mr. J. Ghose's present to the bride was a handsome lady's bicycle. Another very useful and ornamental present was a beautifully-worked brass standard lamp given by Mr. and Mrs. E. Johnson. At the reception which was held immediately after the ceremony at the Croydon residence of Mr. Bonnerjee, the health of the bride was proposed by Sir Comer Petheram, Q.C., late Chief Justice of Bengal, and shortly afterwards Mr. and Mrs. Blair left for Paris, where they will spend their honeymoon.

LORD CURZON ON THE FAMINE.

ELOQUENT SPEECH AT JUBBULPORE.

The following is a full report of the speech delivered by Lord Curzon at Jubbulpore on November 22 in reply to an address from the Municipal Committee:—

Mr. President and Members of the Municipal Committee.—Although I am only the second Viceroy who has visited Jubbulpore since the days of Lord Canning, the fact that I have come here within three years of the visit of my predecessor Lord Elgin is an indication that the Central Provinces occupy no backward place in the regard of the Government of India, and that the welfare of this city and neighbourhood are objects of my personal solicitude and concern. It is not unnatural that we should both of us compare the circumstances of three years ago, when you presented an address to Lord Elgin, with those of to-day. There is this similarity between the two cases, that in both of them the province has been confronted with a serious scarcity arising from deficient rainfall, and has been called upon to make an exceptional effort in the face of widespread and calamitous distress. I gather, however, from a comparison of the statement which you made to the late Viceroy in December, 1896, and that which you submit to me now, that there are features in the present situation which justify feelings, not as you very properly remark of congratulation, but perhaps of some slight relief. We are certainly better prepared to meet a fresh emergency from the experience gained during a former one: the conditions of scarcity and destitution have not upon the present occasion developed themselves with the startling rapidity that they did in 1896; and I am glad to hear you say that the poorer classes in this neighbourhood are physically in a better state than they were at that time. On the other hand, while we may confess a relative sense of relief at the situation as it now stands, we cannot shut our eyes to the possibility of less encouraging features in the near future. Even now you are dependent for your next *rabi* crops upon a rainfall which is ardently hoped for, which may yet come, but which, like the summer and autumnal rains that have lately failed us, may turn out to be inadequate or illusory. It is for this reason that I refrain deliberately from using any words of what might be thought premature hopefulness. I prefer rather to err on the side of caution and to imagine that we are only at the beginning and not in the middle of a long vista of anxiety and exertion, and I call upon all parties, upon all officers of my Government, as to whom I am convinced that a more unselfish or highly trained body does not exist than those who are engaged in the administration of this Province, upon the leaders of public opinion, and upon the wealthy and public-spirited individuals among the Native community, to address themselves with unmitigated energy to meeting a strain which may increase instead of diminishing, and which, before it has slackened, may possibly affect the fortunes, and even the lives of many millions of human beings. Gentlemen, as I go round the various areas of suffering, as I see the efforts that are being made to relieve it, as I observe the unpretentious but unsparring activity of all British officers, civil and military, in combating the afflictions and in alleviating the misery of the people, and as I witness the bold and comprehensive schemes, devised in no commercial or parsimonious spirit, but on broad and statesmanlike lines both by Local Governments and by the Government of India I ask myself questions—and I ask them in no temper of hypocritical self-laudation but in one of philosophic inquiry—has there ever been a period in the history of India when such a philanthropic regard for the well-being of the toiling and helpless masses has been shown by the rulers of the country? Did Hindu or Mussulman sovereigns, a Maharrata, Mogul, or a Pathan, ever so exert themselves for the safe-guarding of human life? Is there at this moment a Government in the world, that if it were in our place, would devote its resources, both of means and men, with so large-hearted a munificence to your relief and would identify itself so thoroughly with the people? And if the answer to all these questions be—as I think it must be—in the negative, may we not find therein a convincing proof, as well as a supreme justification, of the high mission to which British

