

NATIVE OPINION (October 1, 1896).

Friends and Admirers.

These two new creatures were discovered in this Presidency during the *regime* of Lord Harris. They are to be found in every community, but until the late administration there was no proper opportunity to discover them. In the late administration that opportunity was found, and those well-versed in that particular science having discovered the creatures, have given them names and fully recorded their scientific properties as well as all information as to how and where their samples could be seen. The chief property of these creatures is flattery. This property being hereditary, nay, even like the instinct in the lower creatures, their actions are always in consonance with it. None can blame them for this, and there is no use of doing it, because it is their innate quality. It is not possible for any creature to transgress its natural instinct in its natural state. However hard we may try, can we make a dog give up its habit of wagging its tail? We have, therefore, nothing to say against the conduct of these recently discovered creatures that make it conformable to their nature. They may indulge in their flatteries to their hearts' content. But they have begun to make themselves detestable to society on account of the great blunder they make in dragging others into their ranks on the supposition that because there is a physical likeness between themselves and others, the whole world must be inhabited by creatures of their own kind. Although this their foolish attempt totally failed at the time of Lord Harris' departure, they have not been wiser, but have begun it anew. On that occasion they made a display of their inborn property at the feet of the late Governor; now they are going to do it at the feet of Mr. Bhavnagri. The clever and well informed correspondent of the *Madras Standard* has published that Messrs. Chichgar and Dosabhoj Framji and a Parsi barrister are the leaders of this *tamashy*. Mr. Bhavnagri is a creature of the India Office. He is a native of India, he and his father have been fed by India's produce, and he and his children have no other field than India wherein to pass their lives. But notwithstanding all these facts he is, what is to be found in every community, the ruin of his own countrymen. We have heard that on one occasion

he said that he had nothing to do with India, and that he did not wish to represent her in Parliament. In a very recent speech made in England he showed a considerable amount of interest in his native land. But when we think of the two factors, *viz.*, his doings up to date, and his intended return to his native country—no, not native country, but the wretched India—we can easily see what his interest means and what portion of honesty there is in it. He is a gentleman who thoroughly knows the art of accommodating himself to circumstances. If he wishes to get himself honoured by the people of India, he has only to show a large amount of interest in them. If, again, he desires to be patted on the back by the Conservatives, the Indian Civilian and the Anglo-Indian journals, he is equally prepared to condemn India and abuse her well-wishers. This quality of his has served him to the present time, and by this quality he has been endeavouring to take in the people of this country: but, unfortunately for him, the people are not so simple as to be led away by his false representations.

If his friends and admirers have to present him with address, or if they have to offer him dinners or if they turn themselves into the horses of his carriage, they are at liberty to do so. The public at large will not object to their doing any or all of these things; but now-a-days they have been trying to give a different character to their friendship and admiration; which is exceedingly unworthy; and if they continue in these their efforts, we may warn them that they are sure to fall on their faces and bring themselves into disgrace together with their leader. The editor of the *Champion* says that Mr. Dosabhai Framji and some others belonging to his party are thinking of giving him a feast in the Town Hall. May it be that the object of this is to make it appear to the people of England that Mr. Bhavnagri enjoys—if not more,—at least equal honor with Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji on whom addresses were showered by the people in the same hall? We think that one will not be far from being right if one supposes this to be the case. Besides, it is heard that these men have been striving to drag into their own ranks some influential people from this and other towns by importunate requests. Although they are sure to fail in this attempt on account of being repudiated by some they are straining every nerve to increase their number, and in doing this also they must have the

same object in view. As to this, we have simply to tell them that their desire to increase the number will not be fulfilled by their efforts. It is not that all the people in India excepting them are so many sheep. It is not possible to drive men from one place to another like sheep. They should not, therefore, bring themselves into disgrace by undertaking this foolish task. The whole Presidency poured crowds to welcome Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. There was no necessity at that time for men like Mr. Dorabhai Framji to send notes or to exert their influence. Remembering this the friends of Mr. Bhavnagri should cautiously proceed in their undertaking. The one has spent the whole of his life for the good of his country at the sacrifice of his own interest. The other has set about to serve his country, with an annual remuneration of Rs. 35,000 from the Bhavnagar State, having loudly disavowed all sort of connection with the Congress. The friends of Mr. Bhavnagri should bear this in mind that the people in this country will not have the slightest doubt as to which of these is their real benefactor and which is the disguised one. But the people in this country must be careful about one thing, *viz.*, that if occasion requires they should announce (especially the newspapers and political institutions) to the people of England that they have no connection whatsoever with the feast given to Mr. Bhavnagri, so that the people of England should not be led away by the ostentatious speeches of the persons concerned with the feast as to the public opinion here about Mr. Bhavnagri.

THE CHAMPION (October 4, 1896).

Collapse of the public demonstration in
honour of Mr. Bhavnagri.

Pity the sorrows of poor Mr. Dosabhoj Framji! Though he had addressed letters to only a dozen gentlemen, inquiring whether they would allow their names to be put upon a proposed "representative" committee, his little secret got out. And lo! the next moment it was published far and wide. What an "audacious" crime to be sure! And what a cruel fate indeed for the Catilines of Pedder Road! Murder is always discovered; and the plotting of the conspirators to morally murder our beloved G. O. M. was discovered, too, no sooner than it was hatched! This well laid out plan has been entirely spoiled, so much so that a certain organ, the *Rast Gofiar*, announced last week that the proposed dinner to the hero of Bethnal Green—he who posed the other day in the House of Commons, as the representative of all India—was meant to be confined to "friends and admirers" and therefore it had no political significance. So this dinner has been spoiled of its "representative" character and sinks to its correct level—a mutual admiration function!

MR. DOSABHOJ FRAMJI IS TO BE CONGRATULATED.

We congratulate Mr. Dosabhoj Framji and his colleagues, especially Messrs. R. D. Setna and R. M. Patel, on the common sense displayed by them in retracing their steps. It is good that they saw their mistake at the initiatory stage and recognized that popular feeling was against them. For, there is not the least doubt that had they foolishly persisted in their quixotic scheme they might have found their position disagreeable and awkward; as disagreeable and as awkward as the position of those who with equal folly had moved heaven and earth to promote the artificial demonstration in Lord Harris' favour. That "exalted mediocrity," we know, wished that his friends had saved him from the dubious *pooja* paid to him at his departure. And Mr. Bhavnagri might have equally wished his friends had saved him from an unpleasant situation. However, the disagreeable contingency has been averted. So far well and good.

BALM IN GILEAD.

It may be hard to find one's dear object so speedily and vigorously frustrated. But such must inevitably be the fate of those who start public movements without gauging genuine popular sentiment. That sentiment never remains concealed. The enthusiasm and spontaneity of a popular demonstration and their opposite are both easily measured. Popular judgment in praise or in blame comes almost intuitively and unerringly. We, therefore, repeat that we pity the sorrows of poor Mr. Dosabhoj at this speedy collapse of his latest handiwork. To suffer such a cruel blow is hard, very hard indeed. But he knows well that fate is inexorable. And what is inexorable has to be endured with such solace, moral or material, as may be forthcoming under the circumstances. They say there is balm in Gilead. So there is balm in that solid pension of 500 rupees a month which a generous, if not prodigal, *raj* has bestowed on him for his short service of 3 years. To earn this handsome retiring allowance, when the British Government has awarded him a similar amount after a service of 25 years, is certainly a lucky windfall. The thought of this material solace should soothe all the vexation caused by the collapse of his pet proposal.

REPREHENSIBLE CONDUCT OF PARSEE OFFICIALS.

We cannot, however, refrain from drawing the notice of the authorities to the manner in which certain Parsee officials have allowed themselves to be mixed up in the affair. It is superfluous to recall the circular which Lord Lansdowne issued early in 1892, after the Elliott ticket incident, in connection with the Calcutta Congress of 1891 which was presided over by the Hon'ble Mr. P. M. Mehta. It is really reprehensible that Government Servants should mix themselves up in demonstrations bearing a political colour and worse than reprehensible, to use personal influence. Some notice should be taken of such conduct so as to prevent a repetition of this kind of thing in the future.

THE MAHRATTA (October 4, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri's coming visit to Bombay.

Mr. Dossabhai Framjee, who was the author of the curious letter sent to different people in and out of Bombay has written a letter to a Bombay Paper publicly disclaiming having sent any *printed* circular to different leading men asking them to join the small Representative Committee formed to give a public dinner to Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri. Mr. Dossabhai Framjee states that he had addressed autograph letters only to *twelve friends in Bombay* and that the *printed* circulars under his signature were all bogus ones. Mr. Dossabhai also adds that he has sent this *printed* copy to the Police to find out the whereabouts of this audacious forger. We certainly do not know who this Mr. Dossabhai Framjee is, but his public disclaimer proves that he is at least an honest gentleman. Some writers are advocating compromise with Mr. Bhavnagri and the *Hindu* of Madras has gone so far as to say that Mr. Bhavnagri M. M. is second, only to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. Indeed whoever heard of it? At least on the Bombay side, no responsible politician has ventured to accuse Mr. Bhavnagri of having any political insight. Judged by his utterances and writings, it is perfectly impossible to find any peculiar wisdom in Mr. Bhavnagri. On one occasion only he may be said to have done us a good turn and that was his repetition in Parliament of the views held by our distinguished countryman, Mr. Manu Mohua Ghose on the question of the separation of the executive from the judicial functions. This certainly establishes no claim for a public recognition. It is true that Mr. Bhavnagri has succeeded in getting a seat in the Imperial Parliament by a strange freak of fortune. Mr. Bhavnagri's friends and admirers may congratulate him on his good fortune. As for the people, they are naturally indifferent about the man; but if the fussy bodies of Bombay mean to give an entertainment in the name of the public then a counter-demonstration becomes a *sine qua non*.

SURYODAYA OR THE SUNRISE (October 5, 1896.)

Mr. Bhavnagari's return from England.

Mr. Bhavnagari, the politician that burns to be our self-elected leader, is shortly coming back to Bombay. At present he is on his return voyage. Letters under the signature of Mr. Dosabhoj Framjee have been distributed to several gentlemen, here as well as abroad, with a view to give him a public reception. We have also received one letter: but it is useless to occupy our column with its insertion since Mr. Dosabhoj in a letter has clearly intimated to the *Times of India* that he sent manuscript copies of his letter to 12 gentlemen only, and that it was not his intention at all to send it to others and so on. Whether Mr. Dosabhoj did this himself or he was prompted to do this by the revilers of Mr. Bhavnagari (for there is generally a majority of revilers) it is a fact that some of Bhavnagari's friends are working hard to give undue importance to his coming. We have on several occasions laud before the public our opinion about Mr. Bhavnagari, and though he has to a certain extent taken up the cause of the Indian settlers at Natal as regards their present sufferings, yet we see no reason to alter our former opinion. It is quite uncalled-for to receive Mr. Bhavnagari and he is not worthy to be honored. He is not our leader, and if he continues his present policy he cannot be our leader, and it is our firm belief that it is foolish for us to feel jubilant on addresses and feasts accorded to his honor.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (Bombay Correspondent),
(October 7, 1896).

Mr. Dosabhoj's simulated wrath.

Since writing my last, the redoubtable Mr. Dosabhoj Framji has rushed into print and poured forth the vials of his virtuous indignation on the devoted head of some mischievously inclined Puck for having committed what he fancies is an "audacious forgery." Good Heavens! To me it is a wonder that the heavens have not fallen after this tremendous explosion of his simulated wrath! The fact, so far as I have come to know of it is this. The letter which Mr. Dosabhoj says he had addressed to only a dozen men, some Baronets, Knights, and C.I.E.s. came to be published in some of the Weeklies. Some one innocently thought it was too good to remain a local incident, so straight way he reprints it as it was given in the papers and addressed to great many of the press outside Bombay. Some of them were surprised and wrote to their Bombay friends to ask what the invitation meant. Some others, so I hear, replied to Mr. Dosabhoj, in which they do not spare the movement of which he was the prime mover. The ex-Judicial Councillor of Bhavnagar grew very angry thereon. *Hinc illæ lachrymæ Tableau.*

JAM-E-JAMSHED (October 10, 1896).

Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri.

“Save me from my friends.” However grand may be the dinner which the friends of Mr. Mancherji Merwanji Bhavnagri may give to congratulate him on his return here from England, we can have no objection to it, and, to a great extent, we fall in with the views of Mr. P. Ananda Charlu, the well-known citizen of Madras, given with reference to this dinner. However, we deem it our duty to warn beforehand Mr. Bhavnagri’s friends against any attempt at giving an undue importance to his return to this country. Reuter has thought it necessary to inform the people of India that “Mr. Bhavnagri has left for India where he goes to study the Indian questions that are likely to arise in the next session of Parliament.” A perusal of this telegram will cause a deal of amusement because this flattering introduction bears testimony to the fact that a native of India not being familiarly acquainted with Indian questions goes to India for a special study of these questions! We should not be surprised if such flatteries make Mr. Bhavnagri hereafter exclaim “Oh Save me from my friends.”

THE PRABHAKAR, OR THE SUN (October 11, 1896).

A Reuter's telegram announces that Mr. Bhavnagri, M. P., has started from England for this country to study certain Indian questions that will come up before the next session of Parliament. From this we can safely say that there are certain points on which Mr. Bhavnagri is quite uninformed. In our opinion he has as yet a good many things to learn. Up to this time he must have observed a great many things, but they were perhaps seen through the spectacles of his handsome pension and in the company of Anglo-Indians, and therefore his knowledge and conclusions must have been erroneous in many respects. If Mr. Bhavnagri is coming to India to learn something, then he must choose the most deserving preceptor, or else his visit to this country will be of no use. In this respect Mr. Bhavnagri will do well to follow in the footsteps of Mr. Alfred Webb, M. P., President of the Tenth Indian National Congress. One must go to the very spot if one wishes to ascertain whether people are oppressed by the enhanced assessment in Alibag or the severity of the forest rules in the Thana district. The varnished statements in official reports will be of little avail for this purpose. Another thing is that if Mr. Bhavnagri wished to come to India only for this purpose, it was not at all necessary for him to undergo all the trouble of a voyage. There is a living encyclopædia full of every information on Indian questions in London itself. We do not think that, if Mr. Bhavnagri had gone to Mr. Dadabhoj Nowroji as a pupil, the latter would have refused to give him whatever information he wanted. Let that pass; if Mr. Bhavnagri has to collect information regarding India, it would not be amiss to suggest to him to select his preceptor with proper care.

6

NATIVE OPINION (October 11, 1896).

A new Candidate for Public Honours.

After his alleged great doing in and out of Parliament Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri sails for India with the ardent hope that when on the shores of Bombay he may meet with public honours, parties, nay addresses also! With those possessed of ardent temperaments, but not blessed with that rare instinct for the right appreciation and estimate of their own work, the ruling passion for popular glorification is uppermost and though often their inner craving is gratified, history, the great recorder of events, never fails to rate them at their proper worth. When Roman pro-consuls returned from outlying provinces after conquests, they expected great pomp at the capital, and of course every one was given his due; but conquests, mental or moral, are not so easy now as then, and an expectant heart often feels disappointed. We are, however, told that friends and admirers of Mr. Bhavnagri are arranging a great show for his reception, but is Bombay and his wife in a mood of mind to accord him one? Of course the appreciation and estimate of his services is his own proper business, but to our lay mind his services, whatever their nature, do not appear to be so great as to deserve an ovation. His first public utterances in Parliament showed that he never cared for India, and his recent performance has been so lukewarm that one is tempted to say that he rather represented a British constituency than any part of India. Under the circumstances how can he claim public honours from people who are unutterably disappointed at his work. Hole-and-corner meetings may be held, but there can be no public demonstration which so essentially requires self-sacrifice, and self-devotedness to a popular cause which have made the name of Mr. Dadabhai Nowroji so popular with our people. Will Bombay people then be ready with public honours for the incoming M. P.? We hope not.

THE MAHRATTA (October 11, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri again!

Baron Reuter has cabled the very important news that Mr. Bhavnagri has sailed for India. Can you guess why Mr. Bhavnagri is coming here? We trow not. According to Reuter Mr. Bhavnagri is coming here to study the questions likely to arise during the ensuing Session of Parliament! We confess we do not understand why is it necessary for Mr. Bhavnagri to come to India to study these questions. England is a much better place for study, and Mr. Bhavnagri must know that the Bubonic Plague is still raging in Bombay. We therefore think that Mr. Bhavnagri has been ill-advised in coming out to Bombay in such a season, and his coming here to study questions will simply make people laugh at him, unless he wants to study the Bubonic fever. Of course we are glad to welcome him home, but if he is coming here in the fond hope of receiving ovations he is sure to be disappointed. We are at a loss to understand the meaning of the attitude taken up by our esteemed contemporaries, the "Hindu of Madras and the "Hindoo Patriot" of Calcutta. It is always good and right to respect the opinions of others. Nobody has got a monopoly of wisdom. We differ from the "Hindu" on certain social matters, but we have always treated our contemporary with the greatest respect. The "Hindu Patriot's" opinion is also entitled to the same consideration: but we are sorry we have not been able to follow the reasoning of these two journals. The "Hindu" and the "Hindu Patriot" seem to be dazzled by the splendour of Mr. Bhavnagri's position as an Indian Member of Parliament. Now there are some peculiar circumstances connected with Mr. Bhavnagri's position. It is our deliberate opinion that he has not shown by his conduct to possess any capacity or will to do tangible good to India. Of course by little coaxing he may have repeated the opinions of Congressmen on certain questions about which there is a consensus of opinion. Take the question of the grievances of our Indian fellow-subjects in South Africa. Now in regard to this question Conservatives and Liberals, Indians and Anglo-Indians are all agreed in condemning the ruffianism of these English barbarians. Mr. Bhavnagri, it is true, has advocated their cause, but he has sacrificed nothing by such an advocacy. Has he specially interested himself in this question? Has he ad-

vocated their cause with any degree of vigour or persistence? He has talked about the separation of the executive from judicial functions; but here again he has simply echoed the sentiments of almost all responsible English and Indian statesmen. He has therefore not done anything which entitles him to demand a public recognition of his services. Why then should we pay him any special respects? Why should we give him a public ovation? Why should we allow the flunkies and toadies of Bombay to manufacture a public demonstration in his favour? If you give a public dinner to Mr. Bhavnagri because he has succeeded like so many other wealthy and fortunate mediocrities to get a seat in Parliament, why not worship the Raja of Bhinga or that celebrated Maharaja of Vijayanagram who had gone so far as to outrage the conscience of the world by making a sneaking offer of a lakh of rupees for the Suakin expedition? Was not the Raja of Bhinga a Member of the Supreme Council? He too had got a prominent position. Why did we then treat him with contempt? But we are all so degraded that we always want to put forward the left cheek when our enemies give a slap on the right one. He is a gentleman who has allowed himself to be put in a position of opposition to Dadabhai Naoroji. He has spoken of the Congress and the Congressleaders with the most lofty and unmitigated contempt. He has thus insulted our Mehtas, Charlus and Bonnerjees; but as we said self-respect and independence of spirit have become extinct in the land. The *Hindoo Patriot* writes with a lofty air; but what right has our contemporary to question the motives of his opponents? We also do not condescend to pry into the motives of our contemporary. We will not be so ungracious and uncharitable as to accuse him of "passions vain and lowly." If Mr. Bhavnagri wants Congressmen to treat him with respect he should treat them also with the same consideration. Mr. Bhavnagri is simply a crude political adventurer. We hope that he will soon sober down and devise some ways for doing penance for his past follies. He must learn under men like Messrs. Yajnik and Wacha for some few years more. We must frankly tell him that he has absolutely no *bona fide* stands in Indian politics. He has yet to learn many things and unlearn many more. We trust that our contemporary of the *Hindoo Patriot* will credit us with as much sincerity and patriotism as he and others of his way of thinking possess. India ought to ignore Mr. Bhavnagri.

THE MAHRATTA (October 22, 1896).

The Collapse of the Bhavnagri Movement.

We received the following telegraphic message from a correspondent yesterday evening:—Bhavnagri's reception on arrival yesterday was miserably poor. Only half-a-dozen close friends were present. To-day's English Dailies give varnished reports quite opposed to facts given by impartial eye witnesses. Excuse is made of Bhavnagri being in mourning. The plea of a private reception is put forward simply to cover retreat. The attempted demonstration signally collapsed. No single representative public man was present".

This telegram, we have no doubt, will be read with interest, but there is absolutely no ground for jubilation in any quarter. Mr. Bhavnagri, we hope, will have a happy time of it in Bombay. As we said two weeks back, he should learn to be modest and put himself under the guidance of men like the Hon'ble Mr. Mehta and the Hon'ble Mr. Sayani; but if he means to show fight and keep on his airs, he must submit himself to be severely treated by the Bombay public. The Anglo-Indian Dailies of Bombay will, of course, try to lionize him, but Mr. Bhavnagri, if he has good sense, should not allow himself to be befooled in such a ridiculous fashion. Bombay has evidently treated him with scant courtesy, but he has full liberty to console himself with the reflection that Bengal and Madras are waiting to receive him with open arms. If he has come here to study Indian questions, he cannot effect the purpose by sitting quiet at home. The spectre of famine has arrived in India and Mr. Bhavnagri has the best opportunity of witnessing the miseries of the people all over the land. We cannot believe that Mr. Bhavnagri and his friends can be so much infatuated as to suppose that they can dethrone Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji from his position. Mr. Bhavnagri is a member for Bethuel Green and nothing else. He is always fond of telling people that he represents the wishes of the mute millions of the country. We think if he persists in this opinion we can hit upon some way for testing his credentials. We think we can safely challenge a *plebiscite*. Let him stand up in a meeting and declare his views on Indian questions. If he talks of Congress leaders with his usual sovereign contempt and scorn, he is sure to be hissed and hooted off the platform. Of course, Mr. Bhavnagri will not try the experiment.

THE HINDU (October 23, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri, M.P.

The Hon. Mr. M. P. Ananda Charlu writes:—It is perhaps meet that I should correct a misapprehension that has been caused, in some quarters, by my letter in connection with Mr. Bhavnagri. My word "overdone" has been mistaken for a sweeping condemnation of the protest entered at Bombay against the demonstration said to have been contemplated for his glorification.

I confess that it would not have been precisely the word I would have employed if I had fancied that the sentence in which it occurred would be taken by itself, or that there was any room to fear that, if the leaders had not bestirred themselves, *brass* stood the chance of passing off for *gold* and getting hall-marked in our commercial capital, merely by virtue of tinsel glitter.

If my letter had been read as a whole, it must have been clear that I was, by no means, in love with one, who had gone out of India, with neither declared or settled politics, nor authentic credentials, and who, while it suited his personal ambition, did not scruple to yield to the temptation to vilify or disown India's tried friends and dominant aspirations. I went to the task with a pronounced faith in the impossibility, even for his most ardent partisans, to manipulate the public mind, in favour of the untried and unpledged M.P., to evoke anything like an ovation, such as, spontaneously and gushingly, burst out to honor Dada-bhai Naoroji for his life-long labours. I persuaded myself that I made this absolutely clear. Such having been my conviction, I only put it to my brother Congress-men in Bombay and elsewhere that we could, without the least harm to our abiding interests, afford to be tolerant for once, and put aside our political differences in our personal relations, as between man and man. I need hardly repeat, what I already said in plain language, that, in expressing this wish, the course I have suggested is neither to bribe nor cajole him out of the attitude to which he has, barefacedly, committed himself and from which he cannot withdraw, unless indeed he has the ambition to develop into a sort of political Vicar of Bray—a role he cannot very conveniently take up, without forfeiting the confidence of his

present friends and without failing to gain the good-will of his future friends. That there should always be a tug of war between him and the Congress party goes without saying; and both sides may well accept this as a fact and show to each other the ordinary civilities of life; and, seeing what has led to the sharp public rebuke which has been administered by our Bombay brethren to the "friends and admirers" of Mr. Bhavnagri, the latter will do well to give up the erection of a pedestal for their idol and make it possible for him, to go back from India, without dishonor, if also without honor. At best, he has as yet been a colorless M.P., or a smoothwater sailor, provided we can forget his ostentatious parade of his disagreement with the National Congress and the well-considered and solid utterances of our G. O. M. who always spoke as a sturdy patriot and on the basis of patiently-collected and carefully-tested economic facts, which Mr. Bhavnagri could not have taken the trouble honestly to study and understand.

P. ANANDA CHARLU.

LAKESIDE, Madras, 22nd October.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (October 25, 1896).

In Honour of Mr. Bhavnagri.

It is curious to observe the interest shown by some of our Anglo-Indian contemporaries in the matter of according to our only M.P., a "popular" welcome home—curious but not understandable. Why should the *Times of India* suddenly become impressed with the supreme necessity of junketing demonstrations in honor of a mere native? The answer is not difficult to find. Mr. Bhavnagri has immensely pleased the Anglo-Indians. He is not one of the patriotic class; *ergo*, he is quite respectable a gentleman, and so forth and so on. He stands in marked contrast to that pestilential Radical who has never cared for Anglo-Indian smiles and favours, but who has consistently espoused the cause of the people against monopolists and bureaucrats. Mr. Naoroji is of the people and returned to the people; whereas our *svi-disant* "Member of India" does not know or care for the people. Is this not the simple truth of the whole matter? For disguise it how they may, the feeling that finds unmistakable expression in Anglo-Indian circles is that the Indian M.P. should be patronised and encouraged solely for his reactionary tendencies, and for the easy nonchalance of his challenge to the Congress. If the Anglo-Indian hates one thing more than another, it is the successful outcome of the endeavours on the part of the Congress party to gain the ear of the English people. The Indian Parliamentary Committee and the British Congress Committee have powerfully influenced the English public mind in favour of India's cause. It is no matter for surprise that the enterprise shown by the popular party in the direction of enlisting the sympathies of members of Parliament and political organisations of influence and standing in England should be viewed with positive disfavour. How to counteract the growing influence of true Indian public opinion in England, was, therefore, a question of great and pressing interest to Anglo-Indians. There was apparently no means of stemming the tide, when, lo! help came from an unexpected quarter. Mr. Bhavnagri was an unknown figure in political circles. But with reckless impudence, he boldly stepped into an arena where veteran gladiators were contending for justice to their mother-country and offered battle on behalf of Anglo-India, and that other India discovered for an amused and amazed world by

Mr. Bhavnagri—we mean, “Conservative” India. It was magnificent but not political. But politics or no politics Anglo-India eagerly caught at the chance of pitting Indian against Indian in England. From that moment, Mr. Bhavnagri’s future was safe.

And now that their hero and idol is paying a visit to India, the opportunity is taken by Mr. Bhavnagri’s friends to impress upon Indians the desirability of according a grateful welcome to him, otherwise honoring him during his stay in the country. We are told that Mr. Bhavnagri is not only a popular man in the House of Commons, but influential as well. And herein his position is contrasted with that of more persistent and aggressive champions of India’s cause who had proved themselves “utterly ineffectual” in the House of Commons, except as bore. His silence is contrasted with their noisy and blatant bluster. In short, Mr. Bhavnagri is a heaven-bord M.P., and natives of India ought to worship this East Bethnal Green divinity. We wonder whether such precious nonsense will go down with our people. It is not without interest to observe that of direct actual service to India, not a word is said. We sympathise with Mr. Bhavnagri’s friends. Unfortunately for their hero, the catalogue is a perfect blank. The Suakin vote was a cheap (and safe) bid for “popularity” and similarly also, in respect of the separation of Judicial from Executive functions, Mr. Bhavnagri could afford to be brave. But from unpopular causes, Mr. Bhavnagri has consistently held himself aloof. The Hon’ble Mr. Ananda Charlu has, with equal felicity and accuracy, described Mr. Bhavnagri as at best a “colorless M. P., or a smooth-water sailor.”

We do not believe that Mr. Bhavnagri deserves any popular honors for any services rendered to India. That being so, we are not concerned to notice the contempt as silly as it is affected, professed in certain quarters for the “organised exuberance” of a nation’s welcome to a nation’s champion, which was witnessed on the occasion of Mr. Naoroji’s visit to India. It is a case of the fox and the sour grapes over again. Since the above was written, our Bombay Correspondent telegraphs to say that the entire demonstration has fizzed into a deplorable fiasco. Mr. Bhavnagri has indeed been received under those “quieter conditions” foreshadowed by the

Times of India. Not for Mr. Bhavnagri, "the tumultuous verdict of the Bombay streets;" but he will be consoled by the presence at the Bunder of a handful of personal friends who have thus "set the seal of approbation upon work done for India and for the Empire at St. Stephens." Representative public men of Bombay would have none of Mr. Bhavnagri.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (October 25, 1896).

The Bhavnagri Bubble.

The Hon'ble Mr. P. Ananda Charlu writes :—Mr. Bhavnagri put himself forward as the so-called representative of "Conservative India" and a batch of Conservative electors of Great Britain took the bait. It was indeed a capital stroke of diplomacy to trade upon a verbal identity in dealing with an electorate, possessing less than a nebular notion of the conditions in India. But it is perfectly plain it would not answer or suffice to hood-wink men who cannot help knowing better by reason of being on the spot here.

What, on earth, is "the Conservative India" which Mr. Bhavnagri could rightly represent? Socially and in religion alone is the attribute in question intelligible, as applied to this country; but, politically, it is unmeaning to the last degree. The repugnance of the bulk of the Indian people to the creed, social economy and customs and habits of the *Huma* and *Yavana* and *Mlescha* is too pronounced to render it possible for a Moslem, a Christian or a Zoroastrian to make a boast of representing their views and sentiments. What is more to the purpose is that no such representation is, at all, held in request, in the face of the guaranteed religious neutrality of the British Indian rule—despite occasional aberrations of its officers in the opposite direction.

Could Mr. Bhavnagri be the spokesman of "Conservative India" viewed politically? It is, in this sense, that there is the greatest impossibility for him; for, at the very threshold, lies the difficulty interposed by the accepted sense of what Conservatism in truth is. Conservatism, as I understood it, is the spirit of contented adherence to a state of things, established for ages and found, by long experience, to conduce to happiness and prosperity. The present system of administration, admittedly alien and tentative, has not been long enough tried as yet to claim a merit of this sort. The Mahomedan domination that preceded it was of much longer duration for one thing, and recognised and rewarded indigenious merit in a far more enduring and substantial form than with alphabetical honors and other abracadabras which are conferred by the British rulers and which die with the lucky reci.

pients. That cannot be Mr. Bhavnagri's "Conservative India." Going beyond that even, we come upon the system of Government which, with immaterial differences, prevailed under Hindu sovereignties—sovereignties which were national and sympathetic at the same time they were autocratic—sovereignties which gave back to the ryot, the trader and the manufacturer as freely as they took from them in the first instance—sovereignties which, finally, were under neither temptation nor impulse to confer preferments and fortunes on foreigners and on persons who were impatient to get away with their fortunes and their experience, to lands separated from India by wide seas and vast distances. This system of Government—so incompatible with modern political philosophy and so inconsistent with the enlightened theories of taxation and—but one upon which the bulk of the Hindus would look back—statesmanship, could not possess charms for the vaulting ambition of our aristocratically allied M.P. of the present day. When one thus finds all speculation in search of a "Conservative India" which Mr. Bhavnagri might take under his wing is fruitless, one is driven to take a common-sense view as best one may and estimate him as he has palpably appeared. Doing this, one cannot help feeling that the thing of which Mr. Bhavnagri is passionately fond, is just the thing of which Congressmen have been complaining. He is thus fond of it—be it noted, presumably because and just because—Congressmen are dissatisfied with it. This course afforded a bid for cheap praise and a short cut to prominence—if not to eminence—while it secured the good-will and fellowship of what has been, perhaps for the sake of distinction, called Bureaucracy and of all the partisans and hirelings of that overshadowing *upas* tree under the umbrage of which all indigenous growths and forms of life fade or decay. If this is the real object of Mr. Bhavnagri's ardent affections—and what is called "Conservative India" is but a high-sounding *unreality*—it is no wonder that Mr. Bhavnagri should fail to call forth the fervent recognition of his own countrymen and proportionately succeed in securing the special pleading of bureaucrats and their standing counsel alone.

THE GUJARATI (October 25, 1896).

Who is there to honour Mr. Bhavnagri?

Mr. Bhavnagri, who by some strange freak of blind fortune, succeeded in entering Parliament, arrived here last Friday, and Anglo-Indian papers have published reports of the reception given to him which will burst with laughter the sides of the Bombay public, and the report has been telegraphed to England by Reuter. The Bombay public know full well that Mr. Bhavnagri is not India's man, and nobody except a few of his satellites, who are under personal obligations to him ever dreamt of according him a public reception. But the Anglo-Indian Press, though fully conscious in its heart of hearts that the whole thing was hollow—alleges that hundreds and thousands of people were ready to flock to do him honour, but—alas—Mr. Bhavnagri was in mourning for the death of his mother and consequently refused to accept the honour! Verily, he is unwilling to receive any honours, but they are forced upon him against his will and against his inclinations. The truth is that Bombay distinctly and flatly refuses to honour Mr. Bhavnagri. It is only a few of his satellites that rush forward to do him honour. About fifteen Parsees and five or six people from Bhavnagar waited at the Ballard Pier to receive him. Besides these few not one man cared either to see him or to receive him. But the Anglo-Indian Press heard cries of ovation and cheers. Possibly what they heard was the faint echo of the thundering cheers still fresh in our memory that were given to India's G. O. M. our honoured first representative at Stephens Mr. Dadabhai, Naoroji who entered Parliament not by the path of flattery and backstairs influence. The public were ready to honour Mr. Bhavnagri, but he declined to accept their honour! It is a complete reply to this ridiculous perversion of facts to point out that he went that very night to the Phoenix Club to receive the dinner given in his honour by his friends at that Club. The truth is Mr. Bhavnagri is dying to receive honours. But who is there to honour him? and who is there to cheer him? Echo answers: a few parasites and not a soul besides.

THE GUJARATI (October 25, 1896).

If Mr. Bhavnagri's public declarations could be all put together, it would be a difficult thing to reconcile them all. Of all the Congressmen, Mr. Badruddin Tyebji and Mr. Lal Mohan Ghose are the only two against whom he has to say nothing, and the others are, in his opinion, self-seeking and disloyal. But Mr. Badruddin has given the highest testimonial to the Congress and Congressmen. How does Mr. Bhavnagri get over this difficulty? He openly declared in Parliament the other day that he, as the representative of the millions of Her Majesty's subjects, repudiated the views to which Mr. Dadabhai gave fearless expression in reply to Lord Wolseley's extraordinary declaration that India alone had profited from her connection with England. In one of his former speeches he disclaimed speaking as the representative of India and how he could now assume that *role*, consistent politicians find it hard to understand. Mr. Dadabhai has devoted his whole life to the study of the question of the material condition of this country under British rule. According to Reuter, Mr. Bhavnagri returns to India for the purpose of studying Indian questions likely to be taken up in Parliament in the next Session. How does he know what those questions will be? That is not explained. But if a trip to India is necessary for studying questions of an ordinary character, what justification has Mr. Bhavnagri for repudiating the conclusions arrived at by Mr. Dadabhai after life-long study? At Aden he is reported by Reuter to have proclaimed that he would always plead the cause of India and her people. Did he stand up for them when he congratulated the Conservative Government on their decision of the Chitral question and thus helped them in imposing a large financial burden upon his countrymen? In his paper on 'the Empire of To-morrow' he told British Government that "sweet words of promise and hollow expressions of sympathy may delude for a time; but they are not the implements of wise statecraft." Once in a way we are in entire agreement with these views, and we hope he will bear his own words in mind and not forget them, as he has in the past. We venture to add further that opportunism is not genuine patriotism and that even Indians have sense enough to discriminate between their best friends and mere opportunists.

THE CHAMPION (October 23, 1896).

The Bhavnagri Incident.

One or two of our contemporaries *outside this Presidency* have chosen to give vent to a little virtuous indignation—more in sorrow, of course, than in anger, as we gratefully recognize!—at the warning note we sounded against the attempted ‘representative’ demonstration to greet Mr. Bhavnagri on his arrival here. We will not descend to enquire too nicely into the causes or motives which have brought their somewhat pompous effusions on our heads, even though, as is often the case with people who affect or indulge in virtuous indignation, they have shut their eyes to the facts and arguments set forth by us, or charitably ignored or misunderstood them. We prefer to ascribe their comments to ignorance of the real character and antecedents of Mr. Bhavnagri, owing to their want of familiarity with well-known facts in a distant Presidency. We intended at one time to write more fully on the matter, when we could have easily removed some of the misconceptions under which our contemporaries seem to labour. We could then have pointed out to them that we never were in the least afraid of the prestige of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji being in the least lowered in *this country* by any organized demonstration. We could have shown that what was to be guarded against was the attempt to make political capital in England out of such demonstrations and to impose upon the ill-informed people of England a sham and to pass it off for the real article of our affection and confidence. We could have made it clear that we were not concerned in any way with the English politics of Mr. Bhavnagri, be they Home Rule or Conservative. We could have shown that our objection to him was with regard to his playing into the hands of Anglo-Indians, echoing their rabid sentiments against the educated classes, joining in their hatred of a liberal and progressive policy, and falsely corroborating their calumnies against, and misrepresentations of, the real aims and aspirations of the Indian National Congress. We could have shown how the position in which he had placed himself for years together, and the means by which he had risen to it, made it utterly and absolutely hopeless to expect to win him over, as Sir W. Wedderburn and Mr. Dadabhai once tried to do, and deplorably failed, to the

true side in Indian politics. We think we could have satisfied the utmost scepticism of our contemporaries on these points, and shown that what we were striving against was the very thing about which one of the most noble and single-hearted members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee writes sadly, by last mail, who, by-the-bye, was quite hopeful at one time of winning Mr. Bhavnagri to the right side in Indian politics, leaving his English creed to itself. Hearing of the attempt to get up a demonstration for Mr. Bhavnagri, he writes: "Is it really true that there are any really patriotic Indians who can lend themselves to placing such a power and instrument of mischief in the hands of one who, under guise of specious platitudes, is undermining the best efforts of the real friends of India?"

THE CHAMPION (October 25, 1896).

Why we have not answered our contemporaries.

Probably our contemporaries will be surprised to learn why we refrain from further persecuting Mr. Bhavnagri with our jealous and ungenerous malice. When the excitement against the intended demonstration was rapidly rising and threatened to be as bitter and violent as at the time of Lord Harris's departure, especially among the Hindus whom Mr. Bhavnagri was well known to revile in season and out of season in the most approved rabid Anglo-Indian fashion, and before our contemporaries had written a word in their 'pained surprise,' the very gentlemen supposed by them to be devoured with jealousy of Mr. Bhavnagri intervened in favour of peace and tolerance and brought about an understanding by which Mr. Bhavnagri's friends were to abandon all idea of doing anything which might have the appearance of a political or public reception and confine themselves to a welcome from friends in the shape of a dinner or otherwise. It is because we wish to loyally abide by this understanding that we do not care to discuss any further the charitable and virtuous exhortations which our contemporaries have taken the trouble to bestow upon us to chasten and edify us.

MR. BHAVNAGRI'S TRUMPET.

That the note of warning we raised was not unnecessary is proved by subsequent events. As soon as Mr. Bhavnagri mounted his steamer, Reuter's inspired trumpet was as usual laid under requisition. Even Mr. Bhavnagri's friends here could not suppress a smile—in which fun and vexation had equal share—at being gravely informed by wire that "Mr. Bhavnagri had left to study Indian questions likely to arise in the next session of Parliament on the spot." Reuter could never have imagined the delicious irony unconsciously contained in his telegram. What devotion and what knowledge! Then the trumpet blows again from Aden! A reception from the Indian merchants, with the hero's assurance that he would pour his life-blood out in India's cause. Brave words, but alas, they sound familiar. Not a rabid or most ultra Anglo-Indian but talks in the same strain when bitterly opposing every shred of a liberal policy for the real welfare of the country

THE "TIMES OF INDIA" TO THE RESCUE.

And now we have a most significant leader in the "Times of India." If ever a proof was wanted of the Anglo-Indian proclivities of Mr. Bhavnagri, the praise of an organ whose Anglo-Indian policy is so pronounced would furnish it. What sly depreciation of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji! What a shower of curses against Sir William Wedderburn, who is pursued by Anglo-Indians with an intensity of bitterness and virulence in direct ratio with the self-sacrificing zeal and untiring perseverance with which that noble-hearted Englishman has devoted his whole life to do battle for India's cause, and for which this country will never know how to be sufficiently grateful. What a superior man is Mr. Bhavnagri to such worthless fellows! No doubt he is, from the Anglo-Indian point of view which alone the "Times of India" represents.

FOR THE INFORMATION OF CERTAIN GENTLEMEN
IN BOMBAY.

It may not be generally known what are the circular orders of the Government of India in reference to public servants and politics. A Government officer is desired as a "general rule" not to attend "a political meeting where the fact of his presence is likely to be misconstrued or to impair his usefulness as an official." Again, no officer "may take part in the proceedings of a political meeting or agitation." Lastly, the following is the observation as to the liberty of action of officials in connection with political or quasi-political movements: "Servants of Government have not the same liberty of action as private individuals, and are bound to hold themselves aloof from many moments of a political or quasi-political nature, which are perfectly legitimate in themselves and which private persons are free to promote. Their participation in such movements is open to objection, because their connection with them is likely to create, and even to be appealed to for the purpose of creating a false impression in the minds of ignorant persons that such moments have the countenance of Government, and because their influence with the community at large is liable to be impaired by their identifying themselves with the class by which the movement is promoted.

THE KAISER-I-HIND (October 25, 1896).

Fiasco of Mr. Bhavnagri's so-called
"Public" Reception.

Mr. Bhavnagri landed late on Friday afternoon at the Ballard Pier when, according to impartial eye-witnesses, his reception was confined to a few close personal friends, relatives and acquaintances. There was a faint attempt at cheering. This was all about the reception which could be inferred even from the varnished report of a daily contemporary. There were absolutely no "representative" men, known to the public, to speak of. Whether even a "public" reception, so-called, would have attracted larger numbers of "representative" men, we may, for the present, leave to be conjectured by the "friends and admirers" of the honourable member for Bethnal Green.

ECHOES OF RABID ANGLO-INDIANS AND THEIR MISCHIEF.

Of course, Mr. Bhavnagri blew his own trumpet in the small non-political community of Aden Parsia. He would not have been true to himself if he had not done it. He laid the flattering unction to his soul about having "tried to serve the cause of India according to his convictions," which are in such remarkable harmony with those of the rabid Anglo-Indians—official and non-official views which in substance mean that Indians must for ever remain slaves and be content to hew wood and draw water. However he may make an effort to impose on a credulous and ignorant public that it would be "unnatural" for him to go against Indian interests, his parliamentary carrier is *write broad* in Hansard's to tell us exactly what he did do and what he did not for India. No doubt, opinions may differ as to views in particulars or details of broad imperial questions. But no true Indian, in whose heart beats the good of his country, could at all differ as to the lofty principles laid down by sagacious British statesmen of the past generations. How wide apart from those principles was his attitude and action at two important and crucial debates in the House of Commons need not be told. There will be ample time to comment on this and other matters when the Hon'ble Member again opens his mouth and attempts a defence of his "unnatural" attitude as an Indian all through his life, before and after his election as an M.P. The public know little what mischief he has already done to India and what mischief is still in store for her at his hands in the near future.

HINDI PUNCH* (October 25, 1896).

Our especial Correspondent's report of Mr.
Bhavnagri's arrival.

When Mr. Bhavnagri, M.P., arrived here the day before yesterday, crowds of people and carriages had assembled at the Ballard Pier to welcome him. Hundreds of carriages and carts and waggons and hundreds of thousands of people had flocked to the pier to do honour to their hero. But alas for the poor friends of Bhavnagri they were all of them dispersed by the police and, much against their will, bidden to go home. And poor admirers they had no resource left but to pursue their way home, discontented, grumbling and weeping. But still a few would remain in spite of the police, and these, too, were neither few nor unimportant. They were to be numbered not by tens or hundreds but by thousands and even millions. They represented every grade of society from the Prince to the Peasant. They had flocked from all quarters of the country from the Himalay to Cape Comorin and from the borders of Siam to the frontiers of Afghanistan, bent upon paying their tribute of honour, esteem, affection and what not to the brand new M.P. But modest as a maiden, humble as a child, his conquering hero would have none of this. He had done his service, in the proverbial scriptural way, so that the left hand should not know what the right hand did. He alternately entreated, appealed, he prayed, he implored, he even went on his knees before the gushing crowd of his admirers, bidding them stay their hands, and cease molesting him with their honour. But all to no purpose. Nothing daunted and nothing deterred by his tearful appeals his admirers went on shouting, applauding, cheering with their half-a-dozen small lungs till their cries reached even old Jupiter above and awoke father Neptune from his house in the depths of the sea, and till all impatient modest Mr. Bhavnagri jumped into his carriage and four, and went away Phoision like, scorning the vulgar applause of his admirers. But entreaties and prayers, scorn and defiance were equally impotent to damp the ardour of his enthusiastic admirers who would not be happy till they unharnessed his horse and bore him on their backs. But this was not the worst. That is still to come.

* Leading Comic weekly in Bombay.

So the next morning his arrival though strictly private, though on a mournful mission, is by a gross abuse of journalistic etiquette published in the papers in most glowing terms and that in spite of protestations from the brand new M.P. Reporters vying with reporters to exaggerate, to spice, to romance, to garble, all to cater for the taste of an enthusiastic public.

HINDI PUNCH (October 25, 1896.)

Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri, M. P.

We hasten to record the momentous fact of the arrival in Bombay, on Friday evening last, of Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri doing duty in Parliament primarily for Bethnal Green, and secondarily and in a passing manner only for India; thus, according to a local authority versed in such matters, trying to keep his seat with a tact and trimming adroitness, which the Grand Old Man of India—the first who opened the portals of the House for India's sons—sadly lacked? From early dawn, the people had begun to assemble, thronging the streets and thoroughfares and bye lanes and alleys and hunders! But the day wore on and still Mr. Bhavnagri came not? Towards evening a soft breeze, blowing from the direction of the sea brought the message that Mr. second M.P., unlike the first, hated all public, noisy, rowdy street demonstrations. The rabble were, therefore, told to disperse and disappeared, sullen and disappointed. All but a select small band of "friends and admirers," flatterers and beneficiaries, who hailed the "conquering hero" as he landed, with huzzas as loud as their small lungs could make them! Mr. Bhavnagri was all smiles and so pleased with his reception that he might have cried.

My receptions' great because it is so small.

and a wag might have added

Then 'twould be greater still were't none at all!"

But this was no joking matter and no such pleasantries were indulged in. Mr. Bhavnagri is too matter-of-fact to be poetical, and "friends and admirers" are no wags. So lauds our second M. P. on Bombay's hospitable shore! So will he tour it through India! So will he return to his double duty uncared for and unnoticed.

HINDU PRAKASH (October 26, 1896.)

Mr. Bhavnagri in India.

Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri, M.P., Member of North-East, arrived at Bombay on the afternoon of Friday, the 23rd instant, by the new mail steamer *India*. He was received at the Pier by many of his personal friends and admirers. It is given out that his brief visit to this country is strictly of a private character, and that he has come here for the purpose of paying a visit of condolence to his family after the death of his mother, and also to the Maharaja of Bhavnagar after the death of the Raja's father. Mr. Bhavnagri is a man of the Conservative political creed, and as such his utterances in the Parliament are not always calculated to advocate the cause of India. In no sense can he be said to be the "man of the people"—we mean the people of this country. In that respect he is the very antipode—as he is often an antagonist—of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. However, he is our countryman, and on that one single ground, we have some reason to be proud of him—as he is the second Indian gentleman who has won a seat in the House of Commons. We understand that his movements in India are as yet somewhat uncertain, but, whatever they may be, we devoutly hope that, in the course of his stay in this, his mother-country, he will see his way to modify his views and put himself in sympathetic relations with the cause of the National Congress. Will Mr. Bhavnagri be present at the ensuing Congress? And if present, will he speak?

SUDHARAK OR THE REFORMER (October 26, 1896.)

Why attempt it?

We must confess that we did not so long take, in any seriousness, the intentions of the friends and admirers of Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri to organize a public demonstration on his arrival at Bombay during the current Parliamentary recess; and we therefore refrained from adding our opinion to that expressed almost unanimously by the native press as to the undesirability and inutility of such a step. The Hon'ble Member for Bethnal Green arrived in Bombay on Friday evening, when his friends and admirers tried to put their long-talked-of intentions into practice. We learn from a very reliable source that the reception accorded was miserably poor, inasmuch as only a few dozen close friends of Mr. Bhavnagri alone were present at the Pier, and that the accounts given in the Anglo Indian papers are all varnished, as they are opposed to facts observed and noted by impartial eye-witnesses on the spot. The truth is that the attempts for a demonstration failed signally: not a single representative public man in the *urbis prima India* was present. The friends and admirers, being conscious of the sorry figure they were able to cut, are putting forward the excuse that Mr. Bhavnagri is in mourning and that, therefore, the reception was a private one. Mourning has thus unfortunately served as an excuse to the friends to account for the collapse of their endeavours. After all, the reception was not public, but it is to be feared that attempts will still be made to accord the Conservative M.P. a got-up public reception either during his sojourn or at the time of his departure. His friends and admirers ought, we think, to pause and take good counsel before they do anything of the kind. Now we have no reason to quarrel with Mr. Bhavnagri, M.P., or his friends either. They can indeed, as they must, be proud of the high position to which he has been raised; and they are welcome to express their feelings of joy and admiration, during his presence among them, in any way they choose. The objection to it all lies in styling it public or representative. Mr. Bhavnagri is in the House of Commons as a Conservative member, and as such there is no possibility of his being a representative of India and her millions. The creed of Conservatives does not admit the possibility, far less the practicability, of governing India for the Indians, and any pro-

fessor of that creed cannot deservedly lay any claim to the appellation of a representative Indian or an exponent of Indian public opinion. Mr. Bhavnagri is certainly not one, because he openly avows his dislike of the ways and means of the India National Congress and of the views and sentiments of the adherents of that movement. Mr. Bhavnagri as an Indian in the British House of Commons, has, doubtless, spoken like any ardent Congressman in behalf of his mother-land on the occasion of the Suakin debate; he has also written like any ardent Congressman on the disabilities imposed on the Indian residents in South African colonies; and he has been praised for it. But the agreement, such as it is, in a few points does not entitle him to any public honour at the hands the millions of India's children. Such honour was given, and given on a very extensive and magnificent scale to the Grand Old man, Mr. Dadabhoi. Any comparison between the two is impossible and none—not even Mr. Bhavnagri's closest friends—ought to attempt it. We sincerely trust they will desist from any further endeavours in the matter.

THE MADRAS STANDARD, (October 27, 1896.)

The *Pioneer* to the rescue! The official organ writes: "The return of Mr. Bhavnagri to his native country has been made the occasion of much ill-natured criticism of a general sort on the part of a certain section of the Bombay Native Press, and some journals have been affected to see in Mr. Bhavnagri's temperate Parliamentary oratory positive antagonism to Hindu aspiration." Mr. Bhavnagri should be happy.

INDIAN MIRROR, (October 28, 1896.)

Mr. Bhavnagri's brief career in the House of Commons has shown quite unmistakably that his ideal of patriotism is far from being so high as that of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. He appears to be guided by a desire to follow the lead of Anglo-Indian officials or Conservative members of Parliament in questions of Indian administration and reform. If Mr. Bhavnagri supported the separation of Executive from Judicial functions of Indian Magistrates, it was because he could show that a respectable array of Anglo-Indian authorities were in favour of the reform. On many subjects concerning Indian politics, Mr. Bhavnagri holds views that could hardly find support from Indians, who are sincere well-wishers of the country. For this reason, the public dinner, that is proposed to be given to him at Bombay, ought not to command the support of our countrymen. The attempt, that is being made, to give the dinner the character of a political demonstration, representing all the provinces of the Empire, ought to meet with singular failure. We have no objection to the friends of Mr. Bhavnagri entertaining him in as grand and sumptuous a style as they can, but it is, we must say, most unworthy on their part to make any effort to wheedle the public into it.

MADRAS STANDARD (Bombay Correspondent.)
(October 29, 1896).

The Hero of Bethnal Green.

The next topic of some interest is the arrival of the Hero of Bethnal Green. He landed at 6³⁰ in the afternoon of Friday last, but not midst salvoes the artillery of a grateful populace, nor midst the enthusiastic demonstrations of a people who appreciated the true worth of a sterling citizen. No. Not a cheer was raised. Not a shout of applause was heard. Not an enthusiastic note as the hero stepped on the Ballard pier platform. Hurriedly he shook hands with his near relatives, dear friends, and closer admirers. And straightway drove, it is said, to the precincts of that jealousy-consuming and warring Club known as the Phoenix. There, it is said, again, the honourable member had a jolly dinner, though in mourning, waxed eloquent on his Parliamentary victories, and prated wisely on the four magniloquent points—the same which under the thin guise of “M. P.” he has already referred to Parliament” at page 436 of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for the current month.* I need scarcely observe that there was such a strong feeling against him that the “friends and admirers” had to discreetly abandon their original idea of holding a public demonstration. I think they were wise. It was evident, after the way in which their whole affair was exposed by our Congress leaders here, that there was not the ghost of a chance of any “honour” in the right sense of the term for Mr. Bhavnagri. A dozen or two friends gathered and greeted him. There was not among them a single individual who may be said to be “representative.” Yet the most amusing thing is the romantic report given by the two English dailies of the affair. What was a miserable fiasco has been dignified into an “ovation” with “ringing cheers.” What a travesty of truth! What a legendary account! But of course, the dailies are not to be blamed. They are organs of rabid Anglo-Indian opinion. Mr. Bhavnagari, it is not needfull at this time of the day to say, has really sold himself to the Anglo-Indians. He must caw them and they must caw him. But the more amusing thing is the *excuse* given to cover this fiasco and humiliating retreat. Mr. Bhavnagri was in mourning for his mother who died 8 months ago.

But if he was in mourning and wished to land "privately" why did he allow his friends to make an attempt at organised demonstrations fully two months beforehand? Why did he allow them to make so much fuss. He was, they say, in constant telegraphic communication with them. There was nothing to have prevented him from asking his friends weeks ago to stop their friendly flatteries and allow him to land in mournful solitude. So we may take the mourning excuse for what it may be worth. It was a virtue of a necessity. But I am not going to "persecute" Mr. Bhavnagri. Neither am I so consumed with "jealousy" for his extraordinary "parliamentary success" in the brief period of 12 months. What a colossus of success to be sure—as to grudge him all the "honours" which may be in store for him at the coming dinner by his grateful friends, admirers and proteges. By all means, let him have such honours as their friendly enthusiasm may confer. Our task is only to see that he does not impose upon the British public on his return and pass off his "sham" confidence trick as the *Champion* of to-day calls it, for the real and genuine thing and endeavour to dishonour our beloved G. O. M. in England. The national party must take precious care of that. I have not the least doubt that both Madras and Calcutta are now so thoroughly aware of the fact of Mr. Bhavnagri being a plastic and willing tool in the hands of the Anglo-Indians that there will not be the ghost of a chance for him for any reception at all, if he is so indiscreet as to visit their cities. My advice from friends at home is that he has done no little mischief to the national cause, and that if he goes there back with any certificate of "confidence" by our people, there is every probability of greater mischief at his hands in store for us. So we must be all watchful and alert. Let us wait and see what utterances he gives expression to at the coming dinner.

TRIBUNE (October 31, 1896.)

Had it not been for the good offices of the *Bombay Gazette* and the *Times of India* few people would have heard that Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri, M.P., is on a visit to this country and arrived in Bombay something like a week ago. Mr. Bhavnagri's home coming was very unlike that of a conquering hero, but he is a wise man and when he found there was no demonstration he had the modesty to declare that he did not want a demonstration. He was in deep mourning and did not want any garlands and flowers. The Anglo-Indian papers gave a glowing account of his arrival because Anglo-Indians have taken kindly to Mr. Bhavnagri, who is very grateful. The Chief Justice of Bombay has been interesting himself in his behalf, and a banquet will be given to Mr. Bhavnagri. But small rifts in the lute are already visible. Mr. Dosabhoj Framji, who has retired after serving the Government in important appointments, has sent an energetic protest to the papers against his name being used in a printed circular inviting some people to dine with Mr. Bhavnagri. The natural leaders of the people have declined to have anything to do with the second Parsi member of Parliament who must sneak out of the country as he came. Compare Mr. Bhavnagri's arrival with Mr. Dadabhai's historical visit to India in 1893, and that will give a just idea of the hold both men have upon their country. Mr. Bhavnagri will never do anything for India, and his record is merely a story of self-seeking. If he can please his masters he may retain his seat, but his country and country men have scarcely any place in his calculations and thoughts. It is not surprising therefore that he has been severely let alone on his arrival in Bombay, and any demonstration that may be got up to honour him will not have the sanction of the country and our country men. A banquet and an address can be easily manufactured, but we doubt whether Mr. Bhavnagri is the real customer and will get the real article.

THE PRABHAKAR (October 31, 1896)

Mr. Bhavnagri's Popularity.