power has been called in India. It is often observed that we have given to the inhabitants of this country immunity from internal warfare for nearly a century; but we have done more than that. We endeavour to relieve you, and year by year we attain a larger measure of success, from the ceaseless conflict with more inveterate foes of humanity even than human beings themselves, namely, poverty, starvation, disease, and pestilence. It is an arduous campaign, but our hearts are in the task. Gentlemen, I have always heard of Jubbulpore as a place distinguished for the public spirit of its citizens. You have mentioned one case to me in respect of the enterprise of a prominent member of your community—Raja Seth Gokaldas—who has advanced funds to the municipality by which were undertaken the great waterworks that have now been in operation here for seventeen years. Since that date you have been compelled to hypothecate one-half of your annual income from octroi for the payment of interest on this loan; but I learn, with pleasure, that, owing in the main to the sound administration of the Municipal Committee, your revenue has risen sufficiently to enable you now to proceed without risk to the execution of a further scheme which is the natural complement of a good water-supply, namely, the scientific drainage of the city. In this project I wish you every success, and I trust that the Municipal Committee of Jubbulpore may never deviate from the creditable standard of efficiency which they have lately attained. It is a source of pleasure to me to feel on the occasion of my first visit to the Central Provinces that, while you are losing for the time the services of as capable and sympathetic a Chief Commissioner as you have ever had in the person of Mr. Ibbetson, you are about to receive in Mr. Fraser a successor who may be described as a Central Provinces man in every fibre of his being, and upon whose intimate knowledge and high character I confidently rely to guide the Province through its dark days of trouble.

[* Some remarks upon this speech will be found in the letter of our Bombay correspondent printed at page 290 of our present issue.]

INDIA IN THE BRITISH PRESS.

THE INDIAN FAMINE.

The *Investors' Review* (December 9) writes:—

Telegrams, official or other, about this disaster reach the English Press in a curiously erratic manner, and for the last two weeks, therefore, we have been unable to set out the progress of the scourge. On Tuesday morning last the latest telegram from the Viceroy made its appearance, giving the total on the relief works at 1,358,000. This is an increase of 530,000 since we drew attention to the subject in our issue of the 18th ult. In Bombay the numbers have risen to 253,000, and in the Central Provinces to 625,000. Central India is less affected, but in the Punjab, in Berar, in Rajputana and Ajmere, the distress is evidently acute, and all over the territories affected it must increase. Its extent now cannot be measured by these cold figures of people working for the State for an existence wage. We must multiply by at least ten the numbers of those directly afflicted by the scarcity, and, as has already been mentioned, bring in their animals. If we estimate at 20,000,000 the human population suffering to some extent from this hunger, we can only give a faint idea of what it means, and all this time not a syllable has appeared in any London newspaper to advocate the raising of money to assist this mass of distress and misery. All over the country subscriptions are pouring into the Transvaal fund for refugees, for soldiers' wives and children, until upwards of £379,000 has now been collected for the latter alone, but for India never a shilling. A curious commentary this upon the Imperial faculties of the great English people, ambitious to conquer the world, and impatient of any freedom not built on its lines or ready to become slavery at its order.

THE CONGRESS AT LUCKNOW.

British-Indian Commerce (December 15) writes:—The London journalistic organ of the movement represented by the Indian National Congress has been good enough to forecast the programme of the annual Congress to be held at Lucknow during the last week of the year. In his interview with our Special Commissioner, some months ago, Sir William Hunter, the historian of British India, stated that the movement was the natural outcome of our system of education in India. We had thrown open the higher branches of education to the Natives. It was natural that the educated Native, having saturated his mind with the culture of the West, should utilise his information and his broadened views of civilisation in the interests of his own people and class. The members of the Congress may be termed the Reform Party in India, and, like most reformers, they expect too much. When the few politicians, students, and business men who in the United Kingdom watch the development of Indian thought and material resources, think of the National Indian Congress, they imagine it to be a revolutionary body bent on the gradual weakening of British power in India. The leaders of the movement proclaim quite a different *raison d'être* for its existence. It is founded on the principle that "British rule should be perma-

nent and abiding in India, and that, given this axiom, it is the duty of educated Indians to endeavour to the best of their power, to help their rulers, so to govern the country as to improve her material prosperity and make the people of all classes and communities happy and contented as subjects of the British Empire." Nothing could be more admirably loyal than this fundamental purpose of the Congress. Nearly every one of our Anglo-Indian statesmen have declared their policies on similar lines; and it does therefore seem strange that the Congress and the administration hold very strongly antagonistic views on the methods of attaining the high object aimed at. For instance, it is complained that whereas, at the very first meeting of the Congress, demands were formulated for a Royal Commission to enquire into the administration of India—the people of India to be adequately represented thereon—and evidence taken both in India and in England, and for the abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State for India "the necessary preliminary to all reforms," neither of the demands have as yet been complied with. Probably the intense eagerness of the educated Native mind to reach a British-Indian millennium has blinded the Native perception to the magnitude of the demands. The second demand means a fundamental revolution in the conditions of the Government of India decreed by the Imperial Parliament on the establishment of direct Imperial rule. It is not too much to ask the Indian people, who have been patient for ages under the oppressive rule of Native chiefs and princes, to be patient for a little while longer under the more beneficent and helpful rule they now enjoy, while all its defects are being taken into consideration. Meanwhile, the fact that so eminent a man as Mr. Romesh C. Dutt, C.I.E., who was a distinguished servant of the Crown in India, is to preside over the deliberations of the Congress, gives promise that the delegates will be invited to devote themselves to helping their rulers by more practical suggestions. The field in which by advice to the people and co-operation with the rulers, they may improve the material prosperity of the country is wide enough to occupy their fullest attention. To assist the Government in improving the condition of the rayats, in delivering them from the bondage of poverty, and protecting them against the usurer, ought to be for the Congress a very laudable work indeed. But that object will not be attained by opposition to the policy of increased railway communication, which seems to be favoured by some of the members of the Congress. To relieve the people from poverty, markets for the produce are of the first importance. To make good and intelligent citizens of the mass of the population, comfort and education are essentials. Neither the poor nor the ignorant can appreciate nor assist good government. Nor can they promote commerce, which, after all, in these our days, is the potent civiliser in India as well as elsewhere in the world. We look to the Congress for useful suggestions for the improvement of the material condition of the people, leading to the extension of Indian trade and the accompanying blessings of civilisation, rather than for mere political speculations.