Now that Mr. Bhavnagri is amongst us, one would think that he must be in a constant whirl of engagements to receive numerous testimonials of good will and esteem from his countrymen. But it seems there is hardly a spark of enthusiasm for him in the minds of any appreciable number of men. The Anglo-Indian interest did indeed carry him to Westminster on its shoulders; but Anglo-Indians away from home have too dignified an opinion of themselves to allow them to join in any ovation to a black man. Had Mr. Bhavnagri secured any such testimonial, he would have lost no time in giving publicity to it as he has done in a recent case which is little better than a frivolous nature. Colonel Henry Bullards, Resident Secretary of the Salvation Army in India, presents to us this oasis in a desert while one and all of his lay brothers wisely sit silent this hero of a semi-socio-religious Society comes forward on its behalf to hail the member for Bethnal Green. This solitary instance is a sufficient indication of the degree of esteem in which Mr. Bhavnagri is held in India. It was particularly necessary for his Anglo-Indian supporters to rally round him and prop him up in his native land where his miserable failure as a politician was too palpable to allow him the smallest degree of credit for political wisdom. In England he could have easily passed himself off as the exponent of Indian views where no one knew him, and where few care to know what Indian views were. In India it was a different thing altogether, people know him from his past utterances and his apostacy too. Anglo-Indian friends would have therefore done well to spare him the mortification to which Mr. Bhavnagri is now constrained to yield. The almost unbroken silence with which India greets Mr. Bhavnagri's a sufficient indication of his relations with his countrymen. Will Anglo-Indians here and at home now learn the lesson and understand that it does not rest with them to give to the jackdaw the peacock's feathers. That gift is nature's and no human agency can counterfeit it.

THE INDEPENDENT (November 1, 1896.)

Blind hero-worship may be a pleasant task with some people and we do not want to quarrel with them on that score. But when the favourite idol is praised beyond all praise at the expense of another that may have little attraction for its detractors and when in the absence of better argument and sound defence, resort is had of belittling the worth of the latter, so that the former may be raised in the estimation of the unthinking and the ignorant, one's patience is sorely tried and the necessity naturally arises to speak out to those blind hero-worshippers not to overdo their parts, for that often times begets peculiar pain to the very party so slavishly idolised, which may, in its helplessness, whine and say "save me from these ill-advised worshippers, whose fatuous cant does more harm than good to me!" Surely, world is getting better in experience and knowledge of men and things around it and hero-worship too is at once discounted, whenever it is found misdirected or carried to excess, in quarters that know how to judge and estimate it. So, we dare say, the extremely unfriendly tone in which our Parsi Bazar Street contemporary tried to have a fling at Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji the other day while welcoming the honourable member for North-East Bethnal Green to Bombay, will be taken as an index of what it thinks and feels for that ex-M.P. whose name is revered all throughout the country by the people at large, but which is no doubt feared by an extremely narrow-minded section of the governing class and its subservient organs here. As we all know, these organs see in him a strong foe, one worthy of his steel, with whom to fight direct being out of question, back-biting quite cowardly in its way is eagerly sought whenever any opportunity presents itself, by these vilifiers, among whom the *Times of India** is known to take a prominent place. Those who still remember the sort of greeting with which our contemporary had received the news of Mr. Dadabhai's first entrance into the historic House of Commons and the systematic way in which that paper had from time to time opposed and condemned the doings of the eminently estimable gentlemen in and out of Parliament, will no doubt see the vein of animus pervading the leaderette of Wednesday week last. That leaderette simply breathed fire and the fulmination has come out in

* The *Times of India* is our out and out Anglo-Indian English daily Newspaper in Bombay.

a manner quite in keeping with the sentiments of that journal towards Mr. Dadabhai. But so nicely is that veteran politician and patriot of the first water, acquainted with a fumeroles already existing in that journal's office, so far as he is concerned, that he is not, neither the lookers on are, taken aback at the heat and the smoke that occasionally come out of it. So, the fumiferous attack of our contemporary will not injure by a hair's breadth the position that Mr. Dadabhai has enjoyed and is still enjoying in the various native communities in the whole peninsula as the trusty champion of their rights and privileges and a staunch sympathiser with the various grievances they have to meekly put up with under an alien rule. That Mr. Dadabhai is a patriot first and a *Parsee* afterwards is an admitted thing everywhere; so, however virulent the attacks may come thick on this devoted son of India, they will no way mar his reputation or lessen his true worth. No, Mr. Dadabhai is a weather beaten, sturdy oak himself and has seen much storms in his days and also successfully stood them. Hence, any amount of vituperation will be of no avail. But when the *Times of India* has fumbled, let us at least examine its latest exhibition of temper to depreciate Mr. Dadabhai.

It seems the ovation that Mr. Dadabhai had received on his landing in Bombay after he fought his way into the House of Commons, has not still died out of the memory of our contemporary. That was an unique event which has left its marks indelibly on the minds and hearts of the people, and there is no wonder if the journal in question can not also drive out the impress; of course involuntarily left on it. So magnificent was the effect of that spontaneous reception, so strongly had the coming home of that venerable Parsi gentleman full of years and honours stirred the hearts of the people within them, that those ill-wishers who had intended to scoff it, began to think seriously of the whole event when they saw the unparalleled demonstration with their own eyes or read its brilliant accounts in the papers. The carping critics of the type of our contemporary were no doubt inwardly moved, for they too undoubtedly felt its irresistible effect, and they marked the enchantment that was so inseparably connected with the name of Dadabhai Naoraji in and out of the Western Presidency. And when they saw that the genuine regard for the Grand Old Man was responded to

with equal warmth everywhere in the country and that he was received with open arms at all places that gentleman touched on his way to and from Lahore, where he had specially gone to preside on the deliberations of the 9th Indian National Congress, they quite remained spell bound. But the vilifiers had also their end to serve, and they served it quite in their fashion by proclaiming that the ovation was too indiscriminately bestowed! The *Times of India*, while welcoming Mr. Bhavnagri last week, has brought the same ridiculous argument to prove that if Mr. Dadabhai received a people's welcome here in the closing days of 1893, it does not conclusively show that he is, for that reason, the more beloved of the people, than his co-religionist in the present Parliament! And why? Because "the tumultuous verdict of the Bombay streets is not necessary to set the seal of approbation upon work done for India and for the Empire at St. Stephens." Quite a funny piece of logic by the way. Our contemporary seems to have another and quite a different standard of appreciating the merits of public men, whom he approves, but what that standard is, it has conveniently missed to mention. "The tumultuous verdict of the Bombay streets" in December 1893 that stamped the popularity of Mr. Dadabhai as unparalleled, was exactly the standard which we know other nations all over the globe observe in welcoming their heroes and benefactors. Not only that, but in ancient times the Latin nations marked the appreciation of their beloved men by the same sort of "tumultuous verdicts" which in some instances have made the name of those for whom they were given quite well known in their histories. What is a popular demonstration at the best? It is more or less 'tumultuous.' But the jaundiced eyes that found it yellow in the case of Mr. Dadabhai would have gladly noted the warmth of that verdict if it had been extended to any scion of our noble ruling house. We assure our contemporary that no prince and no potentate had ever in the memory of the oldest Bombayite living elicited such proof of popularity, such vigour and warmth of reception as Mr. Dadabhai, and in times to come, be it said, never will. Indeed, such honour comes unasked only once in a century to the lot of the most fortunate one. And yet the Parsi Bazar Street journal is pleased to consider that event insignificant. But the fact that it has not still forgotten its significance, is a proof positive, how powerful must have been the effect of it.

But let us proceed further. The journal says "the organized exuberance of that demonstration was intelligible enough." What does "organized exuberance" mean? The paper seems to think that the demonstration was not a spontaneous outcome of the public regard for Mr. Dadabhai but that it was somehow or other artificially got up and for a set purpose. Absurdity can not go further than that. For if it was a patched up affair how did other places catch the contagion of Bombay? How, in fact, was the whole country electrified? Did it not mark then the vibration of the common sympathetic chord everywhere? We must dismiss this assertion with a contempt. Equally contemptuous is another assertion that "it did not require much knowledge of the merits of the service done by the first Indian Member of Parliament to move the crowd from the native town to the Bunder" when Mr. Dadabhai "once more set foot upon his native land," and that less discriminating enthusiasm "was all that was wanted to rally Mr. Naoroji's fellow citizens in their thousands." We say we have never heard a more ingenious piece of argument than the one held out by our contemporary that 'crowds,' (whether Indian or English) are easily moved to honour public men without any true knowledge and appreciation of their merit or services, or that enthusiasm comes in them i.e. the crowds, without the cause, of inner satisfaction. If that be the case, how can that absurd statement be made consistent with the fact that those whom people dislike never get public reception, nay, even to see whom crowds are not moved, neither do they congregate. Mr. Dadabhai's entrance into Parliament and utterances on important occasions there were hailed in India with genuine satisfaction, and of course, that contributed a good deal to make his reception in 1893 a very "striking popular demonstration." But his mere becoming the first India M. P. had not lent all the warmth to the occasion. The reason was a significant one and it must be traced in his life long devotion to the cause of India, in his sturdy fights for the good of his country extending over a period of four decades and upwards, in his disinterested and patriotic services and the self-sacrificing spirit and self-effacement that he unflinchingly brought to bear on them. He had made his name and established his fame long before he dreamt of entering Parliament. He was the chosen of the people in sixties, seventies and eighties, a

spokesman, so to say, of whole India. Before he became a politician, he was respected as an educationist and a staunch reformer, the leader of the first illustrious band of brilliant Elphinstonians who successfully pioneered the cause of female education and many social healthy reforms. Thus, his local services were most keenly appreciated before he left for England and made her his temporary home where he has sojourned for the best part of his life, far from family and friends, to sincerely discharge the self-imposed duty towards his country and his countrymen. It was the knowledge of all these, the grateful remembrance of his past services, and his continuous usefulness, in short, his abiding sympathy in the will and woe of the subject races inhabiting this great Peninsula, that made the coming home of this trusty champion after he entered Parliament, quite an historical event. It was that which moved the hearts, the crowds, say the whole nation. Who can create such enthusiasm but Dadabhai? Trust and faith at once beget trust and faith, reciprocity of feelings is alone discernible then. Then alone? "tumultuous verdict" spontaneously becomes visible on Bunder and in streets, on railway stations, and in large towns, on platforms and in assemblies. With all sophistries, *Times of India*, you can not make white black!

So much for the love the journal bears towards Mr. Dadabhai. But it has made a brand new 'discovery' too which attracts our attention. After calling Mr. Dadabhai, Sir W. Wedderburn and others of our friends "noisy," "aggressive," and blustering pack of persons whose standard of Parliamentary duty consists "in never letting a chance go by" of getting their names into *Hansard*, the paper gloats over the defeat of Mr. Dadabhai at the last general election in the following strain: "There are" it says, "rigidly defined limitations upon the power of any man who represents an English constituency to plead the cause of India in Parliament," therefore it distinctly gives us to understand that as Mr. Dadabhai went beyond those "rigidly defined limitations" (we don't know in what way) he had to bear defeat last year! And then it draws out an object lesson for the edification of those Indians who aspire after Parliamentary honour and warns them thus:—"The Indian Member of Parliament who sets out with a light heart to play the part of "Member for India," is pretty certain to be told by his constituents sooner or later, that if he turns one ear to India,

he must turn the other to them. If he fails in this, he is soon sent about his business as Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji was last year." Ye, Liberal electors of Central Finsbury, mark these words which will be news to you. You have full trust in your late representative, you have marked his services and appreciated them, you have been through your local Association good enough to thank him for the regard with which he had discharged his duty, you are the proper judges of his worth and work, and you are therefore in a position to contradict that not because Mr. Dadabhai failed to turn his 'one ear' to your constituency, that he "was sent about his business," but because a general wave of defeat that overtook the Liberal party everywhere in that election, swept off Mr. Dadabhai's seat as it did of many other distinguished Liberals. Where Morely and Harcourt, the pillars of the party, were driven out first, what wonder there is if Dadabhai, Cain and other lesser luminaries suffered the same fate. Those who understand party politics as carried on in England, do know what are the whims of electors in England and how materially they affect at times trusty politicians at home, so they will bear us out when we say that not through any disapproval "of the people who placed him in it" that Mr. Dadabhai lost his 'position,' but owing to many circumstances over which he had no control.

There is yet another sophistry that should also be unmasked. The *Times of India* gravely advises us to believe "that no constituency in the kingdom has yet been found that is cosmopolitan enough in its sympathies to sacrifice its own interests to the interests of the Empire beyond the seas." We ask how in their days the electors of Burke and Sheridan allowed those worthies to identify with a momentary Indian issue, before which they had forgotten even their own duty towards their electors? How later on Foxcott and Bright, Slagg and Bradlaugh, Casne and Wedderburn carried on Indian 'crusades' from year to year in Parliament more vigorously than Mr. Dadabhai, and yet their constituencies allowed them to become "Members for India" in one sense or another and retained full trust in them? In the cause of humanity, in the cause of people struggling for better political freedom, in the cause of subject races oppressed by despotism and grinding tyranny, English electors, be it said to their entire credit, have been invariably found to be "cosmopolitan enough" in their

sympathies, nay, instances are not wanting in which these very electors had by the strong proofs of their own magnanimity strengthened the hands of their representatives in Parliament to fight out the cause of the down trodden "beyond the seas," and thus indirectly they have made their country famous. It is casting aspersion, therefore, on the good sense and tolerant spirit of the British electors to say that that old magnanimity they are losing now.

GUJARATI (November 1, 1896).

A novice M. P.

MR. M. M. BHAVNAGRI, M.P.

A short while ago a Reuter's telegram informed us that the special reason of Mr. Bhavnagri coming out to India was to learn and acquaint himself with some of the leading questions as regards India! This telegram of Reuter's came as a surprise on Mr. Bhavnagri's flatterers who extol him to the skies, and for some time were quite at a loss as to what should be done under the circumstances. Because this telegram has proved two facts—first, that whatever Mr. Bhavnagri has been doing in Parliament in connection with this country he does the same without any knowledge and in absence of necessary information; and secondly, that this empty-headed M. P. does not know—although a resident in India—what are the wants and wishes of the people of this country, and wherein they lie; and it becomes a serious matter to know how such an ignorant creature is ever able to do anything in Parliament. Mr. Bhavnagri's admirers were now and again trying to impress upon the minds of the public the fact that Mr. Bhavnagri has done and will still be doing much in the interest of this country, and that therefore they should accord him a high reception, for which purpose Mr. Dossabhai Karaka took a leading part. Mr. Karaka, though in a weak state of health, is in the obligation of Mr. Bhavnagri, through whose kind offices he draws from the Bhavnagar State a monthly pension of Rupees five hundred; and in return for this kindness he issued a circular for the purpose of entertaining Mr. Bhavnagri with a dinner and thus giving him a public ovation. There could have been nothing to do find fault with in this circular had it been circulated only amongst those of Mr. Bhavnagri's personal friends, or those that were under a deep debt of obligation to him. But Mr. Karaka started on his mission by coaxing people into his project. And yet in spite of all this, as far as we know, very little money has been subscribed for the entertainment proposed to be given to Mr. Bhavnagri. We very much regret that although Mr. Bhavnagri has literally done nothing in his country's cause, still our Mr. Harkisandas who is as little known as Mr. Bhavnagri has been appointed Secretary for collecting funds. It has grown quite

a second nature with some of the well-to-do people of Bombay to take a leading part whenever any sort of subscription is floated, and Mr. Harkisandas is certainly one of them, although Mr. Bhavnagri has thrown no light, however dim, on any Indian question; still when a humbug of this sort is going on, so do honour to such an M. P., we feel it our duty to speak out our mind as regards this M. P. without deeds. On his arrival in Bombay some half a dozen people that could be well counted on one's fingers were assembled at the Pier, still in spite of the fact the Anglo-Indian Press influenced by Mr. Bhavnagri's friends had the audacity to say that this M. P. was ^{received} had with a right royal welcome. This Anglo-Indian Press had the impudence to add that Prince Samatsinghji and the gentlemen of the Shrivak community had special ^{arrangements} there to do honour to Mr. Bhavnagri although they ^{partly} went on board the steamer only to receive some of ^{the} European friends, Prince Samatsinghji and the Shrivak ^{gentlemen} have subsequently written to this Anglo-Indian Press ^{as} fearlessly to say that they never knew Mr. Bhavnagri, nor had they been to the Pier in his honour. But from the names given one can clearly see the glaring absence of a single name of note out of so many leading gentlemen in Bombay. Nay, from our own personal knowledge we can say that the cheers and applause so pompously paraded in this Anglo-Indian Press were never heard there. Moreover it has been studiously proclaimed that Mr. Bhavnagri, was averse to a great show made in his honour, and he was wise there. If he had consented to be received as loudly as his friends wished, he should have certainly been hissed and hooted, because an M. P., who has no knowledge to boast of regarding his country, and who only now comes to this country to be acquainted with its grievances, instead of his being honoured would have been disgraced by the Bombay public, and then alas, Mr. Bhavnagri should have said "save me from my friends." Although we know hitherto of no measure of his wisdom in other affairs, yet we think he has proved wise enough in this particular!! Mr. Bhavnagri is simply a member of Parliament, and a member, too, in name only. He does not possess any special knowledge of this country; nay, the party that has elected him an M. P. is the party that is not well disposed towards this country, and that being the case, it is futile to hope for any good thing at his hands.

Mr. Bhavnagri is a Conservative, and he claims to be recognised as a representative of the conservative class of this country. The least honor given to him in this country would lower Mr. Dadabhoi in public estimation, who is the real representative in the truest sense of this country, and Mr. Bhavnagri will then pose as the representative of India. ^{For,} the people of England are so grossly ignorant of certain matters that they never care to distinguish right from wrong or to separate the genuine from the spurious. When Mr. Bhavnagri first entered Parliament, ^{as a} Conservative member, it was hoped that he ^{might} perhaps remain faithful to his country; but that hope ^{is} ~~is~~ ^{has} ~~been~~ ^{is} ~~lost~~ ^{is} ~~gone~~. His policy manifestly shows that he has sold ^{his} ~~his~~ ^{own} ~~own~~ ^{country} to the Conservatives for his own pen does that.

Is it not vain to expect anything more from such an *M. P.* ^{while} he is faithful to his English Electors, the ^{country} ~~country~~ ^{where} he is born and bred fondly looks out for a ^{young} ~~young~~ ^{corner} in his unfeeling heart. He would not pause one instant and think of his unwisdom in becoming faithless to the country of his birth, and pleasing thereby those whom he considers his patrons.

We should always be ready to thwart with all our might even an attempt of his friends to get up an ovation in any shape or form in this country. We believe he will do more harm to this country on his return to England. It has been ascertained from private sources that those Conservatives of England who fight shy of the Congress Committee in London, headed by Sir W. Wedderburn and Mr. Dadabhoi, have advised Mr. Bhavnagri to come to this country so that loaded with heaps of honour in this country when he returns to England, he may be made to prove that Mr. Dadabhoi was no longer a representative of India, but that India's real representative was Mr. Bhavnagri, welcomed and honoured by all the people of ~~India~~ ^{India}—a veritable conquering hero who has won the hearts of his people—an event which, should it take place, will surely harm this country in a great degree. The line of policy on which Mr. Bhavnagri acts in the House of Commons is very injurious to this country, and by honoring Mr. Bhavnagri we shall only weaken the hands of those sturdy Englishmen, the well-wishers of India, who have been so sturdily combating to break the influence of this very policy. Mr. Bhavnagri entirely leans towards the side of

his Anglo-Indian friends, and he has no knowledge whatever as to how the administration of this country is carried on. And under these circumstances how is it not possible for him to become more harmful to India? only to please his Anglo-Indian friends. All these facts must be borne in mind by those patriots—men who have the good of their country at heart, but who would wish to join in the movement to honor Mr. Bhavnagri, for, they must know that the least honor paid him here would excite immense uproar there in England. We have nothing to say for those who are faithless to their country, men who would dance to Anglo-Indian tunes. But we caution those that have the least love for their country not so much as even to touch the movement set on foot to do honor to Mr. Bhavnagri. Mr. Bhavnagri is no lover of his country, but a self-seeking individual; he is a foe to the Congress, and is a slave to the Conservative party which lags behind in securing the interest of this country. Why then money should at all be subscribed—even in a social, non-political movement towards an entertainment in honour of such a Conservative? To do so is to be faithless to one's own country. But we are sure that this proposed entertainment in honour of Mr. Bhavnagri will reach the same fate as his late reception on his stepping on these shores; and that and nothing else will Mr. Bhavnagri's friends ever achieve.

THE AMRITA BAZAR PATRIKA (November 1, 1896).

We welcome back Mr. Bhavnagri, M.P., home. We said the other day that we were proud of his achievements; for, an Indian, who succeeds in entering the British Parliament, is bound to be a man of eminent ability. Mr. Bhavnagri represents a British Constituency,—we wish we could add India also. We are sorry we cannot accord him that reception which we did to Mr. Dadabhoj Naoroji. For, if he, like Mr. Bhavnagri, represented a British Constituency he was also member for India, which we grieve to say Mr. Bhavnagri is not. The attempt to prevent a national demonstration on his behalf is not due to jealousy but to political considerations of high importance. He has sided with the Government of Lord George Hamilton, which is not popular here. It would, therefore, be not safe to give Mr. Bhavnagri a representative character by a national welcome. Yet, as we said the other day, if he is a Conservative by circumstances, he must be an Indian at heart. Let him do all the good he can to his mother country,—and he can do exceedingly much without betraying the interests of his party,—and God will bless him, and his countrymen will thank him in their heart of hearts.

THE PRABHAKAR (November 1, 1896).

When Mr. Bhavnagri, M. P., came here his friends offered him but a poor welcome and he accepted it, ascribing it to his being in mourning. Although the Anglo-Indians there led him on their shoulders into the Parliament still the fact that the Anglo-Indians here are not prepared to give him any honour is apparent from the utter want of any sort of agitation in that direction. But the Salvationists alone, who boast of being sold to India have welcomed him—by means of letters—through their local Secretary, and Mr. Bhavnagri on his part formally sent a letter in reply to it. That no class of people whatever has shown him any greater signs of honour than there is in itself a sufficient measure of his popularity. But we are exceedingly sorry to see that this measure is very short, narrow and shallow.

THE AMRITA BAZAR PATRIKA (November 1, 1896).

We welcome back Mr. Bhavnagri, M.P., home. We said the other day that we were proud of his achievements; for, an Indian, who succeeds in entering the British Parliament, is bound to be a man of eminent ability. Mr. Bhavnagri represents a British Constituency,—we wish we could add India also. We are sorry we cannot accord him that reception which we did to Mr. Dadaboy Naoroji. For, if he, like Mr. Bhavnagri, represented a British Constituency he was also member for India, which we grieve to say Mr. Bhavnagri is not. The attempt to prevent a national demonstration on his behalf is not due to jealousy but to political considerations of high importance. He has sided with the Government of Lord George Hamilton, which is not popular here. It would, therefore, be not safe to give Mr. Bhavnagri a representative character by a national welcome. Yet, as we said the other day, if he is a Conservative by circumstances, he must be an Indian at heart. Let him do all the good he can to his mother country,—and he can do exceedingly much without betraying the interests of his party,—and God will bless him, and his countrymen will thank him in their heart of hearts.

THE PRABHAKAR (November 1, 1896).

When Mr. Bhavnagri, M. P., came here his friends offered him but a poor welcome and he accepted it, ascribing it to his being in mourning. Although the Anglo-Indians there led him on their shoulders into the Parliament still the fact that the Anglo-Indians here are not prepared to give him any honour is apparent from the utter want of any sort of agitation in that direction. But the Salvationists alone, who boast of being sold to India have welcomed him—by means of letters—through their local Secretary, and Mr. Bhavnagri on his part formally sent a letter in reply to it. That no class of people whatever has shown him any greater signs of honour than there is in itself a sufficient measure of his popularity. But we are exceedingly sorry to see that this measure is very short, narrow and shallow.

MADRAS STANDARD (November 1, 1896).

The *Indian Mirror* observes that Mr. Bhavnagri having shown an unmistakable tendency to take the lead of the bureaucrats on Indian questions is in no way entitled to popular honours in India. "For this reason," writes one contemporary, "the public dinner, that is proposed to be given to him at Bombay, ought not to command the support of our countrymen. The attempt, that is being made, to give the dinner the character of a political demonstration, representing all the Provinces of the Empire, ought to meet with signal failure. We have no objection to the friends of Mr. Bhavnagri entertaining him in as grand and sumptuous a style as they can, but it is, we must say, most unworthy on their part to make any effort to wheedle the public into it."

THE KAISER-I-HIND (November 1, 1896).

The Precious Advice of a Precious "M. P." of
India in Parliament.

"M. P." OR RABID NATIVE AND WORSHIPPER OF ANGLO-INDIANS?

Here is some precious advice from a precious "M. P." on "India in Parliament" in the last number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*. The writer, whose identity we need not care to reveal as it reveals itself, endeavours to hide his statesmanlike light under a bushel. But fortunately for him it does not remain hidden. The views expounded there for the benefit of us Indians are certainly not new. Neither are they original. In fact, they are hackneyed and at least, a quarter of a century old. From time to time we have heard of these, only to laugh over them. They owe their origin to our beloved friends, the Anglo-Indian officials and their non-official counterparts, whose extreme solicitude for, and watchfulness of, Indian interests need only to be pointed out to evoke our highest admiration and most enthusiastic gratitude.

HIS PRECIOUS GEMS—ARE THEY FALSE OR REAL?

But let us at once acquaint the reader with those gems of suggestions, lest he should miss their brilliancy and fail to appreciate them at their true worth. "The main points to which," the august and experienced "M. P." "wishes to draw the attention" of the Indian readers are these:

- 1st "That from the Conservative benches equally with the Liberal, the interests of India can be safeguarded and advanced."
- 2nd "That in fact, this is essential, as it would be a sad mistake to woo only one party and rely upon it for doing good to India. This would naturally make the other callous, if not inimical."

On this our commentary is that it is pure humbug to expect at any time the safeguarding of India's interests from the Conservative benches. The simple reason is, that these rabid Tories have been tried over and over again since 1858 and India has found them to be the worst and bitterest enemies—men who have never lost the occasion to carry out, in all its stringency, what

may be called a policy of Repression and Retrogression. They have been our enemies even in point of freedom of speech. It was they, who for a time, introduced into this country the odious Black or Gagging Act of infamous memory. It is they who whittled down the recommendations of the Public Service Commission. It is they who endeavoured to violate every solemn pledge and proclamation of our Sovereign. It is they who uniformly over-rode Imperial Statutes, notably the 55th section of the India Act of 1858, which directs parliamentary sanction for wars and expeditions beyond the natural boundaries of India. It is they who increased the military burdens of the empire by nearly 3 crores for additional 30,000 troops. It is they who waged the unrighteous Second Afghan war, created unrest all throughout the country, and increased the public debt on its account by 20 millions sterling. It is they who created Punjab scare and into the bargain levied the Income-tax under the hollow plea of the fall in the value of silver, and wrought other financial woes, including the swallowing of the Famine fund to the extent of 6 crores. It is they who forcibly seized Upper Burmah which annually entails a net burden of over a crore of Rupees on the tax-payers of the empire. It is they who occupied Chitral, entailed on the revenues a needless expenditure of over 1½ crores and have permanently burdened the treasury with an annual expenditure of at least 25 lakhs. It is they who displayed the melancholy meanness of saddling India with the charges of the native troops on service at Suakin. It is they who made a present of 50 lakhs to the philanthropic Philistines of Lancashire and into the bargain burdened ourgrowing cotton industry with a further excise duty of 11 lakhs per annum. It is they who still contemplate fettering the Native Press under the hollow and fallacious plea of its acerbity. It is they who refuse to give any heed to the agitation for all necessary reforms in the administration. It is they who vehemently resent all cries regarding the reduction of the overgrown civil and military expenditure of the empire. It is they who oppose tooth and nail the reform for the critical examination of the annual budget in Parliament by a competent Standing Committee of members of the House of Commons. In short, it is they who declare that Indians should remain the slaves that they are and be only hewers of wood and drawers of water. Indeed, there is no limit to the catalogue of their sins of commission during the last thirty-

eight years, whenever their party has been in power. The good that they have done is infinitely small and even then it was by accident. The India Act of 1858 is pointed out as their handiwork, but it is an historical fact that the main portion of the Bill was originally moulded by the statesmen of the great Liberal party of that period. The solitary piece of real good rendered to India may be taken as the rendition of Mysore in 1866. Next may be the amendment of the clause in the Indian Act whereby the Statutory Civil Service was constituted in 1870 under the good Sir Stafford Northcote, afterwards Lord Iddlesleigh. But even that was in a great measure due to the powerful advocacy of the just rights of the Natives of India from the Liberal benches, and notably by the ever to be lamented Professor Fawcett, and John Bright. And the third important reform which can be put to their account is the Amended Councils Act of 1892; but here too, the sympathy and liberalism of the late Mr. Bradlaugh first and later on of Mr. Gladstone and other statesmen of the Liberal party who were mostly instrumental in moulding its ultimate destiny, men without whose disinterested intervention and spirit of righteousness the enactment might have been a dead letter and hardly an improvement on the old state of affairs. Lastly, it should not be forgotten that it is the Tories who have impregnated the entire Indian bureaucracy here with their false ideas of autocracy and sowed the seeds not only of the broadest dissatisfaction and discontentment in the land; but of hatred of British rule also. It is they who have systematically attacked the educated classes of India and done their very best to heap abuse on the great National Convention of the empire. Such are the Tories whom this precious "M. P." himself, a rabid member of the tribe, from personal interest, we fancy, rather than from conviction, wishes Indians should woo! We emphatically say, No. We have had the bitterest experience of them for years together and we must refuse to have anything whatever to do with them. The present invitation is simply hollow. It is not even a disinterested one. And it would be rank folly for India to betray itself into their hands. They are wolves in disguise. That is all. And Indians would be fools to allow themselves to be devoured by them, while they are tempting them to their fold in the guise of sheep.

**INDIA, IF LOST, WILL BE LOST TO ENGLAND AT THE
HANDS OF THE TORIES.**

It is observed that they would "naturally" make them "callous, if not inimical." They are *already* inimical and even *more* than inimical; let alone being callous. If they could help it, they would exterminate the whole "pestiferous" tribe of Congressmen and all educated Indians besides. Surely, they cannot commit greater mischief than they have already done to India. And if they wish still more to harm her people, by all means let them do so. They are in power. India is helpless. But they should never forget that their own wickedness and unrighteousness will ultimately recoil on themselves. Nemesis is already dogging their footsteps and the day of Retributive Justice cannot long be retarded. It is our firm conviction that if India is lost to England, it will be lost by the wickedness of the Tories rather than by the righteousness and liberalism of the Liberals. You can never govern a community of aliens, consisting of one-fifth of the human race, with an iron hand and exasperating insolence. No. The empire can never be stable, can never be safe and content, till the eternal principles of Truth and Justice, which are the principles on which the foundation of Liberalism rests, prevail and prevail permanently. There are, we admit, among the ranks of the Tories, men here and there who are sincerely intent on seeing India governed on those beneficent principles. But they are handful and must cry in the wilderness. The walls of the Tory Jericho will not fall because of their cry. So, too, in the ranks of the Liberals there are pseudo-Liberals, men, who, in the bottom of their heart, are rank Tories, of which that pious Nonconformist and consummate hypocrite, Sir Henry Fowler, is the most heinous instance. Perhaps no politician in these latter days has so contemptibly masqueraded under the spurious disguise of a Liberal than the whilom Secretary of State for India.

**INDIA SHOULD SIT QUIET AND ALLOW THE EXPENDITURE OF
THE EMPIRE TO MOUNT UP WITHOUT ONE IP OR BUT!!!**

The third point of the pompous "M. P." is this:

"That moderation and expediency have to be observed in the discussion of Indian questions. By expediency, I mean, such considerations as the temper and time of the

House, and also the element of practicability. For instance it is no use talking in season and out of season about the reduction of military expenditure or civil offices, simultaneous civil service examinations and so forth."

Here, the reader will discern the cloven hoof of the writer and cannot mistake his identity. The paragraph by itself is a full and complete confirmation of what has been said about a certain individual whose vaulting ambition is to pluck the well-deserved laurels from the brow of our beloved Indian G.O.M. and bind them to his own, as the most trusted and trusty "representative" of all India! It is indeed news to us to be informed that it is perfectly useless and inexpedient for Indians to agitate in season and out of season for the reduction of civil and military expenditure! No. Indians are fools to do so. They are not diplomatic. They do not know *when* they should cry out for it and *when not*. They must sit with folded hands and bandaged ears for ever and ever—or at any rate till their friends and sympathisers in all their financial troubles and woes, the Tories, tell them to set the ball rolling. Then alone will such large questions, which have been agitating the breasts of all true Indians for the last ten years and upwards, must be raised. Then alone they will come within the pale of the "practical." So says our Eighth Sage of the East quite fresh with his experience of twelve months in the House of Commons! Ye, Indians, listen to his counsel of perfection and be wise, be practical. Cease your agitation at once, because it will not be heard. Put on shawls on your body and bangles on your arms, and watch for that blessed day in mute retirement when the great Tory trumpet is sounded in your ears, and instructs you to rise or vociferate "To arms! To arms! Citizens to arms. The time has come. And the man is ready!" Till that blessed hour, they must allow expenditure to mount higher and higher; to allow fresh expeditions beyond the borders hither and thither, in pursuit of that grand will o' the wisp of a scientific frontier which the great Guru of Gunpowder and Glory first attempted to catch; to oppress the ryot and squeeze from his impoverished purse more revenue to pay for these precious wars and expeditions, and to overburden the general tax-payer with a heavier load of taxation than the one of 7 crores hanging round his neck ever since the Punjab scare was invented by the diplomatic genius of the great Lord Dufferin! Ye, Indians, go on bearing these

and other burdens which yet may be laid on your shoulders in the near future, for the better prosecution of the "forward policy" which is to obtain for you political salvation for ever, and save your hearth and home from the bloody attacks of the Bear of the North who is prowling night and day beyond your "Compound Wall." Yes, go on bearing these intolerable burdens with many more in the Civil Administration, like the iniquitous exchange compensation allowance, increased cost of the ever increasing army of foreign agency which has conferred such incalculable "benefits" on you, benefits, compared with which all the drain of 30 crores per annum and more from your country is but a bagatelle. All this good and practical advice is thus tendered you free, from the abundance of his loving heart, by our prodigy of "M. P." so that you may learn the value of expediency. There is a time for everything; there is a time for agitating and there is a time for sitting mute. Be advised and hold the silence of the deep, for it is calculated to do you infinite benefit, till that remote contingency arrives, whether in your lifetime or his, when you may set the ball rolling. Oh, political wisdom! Thy name is Expediency. Profit ye Indians, by that wisdom and be guided by this braud new statesman who surpasses in counsel the combined sagacity of the illustrious seven who have left their imperishable mark in the history of the world!

POLITICAL MOUNTBANKS AND THEIR FLAPDOODLE.

It is needless for us to pursue the subject further or offer further commentaries on this kind of writing. In our time we have met with a variety of political flapdoodle, from the poisonous one of the *Pioneer* to the purring one of the *Indian Spectator*, but never such trash which has not even the merit of originality, as the one which the editor of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, in one of his moods, perhaps mental aberration, has allowed to disfigure the pages of his journal. We dare say all Indians will take it at its worth, especially bearing in mind the quarter whence it emanates. Heaven forbid that they should have any thing to do with persons calling themselves M.P., who indulge in such contemptible rhodomontade.

THE LEGEND AND LOGIC OF MR. BHAVNAGRI, M.P.

Our readers may, perhaps, be unaware of the legendary lore which has for some days past been in active circulation

among the "friends and admirers" of Mr. Bhavnagri, who see in him a greater hero, of a more heroic, and disinterested character, every way more clever, clear-headed, and upto the mark, aye, with greater influence and an immense knowledge of practical expediency, which may be taken to be synonymous with the highest personal ambition or opportunism than the poor, decrepit, and little known Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji.

THE GLORIOUS LEGEND.

Here, then, is the glorious legend which is being disseminated, which shows most conclusively how far it is intended by such insidious insinuations to discredit Mr. Dadabhai and discount the national party headed by the indefatigable Sir William Wedderburn—a disinterested Englishman of greater patriotism than our Indian "patriot" so-called, who poses as the member for "Conservative" India in England.

MR. DADABHAI IS A BOOBY AND SIR WILLIAM A GREATER BOOBY.

Mr. Dadabhai is in his dotage. He is not at all popular. Excepting a few red Radicals, no Englishman knows him. He is a perfectly negligible quantity. His friends, headed by Sir William Wedderburn, are a set of impractical humbugs. They, too, are not recognised in the House of Commons. Not even three members care for Sir William. His parliamentary party is a mirage. They take next to no interest in Indian matters. They bring motions and force divisions in the House at inopportune times and ruin India's cause. In season and out of season, they cry out about military expenditure and simultaneous examinations, which are both so intensely repugnant to the Ministerial party and the India Office. In short, they are not proper persons in whose hands Indian interests could ever prosper.

MR. BHAVNAGRI IS INDIA'S MAN.

On the other hand, Mr. Bhavnagri is getting awfully well-known in every English circle. He can shine in society and in the House of Commons. His first year of parliamentary career is a "brilliant success." He is most popular at Westminster. He understands parliamentary tactics better than the old drones of the Indian party. He is a capital parliamentary strategist

and would accomplish such miracles by way of proper reforms for India (not such stupid and absurd financial topics as curtailment of expenditure or that still more absurd and dreamy one of simultaneous examinations) as would hereafter make the party now bitterly opposed to him quite ashamed of itself and to hide its diminished head.

**INDIA, AWAKE! AND GIVE THE NECESSARY CONFIDENCE
CERTIFICATE TO MR. BHAVNAGRI.**

ERGO, if Indians are wise in their generation, and if they have any confidence whatever in this pushing young countryman of theirs who, by some cruel irony of fate, is at this moment so mischievously misunderstood and misrepresented, whose views even on Congress have been grossly and maliciously misinterpreted, though a real friend of the Congress at heart, barring minor differences, and willing to shine in the Congress camp as a visitor or a delegate, if, only Indians, we repeat, knew the striding man and the jewel they possess in Mr. Bhavnagri—a jewel destined to shed its radiance in an infinitely brighter degree, and with greater steadiness, than that old legendary ornament, whom India absurdly loves to call its G. O. M.,—they would not miss the present golden opportunity of his brief visit (albeit a mourning one and purely private) to recognise him and send him back with the confidence certificate as the proper, true, and only representative of India. Let Indians to a man respond to this patriotic call. Let India awake from the gates of the East to the gates of the West and let Mr. Bhavnagri's bidding be done.

THE CHAMPION (November 1, 1896.)

Mr. Bhavnagri and his Admirers.

We have not hesitated to speak our mind freely about Mr. Bhavnagri, but we feel constrained to offer him our most sincere condolence on the way in which his devoted and over zealous friends are maltreating him. It may be all right to try to outstrip each other in loading him with their foud adulation and unbounded admiration. But why, oh why, will they persist in making him ridiculous? We have never for many a day laughed more consumedly than when we read the clumsy and inartistic productions which did duty in the two English morning dailies as veracious reports of the wonderful reception given to Mr. Bhavnagri on his landing. The boast of the French *chef* who could concoct a hundred dishes from a few meagre articles was found in the skill with which he could conceal the slenderness of the stock with which he had to work. It is this skill which marks the genius of the real artist. This skill is sadly wanting in the confectious prepared by our reporting artists of the two English papers. They have, on the contrary, taken great pains to show that grand and striking as was the Reception given to their distinguished friend, it was manufactured from the presence and throats of about ten personal friends, about ten dependents, two or three protegés, and one son. As is well put in last Sunday's *Hindi Punch* :

"My reception's great, because it is so small ;
It would be greater still, if it were none at all."

But we forget. The reception was irradiated with the shining splendour of the presence of a Prince, though we do *not* forget that some unfeeling unbeliever, of which this sceptical age is so prolific, writes to the *Bombay Gazette* to say that the Katyawar Prince had, as a matter of fact, only gone to meet the Katyawar Political Agent who came by the same steamer. But a Prince's light is so expansive as well as diffusive that there is nothing wonderful if some of the rays found their way to the motley group composing *the* reception. In the same way that the Prince was appropriated, the same horrid iconoclast asserts that some other items of admiring humanity were also preferred. However that may be, the alum-

business of the reports most hideously comes out, when so fierce a demand is made upon our credulity as to ask us to believe that twenty throats made "the welkin ring" with their cheers. It must have been a very small welkin indeed. When the reporters want to manufacture a puff on any future occasion, they will let us advise them to omit names and numbers. Then nobody could contradict them if they even jumbled up the whole body of passengers, their friends, the police, the porters the coolies, and all the other different varieties of people who invariably gather round a landing stage, into an enthusiastic assemblage giving 'ringing cheers', for their hero.

A "SATTAWADI" TO THE RESCUE.

We cannot help admiring the dogged fidelity with which the Editor of the *Rast Gostar* makes the most violent and murderous assaults on logic and consistency on behalf of his old friend and fellow-worker, notably in the mischievous crusade which he whilom led for the purpose of sowing dissension between Parsis and Hindus. But we must pull him up when he somewhat too audaciously counts upon the shortness of the public memory. In making an *miserericordium* appeal to let Mr. Bhavnagri alone, ventures to exhort the Congresswahas not attack and abuse a person for a simple difference of opinion. The assertion involved in this Christian advice is utterly and absolutely opposed to the real truth. At the intercession of Mr. Dadabhai and Sir William Wedderburn the Congresswahas were fain to extend to Mr. Bhavnagri a friendly hand. How did he return this willingness to give him a trial? He never missed an opportunity of abusing and reviling the educated classes and the Congress, as indeed the *Rast* admits, of holding them up as dishonest, seditious and disloyal people, giving three cheers for the Queen indred at the close of their Congresses, but, under cover of them, sowing sedition and discontent throughout the land, denouncing them for their egregious folly in agitating for simultaneous examinations and against that disastrous military policy which is surely but slowly impoverishing the country. How was it that all this time, Mr. Bhavnagri's benchman of the *Rast* did not discover that it was wrong to shower abuse and calumny on the educated classes and Congresswahas for holding different opinions from Mr. Bhavnagri's on these subjects? The climax was reached when,

under pretence of a strictly non-political function, both Lord Harris and Mr. Bhavnagri vented their foul-mouthed spleen at the dinner given to the latter, against the Congress revolutionaries. Even then the Congress could have afforded to treat these outbursts of malice and opportunism with contempt. But the situation became serious when a strenuous attempt was made to impose the pensioners of a native Durbar as a real representative of all that was best and sober in the country, of the masses, as well as of the classes who really knew him not any more than the moon in the moon. It was time to expose the utter hollowness of such mischievous pretensions and to strip the borrowed plumes. It is idle to talk of this operation which Mr. Bhavnagri himself compelled all those who had the interest of the country at heart to perform on him, as an intolerant attack or abuse. Many of our readers must be familiar with the oily and wily Bunniah of Gujarat folk-lore; who feloniously lays hand on a passer by, but when respects and paid back, shrieks and shouts in piteous appeal to the gathering crowd with his hands clasped on his belly (भारेयरे आपरे भारेय) that he is being cruelly beaten, not forgetting however to ply his legs in vicious kicks under the belt. We would advise Mr. Bhavnagri not to pose as the unoffending victim of Congress hostility; for the Bunniah is not a character which British manliness respects. We have felt constrained thus to unveil the disingenuousness of the plea urged by the Editor of the *Rast* on his friend's account; for it is started to inveigle unwary people who have not had the opportunity of ascertaining the real facts for themselves.

THE MAHARATHA (November 1, 1896).

The Salvationists to the rescue!

The high-souled Colonels and Soldiers of the Salvation Army have found in Mr. Bhavnagri a man for whom they must have special sympathy. Mr. Bhavnagri is to be congratulated on having found at last one body at least which is ready to hail him as the saviour of India. The Salvationists are, as our readers are aware, a set of humbugs who live upon fads and fuss. Some months back we had an occasion to expose the great doings of these people in Gujerat; but the Salvationists seem to have forgotten rather too early the terrific wiggling which several publicists, including the *Times of India*, administered to them at the time. Mr. Bhavnagri has in a characteristically graceless and pompous letter acknowledged the compliment. The letter speaks for itself and deserves no particular comments:—

COLONEL HENRY BULLARD,

Resident Secretary,

Salvation Army, Bombay.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge with my best thanks the welcome which you offer me in your letter of the 26th instant, on behalf of the officers and members of the Salvation Army in India, on my first arrival here, after my election to the House of Commons. Your eloquent recognition of my services in the cause of India has touched me deeply, and I value it as coming from an influential body which has at once the good of India, at heart, and is capable of understanding the ways and means at the disposal of me in my position of serving her true interests and of judging of the best methods of doing so. I heartily reciprocate your prayers that I may be enabled by the grace of God to continue my humble efforts towards that end, and thanking you again for the same.—I remain, dear Sir, yours very faithfully,

Bombay, Oct. 27.

M. M. BHAVNAGRI.

He talks of his services in the cause of India. We never heard of a man who trumpets his so-called services before the public in and out of season. According to a Marathi poet he who sings his own services is a fool. Whoever heard of our G. O. M. talk of his services? The difference between

brass and gold is too great and palpable to be hidden. Mr. Bhavnagri is going to Matheran and thence to Bhavnagar, from which State he is enjoying a large pension. By the bye, one of the Bombay papers included every conceivable gentleman at the Bunder in the list of those who had come to receive the M. P. We need not wonder at this audacity.

Translation of a letter from a leading Mahomedan Gentleman to Jam-e-Jamshed "and" Bombay Samachar of Bombay (2nd November 1896.)

MR. BHAVNAGRI AND THE BOMBAY MUSULMANS.

It is reported that a movement is set on foot to give an entertainment to Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri, M.P., on behalf of the Mahomedan community of this city, and that Mahomedans are urgently requested to take part in it. This movement is made by two or three gentlemen, who have now-a-days constituted themselves as representatives of the Mahomedans. Shrewd people do not require to be told who are the persons pulling string from behind the screen? Let that alone, but we should like to know how this duty has devolved upon the Mahomedans, that they alone should entertain Mr. Bhavnagri? Mr. Bhavnagri is not a representative of the Mahomedan community, nor do we know of his having made any special advocacy for them. At the same time I must admit that this gentleman does not lay claim to any such advocacy. What Mr. Bhavnagri says is this, that he serves India, and if that were so, an entertainment on behalf of the general public would have been set on foot. But are there any special reasons for the Mahomedans, apart from the other communities, to recognise and approve of the services of Mr. Bhavnagri? Sir, for the sake of truth it must be said that those gentlemen who promote this movement do not know what should be the character of public movements on behalf of a community. The people whom they approach with their entreaties find it delicate to say, "No," nor do they give a moment's thought but "what we lose," "why should we offend these people?" "we shall pay off a couple of rupees and get rid of the thing;" with ideas like these, they join the movement. But my request to these people is that they should ponder over this matter with a cool head as to what is their duty with reference to public affairs, whether the movement is a fit one, in what light the thoughtful people and the general public will view it, and what will be its effect and result on political matters,

Now any thoughtful and unbiassed man, whether a Mahomedan or not, cannot help feeling that if this entertainment is given, the result will be mischievous. Do the promoters of this movement mean to show that Mr. Bhavnagri is the champion of that section of the Mahomedan community, who is opposed to political progress, and that for that reason they wish to entertain Mr. Bhavnagri. The movement is not susceptible of any other interpretation. Out of justice to Mr. Bhavnagri it must be said that he is not opposed to political progress. Notwithstanding, if the movement is taken in that light, one cannot easily understand how Mr. Bhavnagri could have accepted the entertainment. Mr. Bhavnagri out of regard to his own self-respect ought to decline such entertainment with thanks, and it is hoped he will show good sense. My request to my Mahomedan brethren is that they should not be led by designing people lightly treating matter of this character as of know significance. There is nothing objectionable in joining any dinner or entertainment that may be set on foot by Mr. Bhavnagri's friends; but it is certainly objectionable to give an entertainment in the name of the Mahomedan public exclusively.

(The writer of this letter being a prominent citizen, it would have been well had this letter appeared over his signature.)

Ed.—Bombay Samachar. *Ed.*—Jame Jaimshed,

THE DNYAN PRAKASH OR LIGHT OF KNOW-

LEDGE (November 2, 1896.)

Mr. Bhavnagri.

It is needless to open the question, whether Mr. Bhavnagri has really done any service to his mother-country during his brief career in the House of Commons. His utterances in England on the present political activity in India, especially the Indian National Congress unmistakably show that he has willingly forfeited his claim to be called 'a member for India,' and has chosen to follow in the wake of the Anglo-Indian officials, who have no sympathy whatsoever with any political movement in India that tends to advance the interests of the natives of the country. He has abused the Congress and its supporters in season and out of season and always held them up to ridicule. If this be the service done by him which, according to his admirers, deserves to elicit highest encomiums from his countrymen, we think, there is sufficient justification for the cold reception which Mr. Bhavnagri met soon after his arrival at Bombay. Having gone under the Conservative flag Mr. Bhavnagri soon learned when and how to nod or how to make the best of his opportunities for abusing and putting down those who are ever watchful in unveiling the tactics played by him and his political Anglo-Indian comrades. If he had really the interests of his country at heart, he had numerous opportunities which he could have well turned to account. The Chitral Debate, and the Cotton Duties question, for instance, were the two questions that cropped up immediately after he had taken his seat in the House, but strange as it may appear, he allowed himself to be led by the nose by his Anglo-Indian friends during the discussion over these subjects. It is true that he strongly protested against saddling the Indian treasury with the expenses of the Suakin expedition; but then, this fact loses its whole charm when it is remembered that many other Conservative members of the House, persons for instance, like Sir Andrew Scoble and Mr. Maclean, who are no way favourably disposed towards the Congress, also were dead against the proposal. Similarly the latest utterances of Mr. Bhavnagri on the separation of Judicial from Executive functions clearly point out the ring of conservatism and Anglo-

Now any thoughtful and unbiassed man, whether a Mahomedan or not, cannot help feeling that if this entertainment is given, the result will be mischievous. Do the promoters of this movement mean to show that Mr. Bhavnagri is the champion of that section of the Mahomedan community, who is opposed to political progress, and that for that reason they wish to entertain Mr. Bhavnagri. The movement is not susceptible of any other interpretation. Out of justice to Mr. Bhavnagri it must be said that he is not opposed to political progress. Notwithstanding, if the movement is taken in that light, one cannot easily understand how Mr. Bhavnagri could have accepted the entertainment. Mr. Bhavnagri out of regard to his own self-respect ought to decline such entertainment with thanks, and it is hoped he will show good sense. My request to my Mahomedan brethren is that they should not be led by designing people lightly treating matter of this character as of no significance. There is nothing objectionable in joining any dinner or entertainment that may be set on foot by Mr. Bhavnagri's friends; but it is certainly objectionable to give an entertainment in the name of the Mahomedan public exclusively.

(The writer of this letter being a prominent citizen, it would have been well had this letter appeared over his signature.)

Ed.—Bombay Samachar. *Ed.*—Jame Jaimshed,

THE DNYAN PRAKASH OR LIGHT OF KNOW-

LEDGE (November 2, 1896.)

Mr. Bhavnagri.

It is needless to open the question, whether Mr. Bhavnagri has really done any service to his mother-country during his brief career in the House of Commons. His utterances in England on the present political activity in India, especially the Indian National Congress unmistakably show that he has willingly forfeited his claim to be called 'a member for India,' and has chosen to follow in the wake of the Anglo-Indian officials, who have no sympathy whatsoever with any political movement in India that tends to advance the interests of the natives of the country. He has abused the Congress and its supporters in season and out of season and always held them up to ridicule. If this be the service done by him which, according to his admirers, deserves to elicit highest encomiums from his countrymen, we think, there is sufficient justification for the cold reception which Mr. Bhavnagri met soon after his arrival at Bombay. Having gone under the Conservative flag Mr. Bhavnagri soon learned when and how to nod or how to make the best of his opportunities for abusing and putting down those who are ever watchful in unveiling the tactics played by him and his political Anglo-Indian comrades. If he had really the interests of his country at heart, he had numerous opportunities which he could have well turned to account. The Chitral Debate, and the Cotton Duties question, for instance, were the two questions that cropped up immediately after he had taken his seat in the House, but strange as it may appear, he allowed himself to be led by the nose by his Anglo-Indian friends during the discussion over these subjects. It is true that he strongly protested against saddling the Indian treasury with the expenses of the Suakin expedition; but then, this fact loses its whole charm when it is remembered that many other Conservative members of the House, persons for instance, like Sir Andrew Scoble and Mr. Maclean, who are no way favourably disposed towards the Congress, also were dead against the proposal. Similarly the latest utterances of Mr. Bhavnagri on the separation of Judicial from Executive functions clearly point out the ring of conservatism and Anglo-

Indian officialdom about them, and if he supported the reform so persistently and ably advocated by the late Mr. Man-Mohan Ghose, it was simply because there were many respectable gentlemen even on the Conservative side who were in favour of the reform. To a careful and dispassionate observer, it will be thus made abundantly clear, that Mr. Bhavnagri's views on Indian politics are widely different from those of his educated countrymen who are sincere well-wishers of India. Naturally he is not held in much respect by the Indian public. Any attempt, therefore, made to give him a popular reception is destined to fail, or even though it may succeed with the Herculean efforts of his handful admirers, it can not have the assent of the educated and enlightened Indian public.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (November 3, 1896).

The Bethnal Green Humpty Dumpty has "had a great fall," and all his friends and admirers "couldn't put Humpty Dumpty in his place again." The Bombay Weeklies have some very nasty things to say of our Humpty Dumpty, M. P. The *Kaisar-i-Hind* pours contempt on "political mountebanks and their flapdoodle" in ferociously choice language. The *Independent* institutes an interesting parallel between our G. O. M. and our Brummagem, M. P. The *Mahratta* makes a contemptuous reference to the Salvationist testimonial to our M. P. The *Champion* offers its sincere condolence to him for the way his so-called friends are maltreating him.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (November 3, 1896).

The *Tribune* observes:—Mr. Bhavnagri will never do anything for India, and his record is merely a story of self-seeking. If he can please his masters he may retain his seat, but his country and countrymen have scarcely any place in his calculations and thoughts. It is not surprising, therefore, that he has been severely let alone on his arrival in Bombay, and any demonstration that may be got up to honour him will not have the sanction of the country and our countrymen. A banquet and an address can be easily manufactured, but we doubt whether Mr. Bhavnagri is the real customer and will get the real article.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (November 5, 1896.)

The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* gives the most unkindest cut
 when it remarks of Mr. Bhavnagri :—We are sorry
 cannot accord him that reception which we did to Mr.
 Roji. For, if he, like Mr. Bhavnagri represented a
 British constituency he was also member for India, which
 is to grieve to say Mr. Bhavnagri is not. The attempt to
 prevent a national demonstration on his behalf is not due
 to jealousy but to a political consideration of high impor-
 tance. He has to side with the Government of Lord
 George Hamilton, which is not popular here. It would,
 therefore, be not safe to give Mr. Bhavnagri a representa-
 tive character by a national welcome.

THE OBSERVER (November 4, 1896.)

Mr. Bhavnagri in India.

The M. P.'s friends in India made an abortive attempt to welcome Mr. Bhavnagri in the name of India. In his position as a Member of Parliament he has yet done nothing to designate him a true son of India, nay, he has done much to prove otherwise. If he intend to repent his past by his action in future, let him act. It is not what he does but action that secures confidence in public life. If the people are not inclined to take him in trust, it is his own fault but not the people that is to blame for it. He comes to study Indian questions, let us believe so far and wait to see what use he makes of it. We would gladly forgive and forget his past if his future should permit us to do either, nay, honour him if he deserve it, take him into our arms if he be warm in our cause, but we must wait till then, and should like to see him wait too.

THE GUJARATI (November 8, 1896.)

The party of Indian political reform has already formulated its programme. That programme has been before the Indian and English public for more than a decade. No one who does not accept the main and fundamental principles as enunciated by the Congress can be accepted as in any sense representing the views of the progressive party. The most influential and thoughtful and the most talented and illustrious representatives of modern India have identified themselves with the Congress movement, and even Viceroy's like Lord Dufferin and some of the foremost English politicians have admitted that it is a perfectly loyal and constitutional movement. When Mr. Bhavnagri, therefore, denounces it and its promoters as disloyal, and his friends proclaim from the house-tops that he is "an opponent of the Indian Congress," is it possible to make peace with him? Is any compromise with him possible? Is there any guarantee that the terms of the compromise will be strictly observed? We think there is none. When there is a radical difference of opinion on the main issues, how can the people of India place Mr. Bhavnagri on the same pedestal as Mr. Dadabhai? Though the member for Bethual Green has often professed his sympathy with his countrymen, the two men are nearly at the opposite poles, so far as practical advocacy of their grievances is concerned. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has devoted his whole life to the study of the economical and financial condition of India and arrived at certain well-known conclusions. These have been openly disowned in their entirety by Mr. Bhavnagri in his latest utterance upon the subject in Parliament. The question is one with which the moral and material progress of India is intimately bound up, and unless and until he gives satisfactory grounds for his conviction, or the data on which they are based, no Indian politician will be prepared to treat them with the slightest consideration. He is, after all, a mere tyro in politics and cannot, therefore, be allowed to return to England with credentials from his countrymen to enable him to pose as the accredited representative of India and to dethrone Mr. Dadabhai from the position he has all along deservedly occupied. Such a course would be simply suicidal. The question is one of principle and involves vital issues. Far-seeing Indians ought not, therefore, to allow themselves to be blinded by sweet promises and opportunist declarations.