THE CHUPRA SCANDAL.

The *New Age* said (December 7):—"Our contemporary INDIA has done yet another conspicuous public service in reproducing from the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of Calcutta the full text of a judgment pronounced by Mr. Pennell, Sessions Judge of Chupra, reversing a sentence of two months' rigorous imprisonment passed by a Deputy Magistrate for alleged assault and intentional insult provocative of a breach of the peace. Mr. Twidell, officiating magistrate of the district of Chupra in the Patna division of Bengal, issued orders, in August, to the zemindars and rayats to repair certain bundhs, or embankments of watercourses, and directed the police to use "natural persuasion" to get the people to work. "The whole thing," says Mr. Pennell, "in fact was forced labour of the worst kind," and absolutely illegal. Mr. Corbett, an assistant deputy superintendent of police, a "boy" of twenty-three, and Mr. Simkins, the district engineer, went to impress workers in the village of Fulweria. Narsingh Singh, a constable on sick leave from another district, boldly objected. "Why should we help?" he asked; "we are free men." The pressure getting hotter, he snapped his fingers in the face of Mr. Corbett, and said he did not care "that" for his orders. So Mr. Corbett kicked him, and, on his attempting to retaliate, Mr. Simkins hit him on the head with a rattan and Mr. Corbett struck him in the face with his fist three times, knocked him down, sat upon him, and, with Mr. Simkins, pommelled him severely. He went to hospital next morning. The same night, however, Mr. Corbett had talked over the squabble with Mr. Twidell, and Mr. Bradley, the district superintendent of police ("not much older than himself"), and probably with Captain Maddox, the civil surgeon; and when Narsingh went to the hospital Captain Maddox "drove to the Chupra Club and informed Mr. Corbett, and from the club proceeded to Mr. Bradley's house and informed him." Narsingh was at once fetched to Mr. Bradley's house, impressed with the enormity of his conduct, and invited to resign. But Narsingh refused to resign. He was then taken to Mr. Twidell's house, where the egregious officials again consulted, and Mr. Twidell ordered Narsingh to be prosecuted under certain sections of the Penal Code. The prosecution

took place before Moulvie Zakir Hossein, a deputy magistrate of twenty-seven years' standing. The Moulvie allowed Mr. Bradley to sit on the bench and disposes the evidence with him; several times retired with the record to Mr. Twidell's private room, and "discussed the case with him and with the Court Sub-Inspector"; refused to allow cross-examination of certain witnesses; permitted the Government prosecutor a right of reply, though Narsingh's counsel had called no witnesses; talked over the case with Mr. Twidell in the train; admitted fresh charges under other sections of the Code when the case was pending for judgment solely; put oppressive and impracticable conditions on the defendant in meeting the new charges; and at last condemned him to two months' rigorous imprisonment for assault and for intentional insult provocative of breach of the peace! Of course, he dismissed Narsingh's countercharge of voluntarily causing hurt and of unlawful compulsion to labour against Messrs. Corbett and Simkins—"a flagrant piece of servility," as Mr. Pennell remarked. Babu Jagannath Sahay, an experienced pleader, who had taken up Narsingh's case, at once appealed to Mr. Pennell, who instantly released Narsingh on bail, and sent to Mr. Twidell a copy of the documents, inviting explanation. Mr. Twidell, "acting under the orders, or at all events with the approval, of his executive superior, Mr. Bourdillon (the Commissioner of Patna), refused to submit any explanation." Mr. Bourdillon also in a semi-official note invited Mr. Pennell to hear the case "in camera." But Mr. Pennell held on the straight course, and upset the whole of the outrageous proceedings, reversed the judgment against Narsingh, and forwarded his drastic judgment to the Lieut.-Governor. Narsingh's real offence consisted, in Mr. Pennell's opinion, "not in what he had done, but in what he had suffered; it was the crime—and it may be a very grievous crime in these parts—of having been assaulted by a European official." Mr. Zakir Hossein "is a mere servile tool in the hands of his superiors"—but, to our mind, he had practically no alternative, and his wickedness must be very largely laid at the door of Mr. Twidell. As for Mr. Twidell, he "has prostituted his high office as District Magistrate to screen his friends from justice"; "with regard to the actual prosecution, it is clear that his object all through was, not to do justice, but to secure by hook or by crook that Narsingh should be convicted of something, and that any complaint which he might make should be barked." Here, then, is a shocking conspiracy of the whole of the local British executive to do an abominable injustice, the very Commissioner of the Division interposing at least to hamper the course of justice and honour. Hossein is reported to have resigned. Mr. Pennell, who had been sent to Chupra on grounds of health, has been relegated to Noakhally, "the worst place in Bengal." We await the Lieut.-Governor's decision. On the facts as stated in the judgment on revision, one would expect him to make a clean sweep of the officials implicated. Mr. Pennell, who has served thirteen years with distinction, has earned special claims to promotion, and he must be got out of Noakhally without delay. As India says "a man of such spirit, abilities and experience is simply invaluable in existing circumstances." But what do the British public think of the glimpses this case affords into the spirit of the administration of justice in India, on which they pride themselves so much? But for Mr. Pennell—and Babu Jagannath—the villainy of these executive officers would have triumphed, and we should never have heard of it. Yet its effects would have been working disastrously in the community.

THE CHUPRA SCANDAL.

THE SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE DUTIES.

The following letter to the editor appears in the *Pioneer*:—"Sir.—The conclusion which you draw as to the undesirability of the further separation of the judicial and executive powers in India in your article in the Chupra case is hardly warranted by the facts you state therein. The present state of things has not prevented the late Sessions Judge of Chupra from writing as he has in condemnation of the chief executive officer of that district, whereas if the Deputy Magistrate, who tried the case, had been as he would have been in case the judicial and executive were separate, only the subordinate of the judge, he would, even if he be such a man as he is described in the judgment, have acquitted the accused, not having the fear of the collector but only of the judge before his eyes, and a public scandal would have been avoided. As to the expediency of writing much that is to be found in the judgment in question there may be two opinions. The remarks in the same, which refer rather to the conduct of the executive than to the guilt of the accused, might, so many think, with more propriety, have been addressed by the Judge in a D.O. to the local government. As to this it is only to be said that there is a strong feeling that such D.O.'s are only too commonly pigeon-holed and that the Government holds firmly to a belief that the executive can do no wrong. My object in writing to you, however, is not so much to comment on the present case as to call attention to what in Bengal at least is a scandal. I cannot speak of other parts of India of the executive habitually ignoring or reviewing the judicial. In the present case the Government can, if so advised, appeal against the acquittal ordered by the Sessions Judge, and in such case the High Court, the legitimate superior authority, would be

able to express their opinion as to the justice of Mr. Pennell's strictures. Nor need it be said that this would be punishing the accused more than is desirable: for the Government may ask for the conviction to stand, but not press for any further punishment. The High Court is the one body which should sit in judgment on Sessions Judges. But time after time in Bengal, we find judicial decision deliberately come to, ignored or reviewed by an executive officer. Thus in a case I remember some years ago, a police officer was found by the judge to have fabricated documents and to have otherwise acted most wrongfully in regard to an important criminal case. The matter was referred by the Government to the District Magistrate, an officer very much junior to the judge and he said he disagreed with the judge. The police officer's services were retained. This year there was a case concerning a police officer who declared his belief in the Sub-Inspector's innocence as to the wrongful confinement. The District Magistrate went departmentally (not judicially) into the matter, and recorded that he thought the charges were false. Then the Sub-Inspector concerned prosecuted the man who had accused him before a District Magistrate. Evidence was taken at great length. The deputy convicted, his judgment being virtually a copy of the District Magistrate's order ignoring entirely the whole body of evidence given on the other side. The Sessions Judge—not Mr. Pennell—reversed the conviction, his judgment pointing out that there was a great deal of truth in the charges made. What will be done with the Sub-Inspector? Probably the District Magistrate's opinion will be asked. Fortunately he is not the same as the person who declared his belief in the Sub-Inspector's innocence. But the objection is to asking the District Magistrate. The whole of the English judicial system is founded in the finality of judgments till set aside. Our whole system of government goes by the board, if you are to have a secret and irresponsible body of men, sitting in review of the work of the judges of the land.