When Mr. Bhavnagri started for India, Reuter wired to India that he "had left to study Indian questions likely to arise in the next Session of Parliament on the spot." At Aden another attempt was made to blow his trumpet. The inspired trumpets of the Anglo-Indian press were also laid under requisition. But all was in vain. The citizens of Bombay know well enough what they owed to themselves and to their country. The reception that was accorded to the member for Bethnal Green was confined to a few close friends and relatives. Instead of an enthusiastic demonstration there was indifference everywhere. The 'friends and admirers' now changed their front. Mr. Bhavnagri's trip, the public are being told, was undertaken more for domestic than for political and public purposes. We are prepared to accept this statement. But why Mr. Bhavnagri did not contradict Reuter's report in his glowing speech to Aden remains unexplained. Nor are we able to understand why his busy friends were at first intent upon getting up a big demonstration in his honour, when owing to private reasons it would have been assuredly distasteful to him. Though his countrymen as a whole have proved unappreciative, it ought to be some consolation to the parties concerned that the Resident Secretary to the local Salvation Army has made up for their neglect of duty towards him. As if the people had not already been convinced of delusive and misleading character of the statements in which Salvationists often indulge, Colonel Henry Bullard heroically comes forward to tell the world how gratefully the officers and members of the Indian Salvation Army appreciate Mr. Bhavnagri's continuous, self-sacrificing, and disinterested efforts on behalf of India in and out of Parliament. He is naturally grateful for this flattering testimonial from an influential body "which is capable of understanding the ways and means at the disposal of a man in my position of serving her true interests and of judging of the best methods of doing so." There was a faint echo of these fine sentiments in a recent issue of the "Indian Spectator." Writing about Mr. Bhavnagri it exclaimed, "God help our people and all those, of whatever party or persuasion, who work for them according to their opportunities." We heartily join in this prayer and hope it will one day be graciously heard by Providence. But we fail to understand the propriety of the expressions above quoted in the place where they occur. What were the

continuous and self-sacrificing services of Mr. Bhavnagri ? What are the true interests of India and the best methods of serving them ? How did he avail himself of the opportunities he had of serving the true interests of India ? The answer is very simple. This is the duty of a true Indian patriot. Denounce the Congress and the Congressmen as disloyal and seditious. Approve of the annexation of Chitral and thus encourage Government in their reckless trans-frontier policy. Disown Mr. Dadabhai and the results of his life-long study and experience. Denounce educated natives as place-hunters, at the same time draw a preposterously fat pension from a native State, and do not say a word in defence of a helpless prince who was condemned unheard. Turn a deaf ear to the sage counsels of Sir William Wedderburn and Mr. Dadabhai, if they try to win you to the right side in Indian politics. We are not surprised to learn that one of the most noble and single-hearted members of the Indian Parliamentary party, has written in these earnest words :—“ Is it really true that there are any really patriotic Indians who can lend themselves to placing such a power and instrument of mischief in the hands of one who, under guise of suspicious platitudes, is undermining the best efforts of the real friends of India ? ”

THE INDIAN NATION (November 9, 1896.)

Bombay is united in the presentation of a cold front to Mr. Bhavnagri, M.P. If that gentleman has any shrewdness he should make advances, and if he has a political creed that will bear declaration, he should declare it so as to make friends and disarm opposition. Else he will lose what importance he has in the august House that rules the destinies of an empire. He is, constitutionally speaking, member for Bethnal Green,—which, somehow or other, we find it difficult to dissociate from the Blind Beggar of tradition,—but the representative character that it is possible for him to claim on moral grounds is as Member for India. That character will, however, leave him if on his visit to India his countrymen ignore him. Mr. Bhavnagri's prestige will depend on the way he conducts himself amongst his countrymen, now that he is here.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (November 10, 1896.)

Mr. Bhavnagri's speech at Bombay, a telegraphic summary of which appears elsewhere, must be taken for what it is worth. He is evidently trying to conciliate those whom he has offended by these soft words, which in reality mean nothing.

MADRAS MAIL. (November 10, 1896).

Bhavnagri and Brotherly Love.

FUDGE AND FUSTIAN.

We are sorry to have to designate as fudge and fustian the utterances delivered by Mr. Bhavnagri, M.P., at Lodge Rising Sun, Bombay, as telegraphed by our ("Madras Mail") Bombay correspondent, but after all, these are the only terms which adequately describe them. A platitude does not cease to be a platitude, nor does bathos cease to be bathos merely because it comes from the lips of a Parsi M.P., whether he represents the centre of Finsbury or the north-east corner of Bethnal Green. By the way, Mr. Bhavnagri waxed eloquent over "the grand old Masonic precept of judging others by the instinct of brotherly love and charity." "If they did it," he affirmed, "they would push all the true interests of countries or individuals"—and may we be allowed to add, "of joint stock companies." A good deal of information has been asked for regarding the Madras Electric Tramways Company, Limited, of which Mr. Bhavnagri is a director. Will the Bethnal Green Member kindly judge these questions "by the instinct of brotherly love and charity," and furnish the answers without any further delay!

THE TRIBUNE (November 11, 1896).

It is not much use making frequent references to Mr. Bhavnagri, whose visit to India has absolutely failed to produce any enthusiasm. No public dinner or address has been given to the Member for Bethnal-Green, but a Masonic Lodge, of which Mr. Bhavnagri is a member gave him a dinner, and his speech has been carefully telegraphed to Anglo-Indian papers only. Mr. Bhavnagri is nothing if not astute, and he has tried to ingratiate himself into the regard of his countrymen by repeatedly speaking of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji in very appreciative terms. But Mr. Bhavnagri has nothing to hope from his educated countrymen who are everywhere letting him severely alone.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (November 11, 1896).

The full text of Mr. Bhavnagri's speech at the Lodge "Rising Star" is before us. He speaks of "small matters of detail" on which he might differ from Mr. Dadhabai Naoroji. We presume these "small matters of detail" are Congress politics and Congress aspirations. On the "main object of securing the welfare of India and serving her interests", Mr. Bhavnagri assures us he is in agreement with Mr. Naoroji. For this favour much thanks. So does Sir Lepel Griffin agree with Mr. Naoroji—that is, on the "main object of securing the welfare of India and serving her interests." Ah cant, sir, cant!

THE GUJARATI, (November 15, 1896.)

Before noticing some of the points raised in the utterances of some of the speakers at the Masonic dinner given to Mr. Bhavnagri, we might at once mention that his critics heartily join in their wish that he may have a *long, useful, and honourable* parliamentary career to the good alike of England and India. We must also point out once more that no one has adversely commented upon his views and convictions, simply because he has been chosen by a conservative constituency. It is very unfair, not to use a stronger term, to represent that the opposition to Mr. Bhavnagri is based simply upon the fact of his being included in the ranks of conservatives. A grosser misrepresentation and distortion than this it would be difficult to conceive. We can well conceive a conservative member of Parliament defending Indian interests in the House of Commons with as much zeal and vigilance as a liberal or radical. But it must not be forgotten that Mr. Bhavnagri himself would have had very little chance of success at the last election but for the hostile attitude he happened to take up in relation to the Congress movement and educated natives. For a time Mr. Raffaldin made a noise in England. But for obvious reasons he had to be given up. Sir John Gorst and others, however found in Mr. Bhavnagri the very man they wanted to pit against Mr. Dadabhai and his friends. Did not Mr. Bhavnagri denounce the Congress as seditious and disloyal, and educated natives as a set of self-seeking place-hunters? Did he not thus place himself in direct antagonism to Mr. Dadabhai? We are ready to believe that Mr. Bhavnagri acted on *bona fide* convictions. But if the object of conservatives, who happened to be familiar with his views, was to discredit Mr. Dadabhai by supporting the new comer we must confess we cannot say much in their praise, nor in that of Mr. Bhavnagri who put himself in their hands and in direct opposition to the Grand Old Man of India and his Congress party. The member of Bethnal-Green told the public in his speech at Lodge "Rising Star" that between him and Mr. Dadabhai there was only a difference of opinion on small matters of detail, that the differences could after all be slight "as they would bear upon methods of working and that they could not but be agreed as to the main object of securing the welfare of India and serving her interests." Mr. Bhavnagri's countrymen are not so

dull-witted as to be carried away by these misleading platitudes. We showed last week that if his public utterances really represent his inner convictions, there can be very little in common between him and Mr. Dadabhai. The differences are not regarding matters of detail but in respect of fundamental questions. Even his staunch supporter in the columns of the *Rast Goftar* says that he is "an opponent of the congress." It is on parliamentary record that he spoke in favour of the annexation of Chitral, which Mr. Dadabhai did his best to oppose outside Parliament, and that he congratulated Lord Salisbury's Government on the satisfactory solution of the Chitral question. Was this a matter of detail? Is he aware of the frightful financial burden the Chitral policy imposed upon India? And yet he talks of differences on matters of *detail*. It is no use trying to reconcile the irreconcilable and the less he speaks about it the better.

Now as regards the difference in respect of the methods of working. We must frankly confess our inability to understand the platitudes in which some indulge on this question. Will some one tell us what Mr. Bhavnagri's methods have been and how they are calculated to lead to the same goal as those of Mr. Dadabhai? Two politicians might agree as to certain main principles and take their own time and opportunity to advocate them. This we can understand, but we fail to perceive how they can possibly differ in regard to the principles themselves. Does it serve the true interests of India to vilify one's countrymen as disloyal and self-seeking? Is this only a difference in the method of promoting the well-being of one's country? Mr. Dadabhai is of opinion as the result of his life-long study of the financial and economic condition of India, and of the history of the mutual relations between England and her Eastern Dependency that Great Britain has profited more by its connection with India than the latter, and that this country has, on the whole, suffered largely on the material and financial side. Will it lead to the economic salvation of the people to contradict this conclusion and mislead the English public on a most vital question without knowing even the A, B, C, of the problem? Is not modest silence a better mode of serving one's country than enthusiastically supporting optimistic politicians like Lord George Hamilton in their ignorant, interested and delusive statements? There is one more point which we feel bound to notice. It is said it does

not much matter if two Indians sat on the opposite sides of the House of Commons and strove to do their duty according to their lights. We are sorry we can not accept this proposition in its entirety. If both agreed as to the principal issues bearing on India, there is nothing to be said so far. But if one opposed the other on fundamental questions, what a scene it would be in the House of Commons? Will it strengthen the cause of Indian reform or weaken it? Imagine Mr. Bhavnagri pitting himself against Mr. Dadabhai on the Chitral or the Civil Service Examination question God forbid such a contingency. The supposed incident will, however, show the grave danger of indulging in specious platitudes without carefully analysing their serious consequences.

Masons are a generous brotherhood. According to one of them Mr. Bhavnagri exemplified in himself all those cardinal virtues symbolized by the level, the plump, and the square. Another large-hearted brother gave it as his opinion that the guest had rendered 'several valuable and enduring' services, and that he was second to none in patriotism and in his desire to do good to the land of his birth. Mr. Bhavnagri too was all generosity. He admitted that he might have made mistakes and observed that it was ungenerous to attribute these mistakes to sordid motives. When he was elected Member of Parliament, we said we were ready to suspend our judgment and to receive him with open arms, if he availed himself of the opportunities good luck had placed at his disposal. No sensible Indian can have the least personal grudge against him. But a public man must be prepared to be judged by his deeds and utterances. When he asks his critics not to attribute his mistakes to "sordid motives," they have a right to demand from him an explanation of what he meant by his monstrous attack on educated natives and congressmen as disloyal and self-seeking. Does he recollect the contents of the letter he wrote to the *Times* in reply to the speech of the Hon. Mr. Mehta? Did he act up to his precept in that letter? We are, however, pleased to find the member for Bethnal Green confessing that he might have made mistakes. It is equally satisfactory to read his declaration that between him and Mr. Dadabhai the difference is as regards matters of detail and that it is only slight. Whether that is so or not, if he is now anxious to climb down from the most mischievous position he has hitherto taken and to

set himself right with the Indian public, we congratulate him on his decision. After his countrymen have received substantial proofs that the operation of climbing down has been fully completed, and realized that there are conclusive guarantees of his staying at the right point, they would as generously welcome him as his brother masons, but without indulging in legendary descriptions.

THE CHAMPION (November 15, 1896).

Bhavnagri and brotherly love.

We have been accused of persecuting Mr. Bhavnagri and—let us be honest—the accusation has not interfered with our equanimity. We recognize in the member for Bethnal Green an enemy to India, and we have treated him accordingly. But we, in our severest moments, have not used him as roughly as the *Madras Mail*, an Anglo-Indian journal, we believe. We seldom or ever see the *Mail*. Life is too short to read all the Indian papers, and we have to acknowledge that the quotation we are about to give was taken from our Bombay contemporary the *Advocate of India*, and we presume the quotation is correctly given. Says the *Madras mail*.

“We are sorry to have to designate as fudge and fustian the utterances delivered by Mr. Bhavnagri, M. P., at Lodge Rising Sun, Bombay, as telegraphed by our (“*Madras Mail*”) Bombay correspondent, but after all, these are the only terms which adequately describe them. A platitude does not cease to be a platitude, nor does bathos cease to be bathos merely because it comes from the lips of a Parsee M. P., whether he represents the centre of Finsbury or the north-east corner of Bethnal Green. By the way, Mr. Bhavnagri waxed eloquent over “the grand old Masonic precept of judging others by the instinct of brotherly love and charity.” “If they did it,” he affirmed, “they would push all the true interests of countries or individuals”—and may we be allowed to add, “of joint stock companies.” A good deal of information has been asked for regarding the Madras Electric Tramways Company, Limited, of which Mr. Bhavnagri is a director. Will the Bethnal Green Member kindly judge these questions “by the instinct of brotherly love and charity, and furnish the answers without any further delay?”

Poor Mr. Bhavnagri, his home-coming has not been a welcome one, and now his “friends”—the Anglo-Indians are turning against him. By the way, speaking of Mr. Bhavnagri’s Anglo-Indian friends—Is it true that he is to be elected to the following clubs:—the Bombay, the Yacht, and the Byculla? These are the places where Mr. B.’s friends most do congregate. These are the people who according to him, wish so well to the inhabitants of this

country, and these surely should be the men who will welcome to their bosoms this stalwart advocate of Anglo-India. But we doubt the rumour; we do not believe that Mr. Bhavnagri desires to become a member of these clubs. Moreover, we are absolutely certain that—whatever might be his desire, he would not be elected. It is this way,—Mr. Bhavnagri in the House of Commons, may be a useful help to Anglo-India; but, in Bombay, he is a “native,” and, therefore, not permitted within the precincts of English clubdom. Think over this, you stupid ones, who would endorse Mr. Bhavnagri's policy. Think over it. A slave is an object of commiseration, but a slave who fawns upon his master, is an object of loathing.

THE MAHRATTA (November 15, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri at the "Rising Star."

Mr. Bhavnagri tried to explain his position in a speech which is short enough but not sweet. We are glad to find Mr. Bhavnagri becoming sober and we hope that his sobriety is sincere; but he does not yet appear to have given up his pretensions which appear so graceless. We cannot bear his talking about Dadabhai Naoroji as if he was the G. O. M.'s equal. Mr. Bhavnagri did not say anything particular and therefore there is nothing to criticize. We dare say he will depart from this country shorn of his pretensions, as adder but a wiser man.

BOMBAY COMMITTEE (November, 18, 1896).

We understand that the friends of Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri, C. I. E., M. P., have arranged to entertain him at dinner on Saturday, the 5th December next, at Sir D. M. Petit's bungalow, at Nepean Sea Road. The dinner is meant to congratulate Mr. Bhavnagri on his return to Parliament, and will be of a social and non-political character. A committee consisting, amongst others, of Sir Jamsetjee Jejeebhoy, Sir D. M. Petit, the Persian Consul-General, Sir M. D'Quadros, H. H. Aga Khan, Sir Jehangheer, Mr. Donabhoj Framjee, C.S.I., Mr. Premchand Roychand, Mr. Dorabjee Pudumjee, Mr. Fazulbhoj Viscam, Mr. Currimbhoj Ebrahim, Mr. Hurkisondas Nurrotundas, Mr. Vijbhucandas Atmaram, the Hon'ble Mr. N. N. Wadia, C.I.E., and Mr. Noor Mahomed Jairazbhoj Peerbhoj has been formed to carry out the arrangements. We are asked to state that friends of Mr. Bhavnagri, who may desire to join the dinner, are requested to communicate with the Honorary Secretaries at No. 89, Medow's Street.

* Curiously enough the paragraph in both the papers was identical.

THE GUJARATI (November 22, 1896).

When Mr. Bhavnagri set his foot on the Indian shore, some of his friends naturally wished to garland him and make a sort of demonstration in his honour. But considerations of decorum very properly prevailed with the member for Bethnal Green who, it was reported, refused to be garlanded on private grounds. Every one can appreciate Mr. Bhavnagri's feelings, but not the subsequent conduct of his friends and admirers. Why should an attempt be made to put a strain upon his feelings by inviting him to a masonic dinner, inflicting upon him eulogistic speeches and publishing them wide-cast, and making him deliver a long political speech much against his will at a social gathering? But now they are contemplating a much more serious move. It has now been arranged to entertain him at dinner at the Petit Bungalow on Saturday, the 5th December. The dinner is meant to congratulate him on his return to Parliament and will be of a *social and non-political character*. The movement is confined to his friends, and strangers have perhaps no right to disapprove of such a gathering. But past experience shows that a word of warning is not altogether superfluous. Our readers will recollect that a meeting of friends and admirers of Lord Harris was convened at the Town Hall. It was to be a non-political gathering, but the speeches made at the time were at least some of them, of the most objectionable character. Lord Harris had friends and admirers even amongst the Marwadis and Multanees who, it was said at the time, were brought to the Town Hall in hired victorias for what purpose they could not say. The object evidently was to make the meeting as representative as possible. At a *social* gathering held in England in Mr. Bhavnagri's honour and presided over by Lord Harris the speeches were again of a political character, and though Sir William Hunter set an example of good taste and manners in speaking about the Congress and gave it an excellent testimonial, Mr. Bhavnagri denounced those connected with it in language which was utterly unworthy of the occasion, as the extract published below will show. In Bombay there was a *social* gathering at a certain club in honour of Mr. Bhavnagri after his election, but there again the limits of the social function were not duly respected. The intended dinner is declared to be of a *social and non-political character*, and friends have been invited to

join the movement on the strength of such a representation. We trust the public will not have to complain once more on the score that the occasion was seized for making political speeches or political capital out of the movement or giving it a representative character. Beyond this the public as a body do not feel the least concern in it.

Some of Mr. Bhavnagri's friends have had the courage to say that he has never denounced educated natives or Congressmen as disloyal or ascribed to them bad motives. The speeches that he made at the dinner given in his honour under the presidency of Lord Harris was a deliberate and well-considered expression of his opinions, and we, therefore make a present of the following extract to those who still want unquestionable proof on the point :—

I have no quarrel with the Congress as a constitutional body and such men as Mr. Lal Mohun Ghose in Bengal, the late Sir Madhav Rao of Madras, Mr. Justice Tyebjee of Bombay, have had my respect and esteem. But when men of less intelligence than they or others impelled only by motives of selfish ambition seek to use that or any political organisation, for purposes inconsistent with the country's welfare, it is but natural they cannot regard me with friendly feelings, any more than they have done—men like those whom I have just named. This is not an evening, nor have I left myself time for entering upon discursive topics, or I could prove to those sentimental and misguided individuals who think it high patriotism to always complain of India's lot under British rule how they *misdirect* the energies of the younger generation of her people, and *how greatly they retard* the welfare of her inhabitants by creating a gulf of discord between them and those to whose hands their affairs are committed. These gentlemen claim to be the only unselfish patriots of the land, are full of tears for her misfortunes, and their only way of practising loyalty is by proclaiming the advent of riots and rebellions, which they say you and I are too shortsighted to foresee. Is the wish father to the vision? At all events, I deny them the monopoly of all that patriotism and those tears. We also are susceptible of kindred feelings, and perhaps our patriotism, which does not voice itself in puerile rhapsodies about freeing India from the yoke of the British tyrants, and such like epithets, and our tears, which are reserved for the social drawbacks of the various castes and for the wrongs

which the child-wife and the degraded widow suffer may after all be more genuine than theirs. But we will not tickle the youthful ear; we insist upon their having a robust domestic life, an industrial development and a true perception of the difficulties and responsibilities of administration before they can dispense with the guidance and control of the British agency. (Cheers.) We are, therefore, not the genuine article in the line of their patriotism. The new orators and journalists will have none of us. But I think we can survive their wrath.

THE CHAMPION (November 22, 1896).

**Mr. Bhavnagri's whine about Congress
abuse exposed.**

We give below a quotation from Mr. Bhavnagri's speech made by him at the dinner given in his honor under the presidency of Lord Harris. It will enable people to judge what truth there is in Mr. Bhavnagri's tearful protestations that he has never abused Congresswalls, and that he has never ascribed personal motives to his opponents, and that he has never denied their loyalty. Mark the sentence "Is the wish father to the vision."

I have no quarrel with the Congress as a constitutional body, and such men as Mr. Lal Mohun Ghose in Bengal, the late Sir Madhav Rao of Madras, Mr. Justice Tyebjee of Bombay, have had my respect and esteem. But when men of less intelligence than they or others impelled only by motives of selfish ambition seek to use that or any political organisation for purposes inconsistent with the country's welfare, it is but natural they cannot regard me with friendly feelings, any more than they have done men like those whom I have just named. This is not an evening, nor have I left myself time, for entering upon discursive topics; or I could prove to those sentimental and misguided individuals who think it high patriotism to always complain of India's lot under British rule how they misdirect the energies of the younger generation of her people, and how greatly they retard the welfare of her inhabitants by creating a gulf of discord between them and those to whose hands their affairs are committed. These gentlemen claim to be the only unselfish patriots of the land, are full of tears for her misfortunes, and their only way of practising loyalty is by proclaiming the advent of riots and rebellions, which they say you and I are too shortsighted to foresee. Is the wish father to the vision? At all events, I deny them the monopoly of all that patriotism and those tears. We also are susceptible of kindred feelings, and perhaps our patriotism, which does not voice itself in puerile rhapsodies about freeing India from the yoke of the British tyrants, and such like epithets, and our tears, which are reserved for the social drawbacks of the various castes and for the wrongs which the child-wife and the degraded widow suffer may after all be more genuine than theirs. But we will not tickle the youthful ear; we insist upon their having

a robust domestic life, and industrial development and a true perception of the difficulties and responsibilities of administration before they can dispense with the guidance and control of the British agency. We are, therefore, not the genuine article in the line of their patriotism. The new orators and journalists will have none of us. But I think we can survive their wrath.

THE GUJARATI (November 22, 1896).

Tom-tomming extraordinary—Mr. Bhavnagri's flatterers are going to treat him on the 5th of next month. Whether because they were driven out of the Town Hall or for any other reason, the place of the entertainment has been changed from the Town Hall to the residence of Sir Diushaw Petit. Owing to the scarcity of flatterers in Bombay (due perhaps to the failure of the rains and the consequent scarcity of food) only about fifteen busy bodies are seen actively canvassing and soliciting attendance at the "public function." How many gentlemen have accepted the invitation of these busy bodies is not yet known. But the most unreasoning of caste-ridden Hindres are said to be so gushing in enthusiasm that they have decided to defy their caste rules on this occasion, and even the anti Pasteur Jains are said to be bent on joining the dinner, even though it involves the taking of animal flesh.

MADRAS STANDARD (November 23, 1896).

Does Mr. Bhavnagri, M.P., Deserve any Honour
from the Indian Public ?

Yes.

No.

(ACCORDING TO HIS FRIENDS
AND ADMIRERS.)(ACCORDING TO INDIAN PUBLIC
OPINION.)

1. Because he is consumed with a desire to have it.

1. Because his public life has hitherto been a huge blank.

2. Because his friends and admirers are equally consumed with a desire to carry out his wishes at all cost and hazard.

2. Because there is not an iota of evidence to show that he ever rendered the smallest of small service to his country or that he seriously devoted himself with the opportunities which a lucky chance afforded him, to serve his country's cause or underwent the slightest sacrifice or displayed a spark of sterling patriotism.

3. Because his patrons at the India Office command that he should return to Parliament with the seal of recognition as the sole and trusty representative of all India !!!

3. Because unprovoked, he left no opportunity to heap abuse on abuse and cast calumny on the entire educated classes, of his countrymen in order to please his patrons, the Anglo-Indians, and satisfy his personal ambition.

4. Because he has already achieved a unique popularity in and out of Parliament, unprecedented in the life and career of an Indian in England.

4. Because his utterances and acts in and out of Parliament were unnatural and therefore utterly unworthy of a person purporting to be the representative of all India.

5. Because he has been a brilliant parliamentary success, specially in connection with the Sunkin affair and the question of the separation of judicial from executive functions.

6. Because he has already achieved for himself a name and fame by the breadth and depth of his views on the burning Indian problems of the day; notably industrial and economic, his unerring political sagacity, his parliamentary strategy, his unexampled tolerance of educated Indians, and the Progressive party, albeit a bluest of the blue "Conservative" Indian, his unquestionable independence, his single-mindedness of purpose, his lifelong sacrifices, and above all, his sterling patriotism, for his dear country which under the beneficent rule of the British has reaped incalculable benefits for which the payment of the annual tribute of thirty millions is a most incommensurate return.

5. Because as a Member of Parliament he proved an utter disappointment having, after pretending to pose as a representative of all India, voted on all important questions, specially the cost of the Chitral expedition and the control of Indian finances, with those members in the House whose avowed policy is to refuse all reasonable reforms, repress every legitimate aspirations of Indians and maintain the country in a condition next only to serfdom.

6. Because he has chosen to cast in his lot with the Anglo-Indian officials whose deadly hostility to everything Indian is patent, and allow himself to become their willing, or unwilling tool, entirely throwing to the winds the interests of his native country which owing to a costly and disastrous system of foreign administration unparalleled in the annals of the world is, as he knows too well, being daily steeped in growing want and poverty of which the dire famine now prevailing in every part of the empire and threatening the lives of many millions of the poorest masses affords a most conclusive and striking proof.

MADRAS STANDARD (November 24, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri Very Much Unveiled.

We are very sorry for the friends and admirers of Mr. Bhavnagri. They have done a great wrong to their hero by organising so-called demonstrations in his honour. The Aden reception was a tolerably good advertisement, for Mr. Bhavnagri had the advantage of (i) not being in mourning; (ii) of being furnished with an opportunity of avowing his sincere adhesion to "India's Cause;" and (iii) of having a telegraphic report of his "great reception" at Aden being forwarded to England, thanks to the kind offices of Reuter. Great things were expected at Bombay on the occasion of Mr. Bhavnagri's landing, but that astute M. P. had gone into mourning. But in spite of the depressing circumstances attending the M.P.'s lauding, the friends of the gentleman were guilty of the atrocious indiscretion of magnifying the whole affair, even stooping to the device of enlisting the services, on behalf of the M. P., of a Native Prince who had gone to the Bunder to receive a Political Agent. These tricks have all been exposed, but movements in honour of Mr. Bhavnagri still flourish, naked but not ashamed. The latest we hear is that a purely social dinner is to be arranged. The dinner will no doubt be invested with some *cost*, by the circumstance that Sir Jamssetjee Jejeebhoy is to preside. But we would once more ask the friends of Mr. Bhavnagri to spare their hero the humiliation of a thorough exposure. We suppose speeches will be delivered at the dinner, and Mr. Bhavnagri talk the nonsense he habitually does about "India's Cause." Any such trick is certain to provoke a counter-demonstration more influential than any that the friends of the M. P. can dream of organising and the result will be anything but favourable to the impression in England which Mr. Bhavnagri so desperately longs to produce. Meanwhile, we would make a present of the following extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Bhavnagri sometime last year at a dinner promoted and financed by the M. P.'s Anglo-Indian friends and patrons.

"I have no quarrel with the Congress as a constitutional body, and such men as Mr. Lalmohun Ghose in Bengal, the late Sir Madhav Rao of Madras, Mr. Justice Tyabjee of Bombay, have had my respect and esteem. But when men

of less intelligence than they or others impelled only by motives of selfish ambition seek to use that or any political organisation for purposes inconsistent with the country's welfare, it is but natural they cannot regard me with friendly feelings, any more than they have done men like those whom I have just named. This is not an evening, nor have I lost myself time for entering upon discursive topics; or I could prove to those sentimental and misguided individuals who think it high patriotism to always complain of India's lot under British rule how they misdirect the energies of the younger generation of her people, and how greatly they retard the welfare of her inhabitants by creating a gulf of discord between them and those to whose hands their affairs are committed. These gentlemen claim to be the only unselfish patriots of the land, are full of tears for her misfortunes, and their only way of practising loyalty is by proclaiming the advent of riots and rebellions, which they say you and I are too shortsighted to foresee. Is the wish father to the vision? At all events, I deny them the monopoly of all that patriotism and those tears. We also are susceptible of kindred feelings and perhaps our patriotism, which does not voice itself in puerile rhapsodies about freeing India from the yoke of the British tyrants and such like epithets, and our tears, which are reserved for the social drawbacks of the various castes and for the wrongs which the child-wife and the degraded widow suffer may after all be more genuine than theirs. But we will not tickle the youthful ear: we insist upon their having a robust domestic life, an industrial development and a true perception of the difficulties and responsibilities of administration before they can dispense with the guidance and control of the British agency. (Cheers.) We are, therefore, not the genuine article in the line of their patriotism. The new orators and journalists will have none of us. But I think we can survive their wrath.

We would leave it to all impartial men to decide whether a man who had the effrontery to deliver himself of these choice sentiments deserves any consideration whatsoever.

THE GUJARATI (November 29, 1896).

I cannot help thinking, I may be wrong, that he has sold his soul to his masters. He cannot help himself. He must please his masters. There is not a speech he makes in which he does not betray this. If he comes from India accredited with confidence in him, I cannot say what amount of mischief he will do to India. No body can rejoice more than I do to see more Indians in the House. But he will prove a calamity if he does not change his ways and be sincere towards India. His inclinations are toward the Anglo-Indian.

These are the words of a sincere friend of the Indian people who, in and out of Parliament, has fought unselfishly for the advancement of the cause of this country whenever any opportunity offered itself for so doing, and at the present juncture they deserve to be borne in mind by every man in this country. Especially the sentence we have italicised ought to be engraved on every heart. It has often happened in the past that from motives of private friendship or personal aggrandisement or from ignorance of their true interests natives of this country have bestowed undeserved honour upon the enemies of our people, and have thus proved the worst foes of their own country. They have afforded good samples of their intelligence by their inability to distinguish friends from foes, or in the words of the Indian proverb by placing an oilman on a level with the king. The entertainments and honours accorded to some individuals have been paraded before the English people who have thus been misled by our bitterest Anglo-Indian foes into the belief that the tales of poverty told by Fawcett and Bright, Bradlaugh and Schwann, Caine and Wedderburn, are all imaginary and that the people of India are thoroughly satisfied with Anglo-Indian methods of administration. Thus the parasites of Anglo-Indian officials have by their entertainments and demonstrations done unspeakable injury to their country, and have proved false to the public. They have been instrumental in misleading the British public and in putting a spoke in the wheel of the reforms advocated by the Congress.

Mr. Bhavnagri is of the type of some of our Anglo-Indian foes. Outwardly he is a native of this country, but

in his sympathies he is Anglo-Indian. He swallows every word that is told him by those Anglo-Indians who are the greatest enemies of our political advancement.

Though a native of this country it would be a mistake to consider him a friend of the country. He is to be considered an Anglo-Indian, and must be looked upon with the same suspicion with which we look upon some of our Anglo-Indians who have never shown any affection for this country. He now puts forward Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's name as a friend of his political views, and bases his claims to honour on this assertion, but this is not the least doubt. Mr. Dadabhai looks with intense disfavour upon Mr. Bhavnagri's views and his Parliamentary career. Mr. Bhavnagri has lost all confidence with the Congress Committee in England. He has lost no opportunity of reviling the Congress. Men like Messrs. Mehta, Wacha, Sayani, Javerilal, Ananda Charlu, Mathuswamy Ayar and the Bonnerjis are, to his mind, men of no worth. Those whom the public hold in the highest affection and esteem are to him men of no worth. But Mr. Bhavnagri must rest assured that the people are always anxious to walk in the footsteps of these their leaders and are too shrewd to be deceived by his impositions. When on the occasion of the banquet given to Mr. Bhavnagri by his Anglo-Indian friends, Sir William Hunter expressed his sympathy with the Congress movement and bestowed praise upon it, Mr. Bhavnagri rose deliberately to revile the Congress and its leader, Mr. Dadabhai. Again, when Mr. Dadabhai informed the British public that unless the burdens of the Indian ryot and the tax-payers were lessened there would soon be a rising against British rule in the country. Mr. Bhavnagri ridiculed the idea and pronounced it seditious.

Thus on our side stand the leaders of the people with Mr. Dadabhai at their head. On the other side stand the Anglo-Indian Officials and their apologist, Mr. Bhavnagri. Between the two there is an impossible barrier, and you have to choose between the two. No body on Mr. Bhavnagri's side can expect to win popular confidence. Those who think that in honouring Mr. Bhavnagri they are doing no harm to the country must remember that in doing so they are proving false to their country and will have cause to repent very soon. Let them remember it is a fox they are dealing with and the fox will not belie itself but is sure to

deceive its allies. Private meetings of friends he will, when it suits his purpose to do so, declare to be marks of public esteem. Private meetings of friends have often been thus paraded before the English public as marks of public approval. At the private dinner given him by the Freemasons of Bombay he spoke of his public life with the object of using that function as a public demonstration when it would serve his purpose to do so. It is the duty of all to hold aloof from one whose public life has been so full of harm to his country. All considerations of personal friendship should be laid aside. Mr. Bhavnagri's public career has been fraught with harm to his country, and any demonstration his friends may make in his honour should be opposed by the public. It ought to be shown in every way that until he parts company as regard political matters with his Anglo-Indian friends and follows in the footsteps of Mr. Dadabhai and other Congress leaders, he will not receive the slightest mark of confidence from the Indian public, and they will flatly refuse to honour him.

THE GUJARATI (November 29 1896).

We are deeply amused at the telegrams regarding Mr. Bhavnagri who now comes here after having enjoyed himself in England at the expense of the late Maharaja of Bhavnagar. Following the example of the Bombay public, which received Mr. Bhavnagri so enthusiastically the public of Bhavnagri are said to be dying to hold monster demonstrations in his honour. But here, too, the worthy M.P. refuses to receive because forsooth he has lost his patron—the late Maharajah. We are told he performed his obsequies before the remains of the late Maharajah. But the enthusiastic telegraphist from Bhavnagar has forgotten to inform us whether the Maharaja too shared in the enthusiasm of his subject, or whether the exorbitant portion given to Mr. Bhavnagri by the late Maharaj, which is now said to be on the point of being stopped, is still to be continued. There is nothing surprising in the fact that a few of his Bhavnagar flatterers and beneficiaries should lay it on thick for him in the columns of the Anglo-Indian Press, but the reports of so-called ovations are ridiculous.

We have been informed that the late Maharajah of Bhavnagar had promised Mr. Bhavnagri that he would pay all his expenses and maintain him in England. The promise has been kept. Let Mr. Bhavnagri deny it if he can. The new Maharaja is very able, he will understand wherein the well-being of the people consists, and he is anxious to curtail the extravagant expenses of his father. His wish is very worthy and is deserving of the gratitude of the people. If the Maharaja of Bhavnagar is desirous of honours, he is more desirous still of the welfare of his subjects. He seeks the approbation of our English rulers, not by shows and *tamashas*, but by his worthy deeds. He has learnt under Mr. Macnaghten how to make good use of money. He is anxious to stop the pension his father used to give to Mr. Bhavnagri. He asked what good the State gets out of this money. Everybody asks the same question. The money given to Mr. Bhavnagri is absolutely thrown away. It is the duty of the Maharaja to prevent this waste of money. Will not the dynasty of Bhav Sing rise equal to the occasion?

THE MADRAS STANDARD (December 1, 1896).

A correspondent to a Bombay paper sends a most tantalising report of a speech delivered by Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri at Bhavnagar. We call it tantalising because the correspondent reports Mr. Bhavnagri as having said: 'He (Mr. Bhavnagri) asserted that brief as his career in Parliament had been, he had in various instances done his duty by India.' And the M. P. positively enumerated 'numerous instances' of services done to India. We say it is tantalising because we are left painfully in the dark as to what the nature of the services might be which Mr. Bhavnagri is credibly reported to have enumerated. The correspondent would have done better to keep back the superfluous information that Mr. Bhavnagri's enumeration of his services was received with "vociferous cheering," and to have told us what Mr. Bhavnagri said or said he did.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (Bombay Correspondent)
(December 4, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri and Bhavnagar.

At last, after full five weeks, Mr. Bhavnagri was enabled by his friends to set his foot on the soil of Bhavnagar which alas! according to all authentic reports refuses to recognise him any longer. A new chief sits on the *gades* and a new regime stigmatises or rules supreme which appears to be sternly patriotic, rigidly puritan in point of finance. They are said to have found out that Mr. Bhavnagri is no longer necessary for the administration of the State, at any rate in England. If he chose he may revert to the substantive appointment of Judicial Councillor and earn the State salary attached to it or give it up if he thought that the work of an M. P. was more suited to his taste or interest. In the latter case the Durbar must cease the present pension of Rs. 40,000 per annum. Of course we shall soon know which course Mr. Bhavnagri adopts. Meanwhile as a matter of form the Durbar has received him. But you had better put little faith in all the flaming telegrams appearing in the *Times of India* touching his supposed grand ovation by the Bhavnagar people. We have the most authentic reports to the effect that all love between the people of Bhavnagar and the honorable member for East Bethnal Green is lost. Some artificial or forced demonstrations are expected at Ahmedabad and Surat. These are promoted by some Parsee friends who are beholden to him. But you need not think that the people know Mr. Bhavnagri and are eager to welcome him with that spontaneity and enthusiasm with which they greeted our C.O. M. on his last visit to India. No. Here, after the Ballard pier incident and the legendary report in the Anglo-Indian dailies everybody discounts the flaming telegrams appearing about his movements. The fact is homage and welcome of the character which greeted Mr. Dadabhai only come of genuine appreciation of disinterested and patriotic service rendered in the cause of the people. It is only once in an age that a man of his sterling character appears on the scene and blooms like the "secular aloe" to which a living poet refers. To the millions of India Mr. Bhavnagri is as much of an unknown quantity as the man in the moon or Mars. He has yet to show service of the character rendered to them before he can ever expect a more than royal reception of the kind which

India freely and enthusiastically gave to its grand old man. Let us hope that in the fulness of time Mr. Bhavnagri, taking a leaf from the book of that patriarch may deserve something approaching to it; though I am entirely sceptic that he could ever divorce himself from that personal ambition which is his ruling passion.

In this connexion I must say that your leaflet on him which appeared last week in your columns, and the many veracious but pertinent articles you have indited, have been much appreciated by the critical and unbiassed public of Bombay, who can think and judge for themselves. In fact, you should put a feather in your editorial cap that Bombay has honoured your sterling independence by reproducing in thousands the leaflet and other matters. It has had a vastly educating effect. Nay, they have been even translated in the vernaculars. The service which the people of Bombay were not courageous enough to perform has been admirably performed by you. Mind, this is no mere empty platitude or press "puff." There is nothing which in my private and public life is more abhorrent to me than hollow or insincere praise.

THE DINNER AT LAST.

The dinner so long spoken of and in perilous throes is at last fixed for the 7th. Sir Jamsetjee, after having first declined, has, under personal entreaties, so I am authentically informed, consented to preside. Mr. Dosabhoj Framji's young lions are actively busy in the organisation, while one of the Hindu Secretaries, poor man, goes from door to door, and literally takes out his turban, bows, and gives his best smiles to cozen those whom he calls upon, to put "a penny in the slot" of the Bhavnagri entertainment. To such a pass things have come. However, the dinner will be over; the postsprandial-harangues will be made; Mr. Bhavnagri will be happy; and the world will go on as before listless of the event. So I need not say anything more on the subject. But it would not be amiss if one should collect all about the visit of the honourable gentleman in the form of a brochure and present it to the electors of East Bethnal Green as a *souvenir* of their representative's unproductive visit to his native country. It might be called "Booming Bhavnagriana." The electors may inform themselves how the "boom" as originally spread, came to nothing. In fact, how it was sent up like a rocket and came down like a stick. *Sic transit gloria.*

THE PRABHAKAR OR THE SUN (December 4, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri, who has enriched himself by the liberal pension granted to him by the Bhavnagar State, and who by hook or crook has effected his entrance into Parliament with the object of abusing the people of India on whose bounty he lives, returned to this country from England a few days ago. With the expectation that he would be honoured by all people of India just as Mr. Dadabhai was honoured, Mr. Bhavnagri found out a means to make himself known to many by causing telegrams to be published in the dailies to the effect that he was to visit India, that he had started for India, &c., &c. But the people knowing him full well, wholly disappointed him, and this was as it should have been. In thankfully declining the honour of a banquet he told his friends that he had come to this country to pay a visit to the young Raja of Bhavnagar. On his way to Bhavnagar he did not meet with any enthusiastic reception, and who will say that this was not what he deserved? The political leaders of this city have nothing to do with Mr. Bhavnagri, and Mr. Bhavnagri will do well to be wise in time and avoid the address which some busy-bodies among the Mahomedans are going to present to him at Grant Road to-night.

THE CHAMPION (December 6, 1896).

The Bhavnagri Boom.

Among the comic shows, satirizing and appraising men and events of the day, represented in the annual Holi procession which the intelligent enterprize of the Prabhus has now made an institution in this city, there was one last year which took the popular fancy above all others and elicited "the most deafening cheers and most enthusiastic applause." A cart carried a board on which Mr. Bhavnagri, M. P., was perched in the guise of a big frog, with a man behind it, vigorously blowing a huge pair of bellows, puffing and distending the animal into more concocited dimensions. Never was a fable of Æsop utilized for a more felicitous hit. The representation had the rare merit of being more than half a prophecy. For all last week we have been regaled with a repetition of the amusing operation on the frog. Mr. Bhavnagri is happy in the attachment of a devoted parasite who, though ostensibly only a reporter, is convinced, like the fly on the wheel, that he carries the load of one of our English dailies wholly on his own shoulders. One day, it is said, this reporter, in an access of gushing tenderness, went up to the hero of his idolatory, and by the great gods he swore a mighty oath that he would make him famous in the land and manufacture a demonstration before which that spontaneously given to that over-rated decrepit old man Dadabhai Naoroji would pale. No sooner said than done. *Puff, Puff*, went the bellows into the frog, but the first efforts were a failure. The Bombay demonstration collapsed. The bellows have been since carefully taken to Bhavnagar after laborious preparations for their efficient working. One would have imagined that the first thing Mr. Bhavnagri would have done on his arrival would have been to proceed straightway to Bhavnagar, to wait on the present Thakore as a matter of duty. But time was required to persuade, to coax and to organize. So after a month's delay the hero proceeds to Bhavnagar, and we have had ever since laborious puffs from the mighty bellows. *Bue*, alas! they are thin as thin can be. "Our special correspondent" of one paper, being the same as "a correspondent" of others, could not, with the profusest interlarding of deafening cheers and enthusiastic applause, impose on the public. An address from the Bhavnagai people connected with a Member of Parliament could be

got up for the asking. The entertainment by "the Bhavnagri Club" could not deceive anybody at all conversant with Kattyawar. It could not be easy to imagine a more microscopic body composed as the Club is of a few Parsis and most of those accustomed to cringe and fawn on a whilom Durbar official. It is impossible not to laugh heartily at the attempt to pass off the meeting of a few friends and dependants gathered at stations, as is the prevalent hospitable custom in Kattyawar as demonstrations of people gathered from far and near. Even the Conference at Ahmedabad Station with the Jain agitators against the Palitana Durbar, who have been discountenanced by Government, has had to be pressed into the service. We cannot imagine a severer lesson to those who have once again illustrated the story of the mountain and the mouse. The bellows again have been indefatigably and laboriously blown, but not even with the assistance of a section of our Mahomedan friends in the city, whose love for the Congress is well known, can by any amount of puffing transform a frog into the nobler animal which in his envy and ambition he tries to rival.

THE CHAMPION (December 6, 1896).

A BHAVNAGRI IDYLL.

The following has been sent to us for publication :—

A ROOMING BHAVNAGRIAN LAY.

(By a Gushing Tory Bard.)

I.

Unhappy India lay in woeful plight,
In tears the Tories cried, " Oh ! What a dismal sight,
Forthwith to aid us call Bhavnagri bright,
He is the man to put her matters right ;
In Common's House for him must we a seat provide,
To vote with us when on Ind we divide."

II.

Straightway East Bethnal Green a seat supplied,
And gaily to Westminster the henchman hied ;
Behind the rank and file of Tory might,
Right loyalty he made a show to fight,
Bewilder'd and amaz'd India watched the sight,
While joyously the Tories shouted " Wah ! Wah !
What a shining light ! "

III.

" Wah ! Wah ! What a shining light ! "
Echo'd loud the lords of India Office high ;
Lust'ly in chorus did they cry,
" Behold ! this bold black man white,
Who saved India from her sorry plight,
And turn'd into glorious day her gloomy night ! "

IV.

" Behold ! Anglo-India's pampered pride ! "
Once more the stalwarts cri'd,
He who so pluck'ly the Rads defied.
On Jub'lee day he shall be a starred Knight—
Sir M. M. Bhavnagri, K. S. I.,—
Our booming, bouncing blazing light !

THE KAISER-I-HIND (December 6, 1896).

The Ridiculous mouse of the mountain of Bhavnagri Demonstration.

After the fashion of the labouring mountain which produced the ridiculous mouse, the "friends and admirers" of Mr. Bhavnagri have at last been able to get up *one* demonstration in the city. And strange to say, it came from that section of the Mahomedan community which is known to be backward in enlightenment and progress. No doubt it is a wealthy section, but with no political or social influence. More or less, it is a section which is notorious for its abject fear of the police and, therefore, of its slavish homage to that body—a most unnatural and pusillanimous attitude which we can only deplore and pity those who adopt it. It is a puzzle how such a section of the Mahomedan community could come to welcome Mr. Bhavnagri. Excepting a handful of them, who could be counted on one's fingers, they are so backward that they hardly understand what politics is, much less party politics and Parliamentary warfare. That such a section should, therefore, express the sentiments which are to be found in the address presented to Mr. Bhavnagri is wonderful. Evidently there are some wire-pullers of self-interested character behind. This was well brought out in a correspondence in the vernacular dailies a few weeks ago by an enlightened Mahomedan. He lifted the curtain from behind and informed the public that the whole affair was personal, artificial, and highly sectional; and that it had not the sympathy of the more enlightened section. Be that as it may, Mr. Bhavnagri thinks it was an "honour" to be thus congratulated by Messrs. Omar Jamal & Co., just as he fancied it was an "honour" to be praised by his own Bhavnagar *Hindu* Durbarees and proteges, we have nothing to say. We wish him all joy of the "honour" from the bottom of our heart. And may he for ever cherish in his bosom this magnificent address.

MR. BHAVNAGRI HAS NOT YET PICKED UP THE GAUNTLET
THROWN AT HIM BY HIS POLITICAL ADVERSARIES.

As to Mr. Bhavnagri's reply to the address, it might be said that it was a string of platitudes of which he is no doubt a kind of master. What we find most amusing in it is his harping on the exploded theory of Indian questions

being allowed to remain free from the arena of party politics. In a recent issue, we elaborately pointed out that it was impossible under the present conditions of Parliamentary life and that those who talked in the fashion which Mr. Bhavnagri talks are simply canting humbugs. The cant is purely Anglo-Indian in its origin. And at the present moment it has not even the merit of disinterestedness about it. But let that pass. The more amusing thing was Mr. Bhavnagri's challenge as to being in a position to give a complete answer to those who have criticised his unnatural action in Parliament on all vital Indian questions at the root of which lies the broad policy of genuine Imperial statesmanship. The criticism has been made openly and frequently in the columns of almost every Indian journal of note. The charges against him are plain and open. And it only requires for him to defend himself from them instead of waiting and in our opinion most absurdly waiting, for the challenge. Why the gauntlet has been thrown into the arena for months past. But Mr. Bhavnagri has not yet had the courage to pick it up. Let him do so, and then those who threw it down will know how best to deal with it again. He simply begs the question when he challenges those opposed to him in politics. The last have challenged him for 18 months past, but hitherto there has been no response whatever. That is the real situation. Let Mr. Bhavnagri reply to the challenge and the challengers will then be fully prepared to meet him.

THE HINDOOSTAN (December 6, 1896).

The true aspect of the honours done to
Mr. Bhavnagri.

Various were the sentiments expressed by the public press as soon as it was known that Mr. Bhavnagri was coming to India. Those connected with him set on foot a movement to accord him a public reception; but the persons concerned in that movement were wise enough to give up the idea in time. We did not wish to say anything against Mr. Bhavnagri personally. On the other hand, we suggested at the very commencement that there was no need to indite anything against Mr. Bhavnagri or to oppose him. The only thing that we objected to was his being recognised as the representative of the people of India. Current events, however, have forced us to take up the pen once more. Immediately after his arrival, Mr. Bhavnagri left for Bhavnagar, and there was then no movement of an objectionable nature set on foot. But latterly, either his aspiration for fame or the devotion of his adherents to their hero, seems to have taken a new turn. The English dailies began to publish long reports of the addresses given to him at Bhavnagar. Also there began to be published magnified versions of the receptions held by about a score or so of acquaintances at a few way-side stations in his journey through Kathiawar.

As if this were not sufficient, at the instigation of some of his flattering friends, a public gathering in honour of Mr. Bhavnagri was held in Bombay on Friday last, on a circular invitation signed by about 38 Mahomedan gentlemen. Advantage was taken of this occasion by an attempt being made to recognise Mr. Bhavnagri as the representative for India. O, that Mr. Bhavnagri were in reality the representative of the country! We are, however, very sorry to say that Mr. Bhavnagri has not only never stood by India, but also on several occasions his policy has been directed to please the officials at the sacrifice of the interests of India. It is in consequence of this that fears are entertained of the people of England being misled into construing the views of Mr. Bhavnagar as those of all India, by such reports in the dailies. At the Muzzaffarbad Hall gathering the principal political leaders of Bombay as well as the supporters of the Congress were conspicuous by their absence. This fact clearly indicates that a large class of the people of India take no part in such addresses and gatherings,

In this address Mr. Bhavnagri was extolled for his deep and clear reasoning and serene temper. It was also added that India should not count upon the support of any political party at home. Mr. Bhavnagri in reply said that those who hoped for gain by joining the Liberals were wrong. We are glad that what Mr. Bhavnagri has said is quite at one with the oft repeated views of the Congress. Mr. Bhavnagri has also tried his best to tickle the Mahomedans. But in spite of a speech of about half-an-hour's duration, he did not take the trouble to throw out even a passing hint at the line of policy already adopted, or to be adopted, by him to further the advancement of India. The only thing he said was that the line which he follows upon Indian questions is taken up after long deliberation, and a conviction of its being the right one. What does this signify? Neither we nor his opponents say that Mr. Bhavnagri acts against the dictates of his conscience, but the defect is that of experience and knowledge. The only way to supply that defect and to be recognised as the representative of India, is to join the Congress, take part in its deliberations, consider the views advanced by that body, adopt those that appear right to him, and if any appear improper, try to get them discussed and improved. Only when he does so, will he be considered to be on a par with Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji.

THE MUMBAI VAIBHAV, OR THE GLORY OF
BOMBAY (December 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri, M.P.

It must be said that the too pompous a reception that is being accorded to this gentleman by his friends here and abroad is quite a detestable humbug. His views are narrow and he is quite unfit to represent India. The Conservatives at home in selecting Mr. Bhavnagri to oppose Mr. Dadabhai, even at the cost of their professed doctrine of receiving no "blackman" in their ranks have simply brought themselves into ridicule. Puffed up with the hope of a seat in Parliament, this ordinarily educated simpleton of a politician began to rave at random and succeeded in his attempt by abusing the Indian National Congress and its leaders such as Mr. Dadabhai and others. At present he has returned to India with the principal object of educating himself in the affairs of this country, and seems in common with his friends to have the ardent desire of getting respect from the real leaders of the people. The public, however, have found him in his true colours, and from a conviction of his being a politician opposed to their national interest, will take no notice of him. This M. P. has made himself conspicuous as the enemy of Indian interests, but has he compensated his misdoings by one good act? Need there be a justification then for the action of Indian patriots that recognise their own value and rights when they discard him after his vile insinuations at the time of his election, and after that, in a speech at a feast given him by Anglo-Indians, that the demands of the National Congress are quite out of place, and that its movers are a party of selfish and disloyal agitators. The chief demand of the Congress for local representation in the Indian Councils has already been complied with by Government; the propriety of separating the judicial from the executive functions has been acknowledged by Mr. Bhavnagri in person, and the proposal for holding simultaneous examinations for competition in the Indian Civil Service has received the approbation of the House of Commons itself. It is plainly evident, then that Mr. Bhavnagri's statement with regard to the impropriety of the Congress demand is simply meaningless. He voted for the acquisition of Chitral and saddling the expenses of its expedition on India; but he has put in no question in the interests of the Indian people or done a single action for their benefit. He

possesses no Indian political career. India, then, may expect no profit from this unpatriotic and thoughtless prattler. It is natural, therefore, that thoughtful Indian patriots being fully aware that Mr. Bhavnagri is not only against all proper Indian political aspirations but is a tool in the hands of those Anglo-Indians that try to keep down the natives of India,—pay no regard to him. In short Mr. Bhavnagri does not deserve any respect from the people of India, nor is he fit to undertake any work in the field of Indian political affairs.

got up for the asking. The entertainment by "the Bhavnagri Club" could not deceive any body at all conversant with Kattyawar. It could not be easy to imagine a more microscopic body composed as the Club is of a few Parsis and most of those accustomed to cringe and fawn on a whilom Durbar official. It is impossible not to laugh heartily at the attempt to pass off the meeting of a few friends and dependants gathered at stations, as is the prevalent hospitable custom in Kattyawar as demonstrations of people gathered from far and near. Even the Conference at Ahmedabad Station with the Jain agitators against the Palitana Durbar, who have been discountenanced by Government, has had to be pressed into the service. We cannot imagine a severer lesson to those who have once again illustrated the story of the mountain and the mouse. The bellows again have been indefatigably and laboriously blown, but not even with the assistance of a section of our Mahomedan friends in the city, whose love for the Congress is well known, can by any amount of puffing transform a frog into the nobler animal which in his envy and ambition he tries to rival.

THE CHAMPION (December 6, 1896).

A BHAVNAGRI IDYLL

The following has been sent to us for publication :—

A BOOMING BHAVNAGRIAN LAY.

(By a Gushing Tory Bard.)

I.

Unhappy India lay in woeful plight,
 In tears the Tories cried, " Oh ! What a dismal sight,
 Forthwith to aid us call Bhavnagri bright,
 He is the man to put her matters right ;
 In Common's House for him must we a seat provide,
 To vote with us when on Ind we divide."

II.

Straightway East Bethnal Green a seat supplied,
 And gaily to Westminster the henchman hied ;
 Behind the rank and file of Tory might,
 Right loyally he made a show to fight,
 Bewilder'd and amaz'd India watched the sight,
 While joyously the Tories shouted " Wah ! Wah !
 What a shining light ! "

III.

" Wah ! Wah ! What a shining light ! "
 Echo'd loud the lords of India Office high ;
 Lust'ly in chorus did they cry,
 " Behold ! this bold black man white,
 Who saved India from her sorry plight,
 And turn'd into glorious day her gloomy night ! "

IV.

" Behold ! Anglo-India's pampered pride ! "
 Once more the stalwarts cri'd,
 He who so pluck'ly the Rads defied.
 On Jub'lee day he shall be a starred Knight—
 Sir M. M. Bhavnagri, K. S. I.—
 Our booming, bouncing blazing light !

THE KAISER-I-HIND (December 6, 1896).

The Ridiculous mouse of the mountain of
Bhavnagri Demonstration.

After the fashion of the labouring mountain which produced the ridiculous mouse, the "friends and admirers" of Mr. Bhavnagri have at last been able to get up *one* demonstration in the city. And strange to say, it came from that section of the Mahomedan community which is known to be backward in enlightenment and progress. No doubt it is a wealthy section, but with no political or social influence. More or less, it is a section which is notorious for its abject fear of the police and, therefore, of its slavish homage to that body—a most unnatural and pusillanimous attitude which we can only deplore and pity those who adopt it. It is a puzzle how such a section of the Mahomedan community could come to welcome Mr. Bhavnagri. Excepting a handful of them, who could be counted on one's fingers, they are so backward that they hardly understand what politics is, much less party politics and Parliamentary warfare. That such a section should, therefore, express the sentiments which are to be found in the address presented to Mr. Bhavnagri is wonderful. Evidently there are some wire-pullers of self-interested character behind. This was well brought out in a correspondence in the vernacular dailies a few weeks ago by an enlightened Mahomedan. He lifted the curtain from behind and informed the public that the whole affair was personal, artificial, and highly sectional; and that it had not the sympathy of the more enlightened section. Be that as it may, Mr. Bhavnagri thinks it was an "honour" to be thus congratulated by Messrs. Omar Jamal & Co., just as he fancied it was an "honour" to be praised by his own Bhavnagar Hindu Durbarees and proteges, we have nothing to say. We wish him all joy of the "honour" from the bottom of our heart. And may he for ever cherish in his bosom this magnificent address.

MR. BHAVNAGRI HAS NOT YET PICKED UP THE GAUNTLET
THROWN AT HIM BY HIS POLITICAL ADVERSARIES.