O. K.

The *Friend of India* says:—One of our Indian contemporaries complains that there has been a conspiracy of silence in the Anglo-Indian Press over the case of Mr. Pennell. The allegation, it need scarcely be said, is quite unjust; but it rests upon a certain basis of fact. The Anglo-Indian Press have, for the most part, kept their counsel about the case in question; but their reticence, so far from implying a conspiracy, probably springs from very diverse motives. Writers who attach more importance to the maintenance of official prestige than to the vindication of justice could hardly be expected to aid in giving publicity to facts so damaging to our administrative system as those exposed by Mr. Pennell in his recent judgment. Writers, again, who under ordinary circumstances would have welcomed that judgment for the testimony it bears to the urgent need for reform of our administrative system, are not unnaturally reluctant to call attention to vagaries which stamp its author as sadly lacking in one of the most important qualifications of his office. Unless the facts recited in the judgment can be traversed, which does not appear to be the case, not only was the decision arrived at by Mr. Pennell on the appeal of Narsingh Singh the only decision at which an upright Judge could have arrived, but there is hardly in the judgment, from first to last, a reflection that can be pronounced unjust. None the less the judgment is one which no judge with a due sense of either the dignity of his office or the proprieties of official life would have allowed himself to indict. The facts are as well known as those which probably be astonishing to anyone unfamiliar with the way in which officials in the Indian District are apt to play into one another's hands with a clear conscience where official interests or dignity are concerned. Mr. Twidell, the Magistrate of Surin, issued orders to the zemindars and rayats to repair certain embankments, and to the police to get the people to work on them—without remuneration—both orders being wholly illegal and improper. As the work did not progress to his satisfaction, Mr. Corbett, the Assistant-Superintendent of Police, was sent out to expedite it; and with him went Mr. Simkins, the District Engineer. Among the villagers they endeavoured to impress was Narsingh Singh, the appellant, a constable for another district, on sick leave. Narsingh Singh declined to help or get others to help, no doubt impudently, protesting that he and they were free men. An altercation ensued, in the course of which, it is alleged, the constable snatched his fist from Mr. Corbett's face, with the result that the latter seized and kicked him. Narsingh Singh, to quote the judgment, "then ran at Mr. Corbett. Mr. Simkins hit him on the head with a rattan, and Mr. Corbett struck him in the face with his fist, causing him to fall against a house. After he received the blow on the head from Mr. Simkins' stick, the accused, according to Mr. Corbett, called out to the villagers to use their *talis*. Mr. Corbett says that he hit the accused three times in the face, and that each time the man ran at him. It is not, however, asserted by either Mr. Corbett or Mr. Simkins that the accused or anyone else actually struck either of them." Ultimately the man fell down, whereupon Mr. Corbett set upon and thrashed him—not a very English proceeding—and Mr. Simkins also gave him several cuts with a rattan. He was then allowed to go. Subsequently he was brought up again and compelled to work on the embankment, but after a few minutes was allowed to leave, on providing a substitute, on the ground that he was ill. Here, apparently, the affair might have ended; but Narsingh Singh went to the hospital to be treated. This seems to have aroused a suspicion in the minds of the officials that his object was to obtain a certificate in support of a case against Mr. Corbett. Accordingly, after consulting the Magistrate and District Superintendent of Police, Mr. Corbett followed him to the hospital and arrested him. Further consultation ensued. An attempt was made by the latter—with what object we do not understand—to induce the constable to resign; but he refused, and eventually the Magistrate directed his prosecution under Sections 353 and 186 of the Penal Code, and made the case over to Mouvi Zakir Hossain for trial. During the trial the District Superintendent of Police was given a seat on the bench and several graver irregularities were committed, all to the prejudice of the defendant, the trying

Deputy Magistrate making frequent adjournments to the Magistrate's private room for the purpose of discussing the case. A charge under Section 504 was added, and the defendant was convicted under Section 353 read with Sections 114 and 504 and sentenced to two months' rigorous imprisonment. Proceedings more discreditable from first to last to the officials mixed up in them than this prosecution, its incidents, and its result—we say nothing of the treatment of Narsingh Singh by Mr. Corbett and Mr. Simkins in the first instance—it would be hard to imagine, and the Judge would have been doing less than his duty had he, in reversing the sentences on appeal, omitted to take proper steps to bring the conduct of those officials to the notice of the Local Government and the High Court. Hardly less reprehensible was the action of Mr. Bourdillon, the Commissioner, in writing a demi-official letter to the Judge, during the trial of the appeal, requesting him to hear the case *in camera*; and if Mr. Pennell was not imperatively called upon to take notice of this solecism, he would not have been going far out of his way in reporting it also in the right quarter. Not only, however, did Mr. Pennell prefer the more sensational expedient of castigating the officials concerned all round, including the Commissioner, in his public judgment, but he did this in language which no official should allow himself to use publicly of another not directly subordinate to him, accusing the Deputy Magistrate, for instance, of servility and disgraceful conduct; the Magistrate of disingenuousness and prostitution of his high office; the Commissioner himself of a strong desire to hush up the case, and much else which, no doubt, expresses his genuine convictions and may carry conviction with it, but which, coming from a Judge on the Bench, is an outrage on decorum. It is not surprising, but we think unfortunate, as likely to create an erroneous impression, that the sequel, or one of the sequels, to the case should have been the transfer of Mr. Pennell from Surin, where he obviously could not be allowed to remain, to what is generally regarded as the penal settlement of Noakhali.