As to Mr. Bhavnagri's reply to the address, it might be said that it was a string of platitudes of which he is no doubt a kind of master. What we find most amusing in it is his harping on the exploded theory of Indian questions

being allowed to remain free from the arena of party politics. In a recent issue, we elaborately pointed out that it was impossible under the present conditions of Parliamentary life and that those who talked in the fashion which Mr. Bhavnagri talks are simply canting humbugs. The cant is purely Anglo-Indian in its origin. And at the present moment it has not even the merit of disinterestedness about it. But let that pass. The more amusing thing was Mr. Bhavnagri's challenge as to being in a position to give a complete answer to those who have criticised his unnatural action in Parliament on all vital Indian questions at the root of which lies the broad policy of genuine Imperial statesmanship. The criticism has been made openly and frequently in the columns of almost every Indian journal of note. The charges against him are plain and open. And it only requires for him to defend himself from them instead of waiting and in our opinion most absurdly waiting, for the challenge. Why the gauntlet has been thrown into the arena for months past. But Mr. Bhavnagri has not yet had the courage to pick it up. Let him do so, and then those who threw it down will know how best to deal with it again. He simply begs the question when he challenges those opposed to him in politics. The last have challenged him for 18 months past, but hitherto there has been no response whatever. That is the real situation. Let Mr. Bhavnagri reply to the challenge and the challengers will then be fully prepared to meet him.

THE HINDOOSTAN (December 6, 1896).

The true aspect of the honours done to
Mr. Bhavnagri.

Various were the sentiments expressed by the public press as soon as it was known that Mr. Bhavnagri was coming to India. Those connected with him set on foot a movement to accord him a public reception; but the persons concerned in that movement were wise enough to give up the idea in time. We did not wish to say anything against Mr. Bhavnagri personally. On the other hand, we suggested at the very commencement that there was no need to indite anything against Mr. Bhavnagri or to oppose him. The only thing that we objected to was his being recognised as the representative of the people of India. Current events, however, have forced us to take up the pen once more. Immediately after his arrival, Mr. Bhavnagri left for Bhavnagar, and there was then no movement of an objectionable nature set on foot. But latterly, either his aspiration for fame or the devotion of his adherents to their hero, seems to have taken a new turn. The English dailies began to publish long reports of the addresses given to him at Bhavnagar. Also there began to be published magnified versions of the receptions held by about a score or so of acquaintances at a few way-side stations in his journey through Kathiawar.

As if this were not sufficient, at the instigation of some of his flattering friends, a public gathering in honour of Mr. Bhavnagri was held in Bombay on Friday last, on a circular invitation signed by about 38 Mahomedan gentlemen. Advantage was taken of this occasion by an attempt being made to recognise Mr. Bhavnagri as the representative for India. O, that Mr. Bhavnagri were in reality the representative of the country! We are, however, very sorry to say that Mr. Bhavnagri has not only never stood by India, but also on several occasions his policy has been directed to please the officials at the sacrifice of the interests of India. It is in consequence of this that fears are entertained of the people of England being misled into construing the views of Mr. Bhavnagar as those of all India, by such reports in the dailies. At the Muzzaffarbad Hall gathering the principal political leaders of Bombay as well as the supporters of the Congress were conspicuous by their absence. This fact clearly indicates that a large class of the people of India take no part in such addresses and gatherings.

In this address Mr. Bhavnagri was extolled for his deep and clear reasoning and serene temper. It was also added that India should not count upon the support of any political party at home. Mr. Bhavnagri in reply said that those who hoped for gain by joining the Liberals were wrong. We are glad that what Mr. Bhavnagri has said is quite at one with the oft repeated views of the Congress. Mr. Bhavnagri has also tried his best to tickle the Mahomedans. But in spite of a speech of about half-an-hour's duration, he did not take the trouble to throw out even a passing hint at the line of policy already adopted, or to be adopted, by him to further the advancement of India. The only thing he said was that the line which he follows upon Indian questions is taken up after long deliberation, and a conviction of its being the right one. What does this signify? Neither we nor his opponents say that Mr. Bhavnagri acts against the dictates of his conscience, but the defect is that of experience and knowledge. The only way to supply that defect and to be recognised as the representative of India, is to join the Congress, take part in its deliberations, consider the views advanced by that body, adopt those that appear right to him, and if any appear improper, try to get them discussed and improved. Only when he does so, will he be considered to be on a par with Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji.

THE MUMBAI VAIBHAV, OR THE GLORY OF
BOMBAY (December 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri, M.P.

It must be said that the too pompous a reception that is being accorded to this gentleman by his friends here and abroad is quite a detestable humbug. His views are narrow and he is quite unfit to represent India. The Conservatives at home in selecting Mr. Bhavnagri to oppose Mr. Dadabhai, even at the cost of their professed doctrine of receiving no "blackman" in their ranks have simply brought themselves into ridicule. Puffed up with the hope of a seat in Parliament, this ordinarily educated simpleton of a politician began to rave at random and succeeded in his attempt by abusing the Indian National Congress and its leaders such as Mr. Dadabhai and others. At present he has returned to India with the principal object of educating himself in the affairs of this country, and seems in common with his friends to have the ardent desire of getting respect from the real leaders of the people. The public, however, have found him in his true colours, and from a conviction of his being a politician opposed to their national interest, will take no notice of him. This M. P. has made himself conspicuous as the enemy of Indian interests, but has he compensated his misdoings by one good act? Need there be a justification then for the action of Indian patriots that recognise their own value and rights when they discard him after his vile insinuations at the time of his election, and after that, in a speech at a feast given him by Anglo-Indians, that the demands of the National Congress are quite out of place, and that its movers are a party of selfish and disloyal agitators. The chief demand of the Congress for local representation in the Indian Councils has already been complied with by Government; the propriety of separating the judicial from the executive functions has been acknowledged by Mr. Bhavnagri in person, and the proposal for holding simultaneous examinations for competition in the Indian Civil Service has received the approbation of the House of Commons itself. It is plainly evident, then that Mr. Bhavnagri's statement with regard to the impropriety of the Congress demands is simply meaningless. He voted for the acquisition of Chitral and saddling the expenses of its expedition on India; but he has put in no question in the interests of the Indian people or done a single action for their benefit. Hq

possesses no Indian political career. India, then, may expect no profit from this unpatriotic and thoughtless prattler. It is natural, therefore, that thoughtful Indian patriots being fully aware that Mr. Bhavnagri is not only against all proper Indian political aspirations but is a tool in the hands of those Anglo-Indians that try to keep down the natives of India,—pay no regard to him. In short Mr. Bhavnagri does not deserve any respect from the people of India, nor is he fit to undertake any work in the field of Indian political affairs.

INDU PRAKASH (December 7, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri's Bogus Demonstrations.

Hitherto we have not said anything about Mr. Bhavnagri and his actions, for we considered that a man who has got into Parliament has a right to a public reception and to have his doings small and great chronicled in the dailies, especially when they are in want of "copy." The Bombay public, however, did not give him a reception. The M.P. need not have felt disappointed; for he had never tried to win the confidence of the Bombay public. But Mr. Bhavnagri has acquired greatness and he means to keep it on any account. Thus his disappointment in Bombay was explained away by an excuse that he himself did not wish to have any reception as he was in mourning for his mother and also his patron, the late Maharaja of Bhavnagar. Well, if he was in mourning then, we believe he must be in mourning even now. And so his desire to have no reception at the time would remain the same even to-day. And his friends, if they are real friends, would rather like to respect his sentiments than drag him through entertainments and receptions while his heart was sick and his body frail on account of the terrible disasters that had fallen on him. But no. Neither Mr. Bhavnagri nor his friends had the least scruples on that head. The violent fit of grief was over as soon as a wreath of flowers was placed in the temple erected in honour of the late Maharajah. No sooner this act was done than the mourning ceased and Mr. Bhavnagri was ready to receive the tributes of praise, admiration and flattery of his friends and their followers.

What all this does signify is that Mr. Bhavnagri wanted time to organise the gatherings of which we have heard of late. His friends would have done so in fact. But in Bombay they were defeated. So Mr. Bhavnagri had no other course open to him. He stands as a representative of India. Some people at least must recognise him as such. Though Bombay failed, there was loyal Bhavnagar which has ever been conspicuous for its indifference to politics and its high proficiency in intrigues. Thus speeches and addresses were reported by wire from places which were unknown in Bombay and more so in India for their political activity. We have no reason to doubt that these meetings were wired by Reuter to England. Now, Bhavnagri will be enabled to tell his constituency that he represents India even better than

Dadabhai did as he has received addresses from Bhavnagar villages where Dadabhai never dreamt of going.

This highly organised triumphal procession at last reached Bombay. And here was waiting for him a grand entertainment from the Bombay Mahomedans. We had no intention of saying anything against Mr. Bhavnagri or his Mahomedan friends. Had they kept quiet or had they not given publicity to their lucubrations in the dailies, we should have been spared the painful task of criticising them. If their sayings and doings provoke any adverse criticism, they have got to thank themselves for it.

Before we come to the entertainment, it is necessary for us to make a few preliminary observations about the political state of the country. If we roughly divide the population into the agriculturists professional men, and merchants and traders, we shall find that the agriculturists, though suffering from the abuses of British rule, do not yet know their status as British Indians and bear the wrongs patiently; they do not know what political agitation means. Coming next to the merchants and traders, especially in the large towns, we shall find that they are pre-eminently the persons who have derived the greatest advantages from the British raj. These men, as a rule, have received no higher education, and being happy and contented do not aspire to take part in the administration of the country. Their highest ambition usually aims at a Bahadurship or a J.P., and therefore leads them to curry favour with the official class. Thus it remains practically with the professional classes, the men of law and medicine, graduates of Universities, and other men of culture, to represent the country, in politics and to lead the various movements in the country, political, social and literary. The Indian National Congress consists of such men; the National Social Conference is represented by a more progressive section of them; Educational and Industrial Conferences are impossible without their co-operation. In fact, no intellectual movement in India can be made without them. As a rule, they are poor; but at present they alone represent India in political matters. Any one who poses forth as a representative of these people should receive the ungrudging acknowledgment of the people. Mr. Dadabhai had it: Mr. Bhavnagri never had it: and if he stoops to such practices as we have mentioned above he will never be recognised by this class.

The way is now clear to take a review of the representative Mahomedans who had assembled to do honour to Mr. Bhavnagri. One or two of them have reached a high position, some of them have received titles from Government. But none of them has joined or led any political movement either national or sectional. The meeting was emphatically an assemblage of Mr. Bhavnagri's personal friends and their retinue and followers who had never heard of British Parliament or—shall we whisper it?—of Mr. Bhavnagri himself. A few rich merchants, some Government officers, a few unknown Europeans—several Parsees, personal friends of Mr. Bhavnagri represented, as an inspired report in the local Gazette put it, the whole Native community of Bombay. But when the tagrag and bobtail assemble in number there is no necessity of representation. Why not proclaim that the masses of Bombay actually assembled to do honour to the Bhavnagar prodigy? They were to do honour to Mr. Bhavnagri along with the distinguished friends, men who superintend stabling arrangements, men who supply meat to the Bombay markets, and generally men who look to the comfort and convenience of the Bombay public. As a social gathering the meeting was a tremendous success: it was a choice selection of the representatives of the upper ten and of the lower thousands: it gave a remarkable object lesson of the universal brotherhood prevalent in Bombay society—certainly of the organising capacity of Mr. Bhavnagri's friend.

Lets us leave the meeting and examine the speeches. Mir Aun Ali is an esteemable young man, one of the few Mahomedans of Bombay who have received European education. Mr. Bhavnagri is his personal friend. But he spoke at the meeting, not for himself but for the Mahomedan community also. Now, we should like to ask Mir Aun Ali what Mr. Bhavnagri's services were in his political capacity or indeed in any capacity, which entitled him to receive the homage of the Mahomedan community? What has he done for the Indians? What are his political principles? What are his sound ways of thinking? What are the suggestions which Government have accepted because they came peculiarly from Mr. Bhavnagri? What is the 'solid and substantial work' which Mr. Bhavnagri has done? Will Mr. Aun Ali enlighten his own co-religionists and indeed the various Indian communities which are

beholden to Mr. Bhavnagri as to the precise nature of his services? We have never heard of them. We should very much like to know them from Mr. Aun Ali; for it has always been our desire to give even the devil his due—and we shall not certainly fail to do justice to Mr. Bhavnagri, the friend of the Mahomedan community in particular and of all Indians in general.

Alas! we have often found that our Mahomedan countrymen do not exercise their intelligence properly. First of all, they are apathetic, and are disposed to follow blindly wherever they are led. Have they thought for one moment why they should do honour to Mr. Bhavnagri? If there is any motive for doing honour to him, that is found in the last portion of the address when they ask him to be an exponent of their views in regard to the Turkish question. They have only to see how powerless Mr. Bhavnagri is to influence the British Cabinet in its diplomatic relations with the Powers by contrasting his present promise with his past utterances on the subject. Has he ever made a speech in Parliament or elsewhere advocating the continuance of the friendship between England and Turkey? Let him make such a speech and his constituency will know how to make matters lively for him. What we say is this: The Mahomedans of India have a right to express their views on the Turkish question; they should give vent to their sentiments in no unequivocal manner; let the British Government know what they think of the matter; let them make an agitation in India, and if they believe that they can preserve their Empire in Turkey through the influence of those who took it away from them in India, let them certainly appeal to British Government for the preservation of the Turkish Empire and the protection of the Sultan. But we doubt if Mr. Bhavnagri is the person to adequately represent their feelings in the matter. He has not done so before; and we doubt if he would be able to keep his promise in its entirety, to keep it in the same spirit in which the Mahomedans have understood him to give it.

Let us leave the subject, and examine Mr. Bhavnagri's statements from the points of view of truth and honesty. We give all credit to Mr. Bhavnagri for his intention to foster amiable feelings between Parsees and Mahomedans. But he could have very well done it without giving expression to

statements which are neither true nor honest. As for the existence of amiable relations between the Mahomedan and Parsee communities one has to study the history of the first two Bombay riots to find the real truth. No doubt respectable men of both communities deplored the riots, but they could not prevent them. And that was because there was no spirit of amicability existing between the two communities. Then he refers to examples in history, which are known only to himself, showing that positions and missions of trust were given to Parsees by eminent Mahomedan emperors. The 'historical and practical ties of friendship' from remote times unto the present day which Mr. Bhavnagri mentions in his speech are myths. We do not know what is meant by practical ties of friendship—but if he simply means by that expression "Do me here and I'll do you there" there may be some men belonging to the Moslem race who are bound by practical ties to Mr. Bhavnagri. But this is merely, as Mr. Bhavnagri himself says, 'the personal and commercial relation' subsisting between them. Mr. Bhavnagri misrepresents his political opponents when he implicates, by taking all credit to himself for keeping India out of party politics, that the British Committee of the Indian National Congress wants to make Indian questions party questions. The Indian Parliamentary Party started by Sir William Wedderburn has tried to get men from both parties and has succeeded in getting them too. If Mr. Bhavnagri is not a member of that body, it is his own fault, his own exclusive ambition and petty jealousy. Surely he alone looks to his own interests first and Indian interests afterwards if he looks to them at all.

Mr. Bhavnagri talks of his own election as a matter of 'national importance.' Pity that he did not let some of his admirers say that; it would have come with better grace from them than from him. If an ambitious Parsee, with some brains and a large purse, backed powerfully by an Indian Prince and deriving support mostly from his purse, insinuates himself into English society and gets himself returned to Parliament, the event is, no doubt, of supreme importance to himself. Mr. Bhavnagri can do a great deal to himself in that position. It has already brought him honour and distinction. But that his about all. He has not and cannot serve the Indian people. His ways of dealing, his

ways of talking about Indians to his European friends, his method of treating Indian subjects and Indian politicians on the platform and in private are entirely repugnant to the self-respecting Indian public, and will never receive the stamp of national recognition. Let him have one hundredth part of the devotion and loyalty of Dadabhai towards the Indians, to the people who made the continuance of his race possible in this country, and then he will be received with acclamation and honour in the land of his birth. But if he will stick to crooked ways and organise or get his friends to organise mass meetings and public receptions of a bogus character, he will simply bring discredit on himself.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (December 8, 1896).

A word as to the "great" demonstrations and enthusiasms and so forth which marked Mr. Bhavnagri's progress to and from Bhavnagar where he went to mourn with the son of his deceased patron. It is intolerable that this canting M.P. should arrogate to himself the role of patriot and disinterested friend of India. Not a single word has he uttered which could be reasonably construed into an expression of sympathy with the party of progress. We are sick of his platitudes, of this faithful henchman of the Tory party endeavouring to keep Indian affairs out of party, and of his great and signal services to us. So long as Mr. Bhavnagri chooses not to tell us what his views are on the great questions the Congress has pushed into the forefront, so long he remains out of the pale of true patriotism. That is the test. If he dare, let him meet his critics face to face. If not, let him drop the cant he delights in. At any rate, let him be assured that it deceives nobody.

THE ADVOCATE OF INDIA (December 8, 1896).

The Bhavnagri Boom.

It is to be hoped that the Bhavnagri boom is now over. It began months ago with the telegram in which the enterprising Reuter told us, as an item of our European news for the day, that the Honourable Gentleman was starting on a short visit to India in order that he might study for himself on the spot questions affecting India that were likely to come up in the approaching Session of Parliament. Disregarding for the nonce Kings and Emperors, Reuter, for reasons which we cannot fathom, kept his telegraphic eye on Mr. Bhavnagri all the way; and from Aden we learned of the enthusiasm of the natives of that place with regard to him. His reception in Bombay was a quiet one. Every preparation, we are told, had been made to give him a welcome before which the memory of that accorded by the city to Mr. Dadabhai should grow pale. But fate would not have it so. The fact was that as the steamer approached the harbour Mr. Bhavnagri's visit of enquiry and study suddenly assumed the character of a mourning journey overland and sea to the last resting place of the late Maharaja of Bhavnagar. At his special desire, conveyed in some mysterious way from the ship, the crowds dispersed, and Mr. Bhavnagri sorrowfully landed and went to Matheran. He began his investigations on that short journey, satisfying himself, we believe, by personal inspection of the ludicrously exaggerated character of the complaints raised by his friends of the Congress party with regard to the treatment of the third-class passengers on railways in India. Mr. Bhavnagri reviewed and passed the impugned arrangements. After a somewhat puzzling interval on the hills, Mr. Bhavnagri paid his visit of condolence to the present Thakore Sahab of Bhavnagar, and then the telegraphic fun began again. From Dhola Junction, from Ningala, from Sihore, from Botad Station, benighted Bombay heard in quick succession of the many proofs supplied in this important centres of Mr. Bhavnagri's "great popularity." She roused herself from her apathy, and, in what Mr. Bhavnagri has himself deigned to describe as the "remarkable gatherings" on Friday last and of yesterday, she has, if we are to believe all we read, set the seal of her own august approval on a patriot's brow.

Honest scepticism, if there be any, as to the real character of these two final demonstrations must, we think, yield to a careful perusal of all that Mr. Bhavnagri himself had to say about them. He ought to know, and he will be found assuring us, for example, that Friday's meeting was a "remarkable gathering, which has met to celebrate an event of national importance in a spirit of patriotism which it has been the ambition of my life to see fostered among the numerous communities of India." That is good, but there is more to follow. It is doubtful if these worthy Mahomedan gentlemen quite knew all that they were doing on Friday. They and we have only to ask Mr. Bhavnagri about it. "Regardless of race distinction, rising above the level of petty jealousies, indeed as a protest against them, and brushing aside minor differences of opinion such as one must encounter in the field of political thought and action, you have manfully stretched out to me the right hand of fellowship which I grasp with all my heart." This, it seems, was what these men were fearlessly doing on Friday, and they did not go without their reward. From his place in Parliament Mr. Bhavnagri is going to back up the "statesman-like grasp" of things shown by the Mahomedans of Bombay who gave him an evening party, and demand that nothing—not even, we presume the slaughter in cold blood of five thousand helpless Armenians in the streets of Constantinople—shall "impair the solidity and continuance of Mahomedan rule in Turkey." It is a brief of which we wish him much joy.

The same very welcome spirit of frank explanation of what it is all about pervaded Mr. Bhavnagri's speech last night. Lest the gentlemen who were in front of him should entertain any doubt of their own claim to speak for Bombay, he assured them, that they numbered among themselves "all those who are representative of the greatness, the honour, and the influence of the first city of India." We should not have thought it from the list, but there it is in black and white in the speech. Perhaps part of the explanation of the mystery lies in the reference to the several well-known Hindoo gentlemen (names not given), who "entered the marquee after the termination of the dinner, and followed the postprandial speeches with much interest." Otherwise our Hindoo brethren will have to put up with this very authoritative

exclusion of their community from the ranks of those who are representative of the greatness, the honour, and the influence of Bombay. So much for the meeting. The committee who had, with some considerable pains, we believe, brought it together, came in next for their meed of praise. They were, it seems, "as influential a committee as has ever been formed in this capital of Western India for a similar purpose, composed of level-headed men of all the races inhabiting it, whose ripe experience of public life and sound views on public matters lend to the event an importance far beyond my deserts." Again we should not have thought it from the list, and our memory goes back to a good many committees "formed for a similar purpose." But again we find it in black and white in Mr. Bhavnagri's speech, and there is no gainsaying that. There never was such unanimity of praise anywhere. In fact, we are left in a state of agreeable uncertainty as to whether this meeting was held by the committee and subscribers in honour of Mr. Bhavnagri, or Mr. Bhavnagri in honour of the Committee and subscribers. They united to say that he was a good fellow, and he had not words in which to express his sense of their many virtues. With both parties to this boom so thoroughly well satisfied with each other, is it, we again ask, too much to hope that we shall hear no more of it; in Bombay at least?

BANQUETING MR. BHAVNAGRI.

SPEECH BY THE M. P.

A few energetic admirers of Mr. Bhavnagri succeeded in providing an entertainment for the Member for Bethnal Green at Sir Dinshah M. Petit's house last night. There were about two hundred and fifty gentlemen present, many of these being English gentlemen representing the official classes—the Army, Navy and Commerce. Of the natives, with few exceptions, they were composed of gentlemen who, as a rule, give political matters a wide berth. They were in no way representative of those who have been most active in the work of throwing light on the political requirements of the Empire. There was almost an entire absence of representatives of the class who are the only evidence that political activity exists in the city. Sir Jamssetjee Jejeebhoy, Bart., presided. The guest of the evening put in an appearance to the strains of "The Conquering Hero

Comes," performed by a European band. After an excellent repast the business of the evening was commenced.

SIR JAMSETJEE'S WELCOME.

The chairman, in a graceful speech, felt sure Mr. Bhavnagri would, by his services to the country, gain the regard and esteem not only of Bombay, but, in the near future, of all India, which sentiment and hope was cheered. Then he told the M. P. for Bethnal Green he was a lucky man in achieving such an unique honour and success. It was also a compliment to Bombay, and he trusted that Mr. Bhavnagri would make the most of his opportunities and look to things in India as well as Bethnal Green. (Here there were cheers.) After touching on Mr. Bhavnagri's "remarkable talents" and "stubborn perseverance," the chairman said he would have rejoiced to see Mr. Dadabhai Nowrojee ranged on the Liberal side and Mr. Bhavnagri on the Conservative side, working for the common weal. However, he welcomed their guest "bearing in mind that whether he hails or not under Conservative banners, the party politics of Britain can have nothing to do with the social and political amelioration of India." With a well-turned compliment for his work in the past, the chairman spoke of the hopes entertained for the future, and concluded an interesting speech with his best wishes for Mr. Bhavnagri's health and prosperity.

MR. BHAVNAGRI, M.P.

"BRAVO," BHAVNAGRI.

"Bravo, bravo," and prolonged cheers greeted Mr. Bhavnagri on rising. He spoke a column and a half about himself and his enemies, and lead off with a lament that he had not had his own way, or there would have been no tamasha that night. "But a man in my position has to consult something else than his own selfish pursuits and pleasures. (Hear, hear.) He has to take counsel with those competent to give advice as to how he can best discharge the duty he owes to the country and the people who have such high claims upon his devotion and services as India and her inhabitants have upon mine." (Cheers)—Mr. Bhavnagri's duties went further; it was his duty towards those assembled to utter not a syllable but what should express gratitude, but owing to a distant rumbling of "detraction and envy," he was bound just to mention it,

although not a word of complaint on that score should invade their ears. "Hear, hear," echoed the audience.

MOMENTS IN AN M. P.'S LIFE.

Still on the "duty" question, he said: "I know right well that fame is half dis fame, but that there are moments in a man's life when, the sense of duty done, a firm resolve to do it in future, and the approving voice of friends and fellow-men wipe away those years of trouble and anxiety, of misrepresentation and adverse criticism and envy (hear, hear) which fall to the lot of men who would serve their country's cause without special reference to the gallery. (Loud cheers). Such moments and such rewards are mine at the present juncture, when all those who are representative of the greatness, the honour, and the influence of the first city in India have combined to congratulate me on my election to the Imperial Legislature, and to express their confidence in the sincerity of my desire to serve the great interests of this vast country as my humble powers would permit of my doing from my place in that august assembly." (Cheers.)

BLANDISHMENTS OFF.

Pride and satisfaction occupied the speaker for some little time; he got back to personal considerations and said: "Sir, that the significance of the efforts which have resulted in this memorable gathering is more far-reaching than that. (Hear, hear.) It is, as you have remarked, an admission of faith on the part of the representatives of important sections of the people of India that her salvation and amelioration depend upon the good-will of both parties that alternately sway the destinies of the British Empire, and that an inhabitant of India is capable of serving efficiently her true interest, no matter under the banner of which party he has succeeded in gaining admission within the historic walls of St. Stephens, provided he brings to bear upon his work there a clear grasp of Indian problems, and a love for the country strong enough to resist the force of party considerations and the blandishments of hollow fame. (Loud cheers.) If my coming among you furnishes an opportunity for the declaration of such a wholesome belief, and if in your united discretion you create the occasion for it by making me the object of your welcome greeting, it would ill-become me to refuse to respond to your wish that I should lay aside personal considerations and meet you publicly amid such splendid surroundings as these."

DON'T HIT BELOW THE BELT.

After referring to his action in Parliament on Indian questions and parenthetically remarking how easy it is to get oneself voted a bore in the house, he got back to his friend-the enemy, and indicated the lines on which he should like the game to be played, incorporating the rules framed by the Marquis of Queensbury in so far as they applied to hitting below the belt and discouraged the bringing of concealed cutlery into the fray. This is how he said it: "If there be any who, after due deliberation, are honestly persuaded that I have failed in this or that particular to discharge my duty by India, to them I say here publicly: 'Ask, and it shall be explained; lay down well-defined issues, and ask in a spirit of fair enquiry, uninfluenced by unworthy motives, or preconceived notion; come into a fair field, with no hidden weapons and no intention to strike below the belt, and I am ready to prove that in all I have done I have followed the dictates of my conscience with the welfare of India for my only object.'" If these regulations are observed, Mr. Bhavnagri feels it is odds on him being able to get home first, because, in the few encounters he has had, judges have held that he is able to fulfil the contract.

THE END.

"I am scarcely able to express my gratitude as I ought to, but I hope, by the grace of God, to be able to requite your trust in some slight degree by such endeavours as my limited powers will permit of my making in the cause of India. May she flourish for ever under the banner of Britain! (Cheers.) May famine and pestilence be averted from her gates, and may the thoughts and energies of her children be so directed into channels of self-help and mutual co-operation and good-will, while a great peace has fallen upon the land under the protection of a mighty power, that from one corner of the Empire to another might be heard the voice of joy and the voice of gladness as it has never been heard before!"

Dr. John Pollen also made a humorous speech, but his effort was devoted to the Army and Navy.

The morning paper says "the party separated at a late hour."

THE PRABHAKAR (December 9, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri and the Mahomedans.

Nothing could give one cause for greater surprise than the fact that the Mahomedans as a community should now cast off their habitual slough of supineness and let alonism with a view to give a cordial welcome home and a congratulatory address to the second Indian M. P. There was nothing incongruous in the project itself except the circumstance that a community which has allowed itself to be dormant in the midst of the surrounding political regeneration of the other communities should suddenly awake into an active political demonstration at this particular juncture. We heartily congratulate them on their awaking and thank Mr. Bhavnagri for being instrumental in getting the " Sleeper awakened." The address and its reply are replete with platitudes which form no news nor are enlightened reading. The whole affair was tame. Coming to the question, why Mr. Bhavnagri was apostrophised by our Mahomedan brethren, we hold that the clue to the elucidation of this mysterious transaction may be sought for in the antipathy towards the Congress on the part of both Mr. Bhavnagri and the Mahomedans. The birds of the same feather did indeed flock together on Friday evening last for the purpose of mutual adulation and adoration. A fortnight has not elapsed since the pompous declaration of our Moslem fellow-subjects against the Congress. Mr. Bhavnagri's Anti-Congress views are proverbial. There is truly a timely meet, the Congress coming off about the end of the month. We hope that they will compare notes, and after patient consideration learn to appreciate the Congress programme. Last Friday was undoubtedly a Mahomedan demonstrations but it was significantly conspicuous by the absence of the literate and the politically renowned members of that community. Will Mr. Bhavnagri note this ?

THE MADRAS STANDARD (December 9, 1896).

The Bhavnagri Dinner.

The long telegram from our Bombay correspondent, which appears elsewhere, gives us a pretty fair idea of the feelings with which the preposterous pretensions of Mr,

Bhavnagri are viewed by all whose concern for the public welfare does not embrace only purposes which serve a personal end. It is sad to contemplate the sort of moral and intellectual atrophy which must have overtaken one who, with such a record as he has, and with such platitudes and vacuities as form his political stock-in-trade, vainly imagines himself entitled to the affectionate regard of his countrymen. On one point, unfortunately for our modest Parliamentary, contemporary verdict is decisive and unequivocal: and that is that his claims to public confidence have not the slightest rational or national validity. The indiscretions of Mr. Bhavnagri's "friends and admirers" and the impudence of the patriotic Parliamentary have necessitated plain speaking on our part. What is Mr. Bhavnagri's attitude towards New India? Will anybody give up, what remains up to the hour of our going to Press, a grand secret zealously guarded? It is intolerable that this necessary piece of information should be withheld by Mr. Bhavnagri, as well as by his "friends and admirers," while we have no end of vague sympathy with *the cause of India*. Were Mr. Bhavnagri an honest politician, and his regard for the interest he professes so much willingness to serve, real or genuine, we should have had a plain, unvarnished statement of his political faith. But long waiting has proved unavailing, and if Mr. Bhavnagri will not give up the truth as to his own position, why then it is time the public should tell Mr. Bhavnagri as publicly as possible that he is a—humbug!

THE TRIBUNE (December 9, 1896).

Poor Mr. Bhavnagri! He is a Member of Parliament, and since he is in India something must be done to remind people that he is the second Indian M. P. The ball opened with a dinner at a Masonic Lodge, and now it appears 'the Mahomedan community' of Bombay have entertained him at an evening party and presented him with an address. As on the first occasion, so on this, carefully drafted telegrams have been sent to Anglo-Indian papers only. It looks rather odd that Indian newspapers should not be favoured with an account of the doings of an Indian Member of Parliament. 'The Mahomedan community of Bombay' is rather a large order, and we should not be surprised if it turn out to be the same community that 'disowned' the Hon. Mr. R. M. Sayani and the Congress in the same breath. Curiosity as to who composed this great Mahomedan community of Bombay is not likely to be satisfied as not a single name is mentioned and is not likely to be mentioned. But we may be certain that such Mahomedan gentlemen as Mr. Budruddin Tyebji, Mr. R. M. Sayani, Mr. Abdulla Dharamsi, the President of the Bombay Municipality, and a score of others, whose claims to represent the Mahomedan community of Bombay are beyond question, must have been conspicuous by their absence. Mr. Bhavnagri made a speech and part of that has been also telegraphed. There is nothing in it that calls for any remark, except that it is very much like Mr. Bhavnagri himself. We know that he is not a man to be easily put out, but he must have sense enough to see that it is not wise for him to attempt to pose as a publicman or a patriot in this country. He can only look ludicrously small in comparison with Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and he ought to rest content that Bethnal-Green and many Anglo-Indians have accepted him.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (Bombay Correspondent)
(December 10, 1896).

All show and Humbug.

The other event of the week was a demonstration by a section of the backward class of Mahomedans in the city. They are no doubt a rich and influential class, but utterly unenlightened. Very few of them are educated and most of them are police-ridden. Their abject slavishness to the Police authorities is indeed most revolting. That men of wealth and independence should be so pusillanimous and be terrorised by the police is most deplorable. We can only pity their plight. They say *Johookum* to anything and everything the Police demand. This section issued invitations to all Bombay and its wife to congratulate our precious M. P. for East Bethnal Green. The entertainment came off on Friday last. You must have already noticed the flaming account given of it in the columns of your English daily contemporaries. But don't you rely on them. They are as usual highly coloured reports tinged by the roseate views of the writers who are bent on "writing up" Mr. Bhavnagri and parading him in Bombay at least as the showman parades a well-dressed monkey or frog. As to the address and the reply I need not criticise it. You will know how to do it. But our sides are split with laughter at all the bathos in which Mr. Bhavnagri indulged about the cordial relations from times immemorial of Parsis and Mahomedans. I think after this we shall have to re-write history in a Bhavnagri fashion where we must of course bid farewell to truth and welcome its opposite. Another statement was equally legendary. Fancy his talking of "Hindu" demonstration! I am tempted to say confound his impudence. Which d—ls of Hindus paid him compliments. Why *some* of the obliged and grateful proteges of his in the Durbar Bhavnagr. Call this a *Hindu* demonstration! As well call it a universal demonstration of all India. But to such legendary shifts the poor neglected and forsaken Mr. Bhavnagri has had to resort in the absence of any genuine representative from a *single section* of the great Hindu community of the entire Bombay Presidency. I may tell you what is an open secret. Some friends of Mr. Bhavnagri sounded a leading Parsi gentleman in Poona whether the Municipality of the City would give him a welcome! What a humiliation in the first place to

beg for such an honour? But let that pass. Let me at once inform you of the reply. It was a stout *non-possumus*. How can the enlightened and progressive Brahman whom Mr. Bhavnagri has for years denounced and abused especially at an obscure Parsee Club in Mathews Road, ever have the self-respect to give welcome to such a man and that too in the very hotbed of progressive Hinduism. But there is yet another anecdote in reference to this Mahomedan humbug of an entertainment which I must not omit to mention. I give it for what it may be worth. It is this: A certain highly influential spiritual Mahomedan had a case in Bhavnagar. It was a shady or shady case in which something like 4 lakhs of Rupees are said to have been expended in litigation. It must have been a wonderful case which cost so much. Anyhow the Court decided in his favour. The Mahomedan was grateful and in gratitude asked his porteges and followers to give Mr. Bhavnagri an entertainment. Of course Mr. Bhavnagri did not decide the case. But as a big whilom official of Bhavnagar the gentleman thought it would look so nice and well. Truth is stranger than fiction, &c., &c.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (December 10, 1896).

The *Advocate of India* prefaces its report of the Bhavnagri dinner as follows:—"A few energetic admirers of Mr. Bhavnagri succeeded in providing an entertainment for the Member for Bethual Green at Sir Dinshah M. Petit's house last night. There were present about two hundred and fifty gentlemen many of *these being English gentlemen representing the official classes, the Army, Navy and Commerce*. Of the Natives, with few exceptions, they were composed of gentlemen who, as a rule, *give political matters a wide berth*. They were in no way representative of those who have been most active in the work of throwing light on the political requirements of the Empire. *There was almost an entire absence of representatives of the class who are the only evidence that political activity exists in the city.*" The italics in the above are ours. Comment is needless.

"Public Honour" to Mr. Bhavnagri.

TO THE EDITOR, JAM-N-JAMSHED, BOMBAY.

SIR,—As expected, the private dinner to Mr. Bhavnagri given by a few friends and admirers has now assumed the shape of a "public entertainment." The small affair has

been magnified in the Anglo-Indian Press in a manner that excites the laughter of all sensible people. The long telegrams published in other mofussil papers also make it appear as a "Public entertainment to Mr. Bhavnagri." But let us see how many were present at this public entertainment and whether the European gentlemen who joined the dinner were there as "friends and admirers" who had subscribed towards the entertainment or as invited guests. From Mr. Caine's letters and from what we hear every day in the town it would appear that the greater majority of the European gentlemen present went there as guests invited by the committee. But we may be all wrong, and in that case I think Messrs. Dosabhai Framji & Co. ought to be good enough to take the trouble of falsifying us by informing us how many of the Europeans were present as subscribers and how many as guests. For then alone can we be able to judge whether the dinner be public or private. Last October on the occasion of the marriage of my cousin my uncle invited about a thousand gentlemen to dinner in highly illumined and well-decorated premises and a long account of the entertainment was published in the English papers. Can the entertainment in honour of the wedding of my cousin be called a public entertainment? If the dinner in honour of Mr. Bhavnagri be considered public why not should that in honour of my cousin's wedding be also styled a public entertainment.

The enterprise of Anglo-Indian newspapers on the occasion of this dinner was altogether unique. The entertainment concluded at half past eleven o'clock at night at Walkeshwar, and yet a full and lengthy account of the dinner appeared the next morning in both the Anglo-Indian dailies. How creditable to their reporters! All honour to them for their industry! To publish the anxiously expected reports in the course of a few hours to gratify the impatient curiosity of the reading public, what a marvel of short-hand reporting! The public properly appreciate the enterprise of a press that at six in the morning supplies them with full reports of events happening late the previous night. Can the native press, however boastful of its wide circulation, show a record like this? But why multiply words? Least said is best said. It is a pity that the English gentlemen who spoke at the entertainment have not been reported at all.

Up till now I have been a strong friend of the Congress, but I must painfully acknowledge that my views are gradually undergoing modification. We ask for many great rights and powers, but what will they all lead to? Just take the case of the Anglo-Indian Press. Native reporters have been admitted to the Anglo-Indian Press with the result that we are treated to garbled reports and incorrect versions of things that happen. In the *Jame Jamshed's* report of the meeting in honour of Dr. Bahadurji, I read that when Mr. Wadya referred by name to a certain individual, he provoked hisses and cries of shame, while an Anglo-Indian paper told its readers that the name of that individual was greeted with loud applause. How discordant versions! Yet, in justice to your reporter, I must mention, as I was present at the meeting, that his report was the correct one. A volume might be written upon "reporting" as understood in the Anglo-Indian papers, and I would suggest Mr. Wacha or Dr. Bahadurji to undertake the work. Can Mr. Wacha hereafter advocate the employment of natives to responsible posts? But there are natives and natives.—Yours, etc.,

JAN-BHEDU,

BOMBAY, 11th December 1896. i.e., One in the secret.

THE BOMBAY GAZETTE (December 11, 1896).

A Challenge to Mr. Bhavnagri.

Speech of the Mr. H. A. Wadya at a public meeting held in Bombay on 9th December 1896 to welcome Dr. K. N. Bahadurji from his public mission to England in connection with the question of the Reform of the Medical administration of India and to give expression to the public appreciation of his valuable services in that respect. The resolution which has been entrusted to me is in these terms: "That this public meeting desires to give expression to their high appreciation of the valuable services rendered by Dr. K. N. Bahadurji in the cause of the Indian Medical Reform in India, and to mark their high sense of the able and admirable manner in which he gave his evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, and discharged his important mission to England." (Loud cheers.) I feel some diffidence in responding to the call made upon me, because

I cannot pretend to understand the question with which Dr. Bahadurji has identified himself so well as many of you in this hall can understand it, nor can I claim the privilege of his personal friendship, as so many of you, who have known him longer and so actively co-operated with him, can claim it. But I understand that I have been called upon to take the part entrusted to me, because I happened to be in England at the time when Dr. Bahadurji was there, and I accept the task with pleasure, because I was in a manner a personal witness to the way in which Dr. Bahadurji fulfilled the mission which took him to England, and there is no one in this hall who can admire more than I do the ability, perseverance, and zeal with which he did his work, and which has enabled him, in the opinion of many competent judges, to bring the cause of medical reform within a measurable distance of success. (Loud cheers.) I do not propose to describe in detail that cause, because it is well known to you all, and Dr. Bahadurji also has described it this evening in his own admirable way. (Cheers.) Dr. Bahadurji does not attack individuals, but only a system. His contention is that the monopoly which he attacks, however justifiable and beneficial it might have been at one time, is so no longer now. It has outlived its day and can no longer serve the purposes for which it was intended. It now retards what it once promoted, viz, the public weal. It is now extravagant, when the expense was at one time, perhaps, necessary and unavoidable. It is unjust to our own countrymen, not only in the profession, but outside it. It hampers the advancement and cultivation of the science of medicine, on which the promotion of human happiness and the maintenance of human lives so largely depend. There was no time in Bombay when the truth of what I have just said could be better understood or appreciated than now. (Cheers.) The manner in which Dr. Bahadurji has fulfilled his mission is worthy of our highest admiration. (Cheers.) He has sacrificed himself in every way for the promotion of the cause and for the benefit of his country. (Loud cheers.) We have need of such sacrifices, and it is our duty to appreciate them. There is no country where such services require to be appreciated more than in India. In this respect India's position is more like that of Ireland, and there is no more dismal, no more painful page in Ireland's history than that which records how her sons, who had talent and position and power, engaged

themselves in an unjust cause and sacrificed their country's interests for the sake of their own personal advancement, or for a share, real or imaginary, present or prospective, in that ascendancy, which has been so fatal to Ireland's peace and Ireland's prosperity. (Hear, hear.) You have to fear a repetition of that very evil in our country, and the best way in which you can check and prevent a tendency towards that evil here is by appreciating the services of men like Dr. Bahadurji. (Cheers.) The smiles of power, the sweet aspect of the gods who distribute the loaves and fishes and the honours after which there ever is so strange a hankering will always have a powerful allurements which not many of us can resist. To withstand with dauntless breast the persecution and petty tyrannies which obstruct our path and bar our way and to despise the threats of pain and ruin as our friend, Dr. Bahadurji, has done—(loud cheers)—is so rare and so difficult a task that we are bound to applaud and appreciate it when we see it accomplished. (Hear, hear.) Dr. Bahadurji has mentioned to you some defects which have been attributed to him. If he will allow me, I should like to mention one more defect—(laughter),—which some friends have mentioned to me, of course, in the strictest secrecy. (Renewed laughter.) It is a defect which, they say, he shares with your honourable chairman. (Loud laughter, in which Mr. Mehta joined.) That defect is that Dr. Bahadurji has too much in him of the fighting cock. (Laughter and cheers.) I think I can defend Dr. Bahadurji against that charge.

Mr. Mehta: And the chairman, too. (Loud laughter and cheers.)

Mr. Wadia: Mr. Pherozeshah Mehta can never be in need of a defence. (Cheers.)

You must have all, ladies and gentlemen, known and observed something of a fowl-yard. You can imagine what takes place when a new bird is introduced into it. All the veteran inmates are up in arms against the intruder. And if the poor thing is too timid and too little inclined to fight you know the fate which befalls it. But if it has enough of the fighting-cock in it, it maintains its ground and holds its own. That was the position of our friend, Dr. Bahadurji. He was the new bird introduced into an ancient fowl yard. And you know what befell him and how he stood the test. (Loud laughter and cheers.) I

do not forget that Dr. Bahadurji is no longer within that fowl yard. But that is because the owner of the asylum was rather alarmed about the condition of its ancient inmates. (Laughter.) At any rate, you do not find Dr. Bahadurji has lost any of his feathers. I see him look as fresh and as gallant as ever—(hear, hear)—and, if I see any difference it is that he has put an additional plumage. (Laughter and cheers.) Another defect attributed to Dr. Bahadurji is that he is one of that “noisy class sufficiently educated to clamour for everything of which they have read in their college text books.” It was Dr. Bahadurji’s peculiar merit that the gentleman, whose language I have quoted, was persuaded by him to preside at the meeting of the East India Association, where Dr. Bahadurji read his paper on medical reform. (Laughter and cheers.) It was no mean triumph for a man of that noisy class to have the support and encouragement of Sir Lepel Griffin himself. (Renewed laughter and cheers.) The third defect of which I was going to speak has been anticipated by Dr. Bahadurji himself. He is charged with being a Congresswala. (Cheers and laughter.) A high authority once remarked that the Parsees who joined the Congress movement were very few and were held in detestation by the whole Parsee community. (Shame, shame!) I am a Congresswala myself, but I have no personal feeling in alluding to this charge. I am sure if I were to ask that high authority, he would tell me that he never meant to include me in that charge. (Laughter.) Probably he might be of opinion that I have not done enough yet to merit the wholesale detestation which is in store for those who have worked like Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji—(Loud cheers),—Perozahah Metha—(Renewed cheers),—Dinaha Wacha—(cheers),—and Dr. Bahadurji, (Cheers.) That high authority is now in our midst and has been giving some challenges to those who differ from him politically. Will you allow me from this platform to challenge this high authority to make good his charge that the Parsee community holds in detestation men like Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and the gentlemen whom I have just named, for working, as they have done in Congress, for that India to which the Parsee community owes its very existence? (Here voices from the gallery cried out ‘name,’ ‘name.’) I was not going to mention any name, but if you wish to know it, I am not afraid to tell you that it is

Mr. Bhavnagri. (Shame, shame, and hisses.) Let me entreat you, gentlemen, not to indulge in this sort of demonstration. It can do us no good. It can only injure our cause. Let us fight on the simple merits of the issue I have raised. The charge which Mr. Bhavnagri has made is not so much a charge against the gentlemen whom I have named as it is an indictment of the whole Parsee community, and I challenge Mr. Bhavnagri from this platform to substantiate the charge or to withdraw it. (Great cheering, and cries of bravo.) Let him make good this charge before his Anglo-Indian friends or his Mahomedan admirers—(Loud laughter and cheers)—at his own chosen time, anywhere and at any hour, but let him make it good, or let him withdraw it. (Renewed cheering.) Ladies and gentlemen, I have always been anxious to know what is there of so much evil in being a Congresswala? What are the sins that are attributed to the Congress? (Hear, hear.) Some say that the Congresswala's deny that the Government of this country is a good Government. I positively and absolutely deny that charge. (Cheers.) The Congresswala do not deny that our Government is good, but they say that the fact that it is a good Government is no reason why it should not be better—(Cheers) and they say further, that if it does not strive and aspire to be better it will not remain a good Government in the long run. (Cheers.) We were told that the week that has passed was to be a week of revelation, and I thought that I might learn now something about our sins. I anxiously looked through the addresses and the speeches which you all must have read for some indication, if not some description, of our delinquencies. (Laughter.) Well, gentlemen, the net result of all my endeavours has been to find that three of the pet *bachas* (bantlings) of the Congress have been robbed and appropriated by the opponents of the Congress, who now with supreme audacity proclaim themselves the owners and parents of the stolen property. (Loud laughter and cheers.) The three questions of the advocacy of which our opponents pride themselves are questions at which the Congress has laboured for years, and which the labours of the Congress have matured to the very verge of success. (Cheers.) If it is a sin on the part of the Congress thus to labour at large questions of public interest to impress them on the public mind and on the public conscience, so that when the hour for their success draws near men who are tactful and temperate—

(Laughter),—and who are conservative and moderate, might seek to appropriate such work to their own credit. I, for one, feel sure that the Congress is, after all, not such a diabolical body as it sometimes is proclaimed, to be and that the public at large will continue to place in the Congress more and more, from day to day, the confidence which its work so well deserves. (Loud cheers.) There are no further defects on Dr. Bahadurji's part to which I can allude—(Laughter),—and I will only say this is his virtues, that they have commended themselves not only to the public of Bombay, but of Madras and of Calcutta also—(Hear, hear),—so that when he went on his mission to England he went as the chosen delegate of his professional brethren and of the general public in all parts of India. (Loud cheers.) I will not say something of the way in which Dr. Bahadurji's work was appreciated, and of the value which was attached to it by our friends in England. On my voyage out to India, a fellow-passenger, who had heard Dr. Bahadurji in the East India Association, when he read his paper and replied to his critics, told me, admiringly, that if Dr. Bahadurji had been in the Bar, he would have licked us all hollow. (Laughter and cheers.) Of his evidence before the Royal Commission, our honoured guest, who is himself a member of that Commission, will, no doubt, tell you his own valued opinion. (Cheers.) I will tell you the opinion of two friends, whose opinion Dr. Bahadurji himself and you, ladies and gentlemen, will greatly value. I mean the opinion of Sir William Wedderburn—(Loud cheers),—and of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. (Prolonged cheers.) You all know Sir William Wedderburn; how well he worked for our country when he was in our midst, how well he is working for her now when he is far away. (Hear, hear.) I come, from a city, where on all sides we see permanent traces of his beneficent activities, and where on all sides, to-day, there are men who long and regret that they long in vain for a return, however short, of that influence which was not less powerful in preventing mischief in some directions than it was in promoting good in others. (Cheers.) But, Sir, what Poona and Bombay and this Presidency have lost, the whole of India has gained. (Hear, hear.) Sir William Wedderburn is the member for India in Parliament. (Prolonged cheers.) On his shoulders has fallen the mantle—and he bears the burden well—the mantle, which will always recall to our grateful recollection the names of John Bright—(Cheers),—

Henry Fawcett—(Cheers),—and Charles Brandlaugh. (Continued cheers.) There is no more industrious member of Parliament—(Hear, hear, from Mr. Caine, and cheers),—there is no more careful, conscientious or respected member of Parliament, and no more disinterested friend of the British and Indian people in Parliament, than Sir William Wedderburn. (Loud cheers.) Unsupported by men in his own service, ridiculed by many of them, abused by some of them—(Cries of shame, shame),—unappreciated almost by our own countrymen, and even when appreciated how faint is the distant echo of our applause or our appreciation. (Hear, hear.) He is giving to our country the benefit of his untiring work, his great influence, his high reputation, and his unalterable faith in liberal principles. (Cheers.) If he was true to those principles, which were his by a noble heritage—(Hear, hear),—as well as by thoughtful conviction, if he was true to them in the tainted and demoralized atmosphere of this country, is it any wonder that he should be true to them in the atmosphere of free and freedom-loving England? (Cheers.) You can have no idea in this country of the nature of the work which Sir William Wedderburn and the Committee in Parliament, of which he is Chairman, and the British Congress Committee, of which also he is the Chairman, are doing for us in England. The British public are so ignorant of Indian affairs, are so indifferent to Indian affairs, are so much absorbed in the questions that come nearer their hearts and understandings, that they are content as a rule to leave the Government of this country without question or criticism from them to those in whose hands they have placed the power and on whose heads they have placed the responsibility of administering India's affairs. The British Parliament, too, is so much overburdened to attend to all that needs attention, and the necessary result is that it gives precedence to questions not according to their intrinsic merits but according only to their urgency for the time being. If the prison walls of Clerken-well are blown down, if a Fenian rising is apprehended, then Ireland bars the way. (Hear, hear.) If disappointed reformers make a raid into foreign territory, South Africa occupies the field. If desperate Armenians get themselves massacred in Turkey, the Eastern question absorbs all attention. It is only when your cry is loud enough or your wail is deep enough to be heard across the Ocean that divides India from England then alone will India's affairs be attended

(Laughter),—and who are conservative and moderate, might seek to appropriate such work to their own credit. I, for one, feel sure that the Congress is, after all, not such a diabolical body as it sometimes is proclaimed, to be and that the public at large will continue to place in the Congress more and more, from day to day, the confidence which its work so well deserves. (Loud cheers.) There are no further defects on Dr. Bahadurji's part to which I can allude—(Laughter),—and I will only say this is his virtues, that they have commended themselves not only to the public of Bombay, but of Madras and of Calcutta also—(Hear, hear),—so that when he went on his mission to England he went as the chosen delegate of his professional brethren and of the general public in all parts of India. (Loud cheers.) I will not say something of the way in which Dr. Bahadurji's work was appreciated, and of the value which was attached to it by our friends in England. On my voyage out to India, a fellow-passenger, who had heard Dr. Bahadurji in the East India Association, when he read his paper and replied to his critics, told me, admiringly, that if Dr. Bahadurji had been in the Bar, he would have licked us all hollow. (Laughter and cheers.) Of his evidence before the Royal Commission, our honoured guest, who is himself a member of that Commission, will, no doubt, tell you his own valued opinion. (Cheers.) I will tell you the opinion of two friends, whose opinion Dr. Bahadurji himself and you, ladies and gentlemen, will greatly value. I mean the opinion of Sir William Wedderburn—(Loud cheers),—and of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. (Prolonged cheers.) You all know Sir William Wedderburn; how well he worked for our country when he was in our midst, how well he is working for her now when he is far away. (Hear, hear.) I come, from a city, where on all sides we see permanent traces of his beneficent activities, and where on all sides, to-day, there are men who long and regret that they long in vain for a return, howsoever short, of that influence which was not less powerful in preventing mischief in some directions than it was in promoting good in others. (Cheers.) But, Sir, what Poona and Bombay and this Presidency have lost, the whole of India has gained. (Hear, hear.) Sir William Wedderburn is the member for India in Parliament. (Prolonged cheers.) On his shoulders has fallen the mantle—and he bears the burden well—the mantle, which will always recall to our grateful recollection the names of John Bright—(Cheers),—

Henry Fawcett—(Cheers),—and Charles Brandlaugh. (Continued cheers.) There is no more industrious member of Parliament—(Hear, hear, from Mr. Caine, and cheers),—there is no more careful, conscientious or respected member of Parliament, and no more disinterested friend of the British and Indian people in Parliament, than Sir William Wedderburn. (Loud cheers.) Unsupported by men in his own service, ridiculed by many of them, abused by some of them—(Cries of shame, shame),—unappreciated almost by our own countrymen, and even when appreciated how faint is the distant echo of our applause or our appreciation. (Hear, hear.) He is giving to our country the benefit of his untiring work, his great influence, his high reputation, and his unalterable faith in liberal principles. (Cheers.) If he was true to those principles, which were his by a noble heritage—(Hear, hear),—as well as by thoughtful conviction, if he was true to them in the tainted and demoralized atmosphere of this country, is it any wonder that he should be true to them in the atmosphere of free and freedom-loving England? (Cheers.) You can have no idea in this country of the nature of the work which Sir William Wedderburn and the Committee in Parliament, of which he is Chairman, and the British Congress Committee, of which also he is the Chairman, are doing for us in England. The British public are so ignorant of Indian affairs, are so indifferent to Indian affairs, are so much absorbed in the questions that come nearer their hearts and understandings, that they are content as a rule to leave the Government of this country without question or criticism from them to those in whose hands they have placed the power and on whose heads they have placed the responsibility of administering India's affairs. The British Parliament, too, is too much overburdened to attend to all that needs attention, and the necessary result is that it gives precedence to questions not according to their intrinsic merits but according only to their urgency for the time being. If the prison walls of Clerken-well are blown down, if a Fenian rising is apprehended, then Ireland bars the way. (Hear, hear.) If disappointed reformers make a raid into foreign territory, South Africa occupies the field. If desperate Armenians get themselves massacred in Turkey, the Eastern question absorbs all attention. It is only when your cry is loud enough or your wail is deep enough to be heard across the Ocean that divides India from England then alone will India's affairs be attended

to as they ought. (Cheers.) It is in such disheartening circumstances that Sir William Wedderburn and his followers and friends are trying to do that work, of which the Duke of Devonshire himself has declared the necessity and importance, the work of creating an independent and instructed public opinion in England on Indian affairs. (Loud cheers.) To criticise, to carp at, and cavil at their work is, of course, an easy task.

For some minds it may be a pleasant task. (Hear, hear.) There are conceivable circumstances in which it may be a profitable task. (Laughter and cheers.) But it is a task most unworthy, always and for ever, of a son of India. The opinion of Sir William Wedderburn was that Dr. Bahadurji had acquitted himself before the Royal Commission in a way which had created a most favourable impression. (Cheers.) I will now speak a few words about Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and his opinion. I will use no epithets in speaking of him, because to my mind the name of Dadabhai Naoroji unadorned is most adorned. (Great cheering.) You will be glad to know that our friend is as hail and hearty, and as vigorous in mind and body, and as useful and absorbed in his useful work for India as ever. (Cheers.) He is undismayed by his failure to re-enter the Parliament. He knows it was a passing wave which engulfed the liberals and put the Conservatives in power. That has nothing to do with India, and we have high authority to teach us that. (Cheers.) He regrets his failure as we all regret it, and for the same reasons. But in one respect this failure has benefited him and benefited us by enabling him to devote all his time and all his strength to the work of the Royal Commission. You know what that work is and how he is connected with the work. (Cheers.) He has gone to live out of London in order that he may be the better able to lead his student's life. All his life has been one long study and with the great and glorious purpose of how best he can study and serve his country's interests. (Prolonged cheers.) Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's opinion is that he wished there were many more Bahadurji's coming from all parts of India to serve her in different spheres, as Dr. Bahadurji has served those interests in the sphere which he has made his own. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) I have a message for his friends, which I trust I may be allowed on this occasion to publish to them. He wishes that there may be well-informed evidence of facts and figures moderate-

ly, accurately, and industriously gathered together and placed before the Royal Commission before the conclusion of its labours. Now is the time or never. He wishes witnesses to go forth who may strengthen our case and strengthen his hands. (Cheers.)

The Chairman: Mr. Wacha is going.

Mr. Wadya: It will gladden the Old Man's heart to receive this news. (Loud cheers.) It will gladden it still more if more Wachas were going from other parts. I am sure he wishes that Mr. Pherozshaw Metha should be going too. (Renewed cheers.) We all wish the same, and that Mr. Wacha and Mr. Metha in this as in other matters may be inseparable. (Hear, hear.) His heart, his mind, and soul, are all devoted to our country's cause, and I have no fear that he will ever be displaced from his country's affection. There is but one way of depriving Mr. Dadabhai of his first place in our country's affection. Let him, who aspires to it work as disinterestedly, as unselfishly, as devotedly as Dadabhai has done, let him make the sacrifices which for forty years Dadabhai Naoroji has made for India, let him be more successful than how our friend has been in securing the real good of country. And then I know that the first man to yield him the foremost place in our country's affection will be Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji himself. (Loud cheers.) You have heard the opinions of Sir W. Wedderburn and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and you will hear what Mr. Caine will say of his own experience in relation to Dr. Bahadurji. (Hear, hear.) It is Dr. Bahadurji's proud fortune that he has satisfied men such as these, and the opinion of these men strengthens us in the purpose for which we have met this day. (Loud and prolonged cheering, which lasted for some minutes.)