MR. THORBURN'S RETIREMENT.

[FROM THE "PIONEER,"]

Mr. S. S. Thorburn, late Financial Commissioner in the Punjab, sails from Bombay in the "Arabia" for England on December 2. The official who bells the cat in India is apt to get more distinction than credit and, though nobody questions that Mr. Thorburn hit the nail on the head in his famous speech at the United Service Institution at Simla, it is doubtful whether his action on that occasion is held unto him for righteousness: the more so as his literary lance pricked anew the scarcely healed raw a trifle unnecessarily in his recent novel "Transgression." Nevertheless Mr. Thorburn is a type of officer with whom the Indian Civil Service can ill afford to part. Few members of the Punjab Commission have had a longer experience or a wider and closer acquaintance with the land and the people; still fewer have had in the same degree the invaluable instinct which tells the official unerringly where the administrative machine is developing friction, or the power of detachment from official routine which permits sound instincts their proper play. Mr. Thorburn has not only performed all the duties which ordinarily fall to a civilian, filling all the posts of the Punjab Commission, except the highest, with distinguished ability: he has done far more than most to advance the solution of some of the most complex and difficult problems—that of agricultural indebtedness, for instance—which are exercising the Government at the present time, and it is due almost entirely to him that the abuses of impressment in the Punjab, which had attained dimensions quite unsuspected by the public, have been forced on the attention of the Government and are in the way to be remedied. Mr. Thorburn had no doubt the defects of his qualities, and his qualities even were not of the kind which make the most popular officer, but his departure from India is none the less a severe loss to the administration. May we add also that, in losing Mrs. Thorburn, Simla society loses one of its most charming and popular members.

BRITISH RULE IN INDIA.—A correspondent writes: A meeting in Croydon, held under the auspices of the local Y.M.C.A., the question of British rule in India was lately discussed. Mr. R. K. Dass, a native of Bengal and a student for the Bar, introduced the subject. He spoke of the good derived from British administration in the matter of railways, telegraphs, postal arrangements, and education. He spoke, too, of the position of women, and their improved status. "In terms of strong reproach he referred to the caste system. Towards the close of his paper Mr. Dass devoted considerable time to the political condition of the country, the lack of confidence in Indians, and the injustice of not allowing them a voice in the Government. India and Indians remember what they had been and hated being despised. In British rule there was a certain amount of content shown by English officials. The awful poverty of India and its terrible burden of taxation consequent on unnecessary and reckless military expenditure were referred to in pathetic terms, and a magnificent appeal for greater confidence in Indians and for the opening of posts of greater responsibility to them, ended a most instructive and interesting address.

THE INDIAN SOCIAL CONFERENCE.

A circular (says the *Bengalee*) has been issued by Mr. Justice Ranade on behalf of the General Secretary of the Social Conference to be held this year at Lucknow in the last week of December. The Lucknow Committee will notify subjects for consideration for the conference, but in anticipation Mr. Justice Ranade suggests a list of the subjects which he trusts will most likely commend itself to the Lucknow people. The subjects will be: The raising of the standard of female education; promotion of temperance and of total abstinence; reduction of marriage and funeral expenses; increasing the limits of the marriageable ages of boys and girls; promotion of friendly feelings between Hindus and Mahomedans; the question of sea voyages; organisation of charity for the promotion of education amongst boys and the relief of the widows and orphans; improvement of the physique of boys; discouragement of nautch parties and the promotion of purity; prohibition of the sale of girls and of marriages of old persons; the admission of converts to other faiths back into Hindu society; the improvement of the condition of child-widows by promoting their education, and teaching them to be self-dependent. Mr. Justice Ranade invites suggestions.

THE COERCION OF TEACHERS IN MADRAS.