BOMBAY GAZETTE (December 11, 1896.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "BOMBAY GAZETTE."

SIR,—I was present at the meeting in honour of Dr. K. N. Bahadurji, in the Framji Cowasji Institute, on Wednesday evening. I was surprised and indignant to hear Mr. H. A. Wadya go out of his way, while giving deserved praise to Dr. Bahadurji, to attack an absent man. He attributed to Mr. Bhavnagri, M. P., a statement that but few Parsees who were Congresswallahs, including Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, were held in utter detestation by the rest of the community. I challenge Mr. Wadya to prove the truth of that allegation. I have the best reason to affirm that Mr. Bhavnagri never made so foolish a statement.—Yours, &c.

JUSTICE.

MADRAS STANDARD (December 11, 1896).

Madras Standard's Challenge to Mr. M. M.
Bhavnagri, M. P.

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF HIS UTTERANCES EXPOSES HIS
PRETENSIONS TO POSE AS REPRESENTATIVE OF INDIA.

The Bhavnagri Boom has had the undesirable effect of thoroughly exposing Mr. Bhavnagri. A most unlooked-for result, surely, but one for which the friends and admirers of the M. P. have to thank themselves. At any rate, Mr. Bhavnagri has no reason to feel thankful to the indiscreet and obstreperous few who, in their eagerness to get up demonstrations in honor of their hero, were led into excesses which the public have not been slow to resent. The simple fact of the whole matter is that Mr. Bhavnagri had hitherto done nothing to deserve popular honors. On the other hand, he has said and done a great deal too much to be so easily or so soon forgotten as his friends wish that they should be. Words, like phrases, have the habit of coming home to roost. Can we forget the bitterness with which Mr. Bhavnagri assailed the Congress before the General Election of last year? Or, can we forget the manner in which he has, since his election, again and again misrepresented the aims and aspirations of the Congress and thwarted the friends of India in the House of Commons? No, we repeat, Mr. Bhavnagri has all along professed nothing but contempt for the aspirations which the great national movement in India voices forth. We trust, before we conclude this article, to prove that we are not unjust to Mr. Bhavnagri that we are not employing the language of exaggeration or of vituperation. We would leave it to all dispassionate and unprejudiced men to judge between Mr. Bhavnagri and the critics who have felt bound to deny the truth of the claims which Mr. Bhavnagri has with such *weivete* put forth,—claims to be regarded as the only true and disinterested friend of India.

On January 25, 1895, the *St. James's Gazette* published an illustrated interview with Mr. Bhavnagri, in the course of which the would-be M. P. gave expression to certain opinions on the Congress and Congressmen, which we shall do well to recall at the present moment. Elsewhere in this

issue, we extract that portion of the account that appeared in the *St. James's Gazette* wherein Mr. Bhavnagri's views on Congress politics are given. To every word of that extract, we invite the careful attention of our readers. Here we quote the more striking of his deliverances. To begin with, Mr. Bhavnagri made in clear to his interviewer, that it was in his 'connection with India' that he sought the 'main justification' for embracing a political career in England. He posed then, as a representative of India. He was also a representative Indian, in a special and peculiar sense. He was the representative of that large class of people in India, who were opposed to those who demanded impossible rights and advanced methods of Government utterly unsuited to the circumstances and tastes of India. In this description, Congressmen are sought to be included. The Indian Councils' Act, 1892, the most important outcome of the labours of the Congress, is sufficient vindication of Congressmen from the aspersions of this anti-Congressman. As other samples of 'impossible rights and advanced methods of Government may be cited, the demands for the separation of Judicial from Executive functions, for which Mr. Bhavnagri himself has—we hope not insincerely—pleaded. The demand for Simultaneous Examinations for entrance into the Civil Service has been ratified by Parliament. We have no space to catalogue here the triumphs of the Congress, in the past, and those which await it in the future. But one remark may be made in passing. In the implied condemnation of those demands for impossible rights and advanced methods of Government, Mr. Bhavnagri may be presumed to include distinguished Indian administrators, Viceroys of India, the House of Commons, and last not least, Mr. Bhavnagri himself!

Mr. Bhavnagri styled himself "the opponent of what may be termed for the sake of conciseness, the Congress view of India." He went on to declare his profound conviction that considerable mischief was being done "by those who are the adherents of the Congress" to the cause of order and good government. And how? "By their unmerited abuse of officials," and their "unreasoning opposition" to measures of Government. He deplored strained relations between the rulers and the ruled which was the result of the labours of the Congress, and the "distrust of officials" sown by that body. The large body of the people of India, including the

aristocratic and the landed classes—those in fact, who had any stake in the country—were described as being opposed to the Congress, and Mr. Bhavnagri asked with virtuous indignation why these good folk who looked upon the Congress with positive disapproval should not have some one to represent their views. Mr. Bhavnagri further described the Congressmen as ‘young men,’ who were carried away by “specious platitudes about liberty and progress.” In fact, they were “the stock in trade of the Congress-wallah.” Finally, he wound up by declaring: “I claim that the attitude I take up is more in consonance with the real feelings of the people of India than the violent and sweeping measures to which the Congress party give their support.” In other words, Mr. Bhavnagri was in a special sense, the representative of all that was opposed to the Congress. On this ground he claimed election. On that, among other grounds, he was elected. And he has remained such as he described himself to be ever since.

These were not merely election lies. Mr. Bhavnagri apparently believed in them, and stuck to them. In January 1895, this interview with a representative of the *St. James's Gazette* took place. In August, Mr. Bhavnagri was an M.P. In December, he was entertained at a public dinner, by his Anglo-Indian patrons. At that dinner, Mr. Bhavnagri was again to the fore with an attack on the Congressmen as reckless as the one made in January, when the M.P. enjoyed a position of greater “freedom and less responsibility.” Our London correspondent who had exceptional opportunities of knowing and ascertaining the truth described the dinner as an ‘Anglo-Indian feast.’ About a hundred Anglo-Indians were present—and about half a dozen Indians. It is interesting to know that the late Mr. Manomohan Ghose was present at the meeting, but our London correspondent wrote that Mr. Ghose was present on the distinct understanding that his presence was not to be understood as lending any countenance to the political views which Mr. Bhavnagri professed to represent, but solely as mark of his pleasure at the fact of an Indian being elected to Parliament. Mr. Bhavnagri has lately much exaggerated the significance of Mr. Ghose’s generous praise of the self-seeking M. P., who masquerades in the character of a self-styled friend of India. We are constrained to characterize as dishonest Mr. Bhavnagri’s attempt to magnify

that praise as a general certificate of a political character. It was nothing of the sort. It is insulting the memory of the illustrious dead to say that Mr. Ghose approved of Mr. Bhavnagri's violent denunciations of the Congress, or that he had the slightest sympathy with Mr. Bhavnagri's aims and ambitions. Truth compels us to say that in this as in other matters Mr. Bhavnagri indulges in sheer extravagance of language. Mr. Ghose was pleased that Mr. Bhavnagri did not include the demand for the separation of Judicial from Executive functions among those 'impossible rights and advanced methods of Government' in respect of which he had poured limitless contempt on the Congress. The whole tenour of Mr. Ghose's letters shows that the distinguished writer was thinking of Mr. Bhavnagri's speech on the Indian Budget with reference to that single matter, namely, the separation of Judicial and Executive functions.

Well, to return from this digression. At the 'Anglo-Indian Feast' again Mr. Bhavnagri indulged in a tirade against the Congress. With the Congress 'as a constitutional body' Mr. Bhavnagri was patronising enough to be pleased. But he went on to say that when men of an inferior order of intelligence, impelled only by motives of selfish ambition sought to use that or any political organisation for purposes inconsistent with the country's welfare, he declared he felt bound to oppose it. He described the Congressmen as retarding the welfare of her inhabitants by creating a gulf of discord between the rulers and the ruled. He said that the Congressmen's only way of practising loyalty was to proclaim the advent of riot and revolutions. He hinted his belief that the wish was father to the thought. It was like all his other performances, a base attack, utterly unworthy of any intelligent, truth-speaking or loyal Indian. But this tool of the Anglo-Indians had grown by what he fed on; he affects the style of the gods—the Anglo-Indian style; and Anglo-Indian scurrilities have become his meat and drink. And at a feast promoted and financed by his Anglo-Indian friends, what more befitting than that he should indulge in his favorite rhodomontade against the Congress?

A brief retrospect of his Parliamentary career will serve to show how far he has proved himself a friend of the people of India. His maiden speech in Parliament was in defence of the occupation of Chitral. Mr. Bhavnagri

had the impudence to profess a sort of platonic concern for the burdens of the Indian taxpayer; but he straightway voted for the putting on the shoulders of that taxpayer an unendurable burden. His subsequent doings in Parliament have not belied the promise of his maiden performance. He has asked no single question directing attention to any Indian grievance. He has dealt with not one single problem affecting the improvement of the administration—a more liberal and extended employment of Indians in the public service—a fair field and no favour as regards examinations for the Covenanted services,—and the redress of all other grievances, including the reversal of the present policy of external aggression and internal repression. The Suakin vote was not an exceptionally important a piece of service. From the party point of view, it was quite easy the brave member for Bethnal Green to vote against the Government. Similarly, many 'respectable' people are among those who advocate the separation of Judicial from Executive functions. Divesting ourselves of all conscious prejudice, we have no hesitation in saying that from Mr. Bhavnagri we can never expect real service. The Anglo-Indian bureaucracy may safely depend upon its faithful henchman. From so faithful an exponent of Anglo-Indian views, the advocacy of Indian interests and the modification of the policy of repression of the educated classes is not to be hoped for. In all Indian questions, he will vote as his patrons direct him.

Such are the credentials of the modest and estimable Parliamentarian for whom we have been bidden to do honor. Mr. Bhavnagri is unknown to India except by his doings in England; and unfortunately his doings in England were not of a character to arouse any popular enthusiasm. But when obliging Renter kindly sent the precious intelligence that Mr. Bhavnagri was coming out to India to study Indian questions, we felt some satisfaction. For we were glad that Mr. Bhavnagri had made up his mind to begin his education. Renter appears, however, to have been strangely deceived into lending his hand for a brazen advertisement. Mr. Bhavnagri came to India not to study Indian questions but to seek a popular verdict in his favour. All education presupposes a willingness to learn: and how can the prophet of Conservative India become the pupil of New India? So, Mr. Bhavnagri's abode for a time on the Hills, far away from the

haunts of Congress men. Then commenced his modest visit to the Maharajas and the great ones and the flaming telegrams descriptive of receptions and festive gatherings at little way-side stations. And, last of all the greatest, came the gathering under the presidency of one who was the acknowledged head not only of the Parsi, but all the other communities inhabiting Western India, a gathering to which according to Mr. Bhavnagri, "all those who are representative of the greatness, honor, and the influence of the first city of India," flocked to set their august seal of approval on Mr. Bhavnagri's brow!

With the blatant nonsense of Mr. Bhavnagri's speech, we have neither the time nor the patience to deal. The note of intense personal laudation is sickening. Mr. Bhavnagri might have left it to some one admiring friend to describe the greatness and the importance of that "auspicious" occasion. But Mr. Bhavnagri undertook that task. Says this modest gentleman:—

"The innumerable proofs which I have already received of the interest of the different communities in the circumstance of my being among them for the first time after my election and the evidences of their great good will and esteem which have been given me in various shapes that have culminated in the brilliant assemblage which I see before me, fully justify the course which I adopted of taking such counsel. (Hear, hear and cheers.) On an important and auspicious occasion like this it is my wish as it is my duty towards you to utter not a syllable but what should express my gratitude and reciprocate that spirit of compliment and congratulation which underlies the demonstration which you are pleased to make in my honour."

The compliment and congratulation which underlies the "demonstration which you are pleased to make in my honor" is very good. After paying his compliments to the Chairman and his "influential audience," Mr. Bhavnagri turned to the venerable Baronet "at whose stately mansion we are met." Then the committee which brought together that "influential audience" of all that was great, &c., in that stately mansion the first City of India under the presidency of one who was the acknowledged head of all the communities of Western India, were told that it was very gratifying to Mr. Bhavnagri that to the troublesome and innumerable details of the organisation of that unique gathering, should have been

devoted the energies of as influential a committee (cheers) as had ever been formed in this capital of Western India for a similar purpose, composed of level headed men of all the races inhabiting it, whose ripe experience of public life and sound views on public matters lend to the event an importance far beyond my deserts. Then came references to individual men like our esteemed friend Mr. Dosabhai Framji, "who in his revered old age has thought it to be his duty towards his country to take part in this movement," forsooth in honor of Mr. Bhavnagri!

Is this the language of a political mountebank or of a well-balanced statesman? Of any account of services rendered Mr. Bhavnagri told them nothing. "The ridiculous mouse of the mountain of the Bhavnagri demonstration," as the *Kaiser-i-Hind* puts it with trenchant force, is beneath contempt. The people of England, however, will not strain their eyes to have a look at the ridiculous mouse, but they will, assisted by the astute M. P., be led away by the pompous phrases in which he has belauded himself and magnified the "demonstration" in his "honor."

We must conclude. We have written in sorrow and in pain. Under what category, judged according to the principles of "patriotism or even prudence," commended to our admiring notice by yesterday's *Hindu*. Mr. Bhavnagri deserves to be classed—whether among its friends views and benefactors,—whether in the illustrious roll wherein is inscribed the names of the great contemporary workers who are slowly moulding the destinies of the Indian nation or among the enemies and defamers of India,—we leave it to the better judgment of men to decide. Those in whom the claims of a selfish 'prudence' have not stilled the claims of an honest patriotism may be opposed to us. But we have painted Mr. Bhavnagri as he really is.

THE TRIBUNE (December 12, 1896).

It is noticeable that while several Anglo-Indian papers give great prominence to Mr. Bhavnagri's performances in Bombay the *Pioneer* does not attach much importance to them, and the telegrams it receives are condensed into two or three lines. The same paper devoted two leading articles to a criticism of Mr. Dalabhai Naoroji's speech delivered at Lahore as President of the Ninth Indian National Congress

in 1893, and generally keeps up a running fire against him. Mr. Bhavnagri has said or done nothing of any consequence and so the Pioneer, which is not wanting in a sense of proportion, cannot make much of him, Mr. Bhavnagri's friends have succeeded in getting up something like a demonstration in his favour, and he was entertained at a banquet at which Sir Jamsetji Jeejeebhoy presided. The descendant of the great Parsi merchant, whose name is a synonym of success and philanthropy, does not represent political force, but social distinction, and as a social function the banquet was perhaps a success. Mr. Bhavnagri made another speech, quite on all fours with other speeches that he has made in this country, and he was as colourless and inoffensive as usual. Mr. Caine did not attend the banquet but sent a graceful letter saying that he was very glad that a Conservative constituency had elected an Indian member. From the large-hearted Englishman's point of view Mr. Bhavnagri's success may be admired. But the Member for Bethnal Green has failed to satisfy his countrymen that he has any real patriotism or that he will ever be able to render any important service to his country. All his assurances notwithstanding, we must wait to see what he does. Meantime, his countrymen have learnt a great deal against him, and they are satisfied that he is neither to be trusted nor to be acknowledged as a representative of the people of India.

BOMBAY GAZETTE (December 12, 1896).

TO THE EDITOR OF THE " BOMBAY GAZETTE. "

Sir,—I am afraid " Justice " does not quite understand my relations with Mr. Bhavnagri, M. P. We have no personal quarrel. We differ in political opinions regarding Indian matters and in my opinion he has made some foolish and some reprehensible statements. He has been good enough to call upon us to ask and he would explain. He requires a tribunal of special qualifications. I have met his call. I have asked him to substantiate a certain statement, or to withdraw it. I have left him the choice of the tribunal.

" Justice " is surprised and indignant that I attacked a man in his absence I have not attacked Mr. Bhavnagri in reproducing his own statement and in challenging him to substantiate it

I wonder if "Justice" was present at the Grant Road, or at Petit Hall. Were not absent men attacked there, and by Mr. Bhavnagri himself, who charged them with envy and all uncharitableness, with playing to the gallery and with being parliamentary bores? I know some great men's digestion was spoilt at the banquet by the political viands which they were compelled to eat with their dessert. Was "Justice's" digestion spoilt by his indignation at Mr. Bhavnagri's conduct?

I would recommend "Justice," even though it be anonymous and indignant, to keep to the bench and not descend to the bar or to the witness-box. I know not what its best reason may be for saying that Mr. Bhavnagri never made the statement to which I have drawn attention. I am sure truth is not the reason. Let "Justice" await Mr. Bhavnagri's reply to my challenge, and then pronounce judgment if it cares.

After all, I have to deal with Mr. Bhavnagri himself. I await his reply. Let him deny the truth himself if he can. If he cannot, let him substantiate his statement or withdraw it.—Yours, &c.,

Dec. 11.

H. A. WADYA.

THE GUJARATI (December 13, 1896).

The bogus demonstrations held in honour of Mr. Bhavnagri show what a few energetic friends and admirers can do for the object of their admiration. The demonstration in Bhavnagar took nearly a month before it could be given a decent shape and form, and alas! even after so much weary waiting the State Saloon was not to be had to avoid the discomforts of a trip there. It will convince no one even there that it was a spontaneous affair. Outside the State it has excited nothing but laughter everywhere. The demonstrations at railway stations were confined to proteges and grateful admirers, and these have played the part of correspondents as well. 'A correspondent' in one paper figures as 'our correspondent' in another. Mighty efforts were made in many quarters by interested friends to get up demonstrations. But they failed most signally. The Mahomedan demonstration in Bombay has a history of its own. But it would be perhaps premature to relate it, as such a disclosure would be a source of unexpected and grave disappointment to the two Mahomedan gentlemen who were instrumental in manufacturing

it out of gratitude towards a gentleman whose name it is not necessary to mention for the present. If the whole history could be told, it would show how inconceivably hollow the entire movement is. That a man of Mr. Bhavnagri's shrewdness should have ostentatiously made so much in his speech of this ridiculous demonstration shows that, in his desire to be made the object of such hero-worship, he has forgotten more important considerations. The Mahomedan gentlemen, who puffed him up, profess to be opposed to the Congress, and Mr. Bhavnagri has by identifying himself with them ranged himself in an unmistakable manner in the opposite camp. The effusive speech that he made on the occasion was conceived in bad taste. He is labouring under an inexcusable delusion that he has been raised to such a pedestal of greatness that his position has excited feelings of envy and jealousy in those who have adversely criticised his parliamentary career and his slippery politics. A more egregious blunder it is impossible to conceive. Every member of Parliament is not a great man. Not a few of them are tenth-rate men. Mr. Bhavnagri got into the House of Commons by a mere stroke of luck, and not by virtue of his eminent talents or attainments, though the writer in the *Gazette* seems to have discovered from the editorial chair qualifications of a high order in the member for Bethnal Green. Mr. Dadabhai was a thorn in the side of conservatives who wanted to pit a rival against him. This they easily succeeded in doing with the help of an opportunist like Mr. Bhavnagri. With the knowledge of these facts why should any decent mortal grow jealous of the position of Mr. Bhavnagri? But his conceit is, indeed, boundless. He thinks that he has attained to such a pinnacle of glory as to excite envy in the bosom of men by whose side he sinks into absolute insignificance. As admitted by himself the Mahomedan demonstration was a protest against the conduct of those whose criticisms have come in the way of a general demonstration in his honour. We have yet to learn that the gentlemen who are said to have got up the address, the illuminations and banquet understand anything of English or Indian politics or even know anything of his parliamentary career. We are sorry that while all the sections of the Mahomedan community are said to have come forward to do honour to Mr. Bhavnagri, our valiant Suddie friends were not duly represented at the meeting. The member for Bethnal Green must have woefully lost touch with his countrymen, if he thinks that any intelligen-

citizen in this city attaches the least importance to the address given to him by his Mahomedan admirers or to his pompous speech in reply. His challenge to his opponents to meet him fairly is as empty as it is ridiculous. Long before he returned to India and after his arrival in Bombay he has been openly and repeatedly challenged not at bogus meetings and manufactured demonstrations but in black and white to explain his amazing inconsistencies, and to justify the discreditable attack he made against educated natives and congressmen at a time and place when they could not defend themselves. Has he taken up the gauntlet? Will he do it even now? Let him attempt the experiment and we assure him that those whom he has unjustifiably abused and denounced are quite in a position to meet him fairly in the open field.

The dinner given to Mr. Bhavnagri at Petit Hall was confined to his friends and admirers, and it is a gross misrepresentation unworthy of responsible journalism to give it the complexion of a *public* dinner. From the time the movement was set afoot it was everywhere understood that the dinner was intended by his admirers as a social and not a political function. But we had our shrewd suspicions, which have been justified by subsequent events. A movement that was started and supported by friends has been represented as having received the support of the native communities. The gathering at Petit Hall was in no sense representative. There were present no doubt his Parsae friends, and as a matter of course Anglo-Indian guests. But they certainly do not constitute the public of Bombay, who look upon the whole thing as a cleverly got-up show with a view of puffing Mr. Bhavnagri into a representative of the people of India. The public disclaim all connection and sympathy with the demonstration. It is significant that for the first time Petit Hall had, it is said, to be illumined at the expense of those who were burning for a demonstration in honour of their idol. A stronger proof of the utterly artificial character of the movement it would be difficult to give. Though an attempt is being made to inform the English public at home that the so-called demonstrations are a confirmation from Mr. Bhavnagri's fellow-countrymen of the confidence they have placed in him, those who know their real character will not be easily deceived. Mr. Bhavnagri once paraded in his pompous speech the representative character of the gathering at Petit Hall and

boastfully repeated his challenge to his critics to meet him fairly. Mr. Wadia, who is a very eloquent speaker and a staunch Congressman, has already taken up his challenge. Mr. Bhavnagri has been called upon to prove the truth of his declaration that those few Parsees who sympathise with the Congress are held in utter detestation by the Parsee community. Will he now meet Mr. Wadia's challenge? When the latter threw down the gauntlet last Wednesday at the Framjee Cawasji Institute, the hall literally resounded with ringing and prolonged cheers. The public are anxious to learn Mr. Bhavnagri's explanation, and with his much-vaunted fairness he should no longer delay it. In all the speeches delivered by him in Bombay one looks in vain for any thing substantial. They contain little beyond empty platitudes and self-laudatory references. They also bear the impress of his desire to be magnified into a great patriot. With all their herculean attempts his friends have failed in doing it. Meaningless platitudes and handsome compliments freely distributed amongst friends and admirers are no mark of statesmanship, nor are they any evidence of political ability and knowledge, or genuine patriotism.

THE MAHRATTA (December 13, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri on himself.

Mr. Bhavnagri has succeeded at last in getting a demonstration or two to be made in his honour. One was an address given to him by some Mahomedans assembled in a meeting at a private house. The other was a dinner given at the house of Sir D. M. Petit. That the Mahomedans should be seized with a fit of activity and should stir themselves so far as to present an address to Mr. Bhavnagri is easily explained as it is in good tune with a similar deed of mischievous activity which they committed in speaking against the Congress and disowning the Hon'ble Mr. Savani. Mr. Bhavnagri and some of the Mahomedans of Bombay have a common cause in that both of them want to turn traitors to and traduce the National Congress which is now beyond doubt recognised to be not only the best product of Western Education and the ideal movement in promotion of the liberal political aspirations of the people of India, but also a body of the most loyal and well-meaning class of agitators. The only wonder is that Mr. Bhavnagri

was not asked to preside over the meeting held the other day to denounce the Congress. Just look at the wisdom of the Mahomedans disowning Mr. Sayani and embracing Mr. Bhavnagri!! Mr. Bhavnagri has, however, reciprocated the affection and confidence (?) of the Mahomedans. It is a pity that Mr. Bhavnagri should not get any other people except these Mahomedans to dance a jig with, to do justice to their delight and to celebrate the so-called event of National importance. We wonder how he could refer to his election in such grandiloquent terms when the press, the faithful exponent of native public opinion, is unanimously exposing him at every step and disowning the honour he gratuitously seeks to thrust on India, on account of his election to a membership in Parliament. Mr. Bhavnagri challenges scrutiny of his acts and utterances. Will his malicious abuse of Mr. Dadabhai and his expressions against the Congress stand such a scrutiny even for one moment? His speech at the dinner, which a handful of his personal friends had arranged for him, shews that Mr. Bhavnagri is already supposing himself a hero, even more than that, a martyr who is suffering in a righteous cause from the criticism of his opponents, and who has, therefore, a claim upon the nation's sympathy. He is freely parading before his blind admirers the glories and trophies of "the fierce struggle of an election, the arduous duties of a busy Parliamentary Session." Mr. Bhavnagri complains of the festivities and receptions given in his honour, as if they were thrust on him without his consent. "I should have preferred," he says in the tone of a tragedy hero, "to have had a few weeks of quiet to myself with the chance of meeting my numerous old friends as my best recreation. But a man in his position has to consult something else than his own selfish pursuits and pleasures." Mr. Bhavnagri considers himself already famous and resigns himself to the half disfigure which that fame itself means. He tries to apologise for being a conservative on the ground that "an inhabitant of India is capable of serving efficiently her true interests no matter under the banner of which party he has succeeded, in gaining admission within the historic walls of St. Stephens, provided he bring to bear upon his work there a clear grasp of Indian problems and a love for the country strong enough to resist the force of party considerations and blandishments of hollow fame." In saying therefore that it does not matter if

is a conservative, Mr. Bhavnagri makes too many assumptions. Is not this hollow fame exactly which has led his steps from India over the ocean, and led him even to change his principles in politics?

THE KAISER-I-HIND, (December 13, 1896).

The Bhavnagri Boom.

The Bhavnagri boom is for the present over. Meanwhile "friends and admirers," after having solemnly and deliberately announced in the papers the purely social and friendly character of the dinner in his honour, seemed to have thought that after all a dinner without politics may be a dinner without salt. So they eased their easy conscience by violating the promise on which they had induced or seduced, entreated or entrapped, appealed or flattered many a person to join the banquet and gaily launched on the company their frail bark of pot house politics. It was anticipated that in such an eventuality the fragile thing would go to pieces with the crew and the captain. And judging from the report—friendly reports of a flaming character full of that vulgar fiction to which we have now been accustomed, reports in which romance stalked wildly over the reality—that anticipation was more than verified. We need not here refer to other reports which have reached us from the most unimpeachable sources, that there was in this Tory dinner the principle of ranging the representatives of the classes differently from those of the masses, and that there was loud murmur if not indignation, at the way in which politics were introduced in the speeches. But let that pass.

THE PRESIDENT AND HIS SPEECH.

Poor Sir Jamsetji was a regular fish out of water. After having first resolutely declined to preside, his amiability succumbed to sundry piteous appeals of a personal character. So there he was. Placed between the devil and the deep sea he was confused and did not know what the correct thing to say. But the difficulty was solved by a stalwart trinity, including two officials holding a judicial position and a limb of the law who seemed to be as much an adept in managing speeches as in managing clients. No wonder that this trinity, devoid of political intuition and devoid of anything approaching to the *abc* of politics grasp, made a hash of the whole thing, with a few choice specimens of exploded political

cant interlarded to conceal the poverty or the baldness of that precious postprandial pottage which the poor baronet was politely induced to swallow as best he could.

THE RANTING HARANGUE OF THE GUEST HONOURED.

And as to the ranting harangue of the guest honoured, why, its irrelevancy, its impertinence, its hypocrisy, its unmitigated egoism and its disingenuousness are writ large on every line of it. The speech of the chairman got itself admirably dovetailed into this other pompous speech of which the ruling key was Ego in capital letters. Of course it was interlarded too. The material chosen being nine-tenths of the same egotistic butter with an ounce of bitter almonds from the camp of the Congresswallas. These were cunningly mixed to give a somewhat palatable taste. And the cook who prepared it challenged the eaters of this hotch potch to say whether he was not entitled to call himself a master cook. In the same way, he informed them he was able to cook so-called Indian political dishes for the palate of the compay in Westminster where he has already acquired a "brilliant" reputation for his recipe. Happy cook! Happy diners!! They were all made happy and the great boomwalas hied to their homes rejoicing. And the great boom rang himself retired to his home quite self-complacent with his confidence trick which our facetious evening contemporary admirably unmasked the following day and took away all the trumpery and frippery, all the gloss and the gilt in which it was artfully enveloped. Well done *Advocate of India* we say. And for the present we hold our pen waiting for the next trick which is to be in the interest of the ignorant Jains who have already been flatly refused a hearing by the Indian Government. Deluded folk. They vainly imagine that this Bhavnagar magician will work a miracle which the poor Indian Government failed to accomplish. What a way of fishing for "demonstrations" from such guileless fishes!

GUJARAT MITRA (December 13, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri's Reception by the Mahomedan Community: Its Secret History.

Great importance is attached to the address given to Mr. Bhavnagri by the Mahomedans of Bombay. Leaving aside for the present the question of Mr. Bhavnagri's political opinions and the controversy as to whether he is capable of taking care of our interests it is necessary to

inquire how, why and for what reason the Mahomedans who did not vote any separate address as a community to Mr. Dadabhoj Naoroji, the honoured representative of India in the House of Commons, should have done so in the present instance. It has been attempted to construe the movement as a proof of the alleged fact that the Mahomedans are especially pleased with Mr. Bhavnagri's work in Parliament, but the question arises why were not the same Mahomedans pleased also with Mr. Navroji's work ?

The answer to this question is very easy and it is that the same conservative Anglo-Indians who pose as India's sole benefactors, who have put up Mr. Bhavnagri to air their views, have also inveigled a few Mahomedans into echoing their views against the Congress. When the languid movement, in honour of Mr. Bhavnagri, was in danger of collapsing the Mahomedans were caught hold of to give a show of vitality to the moribund movement. What is not a little surprising is that Mr. Bhavnagri himself and his friends say that he is to be judged by his future actions. If so, how is it that they are voting addresses without knowing what his actions are going to be ? It is ridiculous to induce people to join the movement by saying that it has no political significance and then for Mr. Bhavnagri and his friends to make political speeches and talk of approving of his politics.

Mr. Bhavnagri and his Mahomedans Friends.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "KAISAR-I-HIND" COMPANY.

Sir,—I shall thank you to be good enough to insert the following exposition from me re the "Bhavnagri Party." I was present at the entertainment at Muzaffarabad on pleasure bent from the beginning to the end, and I can boldly say that the praises about the decorations of the bungalow in the English papers and in one of the vernacular ones are entirely erroneous. Mr. Haji Cassum Jussab, the proprietor of the bungalow, has permanently richly decorated the hall, and there might have been perhaps 10 per cent. extra decorations on this occasion. I can however say with confidence that the bungalow was much better decorated with hired furniture, &c., on previous occasions, whereas the so-called leaders of the Mahomedan community did nothing of the sort now. The hall of this bungalow can barely accommodate 500 persons,

yet one of the Gujaarati papers has put down 5,000 ! I leave it to the reader to consider at what discount to take these figures. Again, the gathering was not representative of the Mahomedan community, there being hardly any learned men or recognised leaders of the community present. It mostly consisted of the Arab horse-dealers. Those who are behind the scenes know why the persons constituting the managing committee had to bring about the gathering, and it has even been mysteriously hinted at in your paper. How cheap tumbler-lights are is patent to every one, and these tumbler-light illuminations have been pompously styled to have converted the road from the Moos Buildings to the Grant Road Bridge into a "Fairies' nest" ! I wonder how discreditable attempts should be made to delude outsiders by such misleading writings in respectable papers,

I am, &c.,

NURMEHOMED ISAFALL

Khadak, 9th December 1896.

THE GUJARAT MITRA AND GUJARAT DARPAN
(December 13, 1896).

Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri.

The recent demonstrations in Bombay in honour of Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri, our second Parsi M. P. on his return to India after his election to the British House of Commons will long be remembered for their novel character and composition. If there is one thing more than another which particularly excites our attention, it is this, that a community backward in point of education and enlightenment has been the first to come forward to do honour to a gentleman who is in no sense a representative of the political views and aspirations of educated India. That a section of the followers of Islam which does not in any way represent the intellectual aristocracy of their community should be the first to welcome Mr. Bhavnagri and present him with an address expressing their sympathy and approval of his political views of which they know next to nothing is wonderful. The Mahomedan community, be it noted, had strictly kept aloof to do honour to the G. O. M. of India when he visited Bombay three years ago. Goodness knows under what strange inspiration has this

wealthy section of the Mahomedan community been now roused from its political lassitude and isolation to do its duty by the second Indian M.P. The enlightened section of natives know full well the motives underlying such a movement and how they are got up. We will not be uncharitable and ungenerous to grudge Mr. Bhavnagri this honour. We wish him joy and many more such 'honours' in future. We congratulate the Mahomedan community of Bombay—we mean that section of the followers of the Holy Prophet which did Mr. Bhavnagri the honour the other day—for laying aside their religious susceptibilities and unhappy memories of the Parsi Mahomedan Riots of 1874 in this instance and wish they would readily join hands with their Hindu brethren also when next the turn comes to the latter.

THE CHAMPION (December 13, 1896).

The "Public" Dinner to Mr. Bhavnagri.

The disingenuous and discreditable tactics which are being employed to impose upon the public by the Bhavnagri toadies cannot but excite feelings of contempt and disgust in all honest and right-minded persons. When the attempt to get up a public demonstration in honour of Mr. Bhavnagri was scouted and denounced in the most uncompromising terms by every organ of influence and respectability in the vernacular press, the most formal assurances were given and public declarations made, with the view of disarming active opposition, that the only form which the welcome would take would be that of a dinner of friends and admirers *only*. We know that many persons only consented to join the dinner on the express written stipulation that the affair was not to be allowed to assume a public or political character. But the other day the intriguing organizers of the dinner found themselves compelled to announce publicly in both the English morning dailies that the dinner to be given to Mr. Bhavnagri was given by friends, and was to be of a purely social and non-political character. The experience of similar tactics in respect of the dinner given to Mr. Bhavnagri in London should have, indeed, taught people here to estimate such promises at their true value. The same unscrupulous manœuvre, which was practised on that occasion, has been repeated in Bombay. After entrapping people on the faith of solemn assurances and pro

mises, the mask is now thrown off, as soon as the dinner is over. The congratulatory dinner of "friends and admirers" is, with unparalleled mendacity, blazoned forth as a 'Public Dinner' in breach of all promises and in violation of all faith! What is still more unpardonable is, that having lured a few Government officials and even a couple of judges of the High Court to attend as guests we had a purely political appeal, alternately tearful and bumptious, in response to the toast, of the most pronounced type. In the course of his speech, Mr. Bhavnagri read a letter from the late Mr. Manmohan Ghose; but we wonder if Mr. Bhavnagri ever came to know of the uncompromising language use by Mr. Ghose in denouncing the dishonourable dodge by which he was seduced to attend the London dinner we have spoken of above, and then insulted by the most violently hostile political diatribes both from the chairman, Lord Harris and Mr. Bhavnagri. The fate of Mr. Manmohan Ghose has also overtaken many gentlemen whose political views are diametrically opposed to those of Mr. Bhavnagri, but who still, regardless of past experience, went light-heartedly to the Bombay dinner. We wonder how they bore the infliction of the most commonplace political claptrap with which Mr. Bhavnagri mercilessly pelted them, certainly not improved by iteration since trotted out at Bhavnagar and at the gathering of Mahomedan Hajis under the auspices of the redoubtable son of the Head of the Detective Police. We have the very best authority for saying that not a few of the Native and European gentlemen present were indignant at the unscrupulous breach of faith practised towards them and contemplated withdrawal. We are sorry to say that the chairman of the dinner cannot be wholly absolved from the blame of so gross a *contretemps* in so far as, in proposing the toast of the hero of the evening, he travelled a good deal beyond the limits of a non-political congratulatory speech. The object of these tactics is evident. It is to impose upon the British public through Reuter's Agency and other channels that a public dinner was given by the citizens of Bombay to Mr. Bhavnagri in appreciation of his *political* services, and that he is thus acknowledged as their representative and the representative of the People of India as much as, if not more than, Mr. Dada-bhai Naoroji. Mr. Bhavnagri may, however, rest assured that tactics like these will not be allowed to prevail without the most strenuous efforts to strip him of the peacock's

feathers which he has thus donned, and to enlighten the British public of the real truth.

We give below the authoritative statement sent for publication to the *Times of India* of 18th November 1896 as to the character of the dinner :—

The friends of Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri, C.I.E., M. P., have arranged to entertain him at dinner on Saturday, the 5th December, at Sir D. M. Petit's bungalow at Nepean Seaside. The dinner is meant to congratulate Mr. Bhavnagri on his return to a Parliament and will be of a social and non-political character. We are asked to state that friends of Mr. Bhavnagri who may desire to join the dinner are requested to communicate with the Honorary Secretaries at No. 89, Meadows-street. (The Italics are ours.)

MR. BHAVNAGRI'S EXPERIENCE OF THE VANITY OF HUMAN WISHES.

But, alas, for the vanity of human wishes! It is not difficult to perceive from his speech that having got his precious "public" dinner, Mr. Bhavnagri does not at all feel happy, like Pears' soap baby. The speech is evidently of a man who, rushing to have a bite, finds it turn to ashes in the mouth like unto Dead Sea apples. Leaving aside the bumptious egotism which vulgarly obtrudes everywhere throughout the performance, it is impossible not to trace the undercurrent of anger, fury and disappointment at his little game of superseding and running down Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji being spoiled by those dreadfully uncharitable people who, actuated by shamefully "unworthy" motives, will persist in ridiculing his claim to represent or work for anybody but his own pompous personality. Reading between the lines, there are unmistakable signs of gnashing of teeth and breaking of hearts. 'Methinks, my lady protests too much' is the remark that immediately occurs when Mr. Bhavnagri repeatedly protests that he is not going to abuse those atrocious people who deny his title to fame and patriotism, and straightway proceeds to vilify them in the choicest *unparliamentary* language and to charge them with unworthy and jealous motives. We do not wonder at Mr. Bhavnagri's chagrin, disappointment and humiliation at finding his dazzling Dead Sea apple turn to ashes in his mouth. He cannot forget how he got his dinner. He cannot forget how woefully unrepresenta-

tive and miscellaneous the gathering was, after all the herculean labours of his grateful parasites, animated by a lively sense of favours to come. We can scarcely imagine that he was entirely ignorant of the humiliating entreaties and supplications to which some of his illustrious committeemen had to resort to secure hosts for the dinner. Every European was simply an invited guest. In some cases Mr. Bhavnagri had symbolically to go down on his knees. It is possible that he might not know that his friends had to go begging for a chairman and to secure him after repeated refusals. Many people were secured by slobbering protestations of personal friendship either to Mr. Bhavnagri or to Mr. Bhavnagri's friends or dependents. Even the dignity and responsibility of official position were dragged into the mud in this humiliating campaign of solicitation and supplication. Mr. Bhavnagri is fond of throwing out ostrich-like challenges, and shutting his eyes hard at challenges broadly and publicly flung in his face. We challenge him to deny one word of the description we have given of the way in which his "public dinner" was got up. On his arrival from England, the *Times of India*, in an access of natural Anglo-Indian tenderness and solicitude for its Anglo-Indian protege, sneered at the grand and spontaneous demonstration to Dadabhai Naoroji as *organised*, and predicted a modest but hearty public reception for their little hero. But the irony of fate is inexorable. We will ask the *Times* simply to look upon this picture and on that. Modesty and heartiness have certainly not been conspicuous features of the Bhavnagri boom; it has simply covered all connected with it with humiliation and shame.

THE FALSIFICATION OF NEWSPAPER REPORTS.

Speaking of the *Times of India*, it is sad to see a paper of the position and reputation of that journal degenerating, step by step, from romancing into actual falsification in its reports of public proceedings. We have had occasion recently, more than once, to expose the untrustworthy character of its reports in regard to the doings of its pet little hero, Mr. Bhavnagri. But the culminating point has been reached in the report of the proceedings of the successful Public Meeting to do honor to Dr. Bahadurjee. It is true that the occasion was one which was calculated to excite that journal's feelings both with regard to its pet fondling as well as its pet aversion, for it is well

known Dr. Bahadurjee has totally lost the love which the *Times* once lavished upon him. Would it be believed that in reporting the way in which Mr. Bhavnagri's name was received during the course of Mr. Wadia's speech, "cheers", have been unblushingly substituted for "cries of shame and hisses!" We cannot for a moment believe that however prejudiced Mr. Bennett, the editor of the *Times* may be, he could have been cognizant of the trick that was being played. But a paper like the *Times* owes it to itself that no precautions should be wanting to ensure the most stringent safeguards against inaccuracy and falsity of its reporting. People outside the city, who are not likely to be acquainted with the devious ways in which the Bhavnagri boom is being run, will be able to judge from this sample to what an astonishing extent the reports concerning Mr. Bhavnagri's doings in some of the Anglo-Indian papers are untrustworthy and misleading.

MR. BHAVNAGRI'S MOHAMMEDAN DEVOTEES.

There is intense indignation among the best and most respectable portion of the Mohammedan community at the imposition that has been practised on the public in the name of that community with regard to the entertainment and address given to Mr. Bhavnagri. It is true that a certain number of Mohammedans went to the evening party to which they were invited without having to pay anything for it. No general subscriptions were even attempted to be raised, and the cost of the entertainment has been defrayed by two or three interested promoters. The largest subscription, covering one-half or one-third of the cost, was contributed by the manager of a gentleman who had important business before the Bhavnagar Judicial Councillor some time ago. It is true, again, that signatures of a number of illiterate people are appended to the address. But nobody knows who prepared it, and it is certain that it was not adopted at any meeting. The connection of the son of the Mohammedan head of the Detective Police with the movement was sufficient to ensure the signatures of a certain class of Mohammedans without even any active moment on the part of that gentleman. We are in possession of several important facts in connection with this secretly got up and mysterious demonstration, which will expose its real character, but we propose to take up this matter in a later issue, after verifying some statements placed before us of a extremely serious character.

THE GUJARATI (December 13, 1896.)

The Bhavnagri Boom.

The educated classes are learning to distinguish between real and pretended friends of the people. They have afforded a proof of that in the last fortnight. The public of the Bombay Presidency have clearly shown how to keep aloof from one who, without any knowledge of the needs of the people, has been opposing their true interests and befriending Anglo-Indian officials. The power of distinguishing chaff from grain, without being dazzled by rank or wealth, which was so conspicuously shown by the educated classes, is one of the most hopeful signs of the future political progress of the people. It is easy to become enemy of the country in the pursuit of personal interests. It is by no means unusual to see a man harm his country by his perfectly selfish desire to please everybody. But men like that ought to be made to feel that they are looked down upon by their countrymen whose cause they betray. Considering that political movements in this country are still in their infancy, it is a satisfactory sign of progress to note that people are not slow to distinguish between friends and foes. All who have eyes to see can read the signs of the times, but none are so blind as those who would not see. It is not to such that our words are addressed. Everybody concerned from the Government downwards ought to ponder over the object lesson that has been afforded in the past fortnight.

We are led to make these remarks by the Bhavnagri boom, now a fortnight old. Commencing at a few small railway stations in Bhavnagar, the boom has spread to Bombay. It was taken up by a few illiterate Mahomedans and it received a further impetus at the gathering of a few Parsee gentlemen last Monday. Mr. Bhavnagri may pretend to be pleased at his so-called ovation and demonstration, but the public know too well the true character of the movement. Mr. Bhavnagri is too shrewd not to know it himself. He knows within his heart of hearts what manner of men these be that constituted the gathering and what influence they possess.

He knows, too, that the recognised leaders of public opinion have kept aloof from the movement, and that the gathering that was brought together in his honour was

in no way qualified to pronounce on his parliamentary career. What value can possibly be attached to an address voted by such a gathering? But for all that, Mr. Bhavnagri has an end of his own in this entertainment, which he got up by dint of laborious canvassings, solicitations, and entreaties. He will parade this address in England as a proof of popular favour, but he will not succeed long in suppressing the truth. What our leading politicians and our leading political associations think of Mr. Bhavnagri, and what the unanimous voice of the native press says of him, will not remain concealed. Mr. Bhavnagri and his friends may rest assured that the hollowness of the movement will be exposed in England. It will be made clear to the English public that Mr. Bhavnagri is not an exponent of the public opinion of India, but that Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Sir William Wedderburn are its true representatives.

How long can a jackdaw keep his borrowed feathers? What matters it if Mr. Bhavnagri be bloated and swollen by titles and decorations from Anglo-Indian patrons? He will not rise one jot in public esteem for all these. The public will examine the credentials of those who solicit honours at their hands. The public who adore Mr. Dadabhai do so because of his recognised merits. The public honour Messrs. Metah, Wacha, Javerilal, Sayani, Ranade, Tyelji and Sayani for their high deserts. The public hardly look upon Mr. Bhavnagri as worthy to sit at their feet, and it moves laughter and scorn to see Mr. Bhavnagri declare like a boastful schoolboy that these leaders of the people are actuated by motives of envy and jealousy against him. His pronouncement is received with contempt on all hands. What is there in this Mr. Bhavnagri, what position does he occupy that he should be looked upon with jealousy by anybody? Mr. Bhavnagri has obtained no honour that is worth comparison with that obtained by the above-mentioned leaders.

The public are not likely to over-rate his true worth, because by some freak of blind fortune and by the exertions of our Anglo-Indian foes he has got elected to Parliament. Empty vessels sound most, and this Mr. Bhavnagri is an empty vessel. Till he recognises that, he is a cypher in Indian politics, till he takes a leaf out of the books of our recognised leaders, till he walks in the footsteps of our

honoured Dadabhai, till he ceases to filch items from the Congress programme and proclaim them as his own, till he dissociates himself from his Anglo-Indian allies and shows himself a true friend of the country by openly identifying himself with its popular cause, till he does all this, the public will refuse to recognise him or own him as their representative.

Mr. Bhavnagri has got a lesson to learn from Dr. Bahadurji. Mr. Bhavnagri ought to see that all sections of the public, without distinction of caste or creed, join in honouring Dr. Bahadurji, and do so because they approve of his great public services. When Mr. Bhavnagri's name was mentioned at the meeting it was received with hisses and cries of shame by all present—Hindus and Mahomedans included. The Parsees themselves can well distinguish between the merits of Dr. Bahadurji and Mr. Bhavnagri, and it remains to be seen what reply Mr. Bhavnagri gives to Mr. Wadya's challenge to him to prove that Mr. Dadabhai, men like Mr. Mehta, Mr. Wacha and Dr. Bahadurji were held in detestation by the Parsee community. When Mr. Wadya made this public challenge, it was transparent to every one present that the Parsees who were present at the meeting were not at all backward in appreciating the merits of those of their co-religionists who are in favour of the Congress. In paying our tribute of praise to Dr. Bahadurji for his powerful advocacy of this question, we would exhort him still to persist in pegging away at this question regardless of the sneers and frowns of selfish Anglo-Indians and their native flatterers. He must rest content in the knowledge that the public appreciate his merits and look up to him as a politician of no ordinary type. He has a bright future before him, and he has won his position present as well as prospective, by his own merits without the laborious exertion of "friends and admirers" as Mr. Bhavnagri has done.

THE SATYA MITRA (December 13, 1896).

The Gatherings in Honour of Mr. Bhavnagri held by his Friends and the Local Mahomedans.

The friends and admirers of Mr. Bhavnagri wishing to entertain him at a grand banquet on this his first visit to his native country (India) after his election to the Parlia-

ment, had long been busy, making preparations for it, and this event came off with great *eclat* on Monday last, at the Petit Hall, Walkeshwar.

Had the matter ended here, there would have been no necessity of our noticing it. But, in addition to it, the leaders of the local Mahomedan community held a similiar reception in honour of Mr. Bhavnagri, at which they treated him to a dinner followed by an address. At this latter gathering our Mehomedan fellow citizens showed in their speeches their devotion not only to the hero of the hour, but also evinced great regard and sympathy with the Parsi community as a whole. As a Parsi representative of the Press, we bear a willing part in this sympathy. We also assure them that the Parsis entertain friendly feelings for the mehomedans equally with the other communities, and thank them for this declaration of friendliness on their part. With all this we cannot but wish that the Mahomedans had taken advantage of some other opportunity to give vent to their good feelings. This Bhavnagri gathering did not consist of his Mahomedan friends and admirers only, but was a representative one of the whole Mahomedan community of Bombay even telegrams of sympathy with the movement having been received from their brethren of Poona and Bhavnagar. That this should induce the Mahomedans in other parts of the country to follow them is not to be wondered at. It is, however, a well-known fact that the views expressed by Mr. Bhavnagri, both before and after his election, have been antagonistic to those entertained by the political bodies here. Mr. Bhavnagri has in addition, showed his contempt for a philanthropic body like the Congress, which has been labouring for the political advancement of the people. It is mainly on these accounts that the natives, in a body have not only held themselves aloof from publicly honouring Mr. Bhavnagri but they are sorry for him, his election to the House of Commons being an extraordinary event notwithstanding. Even the community to which Mr. Bhavnagri belongs has for the same reason refrained from publicly honouring him, though that community has always been known to take the lead in appreciating public services. When, under such circumstances, the local Mahomedans have come forward to honour Mr. Bhavnagri as mentioned above, will the public at large be wrong in concluding that this action was a clever man-

œuvre on their part to strengthen the opposition to the Congress? The dislike entertained for the Congress by the Mahomedans in Bombay and the Mofussil goes a long way to support this conclusion. Besides, the local Mahomedans did not move when the whole country was astir in honouring the proved and foremost benefactor of India, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, the first native M. P., on his first visit to this country after his election. All these circumstances combine to lessen the value of the present movement. In spite of this, if the local Mahomedans thought it fit to honour Mr. Bhavnagri as his friends and admirers, they could have easily given expression to their feelings by freely joining the entertainment which came off on Monday last, and nobody would have objected to it.

THE BOMBAY GAZETTE (December 13, 1896.)

Mr. Bhavnagri and Mr. Wadia.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "BOMBAY GAZETTE."

SIR,—At last I hear Mr. Bhavnagri's own reply, and it comes from Sholapur. The Hon'ble Member is reported to say "that all he had done was to repel a charge made in London against the Parsees that they were disloyal and that the allegation in question was fictitious." It is a genuine pleasure to me to see Mr. Bhavnagri unable to assert in Bombay, or near Bombay, that the action of men like Dadabhai Naorojee and the Parsees who share his political opinions about India was held in detestation by the Parsee community. Yet, in justice to myself, you will allow me to say and to make good my charge that Mr. Bhavnagri did say in London what he now denies in India. In a paper read before the East India Association, on the 6th March 1895, Sir Lepel Griffin made the following attack directly against Dadabhai Naoroji and indirectly against the Parsee Congresswallas:—"We are not going to draw up an exact balance-sheet of the advantages and losses which accrue to India or England from their mutual connection. A Parsee member of the House of Commons in an amendment to the address was very anxious that this should be done, and that the British Exchequer should pay some share of the charges for the Army and Civil service and the cost of Indian wars

proportional to the benefit England derived from India. Most sensible people would imagine that the balance was entirely the other way. What does England gain by India? . . . We have given to her (India) every blessing which accompanies freedom and peace, and unless our Parsee friends and critics lived under the strong protection of England they could not be living in India at all, or only as an out-cast and proscribed race wearing a special dress in a special quarter of a few towns and paying five times as much taxation as that of which they now complain. The Parsees are an eminently worthy, industrious race, wealthy and charitable, well educated and intelligent citizens. But they do not enlist in our armies. They did not help us to conquer India; and it seems presumptuous in one of their number, who is certainly out of sympathy with his fellow-country men, to dictate to us the cost at which we should defend it." I fail to see in the above any charge of disloyalty "against the Parsees." On the contrary, the attack was directed against Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji who was declared to be "certainly out of sympathy" with his fellow-country men. During the discussion on Sir Lepel Griffin's paper Mr. Bhavnagri addressed the meeting. He did not think it necessary then to defend the Parsees against any charge. Some time later from the quiet of his chamber Mr. Bhavnagri thought necessary to make an extraordinary addition to his speech as follows:—"Mr. Bhavnagri desires to add the following note:—"If I had had time left for further remarks when I spoke at the meeting I should have added that I took exception to the remarks of Sir Lepel Griffin about the Parsees in so far as they would appear to assume that that community has any but the most deep feelings of loyalty towards the British Government. The leaders of the Parsee community as well as the bulk of it have never tired of acknowledging the good that Government has done to India. No doubt a few individuals are now and then found to express themselves in a different tone, which gives good reason for such remarks as those of Sir Lepel; but it is unfair to generalise from this and attribute this tone to the Parsees as a body. The action of such individuals and writers is held in detestation by the community, &c., &c." The words are in Italics above on which I rely for the challenge I gave to Mr. Bhavnagri in my speech at the Framjee Cawasjee Institute. They can bear only one meaning when taken with their context. Mr. Bhavnagri thought Sir Lepel

Griffin's remarks against Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and the individuals and writers of his stamp justified; but Mr. Bhavnagri wanted it published that such men were few and that their action was held in detestation by the Parsee community. I sincerely congratulate the Parsee community more than anyone else on Mr. Bhavnagri's present disclaimer. I wish I could congratulate Mr. Bhavnagri himself. I trust the East Indian Association, which owes so much to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, will publish the disclaimer as it has published the charge. Mr. Bhavnagri knows—for I myself told him this during my recent stay in England—that the fact of his being a Conservative in British or Indian politics has nothing to do with the deep resentment which is felt against him in some quarters, and which he chooses to regard as due also to envy, &c. He owes to his attitude and his attacks such as those I have quoted above and to some of which I drew his attention personally in England, the wrathful feelings of which he has had proofs since his coming to his native land.—
Yours, &c.

Rose Bank, Kirkee, Dec. 16.

H. A. WADYA.

THE INDU PRAKASH (December 14, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri Studying the Indian Famine.

We learn from a reliable source that Mr. Bhavnagri, M. P., has now begun his study of Indian questions! Until now he had no time for such trivial things. The receptions are over now, the platitudes are exhausted; and Mr. Bhavnagri has got tired of trumpeting his virtues. Perhaps the resources of his friends are at a low ebb. When it comes to the question of bearing the expenses of lighting the hall lent by a millionaire, the Bhavnagri boom may be said to be over. The send-off to Sholapur for the study of the famine question on the spot was an altogether tame affair. Somehow or other the dailies did not talk of it. But the fact is there. Mr. Bhavnagri went to Sholapur without the fact being chronicled in the papers the next day. Has Mr. Bhavnagri turned over a new leaf? Let us, for his own benefit, hope that he has once for all left the evil practice of turning social gatherings into political meetings and sounding his own praises at a festive board. Let him in the interval of his hard study of Indian questions brood over

reason of this is, that Mr. Dadabhai has striven with his heart and soul for the good of India, while Mr. Bhavnagri has put forth no efforts in that direction—nay, people have come to know of his having tried in the contrary direction. It is not a matter of astonishment, then, that splendid welcome was given to Mr. Dadabhai on his arrival here, while it was difficult to find even a few gentlemen to receive Mr. Bhavnagri.

“Do unto others as you wish others should to you” is a maxim that must, at all times, be borne in mind. Mr. Bhavnagri should naturally think himself that if he has accomplished nothing beneficial to the people of India, they would not give him any honour; and so Mr. Bhavnagri should not harbour hopes of getting it. But ambition is a very strange thing. It does not allow a man to remain silent. When Mr. Bhavnagri came here he told the handful of gentlemen that went to receive him, that being sorry for the late sad event at Bhavnagar he could not accept their honour. It was a wise act on his part to decline to receive the welcome, seeing that nobody was prepared to give it. But at this he was not easy and comfortable. He went to Bhavnagar where there are some panegyrists of him, who offered him considerable honour which he accepted with delight, not remembering the sorrow he had felt on a former occasion and this is not strange. For if there is no real sorrow, how can it be felt? Thence he has come to Bombay where also there are some bands prepared to sing praises in his honour. They presented him, any how, with *Pansupari* in which very few of the educated gentlemen took part. In fact it is said that it was not the work of the men in Bombay. Of whatever sort a man may be, he must have some friends. The praises of these do not make him really good. The real goodness consists in being commended by the well-informed gentlemen who are others than friends. Great persons, from all classes, honour Mr. Dadabhai, many of whom have not yet seen him, why should they honour him? Are they paid by him for it? Or do they wish to get anything from him? It is the nature of men to call gold by its own name. It does not require any great powers of wisdom on their part to do so. It does not require candles to see the sun. Thus a mere glance at the efforts of Mr. Dadabhai to promote the welfare of the people of this country generates in their minds

feelings of reverence towards him. As to Mr. Bhavnagri everything is the same, but in a contrary manner which makes the only difference. Really speaking there was no reason for any one to think badly of him. But taking into consideration the speeches he has delivered on questions of Indian affairs people, of course, enlightened people—taking him to be a man having no connection with India are not actuated to do him honour. What is to be done here? It is but natural that Mr. Bhavnagri should feel sorry at this. But he should not give himself up to dejection on that account. If he wants the people of India to harbour golden opinions about him, let him take the vow of struggling, like Mr. Dadabhai, for the welfare of India.

DNYAN PRAKASHI, (December 14, 1896.)

Mr. Bhavnagri.

Mr. Bhavnagri, on his arrival here first said that he had come here to take rest after his troubles in England. But he was, against will, offered welcomes! in one or two places. It is needless to relate the way in which he was received at Bhavnagar. However, the wonder is that in a meeting of a few unknown Mahomedans, held in a small private house in Bombay, he was given an address. But why wonder? For it is but evident that those Mahomedan gentlemen, who were prepared to excommunicate of course politically—Mr. Sayani for his being elected the President of the Congress, should present an address to Mr. Bhavnagri, the abuser of zealous patriot Mr. Dadabhai Navroji who has spent all his life in the services of his country. We are informed that Mr. Bhavnagri is now about to go to Bijapur and Belgaum and is thinking of getting an opportunity to boast of being honoured and respected by the public. On this occasion, therefore, the people should see what their duty is and should give him that honour which he deserves. What that is, is not unknown to the leaders of the different places.

SUDHARAK OR THE REFORMER (December 14, 1896.)

Though we are not mere panegyrists of Mr. Bhavnagri, M. P., we are at the same time far from being his censurers. His views may not—and do not—entirely correspond to

mentioned in the meeting. Mr. Bhavnagri, it appears, had uttered an atrocious libel on the Parsi community. The libel consists in the statement that the Parsis who had joined the Congress were very few, and that they were held in utter detestation by the Parsi community. We confess the libel, if it was publicly made, had escaped our notice. The libel is a characteristic piece of Bhavnagrian politics. Mr. H. A. Wadia, an eloquent speaker and a shining light in Indian political life, took up the cudgels on behalf of the community the M. P. had maligned and effectively exposed the impudent lie. Said Mr. Wadia :

“ I am a Congress-wallah myself, but I have no personal feeling in alluding to this charge. I am sure if I were to ask this high authority he would tell me that he never meant to include me in that charge.” (Laughter.) “ Probably, he might be of opinion that I have not done enough yet to merit the wholesale detestation which is in store for those who have worked like Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji (loud cheers) —Pherozeshah Metha (cheers)—Dinsha Wacha (cheers) —and Dr. Bahadurji ” (cheers).

Mr. Wadia proceeded to remark that the high authority of whom he had spoken happened to be in their midst and had been giving some challenges to those from whom he differed. At this stage, cries of “ name, name,” were heard, and in response to those cries, Mr. Wadia let the cat out of the bag. It was our old friend—Mr. Mancherji Merwanji Bhavnagri! Mr. Wadia dealt with this libeller of an entire community in a fitting style. Said Mr. Wadia :

“ The charge which Mr. Bhavnagri has made is not so much a charge against the gentlemen whom I have named as it is an indictment of the whole Parsi community, and I challenge Mr. Bhavnagri from this platform to substantiate the charge or to withdraw it.” (Great cheering.) “ Let him make good his charge before his Anglo-Indian friends or his Mahomedan admirers,” (loud laughter and cheers) “ at his own chosen time, anywhere, or at any hour, but let him make it good, or let him withdraw it ” (renewed cheering.)

The man who could bring himself to utter so infamous a libel does not deserve any consideration at the hands of his community. While, as for the politician, it reminds us of the saying of the Guelph who declaimed against politics as the trade of a not very respectable class of people!

THE MADRAS STANDARD (December 15, 1896).

The Bhavnagri Boom.

The *Gujarati* has a caustic criticism of the contemptible demonstration in "honor" of Mr. Bhavnagri. The bogus demonstration has made the M. P. ridiculous. That is the sad truth, however anxious the friends and admirers of the M. P., far and near, may not realise it. But we forget that policy or prudence or by whatever you call it, it is the better part of patriotism. The *Gujarati* writes:—

In all the speeches delivered by him in Bombay one looks in vain for any thing substantial. They contain little beyond empty platitudes and self-laudatory references. They also bear the impress of his desire to be magnified into a great patriot. With all their herculean attempts his friends have failed in doing it. Meaningless platitudes and handsome compliments freely distributed amongst friends and admirers are no mark of statesmanship, nor are they any evidence of political ability and knowledge or genuine patriotism.

The *Kaiser-i-Hind* has the bitterest things to say, which it well says, of the "ranting harangue" of the guest honored and its "irrelevancy, its impertinence, its hypocrisy, its unmitigated egoism and its disingenuousness."

The *Maharatta* pours ridicule upon the M. P. for masquerading in the character of a hero and a martyr.

The *Champion*, by name and in fact, truly says that the Bhavnagri boom is the result of a premeditated plan on the part of the friends of the M. P. to invest the dinner with a public and a political character.

- The object of these tactics (writes the *Champion*) is evident. It is to impose upon the British public through Reuter's Agency and other channels that a public dinner was given by the citizens of Bombay to Mr. Bhavnagri in appreciation of his political services, and that he is thus acknowledged as their representative and the representative of the People of India as much as, if not more than Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. Mr. Bhavnagri may, however, rest assured that tactics like these will not be allowed to prevail without the most strenuous efforts to strip him of the peacock's feathers which he has thus donned, and to enlighten the British public of the real truth.

Was ever national guest treated to such choice compliments?

THE OBSERVER (December 16, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri and his Home Reception.

Once before we spoke of Mr. Bhavnagri, and once more we are constrained to drag him to our readers. The different readings of the honour—parties of the M.P. are infinitely amusing, and we thank him for breaking the monotony of our work in the desk with such palatable relishes. For us it is too late to express any opinion as regards the constituencies of these honour—parties. The wide world is fully awakened to it. The voice of the friends of the M. P. is pitifully hoarse with the song of lullaby. Mr. Bhavnagri talks of his own election in the British Parliament as a matter of national honour, we accept it, and are forced to remind him that his action there is a matter of national disgrace. The words that he has been uttering since his arrival has justified the *Madras Mail* to comment as “we are sorry to have to designate as fudge and fustian the utterances delivered by Mr. Bhavnagri, M.P., but, after all, these are the only terms which adequately describe them. A platitude does not cease to be a platitude, nor does bathos cease to be bathos, merely because it comes from the lips of a Parsee M.P., whether he represents Finsbury or the north-east corner of Bethnal-Green.” It is undoubtedly a rare talent, the scent of the M.P. of smelling sedition in the constituencies of the Congress. We pity his tears and laugh at his boast of patriotism, and when he is very kind, only invoke the mercy of Heaven “O God save us from our friends.” When the M. P. landed in India we hoped he will permit us to forget his past, but we are forced to make up our mind to forget him entirely. By the bye, we would like to request the Maharaja of Bhavnagar to read the 27th September issue of the *Champion* and pick up his duty therefrom. For this presumptive friend in the person of a servant of the Anglo-Indian, we hold the same opinion with our Bombay contemporary the *Champion* that “a slave is an object of commiseration, but a slave who fawns upon his master, is an object of loathing.”

THE NATIVE OPINION (December 17, 1896).

Raising the Wind.

Well may those who got up a subscription dinner in favour of Mr. Bhavnagri lay the flattering unction to their heart of hearts for their recent performance. Indeed to those who have converted address-giving and entertainment-making into a profession, sage discretion in such a matter is of very little consequence; they only hanker after notoriety, and play their cards in such a way as to lead men of easy belief into doing things which mature deliberation would make them regret. However, *Khatpatism* has its attractions for weak minds, and no wonder that they should suit the promptings of their conscience to the gallery of those with whom personal aggrandisement is all in all. Herein lies the origin of the recent bogus demonstrations—demonstrations that had not an iota of spontaneity about them. And yet Mr. Bhavnagri talks of receptions and parties as if he returned for them from a mission of salvation of his own country! But as for his credentials, and they are to be found nowhere. Yes, he is in the British Parliament, but are not similar mediocrities members of the same House? Being a member of Parliament is no greater passport to fame than being a member of a society or a club, unless that membership is propped up by real substantial works, and what has Mr. Bhavnagri to show in this direction? His interest in Indian affairs, of which he makes so much, has been of a halting character—in fact, his performances may be regarded as utter failures—failures which we hope do not interfere with the progress of this country. At the dinner he said he represented India; we would rather say he represented Anglo-India than the real Indian communities. He laid great stress on the Bombay Mahomedan address to him, but those who know how the show was got up, who particularly worked up on a trivial section of the Mahomedans to get up that show, will naturally look upon it as a bogus one, like the presentations got up elsewhere. Indeed, those gentlemen who brought about the Mahomedan address are now heartily sorry for what they have done. Mr. Bhavnagri pretends to have great interest in Indian affairs; a real patriot, instead of going all the way to Bhavnagar to receive addresses, must have at once instituted inquiries into the state of the famine-stricken, what part of the country was affected thereby, what

stock of grain the country had at present and so forth, and should have paid visits to authorities to know their views in a matter in which really he could have no less interest than the authorities have. Has he moved in the matter to any extent? One would like to know. Then, again, there are various other burning questions that regard our progress, such as the constitution of our legislative councils in respect to the evasiveness of official replies; the position of the wild tribes of the Thana District in regard to their primeval right of collecting dead-wood and other jungle produce as a means of subsistence; the condition of our agricultural classes and a variety of other questions which form the very basis of our people's well-being. Into which of these questions has Mr. Bhavnagri made inquiries? In none, we doubt not, beyond making full justice to cakes and honey served out on the table at some of the receptions. At a critical juncture like the present, a real, genuine patriot would leave aside all this tomfoolery of a *lamasha* and visit parts of the country with a view to study some of these questions first-hand. At the dinner, however, he told his audience that he meant to take counsel with the people on the various questions affecting this country. Whom did Mr. Bhavnagri consult on these burning questions? Oh! are we to believe that he looks upon a consultation with those who provided for him a rich repast sufficient to serve their ends? Amongst us those who have made these questions their own are few, and these he ought to consult with advantage. Has he consulted them on any of these several questions? Probably none of them, and from the way he talked at the dinner, it seems he gave preference to assembled guests for being his authorities over those whom we generally regard our leaders. On what basis, then, will he take his stand when in Parliament as one who had returned from India when that country was passing through a most terrible famine? Supposing some member of Parliament asks Mr. Bhavnagri as to our present agricultural prospects, will he draw upon one of the Anglo-Indian guests at the dinner as his authority? Or what else will he say? In his speech at the dinner there is not the least reference to the present crisis as if the country was in a prosperous condition, and there was no reason for any anxiety on that score! Under such trying circumstances, what would be the conduct of a real patriot? Indeed, he would refuse all these flimsy honours, and talk less of personal

affairs; but beyond personal affairs we find nothing in the long-winded yarn of Mr. Bhavnagri which, put into a crucible, means nothing short of self-glorification. But the Bombay dailies talk of this hole-and-corner meeting of friends and admirers, as one of the people, but obviously it has nothing to do with the Bombay public as a whole, and the attitude of the Native Press is a sufficient indication that the said public had nothing to do with the same. Indeed, on his arrival in England Mr. Bhavnagri may unfurl his flag as an idol of us, Indians, as one upon whom we, Indian people, look as our representative in the House of Commons. To any such opinion we give a flat denial; Mr. Bhavnagri is no more a representative of our people than he may be of the Hottentots or other nationality. Some of the speakers at the meeting attempted to place him on the same level with Mr. Dadabhai. Certainly, that was a bold attempt, and those who attempted it ought to have spared themselves the fiction. Those who have carefully studied Mr. Dadabhai's works cannot but feel convinced that between him and Mr. Bhavnagri there is as much distance as there is between the earth and the heaven. How can pigmies like Mr. Bhavnagri claim to reach a personality that towers so high and whose real worth has been acknowledged both in and outside Parliament and by the whole Indian world. Indeed, Anglo-India is frantic over Mr. Bhavnagri's doings, but in doing so they have to serve a purpose; of this, we are sorry, Mr. Bhavnagri is not aware. He should have known that their acclamation was no true test either of his popularity among people or of his alleged intellectual abilities.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (Bombay Correspondent)
(December 17, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri is a genius. He came to India to study Indian questions. His study of the three R's comprised—Receptions, Rigmarole and Rant. The preliminary course was scarcely over when the interesting pupil found himself suffering from a severe fit of indigestion caused by that dinner, at which all that was great, good, patriotic and so forth in Bombay took part. The public are as disgusted with the jejune speeches delivered at that celebrated banquet as Mr. Bhavnagri himself apparently is with the bibulous hospitality of his friends. So he has betaken himself

(without his faithful henchman in the Bombay press chronicling the news) to Sholapur, where he is studying famine politics. We wish Mr. Bhavnagri god-speed. The study of Indian politics must be a mere bagatelle to the Unionist who had graduated in a greater school than any which India has to show. But we wish that Mr. Bhavnagri had remained true to the original programme, which, according to Reuter, was education, but which was afterwards altered so as to read—advertisement.

THE BHAVNAGRI ROOM.

I now turn to other incidents of the week. There was first *the* dinner, so long talked of, which came off on Monday last. I need not say it was hardly the affair of "honor" on which the member for Bethnal Green would be sincerely congratulated. In the first place it was a *belated* one. There was no help for it. Loud trumpets were blown for nearly *social* jinks that His Excellency the Governor was preside; then Sir Charles Farran; then Mr. Birdwood; and then goodness knows who! But all the same big names of big guns were bandied about by the promoters and active organisers of the dinner to tempt unwilling folk to join the affair. I assure you, Mr. Editor, that were a true and faithful history of it were to be written, the world of India would be startled. It would then declare even with more emphatic voice than it has already done that they would have none of Mr. Bhavnagri's politics or his political strategy on which he pretends to plume himself. They might exclaim arguing from analogy, that if the social strategy was of the character which the truthful historian depicts what may we then think of his political tactics! To say the least the dinner was hardly a *voluntary* and *spontaneous* affair. It was an impressed one. The majority were there but not out of any love or admiration for Mr. Bhavnagri. If not he, his friends on his behalf, have been known to have entreated and appealed, appealed and supplicated, to "honour" the second Parsee M. P. I have authentic information that Europeans were impressed in this way. But even after all this hook and crook manner of getting up the dinner what happened. To say that it was of a *representative* character is to speak the very opposite of truth. The big guns were not there, and the small Anglo-Indian guns who were there were mostly officials. And as to native gentlemen some were there because of the distinct

and solemn assurance verbally given and afterwards publicly proclaimed in the columns of your daily contemporaries that it was a purely social and frindly gathering. The bulk of the diners were Parsis—small fry—friends and admirers so-called. But what happened? Firstly, before the dinner hour there was a murmur touching the way in which seats were marked off. It gave great umbrage to many. There was a regular war of angry words in the case of Dr. Bahadurji, a *personal* friend of Mr. Bhavnagri and the coterie who promoted the dinner. What redoubtable “fighting cock” was relegated to a back seat among the *hoi polloi* which, of course, his dignity resented. The upshot of it was that he was appeased by a modification of the “table of precedence” observed by the official promoters. Again, what happened after dinner? Sir Jamsetji made a speech introducing politics. Mr. Bhavnagri, of course, followed suit. It was all a pre-arranged affair. The amiable but weak-minded baronet was cleverly entrapped. It is said that his speech was inspired by a trinity of so-called clever men, friends of Mr. Bhavnagri. Poor Sir Jemsetji recited the speech or rather read it as prepared for him. Many of the sensible people there were annoyed at the introduction of politics after the solemn decleration to the contrary! I myself heard afterwards from the lips of a gentleman in high judicial position that had he known that this kind of trick was to be played he would neverc have gone to the dinner. Another European official expressed himself in the same manner. And Dr. Pollen who saw through the game, is generally said to have indirectly slapped the promoters for this infringement in a capital and happy speech he made! What a sorry spectacle. Thus the trick which was played at the London dinner where Lord Harris presided was repeated here! Please take special note of it. The two incidents are remarkable as showing how public faith is violated! And yet the next day the dinner was glorified as a “public” one by the party press. And the two dailies “wrote up” the hero of Bethnal Green misrepresenting and even traducing his political adversaries! Of course Baron Reuter was as usual at Mr. Bhavnagri’s service and a flaming telegram, you may depend on it, must have been flashed to London, as the one before it in connexion with the Mahommedan demonstration touching the cost of which, it is whispered, there is already a triangular

quarrel between a reporter, the chief entertainer, and some one else in mask! The amount at stake of this Mahomedan telegram is said to be about 150 rupees! I give this gossip as I hear it, but I am not responsible for its accuracy.

MR. BHAVNAGRI LOUDLY HISSED.

Of course, I need not say aught about the speeches which I presume you have already dealt with. But you must have noticed the brag about having a complete answer and the ostrich-like ways of fencing with the challenge of our Congress-party—a challenge hanging over for the last 18 months—a challenge which the lusty Champion vigorously threw at him some six or eight weeks ago. However the lucky incident of the public meeting called to welcome Dr. Bahadurji on his medical mission to England gave the opportunity to one of the speakers thereat to hurl defiance in the face of the world of India. He was no other than Mr. H. A. Wadia, the well-known Rajkote barrister, a staunch Congress man whom you would remember having heard discoursing eloquently on the Congress platform at Poona last Christmas. He has just returned from London. He hit hard and the hit was telling. The audience asked to name the politician of whom he had spoken. He could not resist and blurted out Mr. Bhavnagri. Immediately there was a regular storm of hisses. Mr. Wadia was unprepared for *this spontaneous demonstration!* So he tried to pacify the enraged audience by observing that they need not so express their indignation. Facts and arguments should be their weapons, and as these were strong enough they need hardly indulge in this popular way of expressing their displeasure at this “booming, bouncing, blazing light” of Bethnal Green as your “gushing Tory bard” sang in your columns the other day his “booming Bhavnagrian lay.” But, Mr. Editor, what a dishonest report appeared the next day in the columns of the *Times of India!* Why, the crowded meeting of really the picked and elite of our intellectual aristocracy, arrayed in solid phalanx in the body and on the platform of the hall of the Framji Institute, was in the opinion of the reporting scribe a meeting of ‘schoolboys.’ This is the stock phrase to which we have been long accustomed and citizens shake their heads when the *Times of India* specially reports a public meeting not to its liking and politics, as that of schoolboys. They know then that positively it must be a most influential and representative one. Next the

report was mutilated. It could not find a couple of columns to report a most interesting and *public* function, though it could spare half a dozen columns to write up a dinner or "demonstration" so called "in honour" of Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri, c.i.e., M.P. But the last thing was the conversion of the "loud hisses" of the audience into "loud cheers." Such were the liberties with truth your contemporary took. It was of a piece with that which converted an amendment of Dr. Bahadurji, in the Corporation some months ago unanimously passed, into one that "was lost." Such are the voracious scribes on the staff of your contemporary.

THE BHAVNAGRIAN CONFIDENCE TRICK NOT OVER YET.

But the Bhavnagriian saturnalia is not over. He has yet to take more "confidence" certificates home. The backward Mahomedans have supplied him with one. And the backward *Jains*, a section of the Hindus, are going to supply him with another. I informed you last week how the former affair was got up. It has already cost many searchings of the heart among the entertainers. Of course, one of the policemen was at the bottom of it. But more about it another time. In the coming affair of the Jains we may hear equally after-searchings of the heart. But I will just tell you why the Jains, blissfully ignorant of politics, are now so dotting on the member for Bethnal Green. They are devout and intensely religious, the Jains of Bombay. They have certain temples in the territories of the Thakore of Palitana. The Thakore was inexorable and refused to hear the prayers. So they went up to Government who, after careful consideration, also refused to hear them. So they think this member of Parliament may work the oracle and achieve a miracle! Deluded creatures! But hope springs eternal in the human breast. In the hope that Mr. Bhavnagri will succeed, they are offering him this self-interested bait of a demonstration which he will show to his patrons in the India Office as another proof of the confidence of the "great Hindu Community" of Bombay! Wah! Wah! Such, Mr. Editor, is the character of all the demonstrations so called that have taken place. They are artificially got up and promoted by selfish persons for their own selfish interests. There is no spontaneity about them and in no sense can they be considered as public demonstrations. But as Mr. Bhavnagri is determined not to leave Bombay without demonstrations which he fancies will establish his character

mentioned in the meeting. Mr. Bhavnagri, it appears, had uttered an atrocious libel on the Parsi community. The libel consists in the statement that the Parsis who had joined the Congress were very few, and that they were held in utter detestation by the Parsi community. We confess the libel, if it was publicly made, had escaped our notice. The libel is a characteristic piece of Bhavnagrian politics. Mr. H. A. Wadia, an eloquent speaker and a shining light in Indian political life, took up the cudgels on behalf of the community the M. P. had maligned and effectively exposed the impudent lie. Said Mr. Wadia :

“ I am a Congress-wallah myself, but I have no personal feeling in alluding to this charge. I am sure if I were to ask this high authority he would tell me that he never meant to include me in that charge.” (Laughter.) “ Probably, he might be of opinion that I have not done enough yet to merit the wholesale detestation which is in store for those who have worked like Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji (loud cheers) —Pheroze Shah Metha (cheers)—Dinsha Wacha (cheers) —and Dr. Bahadurji ” (cheers).

Mr. Wadia proceeded to remark that the high authority of whom he had spoken happened to be in their midst and had been giving some challenges to those from whom he differed. At this stage, cries of “ name, name,” were heard, and in response to those cries, Mr. Wadia let the cat out of the bag. It was our old friend—Mr. Mancherji Merwanji Bhavnagri! Mr. Wadia dealt with this libeller of an entire community in a fitting style. Said Mr. Wadia :

“ The charge which Mr. Bhavnagri has made is not so much a charge against the gentlemen whom I have named as it is an indictment of the whole Parsi community, and I challenge Mr. Bhavnagri from this platform to substantiate the charge or to withdraw it.” (Great cheering.) “ Let him make good his charge before his Anglo-Indian friends or his Mahomedan admirers,” (loud laughter and cheers) “ at his own chosen time, anywhere, or at any hour, but let him make it good, or let him withdraw it ” (renewed cheering).

The man who could bring himself to utter so infamous a libel does not deserve any consideration at the hands of his community. While, as for the politician, it reminds us of the saying of the Guelph who declaimed against politics as the trade of a not very respectable class of people!

THE MADRAS STANDARD (December 15, 1896).

The Bhavnagri Boom.

The *Gujarati* has a caustic criticism of the contemptible demonstration in "honor" of Mr. Bhavnagri. The bogus demonstration has made the M. P. ridiculous. That is the sad truth, however anxious the friends and admirers of the M. P., far and near, may not realise it. But we forget that policy or prudence or by whatever you call it, it is the better part of patriotism. The *Gujarati* writes:—

In all the speeches delivered by him in Bombay one looks in vain for any thing substantial. They contain little beyond empty platitudes and self-laudatory references. They also bear the impress of his desire to be magnified into a great patriot. With all their herculean attempts his friends have failed in doing it. Meaningless platitudes and handsome compliments freely distributed amongst friends and admirers are no mark of statesmanship, nor are they any evidence of political ability and knowledge or genuine patriotism.

The *Kaiser-i-Hind* has the bitterest things to say, which it well says, of the "ranting harangue" of the guest honored and its "irrelevancy, its impertinence, its hypocrisy, its unmitigated egoism and its disingenuousness."

The *Maharatta* pours ridicule upon the M. P. for masquerading in the character of a hero and a martyr.

The *Champion*, by name and in fact, truly says that the Bhavnagri boom is the result of a premeditated plan on the part of the friends of the M. P. to invest the dinner with a public and a political character.

The object of these tactics (writes the *Champion*) is evident. It is to impose upon the British public through Reuter's Agency and other channels that a public dinner was given by the citizens of Bombay to Mr. Bhavnagri in appreciation of his political services, and that he is thus acknowledged as their representative and the representative of the People of India as much as, if not more than Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. Mr. Bhavnagri may, however, rest assured that tactics like these will not be allowed to prevail without the most strenuous efforts to strip him of the peacock's feathers which he has thus donned, and to enlighten the British public of the real truth.

Was ever national guest treated to such choice compliments?

HE OBSERVER (December 16, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri and his Home Reception.

Once before we spoke of Mr. Bhavnagri, and once more we are constrained to drag him to our readers. The different readings of the honour—parties of the M. P. are infinitely amusing, and we thank him for breaking the monotony of our work in the desk with such palatable relishes. For us it is too late to express any opinion as regards the constituencies of these honour—parties. The wide world is fully awakened to it. The voice of the friends of the M. P. is pitifully hoarse with the song of lullaby. Mr. Bhavnagri talks of his own election in the British Parliament as a matter of national honour, we accept it, and are forced to remind him that his action there is a matter of national disgrace. The words that he has been uttering since his arrival has justified the *Madras Mail* to comment as "we are sorry to have to designate as fudge and fustian the utterances delivered by Mr. Bhavnagri, M.P., but, after all, these are the only terms which adequately describe them. A platitude does not cease to be a platitude, nor does bathos cease to be bathos, merely because it comes from the lips of a Parsee M.P., whether he represents Finsbury or the north-east corner of Bethnal-Green." It is undoubtedly a rare talent, the scent of the M.P. of smelling sedition in the constituencies of the Congress. We pity his tears and laugh at his boast of patriotism, and when he is very kind, only invoke the mercy of Heaven "O God save us from our friends." When the M. P. landed in India we hoped he will permit us to forget his past, but we are forced to make up our mind to forget him entirely. By the bye, we would like to request the Maharaja of Bhavnagar to read the 27th September issue of the *Champion* and pick up his duty therefrom. For this presumptive friend in the person of a servant of the Anglo-Indian, we hold the same opinion with our Bombay contemporary the *Champion* that "a slave is an object of commiseration, but a slave who sawns upon his master, is an object of loathing."

THE NATIVE OPINION (December 17, 1896).

Raising the Wind.

Well may those who got up a subscription dinner in favour of Mr. Bhavnagri lay the flattering unction to their heart of hearts for their recent performance. Indeed to those who have converted address-giving and entertainment-making into a profession, sage discretion in such a matter is of very little consequence; they only hanker after notoriety, and play their cards in such a way as to lead men of easy belief into doing things which mature deliberation would make them regret. However, *Khalpatism* has its attractions for weak minds, and no wonder that they should suit the promptings of their conscience to the gallery of those with whom personal aggrandisement is all in all. Herein lies the origin of the recent bogus demonstrations—demonstrations that had not an iota of spontaneity about them. And yet Mr. Bhavnagri talks of receptions and parties as if he returned for them from a mission of salvation of his own country! But as for his credentials, and they are to be found nowhere. Yes, he is in the British Parliament, but are not similar mediocrities members of the same House? Being a member of Parliament is no greater passport to fame than being a member of a society or a club, unless that membership is propped up by real substantial works, and what has Mr. Bhavnagri to show in this direction? His interest in Indian affairs, of which he makes so much, has been of a halting character—in fact, his performances may be regarded as utter failures—failures which we hope do not interfere with the progress of this country. At the dinner he said he represented India; we would rather say he represented Anglo-India than the real Indian communities. He laid great stress on the Bombay Mahomedan address to him, but those who know how the show was got up, who particularly worked up on a trivial section of the Mahomedans to get up that show, will naturally look upon it as a bogus one, like the presentations got up elsewhere. Indeed, those gentlemen who brought about the Mahomedan address are now heartily sorry for what they have done. Mr. Bhavnagri pretends to have great interest in Indian affairs: a real patriot, instead of giving all the way to Bhavnagar to receive addresses, must have at once instituted inquiries into the state of the famine-stricken, what part of the country was affected thereby, what

stock of gain the country had at present and so forth, and should have paid visits to authorities to know their views in a matter in which really he could have no less interest than the authorities have. Has he moved in the matter to any extent? One would like to know. Then, again, there are various other burning questions that regard our progress, such as the constitution of our legislative councils in respect to the evasiveness of official replies; the position of the wild tribes of the Thana District in regard to their primeval right of collecting dead-wood and other jungle produce as a means of subsistence; the condition of our agricultural classes and a variety of other questions which form the very basis of our people's well-being. Into which of these questions has Mr. Bhavnagri made inquiries? In none, we doubt not, beyond making full justice to cakes and honey served out on the table at some of the receptions. At a critical juncture like the present, a real, genuine patriot would leave aside all this tomfoolery of a *tamasha* and visit parts of the country with a view to study some of these questions first-hand. At the dinner, however, he told his audience that he meant to take counsel with the people on the various questions affecting this country. Whom did Mr. Bhavnagri consult on these burning questions? Oh! are we to believe that he looks upon a consultation with those who provided for him a rich repast sufficient to serve their ends? Amongst us those who have made these questions their own are few, and these he ought to consult with advantage. Has he consulted them on any of these several questions? Probably none of them, and from the way he talked at the dinner, it seems he gave preference to assembled guests for being his authorities over those whom we generally regard our leaders. On what basis, then, will he take his stand when in Parliament as one who had returned from India when that country was passing through a most terrible famine? Supposing some member of Parliament asks Mr. Bhavnagri as to our present agricultural prospects, will he draw upon one of the Anglo-Indian guests at the dinner as his authority? Or what else will he say? In his speech at the dinner there is not the least reference to the present crisis as if the country was in a prosperous condition, and there was no reason for any anxiety on that score! Under such trying circumstances, what would be the conduct of a real patriot? Indeed, he would refuse all these flimsy honours, and talk less of personal

affairs; but beyond personal affairs we find nothing in the long-winded yarn of Mr. Bhavnagri which, put into a crucible, means nothing short of self-glorification. But the Bombay dailies talk of this hole-and-corner meeting of friends and admirers, as one of the people, but obviously it has nothing to do with the Bombay public as a whole, and the attitude of the Native Press is a sufficient indication that the said public had nothing to do with the same. Indeed, on his arrival in England Mr. Bhavnagri may unfurl his flag as an idol of us, Indians, as one upon whom we, Indian people, look as our representative in the House of Commons. To any such opinion we give a flat denial; Mr. Bhavnagri is no more a representative of our people than he may be of the Hottentots or other nationality. Some of the speakers at the meeting attempted to place him on the same level with Mr. Dadabhai. Certainly, that was a bold attempt, those who attempted it ought to have spared themselves. It is fiction. Those who have carefully studied Mr. Dadabhai's works cannot but feel convinced that between him and Mr. Bhavnagri there is as much distance as there is between the earth and the heaven. How can pigmies like Mr. Bhavnagri claim to reach a personality that towers so high and whose real worth has been acknowledged both in and outside Parliament and by the whole Indian world. Indeed, Anglo-India is frantic over Mr. Bhavnagri's doings, but in doing so they have to serve a purpose; of this, we are sorry, Mr. Bhavnagri is not aware. He should have known that their acclamation was no true test either of his popularity among people or of his alleged intellectual abilities.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (Bombay Correspondent)
(December 17, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri is a genius. He came to India to study Indian questions. His study of the three R's comprised—Receptions, Rigmarole and Rant. The preliminary course was scarcely over when the interesting pupil found himself suffering from a severe fit of indigestion caused by that dinner, at which all that was great, good, patriotic and so forth in Bombay took part. The public are as disgusted with the jejune speeches delivered at that celebrated banquet as Mr. Bhavnagri himself apparently is with the bibulous hospitality of his friends. So he has betaken himself

(without his faithful henchman in the Bombay press chronicling the news) to Sholapur, where he is studying famine politics. We wish Mr. Bhavnagri god-speed. The study of Indian politics must be a mere bagatelle to the Unionist who had graduated in a greater school than any which India has to show. But we wish that Mr. Bhavnagri had remained true to the original programme, which, according to Reuter, was education, but which was afterwards altered so as to read—advertisement.

THE BHAVNAGRI ROOM.

I now turn to other incidents of the week. There was first *the* dinner, so long talked of, which came off on Monday last. I need not say it was hardly the affair of "honor" on which the member for Bethnal Green would be sincerely congratulated. In the first place it was a *belated* one. There was ~~no~~ help for it. Loud trumpets were blown for nearly ~~three~~ weeks that His Excellency the Governor was preside; then Sir Charles Farran; then Mr. Birdwood; and then goodness knows who! But all the same big names of big guns were bandied about by the promoters and active organisers of the dinner to tempt unwilling folk to to join the affair. I assure you, Mr. Editor, that were a true and faithful history of it were to be written, the world of India would be startled. It would then declare even with more emphatic voice than it has already done that they would have none of Mr. Bhavnagri's politics or his political strategy on which he pretends to plume himself. They might exclaim arguing from analogy, that if the social strategy was of the character which the truthful historian depicts what may we then think of his political tactics! To say the least the dinner was hardly a *voluntary* and *spontaneous* affair. It was an impressed one. The majority were there but not out of any love or admiration for Mr. Bhavnagri. If not he, his friends on his behalf, have been known to have entreated and appealed, appealed and supplicated, to "honour" the second Parsee M. P. I have authentic information that Europeans were impressed in this way. But even after all this hook and crook manner of getting up the dinner what happened. To say that it was of a *representative* character is to speak the very opposite of truth. The big guns were not there, and the small Anglo-Indian guns who were there were mostly officials. And as to native gentlemen some were there because of the distinct

and solemn assurance verbally given and afterwards publicly proclaimed in the columns of your daily contemporaries that it was a purely social and friendly gathering. The bulk of the diners were Parsis—small fry—friends and admirers so-called. But what happened? Firstly, before the dinner hour there was a murmur touching the way in which seats were marked off. It gave great umbrage to many. There was a regular war of angry words in the case of Dr. Bahadurji, a *personal* friend of Mr. Bhavnagri and the coterie who promoted the dinner. What redoubtable "fighting cock" was relegated to a back seat among the *hoi polloi* which, of course, his dignity resented. The upshot of it was that he was appeased by a modification of the "table of precedence" observed by the official promoters. Again, what happened after dinner? Sir Jamssetji made a speech introducing politics. Mr. Bhavnagri, of course, followed suit. It was all a pre-arranged affair. The amiable but weak-minded baronet was cleverly entrapped. It is said that his speech was inspired by a trinity of so-called clever men, friends of Mr. Bhavnagri. Poor Sir Jamssetji recited the speech or rather read it as prepared for him. Many of the sensible people there were annoyed at the introduction of politics after the solemn declaration to the contrary! I myself heard afterwards from the lips of a gentleman in high judicial position that had he known that this kind of trick was to be played he would never have gone to the dinner. Another European official expressed himself in the same manner. And Dr. Pollen who saw through the game, is generally said to have indirectly slapped the promoters for this infringement in a capital and happy speech he made! What a sorry spectacle. Thus the trick which was played at the London dinner where Lord Harris presided was repeated here! Please take special note of it. The two incidents are remarkable as showing how public faith is violated! And yet the next day the dinner was glorified as a "public" one by the party press. And the two dailies "wrote up" the hero of Bethnal Green misrepresenting and even traducing his political adversaries! Of course Baron Reuter was as usual at Mr. Bhavnagri's service and a flaming telegram, you may depend on it, must have been flashed to London, as the one before it in connexion with the Mahomedan demonstration touching the cost of which, it is whispered, there is already a triangular

quarrel between a reporter, the chief entertainer, and some one else in mask! The amount at stake of this Mahomedan telegram is said to be about 150 rupees! I give this gossip as I hear it, but I am not responsible for its accuracy.

MR. BHAVNAGRI LOUDLY HISSED.

Of course, I need not say aught about the speeches which I presume you have already dealt with. But you must have noticed the brag about having a complete answer and the ostrich-like ways of fencing with the challenge of our Congress-party—a challenge hanging over for the last 18 months—a challenge which the lusty Champion vigorously threw at him some six or eight weeks ago. However the lucky incident of the public meeting called to welcome Dr. Bahadurji on his medical mission to England gave the opportunity to one of the speakers thereat to hurl defiance in the face of the world of India. He was no other than Mr. H. A. Wadia, the well-known Rajkote barrister, a staunch Congress man whom you would remember having heard discoursing eloquently on the Congress platform at Poona last Christmas. He has just returned from London. He hit hard and the hit was telling. The audience asked to name the politician of whom he had spoken. He could not resist and blurted out Mr. Bhavnagri. Immediately there was a regular storm of hisses. Mr. Wadia was unprepared for *this spontaneous demonstration!* So he tried to pacify the enraged audience by observing that they need not so express their indignation. Facts and arguments should be their weapons, and as these were strong enough they need hardly indulge in this popular way of expressing their displeasure at this “booming, bouncing, blazing light” of Bethnal Green as your “gushing Tory bard” sang in your columns the other day his “booming Bhavnagrian lay.” But, Mr. Editor, what a dishonest report appeared the next day in the columns of the *Times of India!* Why, the crowded meeting of really the picked and elite of our intellectual aristocracy, arrayed in solid phalanx in the body and on the platform of the hall of the Framji Institute, was in the opinion of the reporting scribe a meeting of ‘schoolboys.’ This is the stock phrase to which we have been long accustomed and citizens shake their heads when the *Times of India* specially reports a public meeting not to its liking and politics, as that of schoolboys. They know then that positively it must be a most influential and representative one. Next the

report was mutilated. It could not find a couple of columns to report a most interesting and *public* function, though it could spare half a dozen columns to write up a dinner or "demonstration" so called "in honour" of Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri, C.I.E., M.P. But the last thing was the conversion of the "loud hisses" of the audience into "loud cheers." Such were the liberties with truth your contemporary took. It was of a piece with that which converted an amendment of Dr. Bahadurji, in the Corporation some months ago unanimously passed, into one that "was lost." Such are the veracious scribes on the staff of your contemporary.

THE BHAVNAGRIAN CONFIDENCE TRICK NOT OVER YET.

But the Bhavnagrian saturnalia is not over. He has yet to take more "confidence" certificates home. The backward Mahomedans have supplied him with one. And the backward *Jains*, a section of the Hindus, are going to supply him with another. I informed you last week how the former affair was got up. It has already cost many searchings of the heart among the entertainers. Of course, one of the policemen was at the bottom of it. But more about it another time. In the coming affair of the Jains we may hear equally after-searchings of the heart. But I will just tell you why the Jains, blissfully ignorant of politics, are now so dotting on the member for Bethnal Green. They are devout and intensely religious, the Jains of Bombay. They have certain temples in the territories of the Thakore of Palitana. The Thakore was inexorable and refused to hear the prayers. So they went up to Government who, after careful consideration, also refused to hear them. So they think this member of Parliament may work the oracle and achieve a miracle! Deluded creatures! But hope springs eternal in the human breast. In the hope that Mr. Bhavnagri will succeed, they are offering him this self-interested bait of a demonstration which he will show to his patrons in the India Office as another proof of the confidence of the "great Hindu Community" of Bombay! Wah! Wah! Such, Mr. Editor, is the character of all the demonstrations so called that have taken place. They are artificially got up and promoted by selfish persons for their own selfish interests. There is no spontaneity about them and in no sense can they be considered as public demonstrations. But as Mr. Bhavnagri is determined not to leave Bombay without demonstrations which he fancies will establish his character

as a "representative of India," you must be prepared for more of this character. Perhaps the final one on his departure will make up for the cold one he received on his arrival. We shall see.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (December 18, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri has finished his study of famine politics, and betaken himself to Secunderabad, where the usual "demonstrations" in his "honor" are all the rage. We do not hear of any speeches. Has the M. P. grown wiser since his last great performance at Bombay?

THE MALBAR AND TRAVANCORE SPECTATOR (December 19, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri.

The Bombay papers are concerned just now not with the bubonic plague or the famine, but with Mr. Bhavnagri and his dinners. The Anglo-Indian papers exaggerate private dinners to the Parsi M. P. into public entertainments; half a dozen friends or relatives joining to receive him at a Railway station into a political demonstration. Congress organs and political journals utilise a great portion of their space to combat the representative character assigned to Mr. Bhavnagri by their Anglo-Indian contemporaries. Mr. Bhavnagri and his friends appear to have been tickled by the splendid ovation which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji received when he landed in India three years ago to preside over the Congress. It testified in a remarkable manner to his representative character and the confidence and respect he commanded. The Anglo-Indians want the English public to believe that Mr. Bhavnagri occupies a similar position here and so they invest him with a popularity he does not now possess or ever hope to obtain. Whereas Mr. Dadabhai is a patriot of the right genuine kind, Mr. Bhavnagri has yet to prove that he is prepared to make sacrifices for the country. When opportunity offered itself he did not fail to decry the Congress or traduce its leaders. This made him unpopular with the educated classes, while to the masses he is an unknown quantity and his political antagonism to Mr. Dadabhai is not calculated to conduce to his popularity. No one in India will be misled by the

Anglo-Indian papers of Bombay and no one taken in by their hero's platitudes. We have no quarrel with Mr. Bhavnagri for casting his lot with the Tories, but upon a division on matters Indian, he should invariably have voted with the Indian Parliamentary Committee. He is not in touch with the leaders of Indian politics either at home or in England and his knowledge of the wants and grievances of the people is at best little less than meagre. Even if we made him our representative, he is not competent to serve as such. The people of India have found him out to be an opportunist seldom commanded the abiding confidence of either of a conflicting party. The hopes of Mr. Bhavnagri and his friends to mislead the British public as regards his real political status in this country are therefore doomed to disappointment. Let him join hands with Mr. Dhadabhai Nauroji, the Congress leaders, the members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee and the British Committee of the Congress; let him forswear his anti-Congress friends; let him by deeds and not words manifest his sympathy with the people of India; let him show that he is prepared to make sacrifices for the political emancipation of his countrymen; let him repent the passed and atone for it by vigorous efforts in the future to further India's cause; let him do all these, and then it will be time for us to consider what place to assign to him in India, but still so long as Messrs. Dadabhai Nauroji, Mehta, Bannerjee, Bannerjee and a score of others remain, it is futile on the part of Mr. Bhavnagri to expect to obtain a prominent place in the Indian polity. If he loyally serves them, we shall not certainly begrudge him the rightful position to which he entitles himself by his disinterested labours for his country. But some think it better to reign in hell than serve in heaven, and this perhaps explains Mr. Bhavnagri's conduct.

THE CHAMPION (December 20, 1896.)

The Bhavnagri Boom.

I.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE CHAMPION."

SIR,—Mr. Bhavnagri's speech, at the dinner held in his honour the other day, is characteristic of him. He is full of self-importance, and in his heart of hearts he thinks himself to be a really great man. In his address he frequently speaks of the uncharitable way in which he is being treated by some Congressionists; and he imputes it to the envy felt

by his opponents at his success. If we consider Mr. Bhavnagri's conduct from the day on which he made known his intention of standing as a candidate for Parliament, it will be seen that Mr. Bhavnagri deserves severe treatment at the hands of the Congressionists, and that he is entirely mistaken in charging his opponents with envy. In a number of speeches and interviews, he attacked the National Congress in terms of unmeasured abuse, not because he essentially differed from it in principle, but simply to recommend himself to the Anglo-Indians, and through their influence to the Conservative Party. He stated in an interview that Congress was composed of hot-headed and rash extremists, that it had no funds and organization, that it demanded Home Rule and representative government, and that it was disloyal, and so forth. Every one of the statements, as all who have glanced at a Congress report know, is a deliberate untruth. After this, how can Mr. Bhavnagri expect to be treated leniently by the Congressionists? After his entrance into Parliament, however, Mr. Bhavnagri made a show of advocating popular Congress measures in order to recommend himself to the people of India, and it seemed that for a time, at least, Mr. Bhavnagri's double-dealing did succeed. Further, Mr. Bhavnagri does not hesitate to call a person a great man and a patriot, whom he at one time characterized as belonging to a set of hot-headed and rash extremists, in order to serve his own purpose. Such is the political integrity and consistency of Mr. Bhavnagri. He is entirely mistaken in supposing that his sudden rise by such means as these has created envy in his opponents; it has merely created contempt for Mr. Bhavnagri and his actions.

Yours, &c.,

Bombay, 11th December 1896.

S. D.

THE CHAMPION (December 20, 1896).

The progress of the Bhavnagri Intrigue.

Those who were inclined to believe, or at least did not think that there was any reason to disbelieve, the bland and child-like professions of the Bhavnagri Boomers are, being now thoroughly undeceived. They thought they were only joining a simple welcome of kindly congratulation. We had warned them that the whole thing was a fraud, and

that the real aim and object was to enable Mr. Bhavnagri to go back to England with some sort of credentials from his countrymen, and to impose upon the British public as an Indian of some consequence in his own country and entitled, as he impudently tried to do in his budget speeches to speak on behalf of "the Millions of India," in support of Anglo-Indian sophistries and calumnies against his own countrymen. The false and misleading reports in the Anglo-Indian dailies formed one act of the conspiracy. But they also were means to an end. It did not matter if their untrustworthiness was thoroughly exposed in this country. They fully served their main object in enabling the unscrupulous 'boomers' to send costly telegrams through *Reuter's Agency* to announce to the admiring British public the grand and public demonstrations accorded to Mr. Bhavnagri. But a hollow conspiracy can never succeed in the long run. If more slowly, not the less surely will the exposure also reach the British public. They will be enlightened to the extent and character of the so-called Mahomedan entertainment. They will come to know how Mr. Bhavnagri's own creatures, among them officials grateful for favours already received and favours still to come, manufactured it by means as degrading to themselves as to their official position. They will know that when the Mahomedan address was pompously announced to have had 5,000 signatures the real fact is that it had scarcely 700 signatures, a large number of them being of men who did not and could not know what they were signing. They will know that when, at the only *bona fide* public meeting at which Mr. Bhavnagri's name was mentioned, it was received with cries of shame and hisses, which were unscrupulously turned into 'cheers' in some mysterious manner in the report of the *Times of India*, whose native reporter has intimate relations with Mr. Bhavnagri. They will know of the frantic efforts made by Mr. Bhavnagri in person to stop the real truth in this matter coming out in the columns of another of the Anglo-Indian journals, and how he furiously rushed about half the night to suppress this damning fact. They will know how the telegrams to England regarding the fictitious Mahomedan demonstration and the fraudulent 'Public' dinner were concocted, how at one time nobody from the promoters of the movements could be found to pay for them, and how the payments were

ultimately made. They will also know how attempts are being made to get an address from the Jain agitators against the Palitana Durbar, who, being discredited by the Kathiawar Agency and the Bombay Government, are now intriguing to secure Mr. Bhavnagri to prop up their shady agitation. Mr. Bhavnagri may be sure that the triumph he vainly thinks he has snatched in this way will yield to a reaction which will be as intense as the exaggeration and falsity of the boom is unparalleled.

MR. BHAVNAGRI'S ANGLO-INDIAN POLITICS

It is not easy to take Mr. Bhavnagri as a politician very seriously. But Mr. Bhavnagri has had now several occasions of giving out his definite political beliefs and sentiments on the practical and burning questions of the day. Up till now he has tried to pose as a well-meaning patriot on the strength of the most general platitudes as to his love for his country and his fierce determination to work for its welfare and happiness. The most rabid Anglo-Indian will conscientiously pledge himself in the same way. The touch stone can only be applied when we come to specific and definite ideas as to the measures necessary for the real welfare of the country. Will Mr. Bhavnagri consent to stand this test, instead of seeking refuge in platitudes and generalities which may pave the way to hell as well as to heaven? Will Mr. Bhavnagri venture to expound and enunciate his views on current Indian problems? Shall we remind him that he has propounded them in England, and that they are in entire unison with the repressive and retrograde views of the most anti-native Anglo-Indians? We will briefly refresh his memory. He has pronounced himself emphatically against simultaneous examinations. He has pronounced himself in favour of the disastrous increase in military expenditure. He has declared himself in favour of forward expeditions like the Chitral Expedition. He has declared himself against the expansion or development of the Legislative Councils. He has prophesied that if the Councils were expanded, the disloyalty of the Native Members would at once propose the disbandment of the European army. He has pronounced himself in favour of reviving the Gagging Act in some shape or other and putting fetters on the Vernacular press. He has pushed-pushed the complaints about severity of the revenue assessment. He has ridiculed the statements as to the enor-

mous drain on the resources of the country, and he has denied the deplorable poverty of the masses. We do not think Mr. Bhavnagri will ask us to produce chapter and verse for our charges, but we are ready to cite them, if he will gainsay one tittle of their absolute correctness. Now that he is posing in this country as a patriot and making *ad misericordiam* entreaties to accept him as such, will he honestly make a definite statement of his views on the above question before a representative native audience; or, if he is nervous as to the treatment he might receive, will he venture to publish his clear pronouncements on them in any one of the Anglo-Indian dailies which have so assiduously worked to 'boom and demonstrate' him?

MR. BHAVNAGRI IN QUEST OF ADDRESSES,

The Bhavnagri boom has been faintly murmuring this week at Sholapore. We have been tickled by two of our Anglo-Indian dailies with a telegram and a report about an address presented by the Parsi community of that place to the wandering M. P. in quest of demonstrations. Will our esteemed contemporaries enlighten us as to who was "A correspondent" who supplied them with the valuable information? Whoever he may be (and we may be allowed to wonder if the grateful High Court official who was chaperoning the M. P. had anything to do with the production of the correspondence), anyhow he has carefully avoided giving the remotest idea as to how many and who the gentlemen were who composed the Parsi community who presented the address at Sholapore. Besides the young pleader—one Mr. Davur, who read the address,—we know of no "Parsi community" at Sholapore except the extremely courteous proprietor of the Refreshment-room at the next station of Hotgi, and less than half-a-dozen other Parsis employed in minor occupations on the railway and in a small way in trade. But we forget; the correspondent has sked out the microscopic Parsi crowd with a dozen Parsi ladies. The inevitable "deafening and enthusiastic cheers" are there; but surely the correspondent might have improved upon the stale phrases which have been doing duty so long by throwing in a delightful picture of the excited waving of the Parsi ladies' turbans. The correspondent has been no less careful in omitting the names of the members of the "Hindu and

ultimately made. They will also know how attempts are being made to get an address from the Jain agitators against the Palitana Durbar, who, being discredited by the Kathiawar Agency and the Bombay Government, are now intriguing to secure Mr. Bhavnagri to prop up their shady agitation. Mr. Bhavnagri may be sure that the triumph he vainly thinks he has snatched in this way will yield to a reaction which will be as intense as the exaggeration and falsity of the boom is unparalleled.

MR. BHAVNAGRI'S ANGLO-INDIAN POLITICS.

It is not easy to take Mr. Bhavnagri as a politician very seriously. But Mr. Bhavnagri has had now several occasions of giving out his definite political beliefs and sentiments on the practical and burning questions of the day. Up till now he has tried to pose as a well-meaning patriot on the strength of the most general platitudes as to his love for his country and his fierce determination to work for its welfare and happiness. The most rabid Anglo-Indian will conscientiously pledge himself in the same way. The touch stone can only be applied when we come to specific and definite ideas as to the measures necessary for the real welfare of the country. Will Mr. Bhavnagri consent to stand this test, instead of seeking refuge in platitudes and generalities which may pave the way to hell as well as to heaven? Will Mr. Bhavnagri venture to expound and enunciate his views on current Indian problems? Shall we remind him that he has propounded them in England, and that they are in entire unison with the repressive and retrograde views of the most anti-native Anglo-Indians? We will briefly refresh his memory. He has pronounced himself emphatically against simultaneous examinations. He has pronounced himself in favour of the disastrous increase in military expenditure. He has declared himself in favour of forward expeditions like the Chitral Expedition. He has declared himself against the expansion or development of the Legislative Councils. He has prophesied that if the Councils were expanded, the disloyalty of the Native Members would at once propose the disbandment of the European army. He has pronounced himself in favour of reviving the Gagging Act in some shape or other and putting fetters on the Vernacular press. He has pook-pooked the complaints about severity of the revenue assessment. He has ridiculed the statements as to the enor-

mous drain on the resources of the country, and he has donied the deplorable poverty of the masses. We do not think Mr. Bhavnagri will ask us to produce chapter and verse for our charges, but we are ready to cite them, if he will gainsay one tittle of their absolute correctness. Now that he is posing in this country as a patriot and making *ad misericordiam* entreaties to accept him as such, will he honestly make a definite statement of his views on the above question before a representative native audience; or, if he is nervous as to the treatment he might receive, will he venture to publish his clear pronouncements on them in any one of the Anglo-Indian dailies which have so assiduously worked to 'boom and demonstrate' him?

MR. BHAVNAGRI IN QUEST OF ADDRESSES,

The Bhavnagri boom has been faintly murmuring this week at Sholapore. We have been tickled by two of our Anglo-Indian dailies with a telegram and a report about an address presented by the Parsi community of that place to the wandering M. P. in quest of demonstrations. Will our esteemed contemporaries enlighten us as to who was "A correspondent" who supplied them with the valuable information? Whoever he may be (and we may be allowed to wonder if the grateful High Court official who was chaperoning the M. P. had anything to do with the production of the correspondence), anyhow he has carefully avoided giving the remotest idea as to how many and who the gentlemen were who composed the Parsi community who presented the address at Sholapore. Besides the young pleader—one Mr. Davur, who read the address,—we know of no "Parsi community" at Sholapore except the extremely courteous proprietor of the Refreshment-room at the next station of Hotgi, and less than half-a-dozen other Parsis employed in minor occupations on the railway and in a small way in trade. But we forget; the correspondent hasoked out the microscopic Parsi crowd with a dozen Parsi ladies. The inevitable "deafening and enthusiastic cheers" are there; but surely the correspondent might have improved upon the stale phrases which have been doing duty so long by throwing in a delightful picture of the excited waving of the Parsi ladies' handkerchiefs. The correspondent has been no less careful in omitting the names of the members of the "Hindu and

Mohamedan" communities who attended "by invitation of the Parsi community" than in fighting shy of giving the names of the members of the "Parsi community" itself. Well, we cannot honestly say that we are sorry that Mr. Bhavnagri should be determined to make himself ridiculous in this manner. We heartily wish him joy of his rambles in quest of addresses and demonstrations. We have no doubt that by the time he returns to England loaded with honors and addresses, which, according to the Trades' Marks Act, will have to be labelled "Made to order in Humbugdom," he will have convinced the most sceptical as to the real importance and character of the notorious Bhavnagri boom.

MR. WADIA'S CHALLENGE.

But the most interesting feature of the Sholapur imposition is the attempt which seems to have been made by Mr. Bhavnagri to take up the challenge thrown out boldly by Mr. H. A. Wadia in his powerful speech at the public meeting in honor of Dr. K. N. Bahadurjee. The attempt is in keeping with all Mr. Bhavnagri's utterances, of a crooked and tortuous character. We can trust Mr. Wadia to make good his challenge against the faint repudiation offered by Mr. Bhavnagri. In the report of his speech at Sholapur which, of course, was carefully supplied by himself, it is clear that he does not venture to grapple with the challenge in an honest and straightforward manner. He first of all pretends to misunderstand the real gist of the challenge, and then under cover of it, endeavours to lead people of the real scent by facetiously lamenting that the only crime he was guilty of was that of repelling an aspersion on the loyalty of the Parsi community. We will leave Mr. Wadia to expose in detail the trickery of this defence. But we may point out that the gravamen of Mr. Wadia's attack lay in pointing out that on the occasion in question, what Mr. Bhavnagri had really asserted was that men like Dada-bhai Naoroji and those who thought with him on Indian political questions were "held in detestation" by the Parsi community. It is true that Mr. Bhavnagri had conveyed this insinuation, not in so many express words, but left it to be inferred by necessary implication, in keeping with the underhand manner which Mr. Bhavnagri has for a long time employed to run down and depreciate Mr.

Dadabhai. Mr. Bhavnagri thinks that he can throw dust in the eyes of people by asking them to look only at the note which he asked the Editor of the *Asiatic Quarterly Journal* to insert, and in which Mr. Dadabhai's name is not openly mentioned. But nobody knows better than Mr. Bhavnagri—and that is why he has not dared to meet Mr. Wadia's challenge in an honest and straightforward manner—that the lecture delivered by Sir Lepel Griffin at the East India Association, Mr. Bhavnagri's speech in the course of the debate on that lecture, and his note subsequently furnished to the journal in which the lecture and the debate were reproduced, must be all taken together. In the lecture, Sir Lepel Griffin had attacked the Parsi community on the basis of the disloyal and treasonable utterances of men like Dadabhai Naoroji. Mr. Bhavnagri had in his speech on the debate endorsed every thing said by Sir Lepel Griffin. In the note, he endeavoured to narrow his absolute endorsement of Sir Lepel Griffin's indictment by adding that the sentiments reprobated by the lecturer,—those sentiments being those of Dadabhai Naoroji and his associates—were repudiated by the Parsi community in general, and that the Parsi community “held in detestation the holders of those sentiments,” leaving it to be clearly understood that those holders of such disloyal sentiments, viz., Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and his Congress associates whom Sir Lepel Griffin had attacked, were the persons whom the Parsi community held in detestation. Mr. Bhavnagri knows that when the full text of the lecture, the speech and the note are laid before the public, the full malice of his attack on Mr. Dadabhai and the Congress-wallahs will be made as clear as daylight. It will be better for him not to add to the malice the whimpering and futile meanness of a cowardly equivocation.

THE WEEKLY REVIEW (December 1896).

Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri, M. P.

We have written enough in these columns to show how little we are in accord with those leaders of ours who think difference of opinion a sufficient reason for vilifying Mr. Bhavnagri to their hearts' content. But, on the other side, we must confess that the friends and admirers of the Honourable Member for Bethnal-Green are over-doing their part with vengeance. They were, of course, quite

competent to make as much of Mr. Bhavnagri as they possibly could in their own circles. But they had no business to try to make out that the three tailors of Toley Street were not only all London but Edinburgh and Dublin put together. This was, to say the truth, not being honest. And considering that no amount of slyness can dim the significance of facts that all the Indian world knows, we are indeed amazed at the way they have chosen to heap "blushing honours" thick upon Mr. Bhavnagri's head. From the day that Messrs. Framji and Co. put their heads together to organise a dinner to the second Parsee M.P., it was clear that the object of their adoration—and perhaps, solicitude—had little of that hold upon the people's hearts which had made Mr. Dadabhoj Naoroji's visit to India, after his success in Central Finsbury, a triumph and a glory. A howl went forth, possibly from some of Mr. Bhavnagri's enemies in Bombay against even the idea of an attempt to do the gentleman public honour. And it was significant that except for a few puny protests here and there—and in these we include our own—it was allowed to echo through the land. If this could not teach Mr. Bhavnagri's friends and admirers to beware how they were overstepping their bounds, the profound silence that pervaded the country which was expected to take Mr. Bhavnagri rapturously to heart, for a month after his arrival here, should not have gone without producing its effect upon their minds. But even that has fallen flat. And, as a consequence, we are having exhibited to us the pitiful spectacle of a host of ordinarily sensible people labouring to render black into white, convert molehills into mountains, to make the private feeling in favour of Mr. Bhavnagri into a public popular one, and thus to heroify him.