The following is the text of the two resolutions unanimously adopted at a public meeting of the citizens of Madras held on November 15 at Pachaiyappa's Hall:—

I.—(a) That the citizens of Madras in this meeting assembled for the purpose of considering the question of memorialising the Government in reference to the recent additions to the Madras Grant-in-Aid Code, resolves, first to thank Government for its gracious consent, as expressed, by it in the meeting of the Legislative Council on the 14th instant, to consider representations that may be made to it on this behalf:

(b) Secondly, to put on record its opinion that any rules which in effect prohibit managers and teachers of Aided institutions from taking part in political movements or agitation or attending political meetings without the consent of the Director of Public Instruction are likely to interfere with the practical and effectual exercise of the right of British subjects to petition Government; that they will inevitably thwart and hamper private enterprise and organisation for the spread of education in this country; that they are likely to prove a source of danger to the Government and the public by making the less informed and less educated classes among the people the interpreters between the Government and its subjects, and respectfully prays that the Government will take speedy steps to remove from the Code the provisions, which the meeting cannot but regard as involving principles detrimental alike to the good government of the country and to the progress of the people.

II.—That this meeting requests and hereby authorises the Chairman to submit the above Resolution to the Madras Government with a suitable letter explaining the feelings and sentiments of this Meeting and the grounds of the above Resolution.

SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

THE "MADRAS STANDARD."

It is significant that the greatest educationist and the head of the largest and most successful institution in Southern India, the Rev. Dr. William Miller, sent to the Chairman of the meeting a letter of sympathy in which he expressed his opinion that the recent additions to the grant-in-aid code were unnecessary. From these and from the frank disapproval expressed by the local organs of Anglo-Indian opinion, it is evident that to European as well as to Indian minds the new departure of Government in its direction of education is uncalled for and mischievous. Public feeling in the districts is even more agitated than in Madras, and besides the protests that have already been sent from many a centre of educational activity, more will soon be heard, until the conviction in the mind of the Government, which we are glad to be assured is open to reasonable and moderate representations, is complete as to the error it has made. The speeches made at the meeting mostly repeated the arguments with which the criticisms of the Press had made the public familiar, and were characterised by a generous confidence in the present head of the Madras Government. It is strange that of all the provinces of the Empire, Madras should have been selected for this reactionary departure—Madras which is the quietest and safest province and where the feverish brain of the Anglo-Indian alarmist on the look-out for glimpses of sedition in the land have till now failed in their unholy endeavour. Nobody knows so well as Sir Arthur Havelock does that to suspect sedition where there is no sedition and to treat educated and respectable people as if they belonged to secret societies occupied with revolutionary designs, is no part of wise statesmanship. Now that public opinion has expressed itself in an

emphatic and unmistakable manner, we may indulge in the hope that this gratuitous cause of public irritation will be soon removed. The sooner the better.

THE "HINDU."

We consider it extremely unfortunate that when nearly four-fifths of his Excellency's term of office has expired, there should proceed from the Government, one after another, measures calculated to seriously offend public feeling, tending as they do to restrict the freedom of the subject. By such restrictions as this we feel convinced the Government gains nothing, while the loss it sustains in its prestige and popularity is immeasurably beyond any possible good that may be imagined to accrue from them. It is our most firm conviction that if there is anything which the Government has cause to feel the least anxious about, it is the political movement in this country. On a close examination of the programme of the political reformers, it will be found that, even though every one of the demands be given effect to, there cannot be any grave political consequence; on the other hand the movement has a distinct advantage in that it reflects the highest feelings and the highest aspirations of intelligent and educated India. The rulers have not been always just or generous to it, and intolerant local bureaucrats here and there have deliberately thrown obstacles in its way. For any public movement it is discouraging enough to be studiously ignored by the powers-that-be. But what we cannot understand is, why this discouraging treatment should be aggravated by such indefensible and preposterous restrictions on the liberty of the subject, restrictions which Governments, sure of their strength and influence, should be above the need of creating. Indeed, the National Congress or any other political movement is not going to be killed by the enforced withdrawal from it of every schoolmaster in the land although they form a most intelligent, honest, and patriotic body.

THE "MADRAS MAIL."

The organisers of our public meeting on the 15th inst. to protest against the new rules on "politics" in the Grant-in-Aid Code had a comparatively easy task to perform, for where practically everybody is more or less agreed on a subject, a meeting of protest becomes merely a formal matter. . . . The Resolution that was passed was somewhat long-winded, but it was otherwise unexceptionable, and will, it may be hoped, along with other representations, influence Government to revise the rules before they are brought into force next April.

THE "AMRITA BAZAR PATRIKA."