And to aggravate matters, we have Mr. Bhavnagri lending himself, with heart and soul, to practise a deception that can deceive none—at any rate in India—and glorying in it. The *Times of India*—the journal, by the way, which felt in honour bound to paraphrase the *hissas* with which Mr. Bhavnagri's name was greeted, at a certain meeting, as *cheers*—notified the dinner at Sir D. M. Petit's in these terms:—

The friends of Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri, C.I.E., M.P., have arranged to entertain him at dinner on Saturday, the 5th December, at Sir D. M. Petit's bungalow at Nepean Sea-road. The dinner is meant to congratulate Mr. Bhav-

nagri on his return to Parliament, and will be of a social and non-political-character. We are asked to state that friends of Mr. Bhavnagri who may desire to join the dinner are requested to communicate with the Honorary Secretaries at No. 89, Meadow-street.

Yet, at the dinner, Mr. Bhavnagri congratulated himself on the fact, that "all those who are representative of the greatness, the honour, and the influence of the first city in India have combined to congratulate me on my election to the Imperial Legislature, and to express their confidence in the sincerity of my desire to serve the great interests of this vast country as my humble powers would permit of my doing from my place in that august assembly;" and also on this, that to the organisation of the gathering "should have been devoted the energies of as influential a committee as had ever been formed in this capital of Western India for a similar purpose, composed of level-headed men of all the races inhabiting it, whose ripe experience of public life and sound views on public matters lend to the event an importance far beyond my deserts." We will not say that Mr. Bhavnagri is a humbug or a born liar. But we must say this, that no man, in his anxiety to get an advertisement, ever played a more desperate game with his reputation, and let his tongue trip more profusely than the Honourable Member for Bethnal Green. We offer him our sincere condolences on the mishap.

THE KAISER-I-HIND (December 20, 1896).

The Challenge to Mr. Bhavnagri.

Modesty has never been the foible of Mr. Muncherji M. Bhavnagri, but if it ever had, he would have been rid of that inconvenient virtue by the perverse adulation of the newsmongers who, in a spirit of contradiction, almost feminine in its intensity, continue to print flaming reports of his sayings and doings in this or that Sleepy Hollow of the Presidency. It would demand "credulity even below the milkiness of infancy" to credit these fictions, according to which all the world does nothing but observe *him*. Indeed, his slightest movements "create a molecular disturbance in type" and his drowsy cackle about himself and his achievements (?) vibrates into paragraphs and even columns. If, under those trying circumstances, the humpty-jumpty of

Bethnal Green did not come to think himself a great man privileged to "cry his own roast meat" in sundry places, he would not be human. The latest of these reports comes to us from famine-stricken Sholapur. Mr. Dhavnagri, we fancy, went there only "to make a study on the spot" (in a few hours) of the most pressing political question of the day. But the ardent enthusiasm of his "friends and admirers" would not allow him to devote himself solely to such a study. They *would* present him with an address extolling "his moderate and thoughtful utterances" and his signal services (?) to the teeming millions of India (of whose real condition he knows nothing). They *would* get up a demonstration at the Cama Hall, invite the clamjamfrey of Sholapur, and hear if only once the word of political wisdom from the lips of their hero. And so they got twelve Parsi ladies to attend, and some one to read the address, which the honoured one was pleased to call pithy. And all this cheered the very cockles of his heart, inasmuch as it was so "spontaneous" and "unexpected" that he himself knew nothing at all about it until that morning. And then the great man proceeded to talk about himself and to let off his popgunnery at the "detested" Congresswallahs. But this time it was not to challenge them to prove this and disprove that, but to reply, as best he could, to the straightforward and direct indictment which Mr. Wadya had drawn up against him, for having said at a meeting in England that his community "held in detestation" certain Parsis who, having made common cause with the Congress, and entertaining liberal sentiments in politics, found occasion to express views adverse to the policy of the British Government. Mr. Wadya had then said that the Parsi gentlemen referred to were certainly men like the Hon. Mr. Mehta, Mr. D. E. Wacha and Dr. K. N. Bahadhurji. Mr. Wadya had hit straight from the shoulder, but the manner in which his opponent parried the blow was quite characteristic of the man. He forthwith applied a lot of soft sawder to the community, called it "docile" and "noble" and "beloved," and would fain nibble at a parallel between himself and a national martyr. He had committed, he said, only "the great crime" of repelling an aspersion cast upon the loyalty of the Parsi community. He had merely asserted that that community was bound to Englishmen by the ties of friendship and gratitude, and that its welfare was intertwined with the permanence of British rule, and that it detested

any declaration to the contrary. In a case like this, where a man tries to wriggle himself out of the quandary he has placed himself in, by paltering with himself, the best thing to do is to set his original words over against the attenuated paraphrase with its harmless platitudes. We will now quote those words : " The leaders of the Parsee community as well as the bulk of it have never tired of acknowledging the good that Government has done to India. No doubt *a few individuals* are now and then found to express themselves *in a different tone*, which gives good reason for such remarks as those of Sir Lepel, but it is unfair to generalise from this and attribute this tone to the Parsees as a body. The action of *such individuals and writers is held in detestation by the community* ; and it is no secret that the Parsees consider their own welfare as that of the people of India generally, to be bound up with the permanence of British rule in the country." (The italics are ours). After this it will be only necessary to ask who are the individuals who are now and then found to express themselves "*in a different tone*," that is, who do not " acknowledge the good that Government has done to India." In the first place, are there any such Parsees? And if there are, who are they? Will Mr. Bhavnagri lay his hand on his heart and say that he did not mean to apply those words to the very gentlemen whose names were mentioned by his accuser? And if he did, of which no one who knows him can have any doubt, is he not guilty of having asserted, of course in his own roundabout, circumlocutory fashion, that the Parsi community held these gentlemen in detestation? After having thus convicted him out of his own mouth, we hope Mr. Bhavnagri will have the good sense not to refer to this " petty-minded (*sic*) incident " in future.

THE GUJARAT MITRA (December 20, 1896).

Dr. Bahadurji's Reception in Bombay and Mr. Bhavnagri's bogus demonstration.

The spontaneous and warm reception given to Dr. Bahadurji on Wednesday last contrasts significantly with the ' unique ' welcome and ' splendid ' dinner given to Mr. Bhavnagri by his friends of the one and admirers of the other community in the week preceding. Even to a passing looker-on it cannot fail to give this important object-lesson

that the hearts of the people do not go with the representative of Conservative India. It might be a tempting platitude for Mr. Bhavnagri to indulge in with a view to win the sympathy of his Tory supporters in England. But those that have the eyes to see will see that with the wave of Western civilization India is progressing and progressing towards a definite goal. The educated young men whom Dr. Gray and his comrades charged with base ingratitude are the pioneers of that movement, and the 'young and ideal' man like Dr. Bahadurji who can give us an example of unselfish enterprise and perseverance is the hero of the day.

From the very beginning of this Medical Reform agitation Dr. Bahadurji has been reviled by his reckless opponents as one who was going out to air his personal grievances. That he should have been willing to throw up a most lucrative practice for the sake of the useful agitation that he has set up, gives a lie direct to the imputation of his selfish criticisms. While in England, he has never attacked individuals but the anomalous and extravagant system of joint Civil and Military Medical Departments, which stands condemned by these very Anglo-Indian critics.

As Dr. Bahadurji himself put it so neatly before the meeting, all that he had said and done was to point out the mischief done by the existing system of medical administration, to the interest of medical science, education and sanitation and the country and its Government. The connection of the Civil with the Medical Department has been a very costly one. Dr. Bahadurji and his friends therefore advocate a complete severance of this costly connection. But his learned brothers of the I. M. S. are extremely reluctant to lose the lucrative prizes of the Civil Department. They therefore raise a hue and cry, not in defence of the existing system which stands condemned by the opinions of some of themselves, but against the person who has the courage and the ability to expose the mischievous character of the system. The Anglo-Indian journals are in their hands; and they use their columns to indite the reckless imputation that "the whole agitation about the Medical Reform in India is a wearisome raking up of old sores, which are now used as a peg on which to hang a bag of somebody's personal woes." The papers in England are not so unfair. The *London Times*, the *Daily Chronicle*, the *Pall Mall Gazette* and the *Army and Navy Gazette* all sympathised with Dr.

Bahadurji's agitation. He was extremely well received by Sir Lepel Griffin and Lord Reay; and his success in the meeting of the British Medical Association at Carlisle, was, as we have been already aware, a moral victory. His evidence before the Royal Commission on expenditure was straight forward and explicit. - It has impressed the Commission favourably, and we trust much good would result from it.

We only hope that India may soon have many public-spirited citizens like Dr. Bahadurji.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (December 21, 1896).

The Champion offers a challenge to
Mr. Bhavnagri.

"Mr. Bhnagri has pronounced himself emphatically against simultaneous examinations. He has pronounced himself in favour of the disastrous increase in military expenditure. He has declared himself in favour of forward expeditions like the Chitral expedition. He has declared himself against the Expansion or development of the Legislative Councils. He has prophesied that if the Councils were expanded, the disloyalty of the Native Members would at once propose the disbandment of the European army. He has pronounced himself in favour of reviving the Gagging Act in some shape or other and putting fetters on the Vernacular press. He has pooh-pooed the complaints about the severity of the revenue assessments. He has ridiculed the statements as to the enormous drain on the resources of the country, and he has denied the deplorable poverty of the masses."

The question is, whether Mr. Bhavnagri still adheres to these opinions. We know how Mr. Bhavnagri would meet this challenge to deliver himself on "political" and "contentious" topics. Failing the brave M. P., will his bottle-holders in the press take up the challenge?

We hope Mr. Bhavnagri's bottle holders are satisfied with that great patriot's speech at Sholapur. "You will not expect me, I know, to make any lengthened speech on political or contentious topics," said this drawing-room, rose-water patriot; but by way of "justifying" the "kind and complimentary action" of Sholapurians, the great

man repeated the assurance that "as in the past, so in the future, my endeavours shall be freely and fully directed to serve the welfare of the people of India on every available occasion." It is impossible to take a statesman seriously who pours forth a cataract of twaddle of this description in one week, washy, ever-lasting flood. Mr. Bhavnagri concluded by expressing his grateful thanks to those who had "gathered on this sacred (?) spot, to express their *delight* at having one of themselves in the House of Commons, by the *wise suffrages* of an *important English constituency*," and with the appropriate sentiment that he was unable to tell them how deeply impressed he was by "this indication of your *patriotic joy*." A great man, truly!

THE BOMBAY GAZETTE (December 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri and Mr. Wadya.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "BOMBAY GAZETTE."

Sir,—Since writing to you on the 16th, I have received the full text of Mr. Bhavnagri's speech at Sholapur. Will the Hon'ble Member forgive my telling him that his speech shows the rapid advance he is making in the art of what the Kathiawarees call *talking gole-gole*? Surely, Mr. Bhavnagri must know what my challenge was. Where is the use of talking of Parsee loyalty or of Parsee writers and individuals (unknown) who are disloyal? Is it or is it not true that Mr. Bhavnagri meant to include Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji in particular, and generally the other gentlemen named by me, when he spoke of the few Parsee individuals and writers, whose action, he said, was held in detestation by the Parsee community? It is, and it was, a superfluous task of defending the *noble and docile* community when nobody attacked it and no one dreams of its being disloyal. Cannot Mr. Bhavnagri give a plain answer to a plain challenge? Let us have a plain denial or a bold avowal, regardless of consequences. Surely, a political leader and guide like our second Parsee M.P. ought at least to have the courage of his convictions.

Yours, &c.,
H. A. WADYA.

Rose Bank, Kirkee, December 21.

HINDU (December 23, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri, M. P.

(FROM OUR CORRESPONDENT).

This Member of Parliament paid a visit to Hyderabad on a special invitation from His Excellency the Minister. He arrived here on Monday evening last, and was put up at *Faluk Nama*, the residence of the Minister. There was an "At Home" on Thursday evening at Sharmadi given by Mr. Shapoorji Chinoi, where the *elite* of the place were invited to meet him; in the night there was a dinner in his honour at the *Faluk Nama* palace. He left Hyderabad on Friday morning.

The object of the invitation and the mission of the Conservative Member to Hyderabad are not known to the public—in fact, no one knows about it all. It might have been to entrust him with any private commission to be executed for His Excellency the Minister in England, or simply an empty gratification on the part of the latter of doing honour to an Indian who holds the unique position of a Member of Parliament. If the former, it is impossible to conceive what service Mr. Bhavnagri could do to Sir Vicar-ul-Umra Bahadur in England, as the nature of that service is extremely delicate and would require the energy and influence of a person of far higher capacities and connections. If the latter, if the Minister desired to honour the Indian, Mr. Bhavnagri is not the Indian who is to have that honour. It is really strange that the Minister thought of honouring a politician who has been changing his opinions as many times as he does his coats every day, and who has not been able to gain the confidence and respect of his own citizens, nay, who is positively disregarded throughout. But the ways of Hyderabad are very peculiar and those of Sir Vicar still more. It is a misfortune that his confidences are always misplaced.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (December 26, 1896).

Mr. Bhavnagri has replied to Mr. Wadia's challenge, and Mr. Wadia has rejoined. The reply is characteristic of that astute and modest Parliamentarian. We hope to deal with the matter in our next.

We have dealt with the vile and calumnious libel for which Mr. Mancherji Merwanji Bhavnagri, M. P., had made himself responsible, when he said that the Parsee community held in "detestation" men like Mr. Naoroji and others of his political faith. Mr. Wadia makes a contemptuous reference to the remarkable reply the M. P. gave to the challenge to *withdraw* or to *substantiate* that libel. As we remarked the other day the M. P. *invented* an attack on the Parsee community for a certain purpose, and that was to make a personal attack on our G. O. M. Unscrupulous tactics ! Mr. Wadia writes :

"Will the Hon'ble Members forgive my telling him that his speech shows the rapid advance he is making in the art of what the Kathiawarees call *talking gale-gale* ? Surely, Mr. Bhavnagri must know what my challenge was. Where is the use of talking of Parsee loyalty or of Parsee writers and individuals (unknown) who are disloyal ? Is it or is it not true that Mr. Bhavnagri meant to include Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji in particular, and generally the other gentlemen named by me when he spoke of the few Parsee individuals and writers, whose action, he said, was held in detestation by the Parsee community ? It is, and it was, a superfluous task of defending the noble and docile community when nobody attacked it and no one dreams of its being disloyal. Cannot Mr. Bhavnagri give a plain answer to a plain challenge ? Let us have a plain denial or a bold avowal, regardless of consequences. Surely, a political leader and guide like our Second Parsee M. P. ought at least to have the courage of his convictions !"

So long as the precise words used by Mr. Bhavnagri were not before the public, the M. P. was safe. Now he is past praying for. An excellent sample of a political leader, forsooth !

THE KAISER-I-HIND (December 27, 1896).

The hypocritical saint Mr. Bhavnagri and his pious Pujari Mr. Kabraji.

Our estimable friend Mr. K. N. Kabraji of the *Rast Goftar* has constituted himself the head *Pujari* of the Bhavnagri cult, with the passionate and unreasoning fervour of devotion with which fanaticism animates its devotees. For weeks past he has abandoned himself night and day to the unceasing *pujah* of his diminutive idol. He dances, jumps,

gyrates before it like a whirling dervish, leaps the most astounding somersaults, stands on his head, and altogether performs the most amazing calisthenic antics in pious glorification of his little deity. He burns before it incense, sickening and nauseating to ordinary mortals! he does not hesitate to offer sacrifices of fairness, truth and consistency. Last Sunday was a special *pujah* day, and Mr. Kabraji surpassed even himself in the impudence of his inconsistency and the audacity of his misrepresentation. Hitherto he had confessed that Mr. Bhavnagri was an opponent of the Congress. In the *Rust* of the 25th October last, he wrote "Mr. Bhavnagri being of the party opposed to the Hindu Congress our Hindu brethren have kept aloof from demonstrations in his honour." In issue after issue, the opposition to Mr. Bhavnagri was explained to proceed from the Hindus who belonged to the Congress of which he was an opponent, and from Parsis who had 'Hinduized' themselves. . By the way, we may mention it for the enlightenment of some of our friends outside the Presidency, that the dislike and hatred of Mr. Kabraji and Mr. Bhavnagri for the Hindus is nothing new. They led the crusade which agitated his Presidency a few years ago for the estrangement of Parsis from all communion with Hindus and preached a Parsi gospel of selfishness advising them to cast their lot with Anglo-Indians in preference to making common cause with Hindus. That is by the way, however. To return to Mr. Kabraji's extraordinary devotional performances, this week he has turned a complete somersault. Bhavnagri, an opponent of the Congress? Who could have published such a gross falsehood? Why, he has all along been friend and advocate of the Congress! And we are treated to extracts from a private letter—carefully prepared for publication—of Mr. Bhavnagri to a friend in which he expresses his pious horror at being so dreadfully misunderstood. Can impudence go further? Only the other day our contemporary the *Champion* quoted *verbatim* a long passage from his speech at the dinner given to him in London by his Anglo-Indian patrons, in which he not only vilified the Congress but made cowardly insinuations against the loyalty of its adherents. But it seems all that was for the purpose of imposing upon his intolerant hosts. Still a Congresswala might well question,

"It was all very well to dissemble your love.
But why, oh why did you kick me downstairs?"

We may at once tell this pious *pujari* of a Kabraji and his hypocritical saint that we have had quite enough of this nauseating jugglery, and that such dishonesty is as degrading as it is futile and impotent.

SUPPRESSIO VERI SUGGESTIO FALSI—*RAST* GOFTAR'S POLICY.

But the unscrupulous misrepresentations of last Sunday's *Rast* do not end here. The whole Vernacular press of this Presidency has denounced and ridiculed Mr. Bhavnagri and his pompous pretensions. To counteract the damning inferences from so unanimous a condemnation by the people to whom Mr. Bhavnagri is best known, the *Rast* tries to make the most of two or three papers which have in a way taken his side. But in doing so, the *Rast* loses all sense of straightforwardness. It quotes at length a para from the *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* written as far back as the 11th October last in Mr. Bhavnagri's favour when it was not in possession of the full facts. The date is carefully suppressed. But not only that, but the *Rast* has not the honesty to publish a subsequent para in the *Patrika*, retracting the old opinion, and admitting that the opposition was justified for important political reasons. To what depths of degradation has a paper which once enjoyed an influential position, descended in the unreasoning zeal of the worship of false gods! The later number of the *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* observes:—

“ We welcome back Mr. Bhavnagri, M.P. home., We said the other day that we were proud of his achievements; for, an Indian who succeeds in entering the British Parliament is bound to be a man of eminent ability. Mr. Bhavnagri represents a British constituency—we wish we could add India also. We are sorry we cannot accord him that reception which we did to Mr. Naoroji. For if he, like Mr. Bhavnagri represented a British constituency he was also member for India which we grieve to say Mr. Bhavnagri is not. The attempt to prevent a national demonstration on his behalf is not due to jealousy but to a political consideration of high importance. He has to side with the Government of Lord George Hamilton which is not popular here. It would, therefore, be not safe to give Mr. Bhavnagri a representative character by a national welcome. Yet as we said the other day if he is a Conservative by circumstances, he must be an Indian at heart. Let him do all the good he can to his mother country—

and he can do exceedingly much, betraying the interests of his party and God will bless him, and his countrymen will thank him in their heart of hearts."

A CRUEL IRONY OF FATE.

There is, however, an amusing incident in connection with this matter. Two long passages from the Madras "Weekly Review" discountenancing the Bhavnagri exposure were exultingly quoted in big type. "A Daniel come to Judgment," shouts the *Rust* in the ecstasy of a triumph. But alas! the malice of fate is inscrutable. While the *Rust's* exulting shouts were being composed in type, and the ink had scarcely dried, the printer's devil of the "Weekly Review" had already the previous night maliciously turned out in black and white a scathing denunciation of Mr. Bhavnagri and his parasites. We give below the following article published in the "Weekly Review" of Saturday evening the 19th December:—

MR. M. M. BHAVNAGRI, M. P.

"We have written enough in these columns to show how little we are in accord with those leaders of ours who think difference of opinion a sufficient reason for vilifying Mr. Bhavnagri to their heart's content. But on the other side, we must confess that the friends and admirers of the Honorable Member for Bethnal Green are over-doing their part with vengeance. They were, of course, quite competent to make as much of Mr. Bhavnagri as they possibly could in their own circles. But they had no business to try to make out that the three tailors of Toley Street were not only all London but Edinburgh and Dublin put together. This was, to say the truth, not being honest. And considering that no amount of alyness can dim the significance of facts that all the Indian world knows, we are indeed amazed at the way they have chosen to heap "blushing honours" thick upon Mr. Bhavnagri's head. From the day that Dossabhoj Framji and Co. put their heads together to organise a dinner to the second Parsee M. P., it was clear that the object of their adoration—and perhaps solicitude—had little of that hold upon the people's hearts which had made Mr. Dadabhoj Naoroji's visit to India, after his success in Central Finsbury, a triumph and a glory. A howl went forth, possibly from some of Mr. Bhavnagri's enemies in Bombay, against even the idea of an attempt to do the gentleman

public honours. And it was significant that except for a few puny protests here and there—and in these we include our own—it was allowed to echo through the land. If this could not teach Mr. Bhavnagri's friends and admirers to beware how they were over-stepping their bounds, the profound silence that pervaded the country which was expected to take Mr. Bhavnagri rapturously to heart, for a month after his arrival here, should not have gone without producing its effect upon their minds. But even that has fallen flat. And, as a consequence, we are having exhibited to us the pitiful spectacle of a host of ordinarily sensible people labouring to render black white, convert molehills into mountains, to make the private feeling in favour of Mr. Bhavnagri into a public popular one, thus, to heroify him.

And to aggravate matters, we have Mr. Bhavnagri lending himself, with heart and soul, to practise a deception that can deceive none—at any rate in India—and glorying in it. The *Times of India*—the journal, by the way, which felt in honour bound to paraphrase the hisses with which Mr. Bhavnagri's name was greeted, at a certain meeting as cheers—notified the dinner at Sir D. M. Petit's in these terms :—

'The friends of Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri, C.I.E., M. P., have arranged to entertain him at dinner on Saturday, the 5th December, at Sir D. M. Petit's bungalow at Nepean Seacrad. The dinner is meant to congratulate Mr. Bhavnagri on his return to Parliament and will be of a social and non-political character. We are asked to state that friends of Mr. Bhavnagri who may desire to join the dinner are requested to communicate with the Honorary Secretaries at No. 89, Meadow Street.'

Yet, at the dinner, Mr. Bhavnagri congratulated himself on the fact, that "all those who are representative of the greatness, the honour, and the influence of the first city in India have combined to congratulate me on my election to the Imperial Legislative, and to express their confidence in the sincerity of my desire to serve the great interests of this vast country as my humble powers would permit of my doing from my place in that august assembly;" and also on this, that to the organisation of the gathering "should have been devoted the energies of as influential a committee as had ever been formed in this capital of Western India for a similar purpose, composed of level-headed men of all

the races inhabiting it, whose ripe experience of public life and sound views on public matters lend to the event an importance far beyond my deserts." We will not say that Mr. Bhavnagri is a humbug or a born liar. But we must say this, that no man in his anxiety to get an advertisement ever played a more desperate game with his reputation, and let his tongue trip more profusely than the Honourable Member for Bethnal Green. We offer him our sincere condolence on the mishap."

THE WEEKLY REVIEW (December 26, 1896).

The readiness with which Mr. Bhavnagri has accepted Mr. Wadya's challenge may be a proof of the Parsi Member's agility. But, it certainly is no sign that he may be trusted to stand by his guns. Having said in London that Dadhabhoy Naoroji and men of his ilk were held in detestation by the community, it is by no means the most natural way of making good that statement to say "that all he had done was to repel a charge made in London against the Parsees that they were disloyal and that the allegation in question was fictitious." It is possible that Mr. Bhavnagri has had time enough since he added his foot-note—which Mr. Wadya has dragged into day-light—to his speech before the East India Association, on the 6th March 1895, to repent or to know himself mistaken. If so, it would have been perfectly honorable to confess it. As it is, even silence over Mr. Wadya's challenge would have been far more dignified than the prevarication with which Mr. Bhavnagri has thought fit to meet it. And one cannot help thinking that Mr. Bhavnagri's advocacy, as well as his opposition cannot matter much after all.

THE GUJARATI (December 27, 1896).

Although Mr. Bhavnagri's friends and admirers are anxious to make out that he is a man of high ability and large experience, none else has ever believed him to be any thing more than a man of perfectly common-place attainments and ordinary mental capacity. His speeches in Parliament, and his recent utterances in reply to bogus addresses, and in acknowledgment of spurious demonstrations afford a convincing proof that his mental equipment is of the most commonplace kind. Look at the informing

deliverances of Mr. Dadabhai, and by their side those of Mr. Bhavnagri pale into absolute insignificance. He was reported by Reuter to have come back to India to study Indian questions on the spot, and by others on some domestic business. As regards his first trip to Sholapur and his effusive reply to the address got up by one or two friends they supply interesting material for comment. Sholapur is one of the famine-stricken districts. It was at Sholapur that the grain-rioters were fired upon. Well, what would a true and sympathetic representative of the people have done? What would have Mr. Dadabhai done, if he had been in India at this juncture? A man, who has spoken for the people and espoused the cause of the people for the last twenty-five years, could not but have uttered a word of sympathy for them in their hour of distress. What does Mr. Bhavnagri do? He is all joy because of the spurious and ridiculous demonstration got up in his honour at Sholapur by the Three Tailors in the Tooley Street, but has not a word to say on the present situation. In his speeches made in Bombay there is not a syllable with reference to the famine which has caused so much anxiety to the whole country. And yet the object of the manufactured demonstrations is to prove to the people of England by flashing telegrams that the member for Bethnal Green is some important personage whom the people delight to honour as their representative. The English people are likely to be deluded by such false reports, but not the Indian public. Mr. Bhavnagri has all along posed as the representative of Conservative India. But Conservative Zoroastrianism showed in connection with a recent function that it was not in favour of the Anglicised mode of going bare-headed; on the contrary, it insisted upon his donning the national head-dress before he could be allowed to associate himself with the function. The incident is a significant one, and the ominously deep silence of Conservative India of Conservative Zamindars, Jagirdars, Talukdars, Princes and Chiefs—in connection with his visit is still more significant. Parsee and Hindu priests came forward at several places to honour Mr. Dadabhai on his way to Lahore along with the rest of the population—an honour rarely conferred even upon princes and kings. But Conservative India has not cared even to take notice of the gentleman who has had the hardihood to pose as her representative in Parliament. Mr. Bhavnagri has since his return industriously

studied the addresses got up by his grateful admirers; and the art of proclaiming the gatherings of a coterie of interested friends as spontaneous and representative. What else he had studied at Sholapur, Secunderabad, and railway stations, no one knows. When he set his foot on the shores of Bombay amidst the silence and indifference of Conservative India, it was given out that owing to domestic reasons he declined to be made the object of a demonstration. But as AEsop has truly said, grapes were indeed very sour, because inaccessible. But as soon as they were well within reach, with what amazing eagerness were they clutched at and devoured, though they were false ones! Alas for human vanity! Spurious demonstrations can delude no one in Bombay. Bumptious challenges can deceive none acquainted with their utter hollowness. Mr. Wadia has boldly met Mr. Bhavnagri's twice-repeated challenge. Now the time has come to ask the blustering Knight:—

When you begin with so much pomp and show,
Why is the end so little and so low?

THE CHAMPION (December 27, 1896).

We expected it.

Our file of English papers, to hand this mail, shows that *Reuter* has been busy booming Mr. Bhownuggree "the representative of India." We read of "large crowds of people . . . including high officials;" we are also told that "all along the line Mr. Bhavnagri met with a most cordial reception from all classes of the community;" that "he was given an enthusiastic reception at the public hall;" "the meeting closed amid deafening cheers," and so on and so forth. Mr. Bhavnagri may think this is fame, and, like other small men, he may imagine that a newspaper reputation is a valuable possession; but even that will be taken from him. The true account of his reception in this country will ultimately reach the British public, and his pleasure, if this sort of thing gives him pleasure, will come to an end. We have been accused of venom, by a certain few, because we have persistently pursued the policy of exposing this political humbug, but of this, we can assure those who read our columns, that we have had all through but one object, and that object was to

prevent this man being foisted upon the British people as the choice of India. Mr. Bhavnagri may represent Bethnal Green, and he will so represent it until that constituency has a chance of electing another person, but he can claim no such title for India. We are pleased to see that certain newspapers, at first inclined to misunderstand our motives, have come round to our views, and with one exception our Indian contemporaries now confess that we were right in our policy as regards the Bhavnagri boom, the exception is a journal which advocates extreme radicalism in public matters combined with miserable conservatism in social life. The *Hindu* is not the journal above referred—we have in our mind a miserable Calcutta print—for the *Hindu* we entertain the greatest respect, and we are sorry that he seems yet disinclined to side with us; but we would ask our contemporary if it be possible for honest men to have now anything to do with this Bhavnagri clique, a clique which has the audacity, in face of known facts, to wire home that its idol has met with “a most cordial reception from all classes.” We, of course, expected to see these telegrams, and so little do we dread them here, that we willingly give them an Indian publicity. Their appearance gives strength to that which we have said concerning Mr. Bhavnagri ever since he became a member of Parliament. Since we wrote the above we see that a Bombay journal—the *Rast Gofar*—has again taken up the cudgels on Mr. Bhavnagri's behalf. We shall deal with the *Rast*, in the manner he deserves next week.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (December 30, 1896).

Apologists of Mr. Bhavnagri.

We are much amused to observe the desperate efforts made by Mr. Bhavnagri's bottle-holders to explain away that great man's anti-Congress attitude. Thus we are told the aforesaid bottle-holders are “wondering” why so estimable a statesman did declare himself against the Congress. It appears the attack against the Congress was “rash”; that when the great man so rashly attacked it he had only “a vague notion of it;” that he has since done his best to retire from his position, by declaring himself in favour of “most, if not all of the proposals and movements which collectively form the platform of that national organisation,” and that

if he has not done anything more to mark his thorough disagreement with his own views (or rather, "words"), it is because "self-respect" wouldn't permit it. All this is truly wonderful. The great man attacked the Congress on the strength (or rather the want of it) of "vague notions," is it? Most wonderfully vague notions they must have been! Mr. Bhavnagri posed as the specially accredited representative of a conservative India yearning for the extinction of the Congress. He based his claim to the suffrages of a Tory constituency as the opponent of the Congress. We, at any rate, shall not do the poor M. P. the injustice to assume that this attitude of uncompromising opposition to the Congress was the result of "vague notions" of the national movement. No, facts have not the habit of so readily composing their differences with fancies as Mr. Bhavnagri's friends would wish.

As to his having since declared himself in favour of most, if not all, of the proposals and movements which collectively form the platform of that national movement, we entreat Mr. Bhavnagri's friends to drop their reticence for the nonce, and enlighten national ignorance as to the declarations so vaguely, so tantalisingly hinted at. So far as the public are aware, Mr. Bhavnagri supported the demand for the separation of judicial from executive functions—we hope on notions of it not open to the suspicion of vagueness. Here ends Mr. Bhavnagri's adhesion to the proposals and movements which collectively form the platform of that national organisation, for which we are bidden to admire the M. P. Oh, the catalogue of Mr. Bhavnagri's services to India is not yet exhausted. Has not Mr. Bhavnagri in more than one of his speeches taken occasion and even went out of his way to refer to Dadabhai Naoroji, in terms of undisguised respect and admiration? The venerable patriarch, then has not lived and worked in vain! We suppose that when Mr. Bhavnagri indulged in that atrocious calumny against the venerable patriarch which has recently been brought home to him, the M. P. was only doing a "rash" thing, that he had only a vague notion of it, and that having seen the error of his ways, he is expiating for it by rendering homage to the illustrious patriot. Poor M. P.! His political career bids fair to be one long expiation!

THE MAHOMEDAN ADVOCATE OF INDIA.

(December 31, 1896.)

Mr. Bhavnagri, M. P.

Need it be said that every recruit offering to wear the national cockade and to enlist in the ranks of the pioneer army struggling to win political privileges for India should be welcomed with open arms, but obviously a recruit should give evidence of being fit for the duties he would undertake. When in this light we examine the claims of Mr. Bhavnagri to bear arms, we find it impossible to pass him on as an eligible combatant. Taking the chances of an election in England, he has managed to obtain the suffrages of a Conservative constituency, and now enjoys the privilege of affixing M. P. to his name. Governed by the spell of this conservative label, he has deemed it suitable to oppose the Congress in every way as a propaganda too radical to fit readily into his fossilised ideas. The limitation he has set upon himself in handling Indian political problems while gaining for him the high approbation of Anglo-Indians and faint-hearted Indians, who belaud his "moderation," have alienated the sentiments of such of his countrymen who believe that work for India, if it is to be carried out effectively, should be thorough and definite as to its ends. In a little, we may say that it is Mr. Bhavnagri's indefiniteness that makes his sincerity suspected and causes his claims as a champion of India to be indignantly rejected. The want of tact on his part is conspicuous in all his public utterances, which are marked by a desire to run counter to all the most cherished convictions of his patriotic countrymen and to decry their methods. We need not quote chapter and verse as his present visit to India results in quite a host of his adverse critical opinions being dragged to light by the Indian Press, this rock-hewn mass of evidence pulverising his representative claims, it is idle to set the wire-pulled demonstrations got by a few of his friends who bid him welcome to India. Not all the popping corks of the champagne consumed at the convivial gatherings got up to do him honour can drown the din of disapproval that his Indian advent has justly created in the columns of a press which truly voices the sentiments of advanced India. It passes us to understand how he could have had the hardihood to accept these artificial tributary ovations, in the face of the fact that patriotic India recognises only one true

Indian representative on English ground—Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, before whose services for India, his, which consists of little more than a few hedging speeches delivered at *St. Stephen's* sinks into utter insignificance. Long before his appearance again in this country he was made aware of his unpopularity which should have made him more cautious in accepting anything like demonstrations, of the hollowness of which, as vehicles of national sentiments he was fully aware. In yielding to the pressure of friends—the colour which he wishes to give to his proceedings in India—he has put himself in a painfully false position which he unsuccessfully strives to get out of by furnishing explanations which sink him deeper and deeper in the mire in which he is involved. Perhaps no folly committed during his stay is more striking than the dinner given him by some Muhammadans of Bombay which must be considered as the most incongruous of all the functions organised for his reception in India. What the exact significance attaching to it is must transcend the comprehension of the wisest. We are told that the Bombay Mussalmans are, as regards the Congress, ultraists, and Mr. Bhavnagri, by accepting their recognition, commits himself practically to the principle on which they take their stand that the administration being a benevolent despotism must be considered as lying completely out of the reach of the public voice. However, as Mr. Bhavnagri has divorced logic, we must not perhaps emphasise too much this little detail of his doings in India. One service his presence has done, it has brought out with overwhelming force the true state of Indian political opinion and the linked truth that nowhere in India is Mr. Bhavnagri recognised as being even in the remotest sense an exponent of that opinion. We are truly sorry for Mr. Bhavnagri, M.P., who, when he returns, will ruminate painfully the incidents of his Indian tour which, we trust, if they make him a sadder, will also make him a wiser man.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (January 2, 1897).

Whether Mr. Bhavnagri is endowed with the "giftie" which Burns invoked "of seeing ourselves as others see us" or not, it must now be painfully obvious to that great man that the way "others" see him is certainly not the way in

which his handful of wire-pulling admirers do. To the "others" must now be added the "*Muhammadan Advocate of India*, which organ of enlightened Muhammadan opinion has something very interesting to say about Mr. Bhavnagri's representative character. Writes our contemporary :

"Need it be said that every recruit offering to wear the national cockade and to enlist in the ranks of the pioneer army struggling to win political privileges for India, should be welcomed with open arms, but obviously a recruit should give evidence of being fit for the duties he would undertake. When in this light we examine the claims of Mr. Bhavnagri to bear arms, we find it impossible to pass him on as an eligible combatant."

This drawing-room, rose-water politician, what does he know of India? Nothing. What has he done for the India? Again the answer, the transcendently humiliating answer, is—Nothing. Our contemporary observes :

"Not all the popping corks of the champagne consumed at the convivial gatherings got up to do him honour can drown the din of disapproval that his Indian advent has justly created in the columns of a press which truly voices the sentiments of advanced India. It passes us to understand how he could have had the hardihood to accept these artificial tributary ovations in the face of the fact that patriotic India recognises only one true Indian representative on English ground—Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, before whose services for India, his, which consists of little more than a few hedging speeches delivered at St. Stephen's sinks into utter insignificance."

The conclusion of the whole thing is stated as follows :—

"One service his presence has done, it has brought out with overwhelming force the true state of Indian political opinion and the linked truth that nowhere in India is Mr. Bhavnagri recognised as being even in the remotest sense an exponent of that opinion. We are truly sorry for Mr. Bhavnagri, M. P., who, when he returns, will ruminate painfully the incidents of his Indian tour which, we trust, if they make him sadder, will also make him a wiser man."

Nothing can save the Bethnal Green Humpty-Dumpty—not all the heaven-sent fatuities in which the *Times of India* and the *Pioneer* have swathed him.

KAISER-I-HIND (January 3, 1897).

Mr. Bhavnagri and his Admirers.

A PUBLIC CHALLENGE.

TO THE EDITOR, "KAISER-I-HIND."

SIR,—The insertion of this letter in your widely circulated paper will oblige not only myself, but the whole Zoroastrian community in particular.

Sir, the friends and admirers of Mr. Mancherjee Merwanjee Bhavnagri who have been treating him to dinners and addresses of late, and that, too, in the name of the public, are virtually the enemies of India, and what they do to feed the vanity of their *protege* is undoubtedly an affront to the whole country. People may honour a deserving person to repay the debt of obligation under which he has placed them by his labours on their behalf: but God knows how they fail to perceive that they are making themselves the butt of ridicule of the civilized world by doing and receiving honour where none is deserved. Sir, in spite of all the paeans of Mr. Bhavnagri's friends, the educated people of India know that it is all claptrap and mummery. The friends and admirers of Mr. Bhavnagri are at liberty to do him honour for his election to the Parliament, but what is their motive in doing so in the name of the public? Their motive is to cast into the shade the reception given to the Grand Old Man of India, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. I hereby publicly challenge Mr. Bhavnagri's friends, Messrs. Dossabhai Framjee, Kaikhushru Kabraji and Co. to produce a detailed list of the benefits done to India by Mr. Bhavnagri and those likely to result in the future from his speeches on Indian affairs in the House of Commons. I am ready to give full details of the harm instead of the good that has been done and is being done by Mr. Bhavnagri. What is Mr. Bhavnagri when compared to Mr. Dada-

bhai Naoroji? One may as well call brass gold. If one cannot distinguish between brass and gold, he had better turn savage, and go and live in the wilds of Africa. Whatever attempts the friends of Mr. Bhavnagri may make to magnify him, a fifteen-years old youth of the current nineteenth century will not be taken in by such false praises. Mr. Bhavnagri is nobody beside Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and his attainments sink into insignificance in comparison with those of Mr. Dadabhai. To have the audacity to compare such a person with Mr. Dadabhai is like throwing dust at the sun. To my mind, Mr. Bhavnagri is little to blame in this, but the blame lies more at the door of his friends, who have created all this humbug. They wish to delude not only the people of India but the Anglo-Indians as well. Do not these witless persons know that an Englishman can at once distinguish the truth from the falsehood and such actions only provoke ridicule and laughter in him. Granted that Mr. Bhavnagri stands in the good graces of the Anglo-Indians; but the cause of this is not far to seek. The Anglo-Indians have thrust Mr. Bhavnagri into Parliament by their influence to have their own ends served. His election is not due to any attainments, cleverness, or deserts of his own.

To say in the words of our proved well-wisher Mr. Caine, had not Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji thrown in his lot with the Liberals, Mr. Bhavnagri could not have been returned to Parliament. Do not the people of India know that the principal motive which actuated the Conservative Anglo-Indians to use their influence to get Mr. Bhavnagri elected, was to put him against Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who was admitted by the Liberals into their ranks? This being patent to all, it becomes Mr. Bhavnagri to bid farewell to his friends so as to prevent further tom-foolery. It was mentioned in one of your previous numbers that Sir Jamsetji Jejeebhai, Bart., presided at the banquet given to Mr. Bhavnagri by his friends and admirers, and complimented the recipient of the honour. Sir, the tom-foolery would be complete, could not the wire-pullers induce, for their own ends, a few such puppets to be present on such occasions. We, Parsees, are well aware what stuff both our baronets are made of. The Parsees have already borne witness to, and formed their opinions of the cleverness and independence of all such matters of these gentlemen. Such being the

case, the friends and admirers of Mr. Bhavnagri will be reckoning without the host, should they delude themselves with the thought that the presence of the baronets and the knights at the entertainment was significant of the approval of the whole Parsæ community.

Secunderabad, Deccan, } A Lover of Justice,
30th December 1896. } KAIKHUSRU RUSTOMJI DOLI MEHERJI.

The sensible portion of the natives of India think in the same strain as Mr. Doli Meherji, and his moral courage in thus openly putting them before the public is praiseworthy.

ED.—"KAISER-I-HIND."

THE KAISER-I-HIND (January 3, 1896).

Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri, M. P.

A STUDY IN CONTRAST.

(August 1895.)

In response to an interviewer Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri, M. P., observed that he disclaimed any pretence to be "the representative of India." He was, he said, the representative of the constituency of North East Bethnal Green. Nor did he even set himself up as a "special authority" on Indian matters.

(August 1896.)

It was due that from his place there (House of Commons) he should also disown the sentiment* which was uttered within a very few months within the same room as that in which the gallant General's remarks were made. There was an exclamation used to the effect that the connection of Great Britain with India only tended to impose a great and material burden upon India, and that India also, at the same time, contributed to the glory and greatness of England. He should be

* Mr. Dalabhai Naoroji's views during the sitting of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure.

falling in his duty if he did not take the opportunity, in the name of the people of India, of saying that the connection of Great Britain with that country had been the instrument of conferring manifold blessings upon the people of India, and that if India had contributed in any sense to the greatness and glory of England, that was but a poor payment for the many blessings she had received.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (January 3, 1897).

Muhammadian Opinion on Mr. Bhavnagri.

Whether Mr. Bhavnagri is endowed with the "giftie" which Burns invoked "of seeing ourselves as others see us" or not, it must now be painfully obvious to that great man that the way "others" see him is certainly not the way in which his handful of wire-pulling admirers do. To the "others" must now be added the *Muhammadian Advocate of India* which organ of enlightened Muhammadian opinion has something very interesting to say about Mr. Bhavnagri's representative character. Writes our contemporary :

"Need it be said that every recruit offering to wear the national cockade and to enlist in the ranks of the pioneer army struggling to win political privileges for India, should be welcomed with open arms, but obviously a recruit should give evidence of being fit for the duties he would undertake. When in this light we examine the claims of Mr. Bhavnagri to bear arms, we find it impossible to pass him on as an eligible combatant."

— This drawing-room, rose-water politician, what does he know of India? Nothing. What has he done for India? Again the answer, the transcendently humiliating answer, is—Nothing. Our contemporary observes :

"Not all the popping corks of the champagne consumed at the convivial gatherings got up to do him honour can drown the din of disapproval that his Indian advent has justly created in the columns of a press which truly voices the sentiments of advanced India. It passes us to understand how he could have had the hardihood to accept these artificial tributary ovations in the face of the fact that patriotic India recognises only one true Indian representative on English ground—Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, before whose

services for India, his, which consists of little more than a few hedging speeches delivered at St. Stephen's, sinks into utter insignificance."

The conclusion of the whole thing is stated as follows:—

"One service his presence has done, it has brought out with overwhelming force the true state of Indian political opinion and the linked truth that nowhere in India is Mr. Bhownaggri recognised as being even in the remotest sense an exponent of that opinion. We are truly sorry for Mr. Bhavnagari, M. P., who, when he returns, will ruminate painfully the incidents of his Indian tour, which we trust, if they make him a sadder, will also make him a wiser man."

Nothing can save the Bethnal Green Humpty-Dumpty—not all the heaven-sent fatuities in which the *Times of India* and the *Pioneer* have swathed him.

THE GUJARATI (January 3, 1897).

The *Amrit Bazar Patrika* the *Hindu* and one or two other papers could not understand the position of the Bombay publicists in regard to Mr. Bhavnagari. They could not have had intimate knowledge of him and were more or less misled by their London correspondent who is a personal friend of Mr. Bhavnagari. The *Patrika's* attitude especially was most deplorable. Our contemporary went out of his way in attributing base motives to the *Champion* without the slightest justification. As was to be expected, the *Rast Goftar*, which is a pronounced enemy of the Congress and a staunch supporter of Mr. Bhavnagari, has made a good deal of capital out of the ill-informed criticisms and views of the *Patrika*. It is, indeed, a pity that our contemporary should have thus lent his countenance to the opponents of the Congress. But as we have often said in these columns, India's enemies are to be found in the country itself, and though it is to be regretted, there is nothing to be wondered at if the *Patrika* should have rendered disservice to the cause it has all along upheld. We are, however, glad the *Patrika* has expiated its sins by recanting its utterances. Our contemporary ought to have known by this time the circum-

stances under which the Conservative party took up Mr. Bhavnagri; otherwise it would not have published such inexcusable nonsense that the member for Bethnal Green is "a man of eminent ability." This kind of extravagant praise simply argues gross ignorance about him. We are, however, pleased to note that even the *Patrika* has at last realized the unwisdom of giving him a representative character by a national welcome, and of the gross injustice of thoughtlessly ascribing petty motives to more well-informed publicists in Bombay. Here is what the *Patrika* now says:—

"We welcome back Mr. Bhavnagri, M.P., home. We said the other day that we were proud of his achievements; for, an Indian, who succeeds in entering the British Parliament, is bound to be a man of eminent ability, Mr. Bhavnagri represents—a British constituency,—we wish we could add India also. We are sorry we cannot accord him the reception which we did to Mr. Naoroji. For, if he, like Mr. Bhavnagri, represented a British constituency he was also member for India, which we grieve to say Mr. Bhavnagri is not. The attempt to prevent a national demonstration on his behalf is not due to jealousy but to a political consideration of high importance. He has to side with the Government of Lord George Hamilton which is not popular here. It would, therefore, be not safe to give Mr. Bhavnagri a representative character by a national welcome. Yet as we said the other day, if he is a Conservative by circumstances, he must be an Indian at heart. Let him do all the good he can to his mother country,—and he can do exceedingly much without betraying the interests of his party,—and God will bless him, and his countrymen will thank him in their heart of hearts.

THE CHAMPION (January 3, 1897).

. The Bhavnagri Boom.

THE EDITOR OF "THE CHAMPION."

SIR,—Please allow me to withdraw my letter which I sent to you last week, and to give you in its place the following cutting from the *Kaisar-i-Hind*. This cutting gives the ideas which I want to present better than my humble pen

can do. " We are deeply amused at the frantic efforts of our contemporary, the *Rast Gofstar*, to bolster up the now completely discredited movement in honour of Mr. Bhavnagri. Not content with magnifying the movement of a few friends and beneficiaries into a public demonstration this faithful henchman of the Member for Bethnal Green would now have the credulous believe that even a considerable section of the Congress papers are in favor of demonstrating the self-seeking M. P., who has been touring in the quest—so far unsuccessful—of addresses from the public. But it is a pity that the writer, while distorting and torturing passages out of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* and the *Weekly Review* and the *Hindu*, should have omitted to give its readers the whole of these papers' writings concerning the hollow boom now turned inside out and seen in all its nakedness. For the edification of those who have been misled by the *Rast Gofstar* into thinking that the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* and the *Weekly Review* are in anyway inclined to favour the so-called public demonstration, we quote the following from the *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* of November first :—

" We welcome back Mr. Bhavnagri, M.P., home. We said the other day that we were proud of his achievements ; for an Indian who succeeds in entering the British Parliament is bound to be a man of eminent ability. Mr. Bhavnagri represents a British constituency—we wish we could add India also. We are sorry we cannot accord him that reception which we did to Mr. Dadabhai. For if he, like Mr. Bhavnagri, represented a British constituency, he was also Member for India, which, we regret, Mr. Bhavnagri is not. The attempt to prevent a national demonstration on his behalf is not due to jealousy, but to a political consideration of high importance. He has to side with the ~~here~~. It would therefore be not safe to give ~~George Hamilton~~ Bhavnagri a representative character by a national welcome. Yet, as we said the other day, if he is a Conservative by circumstances, he must be an Indian at heart. Let him do all the good he can to his mother-country—and he can do exceedingly much without betraying the interests of his party—and God will bless him and his countrymen will thank him in their heart of hearts.

"This will enable our readers to judge of the attitude of the *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* towards the 'Bhavnagri Boom.'"

Yours truly,

A PARSEE.

Bombay, 31st December 1896.

THE CHAMPION (January 3, 1897).

More Bhavnagri Telegrams.

Reuter has thus wired (at whose cost we should like to know) to England:—

MR. BHAVNAGRI, M.P., IN INDIA.

MOHAMEDAN APPEAL TO SUPPORT TURKEY.
(REUTER'S TELEGRAM.)

BOMBAY, December 5.

A great Mohamedan demonstration took place to-day at Bombay to congratulate Mr. Bhavnagri, M.P. All sections of the community were present. The mansion and grounds were splendidly decorated and illuminated.

An address, which bore numerous signatures, was presented to the hon. member, asking him to represent the desire of the Mussulmans in India for the continuance and integrity of the Mohammedan rule in Turkey, though the atrocities committed against the Armenians meet with their detestation.

Mr. Bhavnagri thanked them for this sober expression of their views on the Eastern Question, which no British statesman could disregard. He accepted the mandate to represent their views in London.

In commenting upon this wonderful piece of news, the London correspondent of the *Yorkshire Daily Post* shrewdly writes:—"Mr. Bhavnagri's selection by the Mohamedans of India to represent their views on the Armenian question in the House of Commons has some interest and significance. It shows how closely the progress of affairs in Turkey is being watched in India, and with what keenness of apprehension the Indian Mahomedans regard the possibility of hostile movement against the Sultan. But, perhaps, the most striking feature of all about it is that Mr. Bhavnagri should be chosen as the Mohammedan mouthpiece." The correspondent of the *Post*, with other

English journalists, will, by this time, have read the Indian papers in which this precious "demonstration" has been correctly described, and poor Mr. Bhavnagri's "triumph" will be short-lived. The last sentence of the *Post* writer is significant. He wonders why Mr. Bhavnagri should be chosen as the Mohammedan mouthpiece. Why indeed? The answer, of course, is, so long as it gives an opportunity of sending a *Reuter's* telegram to England, some people will be the mouthpiece of anything or anybody.

THE BHAVNAGRI ROOM.

Last week we said that we should deal with some remarks made by the *Rast Gofstar*, a Bombay publication, about the treatment which Mr. Bhavnagri had received in this country. But we noticed that our contemporary, the *Kaisir-i-Hind*, has dealt with the *Rast Gofstar*. Life is too short to kill the slain, and after the drubbing which the *Rast* received last week, we do not think it necessary to bother further with Mr. Kabraji and his journal. Let it suffice to state, that the *Rast* quoted, as favourable to its idol Mr. Bhavnagri, two or three Indian newspapers, which have since withdrawn their support from the chosen of Bethnal Green, and their remarks now are as severe as any thing that we have written. Poor *Rast Gofstar*, you must be sorry that you spoke so prematurely.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (January 9, 1897).

An obscure Bombay print, the *Rast Gofstar*, made itself conspicuous by supporting the pretensions of Mr. Bhavnagri. That paper has of late been attacking the Congress savagely. Verily, birds of a feather flock together.

THE CHAMPION (January 10, 1897).

(Special Correspondent at the Twelfth Indian National Congress, Calcutta.)

When Mr. W. C. Bonnerji in the course of his speech referred to Mr. Bhavnagri's entrance into Parliament, there were loud hisses. In fact, when he again referred to him during the Congress Session, and when Mr. Bonnerji mentioned this precious "Conservative" (?) Indian's

name, when speaking on the resolution expressing India's unabated confidence in Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji as the true and only representative of India, there were loud hisses which would have remained uncontrolled but for the cries of order from the Chair. The incident clearly demonstrates in what regard this "booming, bouncing, blazing light" of Bethnal Green is held by the picked men of all the provinces of India. Another remarkable incident which occurred during the Congress sitting in connection with Mr. Bavnagri should not be omitted here. Numbers of cartoons in leaflet form of this gentleman, as depicted by the *Hindi Punch* (Bombay), passed round among the leading men on the platform. This was the famous cartoon in which he is depicted as a frog endeavouring by the aid of his friends, Jamsetji, Fazulbhoy and Company, to distend to the size of the bull, while next to him stands the Grand Old Man of India, tall and erect; a towering personality by himself. The cartoon afforded infinite merriment to the Bengalee gentlemen. Thousands of copies were distributed later on after the sittings of the Congress had concluded.

THE INDEPENDENT (January 10, 1897).

Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri, M. P.

Yesterday's Mail has carried Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri back to England, and in a few days' time the Conservative member for North East Bethnal Green will attend the fresh Session of the House of Commons, there in all probability to begin his career as a politician in consonance with the views of the Anglo-Indians who have bestowed their best affection and regard on him. But we ask, does Mr. Bhavnagri now like to carve out a new way to ingratiate himself in affection and regard of his country, the country of his birth, where he had acquired worldly prosperity, the country which can lay all claim to the best and the noblest services of any Indian; who has himself educated and withal a public man, and who may have the opportunities of recompensing by meritorious deeds all that he owes to his motherland? We ask, will Mr. Bhavnagri begin a new lease of political life in Parliament, such as can go far to drive off all those bad impressions his hitherto unsatisfactory career has given rise to? And will he thus implant that love which

he has, by his own hasty judgment on the Indian political movements of the day and ill advised criticisms on the men and methods that regulate those very movements, displanted? We don't wish to speak ill behind his back, neither have we the time and space to indulge in the task of holding him guilty for all his sins of omission and commission in that respect before and after his becoming an M. P. Enough has been said and written on the faults and shortcomings of Mr. Bhavnagri and no addition is needed now. But we must say this much *independent* as our manner of viewing men and things is, that if Mr. Bhavnagri is yet wise in his generation, he must seriously ponder on the attitude adopted by his educated countrymen all over the country and the powerful Indian Press, since he came to visit India, and that he should profit by even the hostile criticisms the miniature demonstrations of his friends have met with on all sides. There is a lesson underlying them which he can not possibly neglect. Blind worship of friends and applause of interested dependents as well as parasites may be even palatable in the absence of any better and more substantial *public* regard, but the former has only a sham value and thus becomes distinctly valueless. Mr. Bhavnagri is undoubtedly a shrewd man. His contact with *Nagars* of Bhavnager and the insight he has gained into human charac. cannot but enable him to see and feel how in prosperous times a man is loved and praised, worshipped and extolled to the seventh heaven, even though he may himself for the whole time be perfectly acquainted with his own defects and weaknesses. Money makes the mare go, but money ~~also~~ purchases friends, sympathisers as well as praise singers. Ah dependents do try to pass off black as white and their plans and tricks of the times serve them well, even if these reap wholesale ridicule and something more in the bargain. Again, hero-painting is held by some to be a fine art and also a paying concern; so, if under the necessity, if not actual compulsion, the parasites have to say sun as moon and call day as night they would go even that length like ~~the~~ *Shrew* to please their beloved 'Antonio'!

We say, therefore, that Mr. Bhavnagri must not have failed to mark that although his riches and the obligations under which he may have laid some people and certain individuals, have brought for him no doubt a chorus of applause and a laudation from certain quarters during his short stay in India, that has indeed not brought for him nor bought

for him the hearts of the people. You may buy any thing under the sun, provided you are opulent and generous enough and provided you have the happy knack to spend money lavishly, but money cannot buy, even for the wealthiest, the hearts of the people so long as his public deeds and achievements fall short of popular views and sentiments. To rise in the estimation of a nation requires highest sacrifices. The first sacrifice is the effacement of self, the second sacrifice is the disinterested advocacy of the people's cause at any cost coupled with those sturdy manly fights which may alarm enemies, but which may endear one to his nation. Fearless championing of the rights and privileges of subject races on the public platform, in the legislative assemblies, and in the governing councils, the best of which is the British Parliament, are the only safe ways of showing the public itself what stuff a popular leader is made of. One's writings and speeches are also the best criterion to gauge the depth of sincerity and singleness of purpose, devotion to, and love of duty. Will Mr. Bhavnagri stand in future the test successfully as a public man, the test we say, that is universally applied to separate chaff from chaff and the alloyed metal from pure gold? What we have to say is this that despite his being a Conservative member of the House of Commons, he can stand manfully if he has a will, by India's side in her hour of need. During the last sessions of the House, when on more than one occasion, India's interests were ruthlessly injured, nay sacrificed, Mr. Bhavnagri of course gave a good deal of disappointment to the anxious Indians who had expected better things of him. It is needless to dwell on that, already as it had become a matter of history. Suffice it well, if we advise Mr. Bhavnagri not to depend on the false security on which his interested admirers and the Anglo-Indian critics tell him to repose. He should, if he wants to become India's friend, act his part in the way other *true* friends of India are acting in and out of Parliament. He should sacrifice his love of Anglo-Indians on the altar of India's cause if he wants to prove true to his country. Then alone he will gain the first step of securing the confidence of the people. Again, he should never play the part of an opportunist, for that is worse than remaining a pronounced enemy of all the progressive political movements in this country, as opportunists every where oftener than not try and tend to deceive the unwary.