We have already referred to a notice in the Madras Government *Gazette* which runs to the effect that no teacher—not even those employed in Municipal and Local Fund institutions—are to be permitted to mingle in any way with political agitations. This, says a correspondent of the *Hindu*, means "a serious blow to the National Congress." But something still more ridiculous is to be found in the declaration which managers of Government-aided schools are required to sign. Such managers must sign a declaration that "Neither my teachers or myself will take part, directly or indirectly, in any political movement, etc." Now, many Zemindars in Bengal maintain a good many educational institutions which get also some aid from Government. If this Madras rule were introduced here, they would be asked to state whether they are in the habit of affording help to the National Congress, directly or indirectly! If they say—yes, the Government would then say—"We would then withdraw aid from the schools you maintain." It so happens that the city in which the National Congress holds its annual sittings, has to accommodate delegates and sometimes to ask wealthy men to allow their houses, if available, for the use of the guests. If one such wealthy man is a benefactor to his fellow, that is to say, maintains a school which at the same time receives some aid from the Government or the District Board, that aid is to be forthwith withdrawn; for here the owner of the institution is guilty of offering aid indirectly to a political movement. The grant-in-aid schools are usually maintained by wealthy men, who have no personal interest in the institutions they maintain. If therefore these institutions are deprived of Government aid, simply because their munificent patrons sympathise with the Congress, it is the innocent and poor people who will suffer. Is it not? We think the Madras Government is wrong from the beginning to the end.

THE "INDIAN SPECULATOR."

The Government of Madras seem to have acted without adequate justification in introducing, among their rules for the distribution of grants-in-aid to educational institutions, a new rule making the grant-in-aid managers who will now sign all the school regulations, that they would abstain from taking part in all political movements. Considering that the class of non-official educated Indians is largely composed of lawyers and school-masters, the notification was bound to evoke discontent, and it has done so. A similar rule, enjoining that a person should promise to eschew politics before he can be enrolled as a lawyer, would exhaust the ranks from which our politicians are mostly drawn. With the lawyers and the school-masters held in check, political activity of the open, organised kind, must, to a very large extent, disappear. But why should it disappear? How is the Government interested in its disappearance? We may say at once that we have no faith in the pedagogue-politician. His politics are only too apt to pervert his teaching, on the one hand, and, on the other, the pedagogic spirit carried into politics is the parent of more than one of our incoherencies. In the interests, therefore, of both politics and teaching, a divorce between them is much to be desired. But we should prefer this to come out of the voluntary influence of public opinion rather than through the fiat of the Educational Department of Government. The idea of Government associating abstinence from politics with the giving of grants-in-aid is repulsive. From it, to regarding the amount spent on education by the State as a sort of secret service money, the distance is not great, and there is a danger of its tending to become less great in course of time.

SINGER'S SEWING MACHINES.

FOR CASH OR HIRE.

Machines Exchanged and Repaired.

DUPLICATE PARTS, NEEDLES, OIL, &c.,
ALWAYS IN STOCK.

100 Offices in India, Burma, and Ceylon.

Instructions Free. Price Lists Free on application.

The SINGER } 5, CHURCH GATE ST.,
Manufacturing Co. } BOMBAY.

"INDIA," JAN.-JUNE, 1899.
VOL. XI.

NOW READY.

Bound in Cloth (post free)
7/6 each net cash.

The following volumes of "INDIA," bound in cloth, can also be obtained:—

Vols. V. (1894), VI. (1895), VII. (1896), VIII. (1897).

Price 8/6 each, post free.

Vols. IX. (Jan.-June, 1898), X. (July-Dec., 1898). Price 7/6 each, post free.

Remittances should accompany order.

Apply to the Manager, "INDIA,"

84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

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,

SONO SQUARE, NATIONAL HOSPITAL, LONDON, N.W.

To Political Associations, Literary
Societies, Ethical Societies,
Etc., etc.

LECTURES and ADDRESSES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

The British Committee of the Indian National Congress (84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.), is now making arrangements for lectures and addresses on Indian questions during the Autumn and Winter Season.

Associations or individuals that desire the services of thoroughly competent speakers on Indian questions are requested to communicate as early as may be with the Secretary to the British Committee at the above address.

For a limited number of lectures lantern slides can be provided.

No charge will be made for the services of speakers with whom engagements are made through the British Committee.

Address, *THE SECRETARY,*
BRITISH COMMITTEE of the
INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.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, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will cure Croup, Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

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



is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER,**

and Cures Malarious, Intermitent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, 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. I know more than magic in it.

North Baffin Barrocks, Devonport.
C. E. WOOD, Capt 2nd North Staffs. Regt.

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

Enclose Royal Municipal Councils' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your 'Omum-Carpoo' was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 anns. 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 STOCK, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.