THE CHAMPION (January 10, 1897).

Is Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri, M. P., a Mussalman?

We are impelled to make this query from what appears in the December number of a new monthly *Young India*, which whilst welcoming the member for Anglo-India as one of our affectionate brothers, gives it out, "it is not perhaps generally known that Mr. Bhavnagri is a Mahomedan by religion." We must candidly confess that we are supremely indifferent as to what Mr. Bhavnagri's religious belief may be, but it is quite worth one's while to enquire and find out whether this idea of his being a Mussalman, or going to become one, is not one of the many wholly unsustainable grounds his mercenary followers have, with the utter unscrupulousness which has made them notorious, put forward to produce the so-called Mussalman demonstration that was lately seen in Bombay and which this hero of half-an-hour has been industriously making so much of. Of this Mussulman ebullition we shall have occasion to refer to later on. Meantime we make a present of this splendid idea to Mr. Bhavnuagri, of passing off as a follower of the Prophet. To one of his versatility it would not be difficult of adoption. Do we not know how this versatile, but eminently modest, personage has proclaimed himself an author and a man of letters on the strength of having written a second-rate school boy essay, and an indifferent translation of Her Majesty's "Diary in the Highlands," a publication which commanded hardly any sale, and we suspect volumes and volumes of which may yet be found encumbering *Durbar* shelves at Bhavnagar? Do we not know that he has had the assurance of passing himself off as a journalist on the pretence of a few miserable letters and paras. in some local newspapers? Do we not know that being a partner in a certain mill of no particular position, he has claimed to be an employer of labour? And that owning some plot of barren ground on some hill or other,—enough no doubt to swear by—he poses as a Zemindar? If a man could in this light and airy fashion pass for an author, a journalist, an employer of labour, and a landholder, for electioneering puposes, what's to prevent his passing for a Mussalman or a Turk, if it could serve to procure for him some recognition, however infinitesimal, from the most backward of the backward classes as the

"Champion of the Turks" ? It is, indeed, given out that a number of those who assembled at the "Mossafarabad" bungalow entertainment in Bombay were induced to be present on being persuaded that "the guest of the evening" was either a Mussalman or about to be made one. It almost passes belief that such impudent tactics could be adopted to bolster up a losing cause; and but for the unscrupulous manner in which the Bhavnagri hirelings and dependents have been working to blow out their little tadpole, we should be entirely disinclined to give credit to this curious rumour. The quotation, however, given above from the *Young India* does seem to lend some colour to it.

FURTHER BHAVNAGRI TELEGRAMS.

We clip this from a London newspaper. It is interesting reading, and why should Bombay be deprived of it ?

Mr. Bhavnagri, M.P., was entertained yesterday at a grand banquet at Bombay, organised in his honour as an expression of the confidence felt in him. Sir Jamsetji Jejeebhoy presided, and a number of leading official and unofficial Europeans were also present. The Chairman, in the course of a speech, declared that India looked to both British political parties for friendship. He added that Mr. Bhavnagri's advocacy of India's claims and all that he had done in the past gave those present confidence in him for the future.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (January 11, 1897).

Mr. M. M. Bhavnagri, M.P., C.I.E., left Bombay by the last mail steamer. We are very much concerned to hear that he will arrive in England a week too late for the opening of Parliament. The great man will be much missed but doubtless there is sufficient strength still left in the mammoth majority that follows Lord Salisbury to survive the struggles of the opening session. A Bombay paper obligingly assures us that Mr. Bhavnagri was "obliged to decline the invitation of a number of his Bombay friends to a good-bye party in his honor." The M.P. has grown wiser: his "friends" can no more fool him to the top of his bent.

THE MADRAS STANDARD (January 13, 1897).

Mr. Bhavnagri is all things to all men—he is a versatile genius. So we are not surprised to learn that Mr. Bhavnagri is a Muhammadan by religion. At least, so says "Young India." It appears that the vaunted Muhammadan demonstration was the outcome of a feeling of sympathy with a brother Muhammadan. A veritable champion of the Turk indeed!

THE TRIBUNE (January 13, 1897).

The *Pioneer* is greatly distressed that Reuter's representative in London should have gone out of his way to ascertain Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's views on the famine and to have telegraphed them out to India. Our contemporary is of opinion that there must be hundreds of people better qualified than the Parsi patriot to express an opinion on such a subject. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has visited India only once since the Mutiny, and his knowledge of this country must be more meagre than that of the youngest Assistant Magistrate. The statement that Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has paid only one visit to India since 1858 is more striking than correct, but it must be allowed that his voluntary expatriation from his native country has not done him much harm in the eyes of his countrymen, who, after all, are the best judges whether his life has been devoted to the service of his country or not. It is needless to recall to the mind of our friends the reception given to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji in 1893 in Bombay and all along the route to Lahore. A welcome of that kind is not accorded to a Viceroy, far less to an Assistant Magistrate. The explanation that Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji was at that time a member of Parliament is not sufficient, for Mr. Bhavnagri also enjoys that honour, but the most strenuous exertions of his friends have not been able to obtain for him anything like a popular demonstration. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji is not only an Indian expert, for that is a distinction claimed by every retired Anglo-Indian official, but a man whose singleness of purpose and devotion to duty are beyond cavil or question.

THE KAISER-I-HIND (January 17, 1897).

Mr. Bhavnagri and his Politics.

In the face of clear and convincing proofs of Mr. Bhavnagri's wanton and reckless antagonism to the great liberal political movement of this country adduced by our contemporaries here and in the other parts of this country, notably the *Champion* and the *Madras Standard*, it is really to be regretted that the bottle-holders of Mr. Bhavnagri should be still perverse enough to hold him up as more *sinned* against than *sinning*. We lay the following two extracts from Mr. Bhavnagri's utterances (the first in December 1894 and the second in September 1895) and ask the advocates of Mr. Bhavnagri if they will still persist in an attitude which cannot but raise a cry from him: "Oh, I wish I had been let alone by my friends who have, if anything, dug deeper and deeper the grave of my political death."

December 1894.

"The Congress has absolutely no backbone. It has no funds, and no organisation, and is merely whipped up at the end of the year, when it indulges in a *lot of irresponsible talk about extreme progressive* and revolutionary measures which serve only to extinguish the more reasonable and sensible of the demands which in the last year or two the Congress has made. The proceedings of the Congress have been instrumental in starting two currents in India which cannot be contemplated without regret and misgiving. They have created desires among certain of the more educated natives, which cannot be satisfied, and they have roused suspicions in the breasts of the British Governors of India which are resulting in an estrangement between the British and the natives more marked than anything witnessed twenty years ago. In those days many Englishmen made friends and confidantes of natives. Now Englishmen are becoming more cautious and more doubtful of native loyalty and friendliness. In this way the Congress is undoubtedly doing serious harm to the whole native community. The Congress represents itself and nothing more. That is to say, it represents a section of educated but inexperienced natives, whose idea of Empire

is to drop down into comfortably cushioned appointments, If the few leading men, who represent the voice of India, toned down both their words and their demands, they would deserve attention. As it is whilst most of its talk is irresponsible, its aspirations are unattainable,—a circumstance which does good to no one, and is harmful for the reasons I have suggested. It indirectly teaches people in India to think that they can expect no rights and no justice from the Conservative party. This is a gross error, and no friend of the union of India with England can sympathise with a body that inculcates such a notion."

September 1895.

Many gentlemen of this class of writers are coming forward on behalf of the Indian Congress. They are, with scarcely an exception or two, students and cannot be expected to have mature views on such important matters. They have not mixed with the world, do not know what the most elementary problems of Government are, and are really tickled with fanciful ideas of having Home Rule for India. The Congress programme is absolutely inconsistent with the industrial and material development of India. It asks always for University Education almost free of cost and for all the privileges of an advanced Western Nation while the myriad population of the country is buying pins, needles and buttons every item of the basest wants of every day life—from continental markets. They claim loyalty for the Congress meetings and with "three cheers for the Queen" invariably, but all their talk and teaching are such as to steadily develop discontent against the English rule. I dare say the young gentlemen who talk gallantly of the Congress do not perceive this, but this fact rather strengthens their shakes my attitude towards the Congress tactics.

Twelfth Indian National Congress, Calcutta,
December 1896.

VOTE OF CONFIDENCE IN

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI AS THE RECOGNISED
REPRESENTATIVE OF INDIA.

Resolution :—

That this Congress again expresses its full and unabated confidence in Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji as the Representative of the people of India and hopes that he will be elected by his old constituency of Central Finsbury or any other Liberal Constituency :—

Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, in proposing this resolution, said :—
Mr. President, brother delegates, ladies and gentlemen,—
This resolution was entrusted to me without my consent and in spite of my remonstrance. I believe that our Subjects Committee were fatalists at the moment they made up their minds to force this upon me. I remember that I had to move a similar resolution in the Congress of 1891. It was received as enthusiastically then as it has been received by you to-day. In 1892, there was a general election in England and our esteemed friend, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, (loud applause) was returned at the head of the poll as member for Central Finsbury to the House of Commons (cheers). I suppose the Subjects Committee thought that if this resolution is brought before you by that same individual who presented it in 1891 similar results might follow. At any rate, here is a resolution of which I can only say that it does not require any words from anybody to make it acceptable to you. The example which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has set is perfectly unique. (Hear, hear.) Here is an old man of 70 years of age working day and night, night and day, for the benefit of his country men. (Hear hear). He has banished himself from his own country and has been living in a foreign country, far away from his friends, for the sake of his country. (Cheers.) Some little time ago our only member of Parliament, who is the only Indian gentleman, who has succeeded in entering the House of Commons at the last election—Mr. Bhavnagri (hisses)—came back to his country, and some foolish friends of his wanted to get up a demonstration in his

honor equal to the one given to Mr. Dadabhai Navroji when he came out to this country to preside over the deliberations of the Lahore Congress, thus showing that Mr. Bhavnagri was as popular as Mr. Navroji is. (Cries of shame.) I have no quarrel whatever with Mr. Bhavnagri, and am very proud to see that a native of this country is a member of the House of Commons. (Hear, hear.) You cannot expect that every one would be of the same opinion as himself (Mr. Naoroji) and I should have been pleased that if instead of being a Conservative member Mr. Bhavnagri would have been a Radical member ; but then I am also afraid that if he had been a Radical he would not have found his seat in the House of Commons, so that there is some advantage in his having been a Conservative. But for that no one should consider that Mr. Bhavnagri is not a member for India ; and to think that he has the same confidence as Mr. Dadabhai has, is absurd. We hope and trust that we may again find Mr. Navroji in the House of Commons. (Applause.) Nothing will more content us than to see our old Man again sitting in the House of Commons doing his duty towards his own constituency and towards his own countrymen. One reason why he failed to secure his seat in the House of Commons this time was that while he was discharging his duty night after night—I believe he has a unique record of his attendance in the House—while he was doing this, his opponent who is now successful, was canvassing his constituency and was trying to take away the supper which would otherwise have been his due. I do not think I shall detain you any longer and you will pass this resolution with acclamation and carry home with you the hope that Mr. Navroji will again get his seat in the House of Commons. (Continued cheers.)

**Extract from the Speech of Mr. N. M. Samarth
at the Twelfth Indian National Congress,
Calcutta, December 1896, on the Resolution
on Famine.**

It is this growing poverty, gentlemen, this huge suffering of millions of human beings, dragging out a miserable existence year in and year out, this piteous and multitudinous waiting of the victims of an oppressive fiscal system, as also that tremendous drain upon the resources of the country which sucks away each year a large portion of the produce

of the country without bringing any commercial return whatever; it is this grave economic situation becoming more and more perilous from day to day which has been a source of alarm and anxiety to those who sincerely wish for the welfare of the present rulers of this country and notably among them to that political hermit of India, our Grand Old Man, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. (Cheers.) It is this colossal poverty and this terrific drain which you may remember called forth from him the remark the other day in the Royal Commission that England had done the greatest possible material injury to India. And you may also be remembering that a certain member of Parliament, who has been making desperate attempts to palm himself off on the British public as representative of the princes and people of India and who has been recently busy manufacturing demonstrations in his own honor in the Bombay Presidency and getting himself inflated in the columns of friendly sheets,—well, he had the audacity to contradict that statement from his place in the House of Commons, not in his own individual capacity but in the name of the people of India. Now, gentlemen, whether Mr. Bhavnagri means by the people of India those starving wretches, those embodiment of poverty in her shivering nakedness, that form such a large portion of the rural population in British India or whether he means by that expression the thinking portion, the educated cream of the Indian people; whether he means the millions of India, or claims to reflect the opinion of the intelligence and culture of India, I have no doubt I am speaking the mind of every one present here when I say that the people of India indignantly repudiate that spurious contradiction unscrupulously made in their name by that pretentious *soidisant* spokesman of theirs in the British House of Commons (Cheers.) I have no doubt I am echoing the opinion of this august assembly when I remark that the people of India contemptuously discard that tinsel which has been given currency to by Conservative tacticians with a view to discredit that genuine representative of India's views and aspirations Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji (Cheers.) Gentleman, he is no true friend of the people of this country, he is no true friend of the rulers of this country, who blinks the truth and shuts his eyes to the gravity of the economic situation, the appalling magnitude of the poverty question in British India.

Reorganization of Indian Provinces.

Being a note presented to the Indian National Congress.

1916.

REORGANIZATION OF INDIAN PROVINCES.

THE ARGUMENT.

Growth of provinces in India due to expansion of territory and need for administrative efficiency, (history of such growth given in appendix) ; growth more or less chronological ; hence Indian Provinces heterogeneous ; each province containing several languages and each language distributed between several Provinces ; growth not influenced by idealism or policy ; testimony of the Lord Bishop of Madras in this behalf.

Nevertheless certain administrators recognised the necessity for redistribution on a linguistic basis ; opinions, of Sir John Strachey, Sir Thomas Holderness and Sir Bampfylde Fuller in favour of such redistribution ; not all such opinions in tune with the popular stand-point which was first expressed by B. G. Tilak before the Decentralisation Commission.

The problem of Indian nationality, a new problem : requires a new solution. Nationality possible only on a plan of federation of homogeneous provincial (or sub-national) units coextensive with different language areas, each marked by contiguous territory, common literature and traditions, common sympathies and temperament.

The non-development of such units in the existing system is the first evil. Other evils are—the neglect of vernacular languages and of the cultivation of modern literature in them ; undue emphasis on the English language as medium of instruction and of administration, as a means of enlightenment and

as a symbol of authority, a widening chasm between the classes and the masses, want of pride in local government and failure to foster local patriotism in attunement to the larger national consciousness ; unequal progress of different language-bound communities in the same province and consequent prejudices and bitterness of feeling between them, accentuated by inequality in influence.

Some of these evils were recognised by Government but only from the view-point of administrative expediency. Old narrowness of vision still reflected in the remedies adopted in which Orissa is attached to Behar and in the failure to apprehend the problem in the light of national reconstruction.

The fault was not wholly with an unimaginative Government, but with the people as well ; for the agitation to reunite the dismembered Bengal, without urging the separation of Behar and of Orrissa, was lacking in national outlook. Glimpses of the larger idea noticeable in the endeavour that sought the addition of the Berars to the Bombay Presidency in 1908. The Andhra Movement, the first to set forth the problem of redistribution on linguistic lines as national in scope and as a necessary preliminary to real Provincial Autonomy.

Conditions to be satisfied in the settlement of boundaries of a province as laid down by Lord Hardinge in the despatch of 25th August 1911 :—They must provide

- (i.) convenient administrative units; hence the five Bengali speaking divisions grouped together and the Hindi area grouped separately. Distinctive language areas provide such units;
- (ii.) satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the people ; hence recognition extended to the

marked awakening in Behar and the sentiment kindled in the Beharees "even if it be exaggerated;"

- (iii) and should be based on broad grounds of administrative and political expediency so that inequality between different language-bound communities in a province in educational progress, civic advancement or social influence, demands due rectification.

No need for apprehending that too many provinces will be carved out. In India only 15 or 16 cultivated languages exist so that the existing provinces 15 in number will become 19 including the enclave of Delhi, Coorg, Ajmere-Merwara, Baluchistan and North Western Frontier Province.

Advantages of reorganisation: Evils arising from the existing heterogeneity already described, will be removed. Ideal of Provincial Autonomy possible of full realization only in provinces with homogeneity of language, sentiment and tradition; Professor Morgan's opinion in support of this view. Provinces thus consolidated by the growth of a sub-national sentiment would be simultaneously started on the road to self-government and self-development.

Organization of provinces on the natural basis of language areas signifies, for its benefits to be fully realized, two reforms (1) the adoption of the vernacular as the language of administration and (2) of education.

(1) *Administration* no more mechanical than education; depends for effectiveness on the understanding and responsiveness of the people; present administration ineffective and bureaucratic because not carrying with it the cooperation or understanding of the people; e. g., failure of Local Bodies, because incompletely democratic in themselves and never commanded popular sympathy or appreciation. Present

system of Police less effective than the village nayakavadi of old. Civil and Criminal courts, centres of evil influence, poor substitutes for the panchayat system. Charges of superstition and ignorance uncharitable and undeserved by the Indian people.

True remedy is to conduct administration in the vernacular. Highest Executive Government may continue to use English in the interests of uniformity of National Political development. But fountains of legislation and administration must be in the vernacular. Advantages manifold. Such an administration becomes simple, easy, efficient and natural ; is indispensable where reforms of agricultural or sanitary practices are sought ; would cleanse courts of immorality ; make justice natural, real and helpful to harmony of relations. Finally would endow British Government in India with a national character.

2. *Education* :—Vernaculars as proper media. Evils of forcing an alien language : steady and increasing alienation from national culture, the greatest calamity that can befall a nation. Restoration of vernacular ascendancy, primary duty of Government ; with vernaculars enriched and exalted as media of instruction and of administration, separate, stable, self-contained and self-reliant states would come into existence fast fitting themselves for the ultimate self-government. Self-Government only a means to good government. And for sympathetic, popular and liberal administration it must provide compact states. Hence self-government on this plan, not merely a demand of self-seeking, English-educated few, but subserves the wider interests of the vast populace. Again states (provinces) thus started on the road to independent racial self-development preserve their distinctive features and enrich the national culture so that organisation of provinces on a linguistic basis necessary both as requisites to self-government and as aids to nation-building.

REORGANIZATION OF INDIAN PROVINCES.

The history of Indian administration under British rule reveals a steady growth in the number of provinces into which the country has been divided. This increase was not only due to the gradual expansion of territory acquired by the British from time to time, but also to the necessity of effecting suitable rearrangements on grounds of administrative expediency. The growth of the Indian Provinces has, therefore, been more or less chronological and was not based on the operation of any logical, linguistic or ethnic considerations (see appendix at the end for a history of this growth). This accounts for the arbitrary divisions of the country into provinces and the heterogeneous grouping of districts into each province. The process of acquiring territory extends from the cession of Bombay (1661) as part of the dower of Catherine of Braganza to the year 1916 when Bassra has been conquered; and British India which was at the time of Warren Hastings composed of the three Regulation Provinces of Bombay, Bengal and Madras, has now grown to the dimensions of a country consisting of 15 provinces differing from one another considerably in area, population and importance, leaving alone the more vital differences of language, manners and customs. The process of multiplication of provinces reveals strange workings of mind in the

* A note prepared by the Standing Committee of the Andhra (Provincial) Conference, Guntur,

administrators of the land, and it would be not a little amusing to re-call what was in 1839 a common topic of conversation in the London East India circles that the Madras Province was to be abolished and apportioned between Bengal and Bombay and that the seat of the Supreme Government was to be transferred to the Bombay Presidency. If such an anomaly had happened and continued, the people of India would probably have no more thought of the incongruity of the arrangement than they have been till recently; for, on close examination, the existing arrangement would be seen to be equally incongruous. Bombay Presidency is divided between the Maharathee, the Guzarathi, the Sindhi and the Kanarese; Madras is likewise divided between the Uriya, the Telugu, the Tamil, the Canarese and the Malayali; Central Provinces between the Marathi, the Telugu and the Hindi; Bengal till recently between the Bengali, the Behari and the Uriya or between the Bengali, the Behari and the Assamese. Viewed from another standpoint, the Maharattas are divided between Bombay, the Central Provinces and the Nizam's Dominions; the Telugus between the Central Provinces,* Nizam's dominions, Mysore State and Madras Presidency; the Canarese between Madras Presidency, Mysore State and Bombay; the Uriyas between Madras and Behar Provinces and till recently Central Provinces †. Such an

* The transference of Nagur and Seruvancha taluks to the Godavari District from Central Provinces recently reduced the Telugus in the latter area.

† The Uriya Taluka of Sambalpur in Central Provinces was transferred to Orissa in 1905.

arrangement based on no principle whatever clearly indicates that the whole grouping was haphazard and that neither ideals of administrative efficiency nor those of national upbuilding have ever exercised the minds of the rulers or the ruled. This fact has indeed been well described by the Lord Bishop of Madras in an article that he recently contributed to *The Nineteenth Century and After*. His Lordship says, "We, English people, are by temperament suspicious of ideals. We naturally fix our attention on present facts and deal with them as best we can; our whole interest is in the *status quo*; we live and work for the present and do not look forward to the future, and that to a large extent is the secret of the success in the building of our Empire. We did not come to India with any idea of Empire; we came as traders; we established factories because they were necessary for the security of our trade; we assumed government of the districts and states, because it seemed necessary to do so for the security of our factories, and so were led on by the practical necessities of the case, step by step, until at last there came out this Empire. We are doing much the same thing now. x x x x. But we never trouble ourselves to look ahead or seriously to think what is the inevitable goal towards which we are tending. Sufficient unto the day is the good and the evil thereof." A race of people who had thus built an Empire without plan could not develop the nation's culture and traditions and therefore not demarkate areas according to those laws that would help best in such a development.

However lacking in policy or in idealism the governance of India may have been, there have arisen individual administrators from time to time who have had the perspicacity to discover the error in the existing territorial divisions and with due forethought sketched a correct plan of distribution. It was Sir John Strachey that pointed out that "the political limits of the provinces have little connection with any physical characteristics." Sir Thomas Holderness, Permanent Under-Secretary of India Office, writing before the Partition of Bengal observes that "with the exception of Burma, no province represents a natural unit; that is to say, they (the provinces) do not stand for differences of race or language or geographical distribution. They are purely administrative divisions of territory. An Indian province is not what we mean by a nation, though it tends to create a provincial spirit which is not far removed from the beginning of national life." Sir Bampfylde Fuller, a former Lieutenant-Governor in India, wrote, "It would have been well for the country, had its divisions into provinces for purposes of government followed the lines marked by race and language, so as to reinforce the sympathy which arises from similarity, by feelings of pride in the local government. The existing administrative divisions are so heterogeneous as to have a directly contrary effect." The same officer says that the nearest approach to national sentiment in India is that which springs from language.

In making such observations, the different writers have not looked at the problem from the

same point of view, but it cannot be denied that they have made the nearest approach to the popular standpoint of the present day, which has directed attention to the urgency of reorganising the Indian provinces on the basis of language. The popular standpoint was for the first time expressed in a constructive suggestion made by Sriyuta Bal Gangadar Tilak in his evidence before the Royal Commission on Decentralization. The object of such a reorganisation would, in the first place, be to develop that provincial spirit, which, in a properly constituted province, as pointed out by Sir Thomas Holderness, is not far removed from the beginning of national life. The experiences which the Indians have to face in solving the problem of their nationality are like those of a Western race in governing an Eastern country, altogether unique and have few precedents to help them in their struggles. Where there are hundreds of millions of population, seemingly divided by differences of language, but really welded together by a common home and a substantial unity of life and culture, the upbuilding of the Indian nation is only possible on a plan of federation in which each provincial factor shall occupy subnational position. Unto this end, the provinces should be homogeneous as far as possible and be devoid of all elements that make for division, jealousy of feeling, or inequality of progress so that various subordinate centres of self-consciousness may come into existence, around which national life groups itself into clear and distinct unities. And here in India, the home of divers races and civilizations, of long unfolding thought and ancient growth of spirit, the

need for a saner and sounder organization of a nation should express itself in a distinct sense of provincial autonomy, and under the stress of this new feeling should arise revived the idea of language unity and substantial integrity. A clear sketch of contiguous territory, a common language and literature, common traditions of heroes and poets, warriors and kings, and deep down a strong similarity of temper and character—these constitute the full and just title of the different language-bound communities to be out-lined each into a single race and accorded all those accessories of communal and political institutions which illustrate and feed that unity. It need hardly be mentioned that, in the recognition of such a unity, there is no fragmentation of the higher idea of Indian Nationalism. The spirit indeed may never be divided, for it concentrates in equal fulness into every fragment.

That such fragments and factors have not been brought into existence must be regarded as the first evil resulting from the existing conglomeration of peoples and provinces, and when that is said, it includes a host of minor evils, drawbacks and disadvantages which necessarily flow from the original defect. The different vernacular languages which should have properly been the vehicles of modern thought and culture, the media of instruction and administration have been greatly neglected; the indigenous sciences, both metaphysical and positive, have been altogether consigned to the limbo of the forgotten past. The English language has been confused with the

Western thought and science which it enshrines in part and has come to be regarded as the one means of enlightenment and as a necessary symbol of authority and power. A chasm has, therefore, come into existence between the class of people who have worshipped at the shrine of this language and the much larger class of people who are the repositories of the ancient learning of the land. Pride in local government has not been developed in its fullest measure. Local patriotism which, in proper relationship to the larger national consciousness, ought to be "the only safe and sure incentive to right political execution, and which, in the past, has determined the course and conduct in life of all those men who have attained the most lasting and world-wide reputation as benefactors of the human race," has had little chance of operation over the minds of men differing widely in language and temperament, but huddled together within the vinculum of a common province.

It must be confessed too that in certain areas instead of developing a true sense of responsibility and a generous spirit of co-operation, the promiscuous yoking of communities has had the effect of fostering prejudices towards one another and in that measure, of weakening the forces that should make for national consolidation. Judged from the lower standpoint of administration, the present arrangement has manifestedly resulted in impairing efficiency by entrusting the rule of the province first to foreigners who had to learn more than one language in the same province, and next, among the Indians, to people speaking different languages who

feel continually embarrassed in having to learn the particular language of the place. Then again, the location of the seat of authority and the centre of influence in one part of the province as against another has resulted in markedly diminishing the influence of one community and even denying them certain opportunities for self-development.

Some of the evils, notably those which have made administration cumbersome and inefficient, have been recognized by the authorities who, however, have not been able to perceive the standpoint of the nation-builder. The British administrator who performs his duties with a single eye to the maintenance not only of British authority in India but to the domination of Western thought and culture over an Eastern people, does not pause to consider a scheme of reorganization directed towards the realization of the national destiny, nor does he fully sympathize with the cultivation of those vernacular languages which alone can render valuable aid in such a realization. Expressions then such as 'Indian Nationalism,' 'Provincial Autonomy', 'the Resuscitation of the Vernaculars', the Cultivation of Indigenous Sciences' do not convey their real significance to him. Such events, therefore, as the partition of Bengal, the addition of Assam to East Bengal at one time, the coupling of Orissa with Behar are instances which prove absence of true political insight on the part of the executive government of the country in working out changes of real moment and magnitude. They further reveal the manner in which have been baffled the high hopes inspired in the Indian

public by such despatches as the one dated 3rd December 1902 in which Lord Curzon's government boastfully wrote: 'The question of territorial and administrative redistribution in India is indeed, in our judgment, one of the most urgent and vital of the many problems for which we are at present endeavouring to find a solution.' For the first time, however, a right solution was attempted by the Government of Lord Hardinge when they repaired the wrong done by the partition of Bengal and reunited the five Bengali speaking divisions into one province and integrated the Hindi speaking population of Behar and Chota Nagpur into another. But that liberal spirit had given way to mere considerations of administrative expediency when Orissa was tacked on to Behar, only because the Government of the day had not the required measure of imagination to take on hand a comprehensive scheme of reform affecting the whole country on the very lines and principles recognized by themselves.

The fault did not lie with Government alone. Popular ideals and popular aspirations had never taken shape, and no constructive plan of Indian Nationality or of Indian self-government had been evolved till the need for this emphasis upon the place and function of language has been recognised as of paramount importance. It was therefore that even the foremost men of the country advocated a reunion of Bengal as a remedy of the thrice-cursed partition; and beneath all the furious protests against this enforced dismemberment, one looks in vain for any large-eyed plicity of territorial reorganization.

It is not a little significant that the alternative scheme adopted by the Government of India at the time of Coronation as a remedy to the partition is looked askance at by some political leaders in Bengal who are not reconciled yet to the distinctive integration of Behar as a separate province. Even the efforts of men like Mahesh Narayan and his coadjutors to secure recognition of Behar's entity were rooted more in a perception of the backwardness of the Beharees in education and influence, and in the unequal yoking to which they were subjected with the Bengalees, and the resulting restriction in opportunities for self-development that they were labouring under. More in tune indeed with the idealism of the present day was the public opinion that faintly expressed itself when the Berars which the Nizam had given away to the British were desired to be added to the Bombay Presidency so as to mix with and swell the Mahratta population there; but when the suggestion was not put forward as a piece of a larger scheme of reorganization, there was as much propriety in adding the Maharata speaking Berars to the Central Provinces as to Bombay, for in both these provinces, there is a proportion of the population speaking Maharashtra. The Andhra Movement, however, that has been stirring the minds of the Telugus during the past four or five years is the first organized effort of a (whole) community working as a true reflex of the larger national movement. In seeking the constitution of the Andhra Desa into a distinctive province, there has not been simply the calculation of the advantages accruing therefrom to a particular community, but, also the setting forth and advancing

II.

of the conception that, in preserving its own clear individuality, it shall seek only to stimulate the self-consciousness of the sister communities and by a happy blending of all those, enrich the ideal of Indian Nationalism.

We may now consider the requisite conditions which must be observed in the settlement of the boundaries of provinces, in order that they may be satisfactory and conclusive. In the Government of India Despatch dated 25th August 1911, Lord Hardinge's Government laid down that a settlement of boundaries should

- (i). Provide convenient administrative units.
- (ii). Satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the people and
- (iii). Be clearly based upon broad grounds of political and administrative expediency.

Each of these may be examined in detail.

1. Few will deny that convenient administrative units are at once furnished by contiguous tracts of country where the people speak a common language. The evils of constituting provinces on any other basis have been pointed out in the foregoing pages. That is why Lord Hardinge has begun the annulment of the Partition with a decision to "reunite the five Bengali speaking divisions and form them into a presidency to be administered

by a Governor-in-Council." Again, in paragraph 19, he proceeds to say "We are satisfied that it is in the highest degree desirable to give the Hindi speaking people, now included within the province of Bengal, a separate administration. These people have hitherto been unequally yoked with the Bengalees and have never therefore, had a fair opportunity for development." It is impossible to quote a higher and better authority than that of this despatch (of 25-8-1911) in support of the theory that language areas provide the best administrative units.

2. The legitimate aspirations of the people must be satisfied in carving out provinces. During the last few years, a new consciousness has dawned upon the people that opportunities for self development, scope for civic discipline and political popular education, chances for the cultivation of one's own language and literature, and above all possibilities of provincial autonomy would exist only when each language area has a scheme of administration wholly unto itself. It is the recognition of this consciousness that impelled Lord Hardinge to write in paragraph 19 as follows: "There has, moreover, been a very marked awakening in Behar in recent years and a strong belief has grown up among the Beharees that Behar will never develop until it is disassociated from Bengal." If the British came into India for the first time in 1916, and met with an admixture of peoples and languages, in a random and disorderly manner, as at present, would it not strike them that a demand from the people to group them on the basis of a

common language and likewise reorganize their provinces, was the most natural, the most legitimate and the most justifiable that could be made by a nation which had not been taken into confidence in the determination of such vital affairs? While the legitimacy of such aspirations may be supported by abundant proof of advantages and benefits calculated to flow from them, there is an additional factor operating, higher than the benefits and the advantages, *viz.*, the factor of sentiment, and Lord Hardinge recognizes the place of such a factor when he writes in paragraph 12, "no doubt, sentiment has played a considerable part in the opposition offered by the Bengalees and in saying this, we, by no means, underrate the importance which should be attached to sentiment, even if it be exaggerated." Sentiment, after all, is not a factor to be slighted, for it implies the "readiness to react against the despotism of fact." It implies not "the vulgar satisfaction of sense" but a "ready susceptibility to the stimulus of emotion and excitement."

3. The last of the considerations is something higher than one of administrative convenience or the aspiration of the people. If political expediency demands a change, it shall be affected, though it may not be wholly in conformity with the first conditions. "Political expediency" may be interpreted from the standpoint of a progressive people struggling in their march towards nationality or from that of a Government untouched by such struggles. That Lord Hardinge's Government intended the former is made clear from paragraph 12:—"As matters now stand, the Bengalees can never exercise in either province that influence to which they consider themselves entitled by reason of their numbers, wealth and culture. This is a substantial grievance which will be felt all the more keenly in the course of time as the representative

character of the Legislative Councils increases, and with it the influence which these assemblies exercise upon the conduct of public affairs. There is therefore only too much reason to believe that this bitterness of feeling will become more and more acute," and from another sentence in paragraph 19 in which it is said that "that belief among the Beharees (that Behar will never develop until it is dissociated from Bengal) will, unless a remedy be found, give rise to agitation in the near future and the present is an admirable opportunity to carry out, on our own initiative, a thoroughly sound and much deserved change." Of such changes only one has been effected and if other changes thoroughly sound and much deserved in equal measure should follow, the initiative should come not incidentally in the course of repairing a wrong done, but deliberately in the form of a comprehensive scheme of reform advocated by the people's congress.

It may be feared that such a scheme would necessitate too many provinces, but in this vast country where nearly hundred and forty seven languages are spoken, those with a distinctive literature and culture of their own are not more than 15 or 16. Accordingly in our ideal scheme of "one province, one language," we may not have to provide for more than 15 or 16 provinces. The day may indeed come when the growth of population, the needs of administration, the aspirations of the people marked by local variations in manner and temperament, and political expediency may demand a further increase in the number of provinces, so that we cannot lay down the proposition of 'one language, one province', and just as the Hindi-speaking people being even now too numerous for one province have absorbed two provinces for themselves, other language areas may, at a remote future, comprise more than one province.

The following table shows the existing conditions.

Provinces.	Number of Districts.	Area in square miles.	Population.
1 Ajmere-Merwara ...	2	2,711	501,895
2 Andamans and Nicobars	3,143	26,459
8 Assam ...	1	52,959	6,713,635
4 Beluchistan ...	6	45,804	414,412
5 Bengal ...	28	78,412	45,483,077
6 Behar, Chotanagapur and Orissa ...	21	88,205	34,490,084
7 Bombay ...	26	123,064	19,672,642
8 Burma ...	41	286,738	12,115,217
9 Central Provinces and Berar ...	22	100,845	13,916,308
10 Coorg ..	1	1,552	174,976
11 Madras ...	24	141,720	41,405,404
12 North West Frontier Province (Districts and administered territories) ...	5	16,466	2,196,933
13 The Punjab ...	29	97,209	19,974,956
14 United Provinces ...	48	107,164	47,182,044
15 Delhi has been made an enclave	557	391,828

Reorganization of Provinces on the basis of language would alter the Map of India as follows;

Provinces.	Language.	Number of Dists.	Area in square miles.	Population.	Relative population to Belg (11,800 Sq. miles)
... ..	Local dialects of Rajastani and Hindi.	2	2,711	501,395	
... and Nicobars	3,143	26,459	
... ..	Bengali 46 per cent Assamese 22 per cent Hindi and Uria.	12	52,959	6,713,635	
...	6	45,804	414,412	
... ..	Bengali.	28	78,412	45,483,077	
... including ii Uria tracts of and Vizagpatam in Presidency).	Uria.	...	i Orissa. } 13,770 } ii the rest } 10,000 }	6½ millions	2 times
... Chota Nagpur (excluding ...) ... Hindi speaking area of ...) ... Provinces.	(i.) Behari (ii.) Hindi (The rest.)	...	i 70,000 } ii 40,000 }	30 millions } 7½ millions }	10 times
			110,000	37½ millions	

i Marata speaking area of Provinces and iii of Bom-	} Marathi.	...	i Berars.	17,718	3 millions	
			Bombay.	ii 37,192	6 millions	
			the rest	iii 20,982	4½ millions	
				75,892	13½ millions	7 times
i speaking area of Bom-	Gujarathi.	6	13,710	3½ millions	1½ times	
... ..	Sindhi.	6	47,066	3,513,435	4 times	
...	1	1,582	174,976		
Province (Telugu speaking } Madras Presidency) ... }	Telugu	11 will be- come 12 dts. in a year.	73,318	14 millions	6½ times	
Province (Tamil speaking Madras Presidency).	Tamil	10 including Madras.	50,000 square miles	15 millions	4½ times	
Province	Malayali.	1	5,794	3,015,119	½ of	
do. (Bombay & Madras)	Kanarese.	7	29,015	6,265,919	2½ times	
West Frontier Province	5	16,466	2,196,933		
Lab	29	97,209	9,974,956		
Provinces	48	107,164	47,182,044		
(enclave)	1	557	391,828		

A better knowledge of the local feelings in the different parts of the country suggest variations not contemplated. There is certainly a volume of discontent with its own present lot while some in its addition to the Punjab and in the addition of the Northern Circars Presidency to the Central Province altered map of India, the Central Province has been removed and the provinces of Orissa, Andhra, Karnataka and Maharashtra added. Orissa is taken away from the Hindi speaking population of the Central Province and added to Behar and Chota Nagpur; the Telugu-speaking population of Central Province and Berars along with that occupying contiguous territory in the Bombay Presidency constitute a separate administration; while the Guzerat and Kathiawar presidencies are exclusively to themselves. The districts of Bombay along with the districts of Madras form one entity, while the Telugus and Tamils have each a province. The Uriyas of Orissa and those of Ganjam and Vizagapatam in the Madras Presidency are grouped together under one administration. The problem of the Sindhis and the Malayalis is considered by some to be a complicated one and whether they should be constituted into separate provinces analogous to those in the existing arrangement, though districts larger, is a matter that may be left entirely to the wishes. In this scheme, no note is taken of the complicating circumstance of the Native States.

* *Vide* address of the Hon'ble Mr. Vishin Das, Chairman, Reception Committee, Karachi Congress.

Relative size in relation to Belgium. (11,800 Sq. miles.)

Population.

Area in square miles.

Number of provinces on the basis of language would alter the Map of India as follows:—

ing a portion of the Hindi, Telugu and Mahratta speaking peoples, and until the day comes when they may enjoy genuine self-government, their problem may baffle all attempts at solution. But this theoretical imperfection need not operate as an impediment to the reorganisation of Provinces in British India.

The advantages of such a re-arrangement are obvious. The evils arising from its absence have been described in outline and the removal of these evils brings in its train results of great value to the progress of the country. In the first place, the ideal of provincial autonomy authoritatively held up to the Indians in the despatch dated 25th August 1911 would have the surest chance of fulfilment only in provinces of a homogeneous structure. In them alone does solidarity of feeling and pride in Local Government develop, and the people of such provinces alone speaking one language, paying homage to one literature, inspired by common traditions, and worshipping the memories of common heroes and saints, are best able to examine their civic laws and social institutions from a common standpoint and judge of their common need for reform and legislation. Indeed "the creation of a common standard of civilisation in certain matters" as Professor Morgan puts it "and of a certain measure of national sentiment may be necessary before local autonomy is either desirable or possible". If all governments are agencies for enforcing the will of the majority on the minority, the different provincial governments enjoying a full measure of autonomy, administrative and legislative, can enact

A better knowledge of the local conditions and feelings in the different parts of the country may suggest variations not contemplated in this list. There is certainly a volume of discontent in Sindh* with its own present lot while some have suggested its addition to the Punjab and in the same spirit the addition of the Northern Circars in the Madras Presidency to the Central Provinces. In the altered map of India, the Central Provinces has been removed and the provinces of (Kalinga) Uriya, Andhra, Karnataka and Maharashtra have been added. Orissa is taken away from Behar; the Hindi speaking population of the Central Provinces is added to Behar and Chota Nagpur; the Maharashtra-speaking population of Central Provinces and Berars along with that occupying contiguous territory in the Bombay Presidency constitute a separate administration; while the Guzarathees have a presidency exclusively to themselves. The Kanarese districts of Bombay along with the one in Madras form one entity, while the Telugus and the Tamils have each a province. The Uriyas of Orissa and those of Ganjam and Vizagapatam in the Madras Presidency are grouped together under one administration. The problem of the Sindhis and of the Malayalis is considered by some to be a complicated one and whether they should be constituted into separate provinces analogous to Coorg in the existing arrangement, though distinctly larger, is a matter that may be left entirely to their wishes. In this scheme, no note is taken of the complicating circumstance of the Native states

* *Vide* address of the Hon'ble Mr. Vishin Das, Chairman, Reception Committee, Karachee Congress.

Sharing a portion of the Hindi, Telugu and Mahratta speaking peoples, and until the day comes when India may enjoy genuine self-government, their problem may baffle all attempts at solution. But this theoretical imperfection need not operate as an impediment to the reorganisation of Provinces in British India.

The advantages of such a re-arrangement are obvious. The evils arising from its absence have been described in outline and the removal of these evils brings in its train results of great value to the progress of the country. In the first place, the ideal of provincial autonomy authoritatively held up to the Indians in the despatch dated 25th August 1911 would have the surest chance of fulfilment only in provinces of a homogeneous structure. In them alone does solidarity of feeling and pride in Local Government develop, and the people of such provinces alone speaking one language, paying homage to one literature, inspired by common traditions, and worshipping the memories of common heroes and saints, are best able to examine their civic laws and social institutions from a common standpoint and judge of their common need for reform and legislation. Indeed "the creation of a common standard of civilisation in certain matters" as Professor Morgan puts it "and of a certain measure of national sentiment may be necessary before local autonomy is either desirable or possible". If all governments are agencies for enforcing the will of the majority on the minority, the different provincial governments enjoying a full measure of autonomy, administrative and legislative, can enact

laws to the complete satisfaction of a particular province not by enforcing the will of one language-community upon another, but by ascertaining the bulk of opinion from among a homogeneous population marked by similarity in sympathies and sentiment. If India should consist of a "number of administrations, autonomous in all provincial affairs, with the Government of India above them all" as has been foreshadowed by Lord Hardinge and his colleagues, that autonomy should bring into existence separate, stable, self-contained and self-reliant states which would leave no scope for the upspringing in any one state of bitterness of feeling, prejudices or antipathies, and in each of which no one community could drag down or even retard another in its progress. It is thus that in the words of "Action Front"—"*The Political Future of India*".—*Hodder and Stoughton, London 1908*: "All the (sub) nationalities in India would be simultaneously started on the road to self-development and ultimate self-government. Those which advance rapidly would be given greater facilities and would necessarily be more independent than those that lagged. No greater facilities could be given to the peoples of India than the fostering of local patriotism (by the construction of a new map of India on an ethnological and linguistic basis) and the consequent friendly inter-racial competition for civilised progress and ultimate autonomy."

The organisation of Indian provinces on natural and linguistic lines forms but the first step in the achievement of that provincial unity which is essential to the perfect flowering of Indian

nationalism. For, the singleness of political administration, while it perhaps takes rank as the highest symbol of racial integrity, would prove of no farther significance, if it did not avail itself of those vital forces which sustain and develop communal life among a people. And any government to be fruitful of these benefits for which all governments exist, must, in the daily business of administration relate itself intimately to the life and habits of the people whom it seeks to govern. Administration, in the full interpretation of its end and aim is really no more mechanical than education, depending for its success in a very vital measure on the inner psychology of relations between the governing and the governed. Judged by such a standard of administrative perfection, the most serious defect of British administration in India appears to be the lack of correspondence between the mind of the English rulers and the mind of the Indian people, between the demand for organisation and the impulse to respond. Thus it is that, though essentially democratic in temper, the British scheme of government has lain on its Indian subject races with the weight of an arbitrary Bauracracy, while, on the other hand, it has found its task of administration peculiarly hard and unsatisfactory even with a people who have been for ages accustomed to democratic forms and institutions of self-government.

One important reason for such small measure of success of British institutions in India is doubtless the fact that the daily business of administration is carried on in a language not understood by the people. The increasing employment of English

educated Indian interpreters has never proved any real palliative to the evil of government in a foreign language. For, where the fountain of authority is foreign in *personnel*, the more faithfully and efficiently the task of interpretation is discharged, the more completely does the administration retain its impress of an alien character. So that government by the English educated Indian has often-times proved itself as un-Indian in tone and temper as that by European officers uninformed of the ways of Indian life. Things seem to have been somewhat better, if not radically different, in the days when European administrators learnt the language of the land and were more intimately in touch with the habits and characteristics of the people.

But with the advancement of European education in the land and the universal acceptance of English as the language of administration has come into being a body of English officials with set notions of how to govern India and a great army of English educated Indians, who, though largely in evidence in the actual business of Government, function only as passive media for the transference of ideas from the really governing to the vast mass of the governed. The existence of this intermediary body of Indian officials, without any power of initiative, has had only the result of putting further away from the vision of the rulers the real people of the land, so shutting off that natural exchange of influences between the governing and the governed, which is the true root of political reform among all progressing races of the world.

The appointment of a few Indians to the higher ranks of service has gratified individual ambitions but has had absolutely no influence in altering the tone and temper of the administration. The representation of Indian opinion in the Legislative Councils of the land has perhaps helped to moderate the rigour of English ideas but has failed in its essential purpose, because it did not clearly enough realise or interpret the needs of Indian life.

To illustrate by a few examples the truth of the above interpretation of a complex situation: The great experiment, as it is called, in local self-government initiated through Local Boards and Municipalities has proved far less than a success, because the English rulers have, with characteristic hesitancy, kept back from the people the essentials of the privilege, while the people themselves have not so far displayed any talent sufficiently noteworthy in putting to use even that which was actually conceded. And yet, more than two thousand years ago, under the reign of Chandragupta Maurya, in the city of Pataliputra, flourished an almost perfect system of Municipal self-administration with hundreds of well organised guilds each in charge of some one profession, art or craft. Similarly, the British have introduced a costly and abundant police force to maintain peace and security in the land whose inefficiency and oppression have become a by-word of popular disregard, while in strange contrast was the village Nayakwady, maintained out of the village's own revenues, who, till a very few years ago, guaranteed the safety, personal and of property, of the whole village.

Among the achievements of the English for which they desire the highest praise and credit, is the institution of civil and criminal courts intended to administer justice among the people, but which have afforded opportunity for the growth of litigious discord and mental harassment to an undesirable extent. One turns aside with a pang of regret but with immense moral relief to the picture of the now disorganized village panchayat which for forty centuries kept the lives of the villagers clean, prosperous and pure. Instances may be endlessly multiplied to prove how ill European institutions have fared with the people of the land, how they have provoked, not sympathetic response, but suspicion and distrust and how, as a consequence, some of the new usages and institutions, meant for their good, have in course of time turned into instruments of oppression. The rulers have readily set it down to the innate ignorance and superstition of the Indian mind. Strange accusation to be laid at the door of a people who, through their social organisation, successfully regulated the very motive springs of individual action, through their panchayats solved their own disputes, through their servants maintained perfect security to person and property and through their various institutions revealed the highest capacity to deal with the most complicated problems of national life !

Where then would the solution to such a seemingly contradictory problem lie? Most probably in the fact that government through an alien language has given a general air of alienness to the

administration itself, so that every usage or institution of that administration, however harmless or beneficent in itself to the people, was so to speak morally rejected under an instinctive apprehension of its unsuitedness to the Indian life or where persistently enforced, was silently submitted to as part of the inevitable indemnity of conquest. If this explanation be right, the one and only remedy must be in the complete adoption of the vernacular as the language of administration in the land, in the necessary modification of the *personnel* of government at least to the limit of the District administration in accordance therewith. But this does not mean that, in the sphere of the highest government, the use of English would not prove essential both in the interests of the uniform evolution of national administration in the land and for the dominance of the finer tradition of the British Raj. But allowing for the inevitable supremacy of both language and *personnel* in the highest sphere of executive government, the fountain sources of legislation and administration must be laid entirely in the realm of the vernacular, rendering possible the freest and fullest discussion of all vital problems of public interest, and their publication as deep and wide as would be necessary to reach the millions toiling in the Indian villages.

Such dominance of the vernacular in the mutual relations of the government and the people is bound to make the task of administration infinitely easier and more satisfactory by rendering free communication of ideas possible. It will raise the efficiency of administration by enlisting on the side

of good government the whole force of popular will where it is substantially in agreement with the will of the executive. Also in cases where the essence of an administrative act is the practical adoption by the people of a great sanitary, municipal, agricultural or other similar reform, the first condition for success is the full and clear understanding by the people of the purpose and value of the reform to be introduced, possible only where exchange of thought is habitually frank and free and action unfettered by doubt or distrust. Similarly the complete adoption of the vernacular in civil and criminal courts would not only ensure natural and substantial justice, effecting incalculable saving in time and money but would ultimately help in simplifying law and procedure in harmony with the social instincts of an essentially agricultural people. Thus in many known and unknown ways the introduction of this reform, which would become possible only under a reorganisation of provinces on a linguistic basis, would not only facilitate administration but would make of the British Government the nearest approach to a truly national institution springing from the heart of the people and deriving its strength, not from an objective fountain of power, but from the moral and emotional relation of its fundamental unity with the highest interests of national life.

The next important corollary to a reorganisation of provinces on a linguistic basis is the free and universal acceptance of the vernacular as the sole medium of instruction in all the educational institutions of the land. As a general proposition

has found the acceptance of all classes of thinkers that the children of a race would be best educated in and through their own mother tongue, but the full significance of the fact would be realised only when in a rightly constituted province the full vigour of national life expresses itself in a rich and varied glorification of the vernacular. For, the evil of forcing an alien language on the children of another race is proved not only by the tremendous drain it involves on the vital energies of youth, when most they should be conserved, but extends to all their varied activities, drying up, so to speak, at their sources the very fountain-springs of national power. Thus it is that a century of European education has left the Indian mind richer by a new language but seriously impoverished on the side of initiative and originality. It was had psychology at best to have conceived of the possibility of educating an oriental people, with a well-formed organisation of mental and moral tendencies through a scheme of culture utterly at variance with their own. The very strain of mind involved in the acquisition of a new vocabulary of ideas and words has resulted in the disappearance of many of the characteristic traits for which the Indian mind was justly famous. While the very extent of apparent success which has attended this tremendous educational experiment, due entirely to the dominance of an administrative expediency, may really be accounted as the measure of its failure from the point of view of the evolution of a true national culture. For, the progress of English education in the land has been marked by a steadily increasing alienation and estrangement of

the people from the ancient inheritance of their culture. And if it be true that the individuality of a people's culture is their greatest treasure in the eye of humanity and that nothing may rightly be permitted whether to individuals or nations to weaken or destroy the integrity of that culture, then surely the primary duty of the British Government in India, would lie in the restoration to each vernacular of the land that dominance which English now holds over all. For, if a culture is to be constantly replenished and kept alive as a growing entity, the language which is its vehicle must be frankly accepted as the one medium of self-expression for all of a nation's activities. But more than elsewhere, in the Vidyalayas of the land the vernacular of the race must form the sole medium of education, and be universally accorded that reverence of young and old which alone can make of it the store-house of national power and passion and influence.

Thus, it is evident that from whatever aspect considered, true national uplift is vitally bound up with the restoration of the vernaculars to their rightful place as the vehicles of the living, growing thought of the various Indian peoples and that herein only is the true conclusion to the scheme of the national provincial areas in the country.

Provinces which are so consolidated by the vernaculars replete with modern, scientific, and historical literature, and presenting in a telling manner the ideals of life and conduct, alike in the West and the East, provinces too in which the

centre of attraction and authority shifts from the English educated few to the many unsophisticated representatives of ancient and modern culture, acquired in their mother tongue, become at once distinctive and potent states, federated together to constitute the mighty Indian Nationality that is now in its process of evolution. As separate, self-governing states, acknowledging a suzerain power over themselves, they prepare the vast continent for that ultimate autonomy which has been acknowledged as the ideal for which the British and the Indians have been labouring in common during the past one and a half centuries. However true it may be that good government is no substitute for self government, it must be admitted that, in the last analysis, self-government in any country is itself only a means to good government and if that be so, it is of paramount importance that a self-governing India should comprise components enjoying the best facilities for liberal, sympathetic and popular government. The demand for self-government safeguarded and exalted by such high ideals would not become exposed to the commonplace cavil that it emanates from the English educated classes prompted by self-seeking motives, for, on the plan on which it is designed, it develops a policy beaten out into harmony with the needs of the nation and serves primarily and for ever the requirements of the millions that toil in this land and labour to produce its wealth.

Again, provinces and states thus organized and strengthened enjoy legitimate opportunities for independent racial self-development and foster

distinctive tributary cultures whose commingling enriches the central stream of national life. "The great virtue which we call patriotism" as Mr. Asquith points out, "and which cements the unity of a people comes from many sources as it assumes many different shapes" and while there is no antagonism between the consciousness of a separate sub-nationality and that national pride and patriotism not more ardent indeed but larger in its scope, modern thought and experience agree in the conclusion that that nationalism would surely be counted highest which is compounded of the finest contrasts and the most delicate harmonies of temper and character within the unity of one culture type. Whether, then, the problem of India's future is examined in an analytical way in which as Bright predicted the different provinces shall ultimately form locally autonomous states with separate Governments, separate armies and so on, based upon a policy of a sort of Home Rule all round, or whether it be approached from the synthetic standpoint by which the higher national life would seem to be integrated by a happy reconciliation between the increasing insistence of the individual type and mastery of power and passion hid in the nationalistic ideal, the conclusion is irresistible that, for a solution to be final and satisfactory, the statesmen in India should display great imagination and courage and carve out natural and self-contained provinces, each sustained by a thought of internal unity and enjoying a simple system of self-Government, and all held together and uplifted by a common ambition to realise the individual soul in a life, larger and diviner than its own.

APPENDIX

In 1765 the provinces of Bengal, Behar and Orissa (old) and the Northern Circars were granted by the Emperor of Delhi. The first three provinces were attached to Bengal and the last to Madras. On the annexation of the district of Benares in 1775, it was attached to Bengal. The districts ceded and conquered after the Mysore Wars in 1792, and in 1799, the territories of the Maharaja of Tanjore who retired on a pension in 1799, the district ceded by the Nizam in 1800 and the territories of the Nawab of Karnatic, who too retired on a pension in 1801 were all attached to Madras. Thus practically the whole of the Madras Presidency was acquired by 1801. Allahabad and other districts ceded by the Nawab of Oudh in 1801; the districts of Delhi, Agra, Mathura, and Orrissa (present) were conquered from and ceded by the Maharatas in 1803 and they were all attached to Bengal. Between 1800 and 1805 the districts of Surat, Broach and Kaira were acquired from the Nawab of Surat and the Gaekwar; they were attached to Bombay. After the Nepal War 1815, Dehradun, Kumaun, Gharwal and Simla were acquired and attached to Bengal. Thus practically the whole of the province of Agra was acquired by 1815. Ahmadabad was acquired from the Gaekwar between 1802-17 and was attached to Bombay. In 1818, after the last Maharatta War, the bulk of Maharashtra and several districts of C. P. were acquired from the Maratas. Except the Central Province districts, all these territories and the rest of the Maharashtra which was acquired from the Nizam and the Kolhapur Maharajah between 1819-27 were attached to Bombay. Thus practically the whole of the Bombay presidency except Sindh was acquired by 1827. Ajmer-Merwara was acquired in 1818 from Scindia, and was placed under the agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana. After the first Burmese War, Assam, Arakan

and Tennasserim were annexed in 1826. Assam and Arakan were attached to Bengal, Tennasserim was placed under a Commissioner directly under the Supreme Government. After the Kol rebellion, Chotr-Nagpur was annexed in 1833 and placed under the South West Frontier Agency; later on, it was annexed to Bengal in 1854. Coorg was annexed in 1834 and placed under the Resident of Mysore. Between 1829 and 1835, Shillong and other hill tracts in Assam were acquired and attached to Bengal. In 1836 all the territories west of Behar were separated from Bengal and were placed under a Lieutenant-Governor and called North-West Province. In 1837, on the deposition of the Rajah, Satara was annexed and attached to Bombay. Since 1840, the districts of Jhalun, Jhansi and Dalitpur were annexed and attached to North-Western Province. Sindh was attached to Bombay shortly after its conquest in 1843. After the first Sikh War, Jalandhar division was ceded in 1846. The Punjab was at first placed under a Board of Administration, and soon afterwards under a Chief Commissioner; but in 1859 with Delhi and some other districts, it was formed into a Lieutenant-Governorship. In 1852 after the 2nd Burmese War, Pegu was annexed and Arakan which was detached from Bengal, Tennasserim and Pegu were placed each under a separate Commissioner and were all under the Supreme Government. In 1854 the territories of the Rajah of Nagpur were escheated, and were placed at first under a Commissioner directly under the Supreme Government, but in 1861, with 2 districts from the North-Western Provinces they were placed under a Chief Commissioner and the province was named the Central Provinces. In 1858 Port Blair was made a convict settlement, and under its superintendent, the islands of Andaman and Nicobars were placed. Oudh was annexed in 1856 and placed under a Chief Commissioner. By 1861, Darjeeling and Jalpaiguri districts were acquired from Bhootan and attached to Bengal. By the treaties of 1835 and 1860, Berar was assigned

by the Nizam but it did not form a British Province. In 1861 the Panch Mahals were ceded by Scindia and added to Bombay. In 1862 all the Burmese territories (Lower Burmah) were placed under a Chief Commissioner. So was Assam with certain Bengal districts in 1874. In 1887 Oudh was placed under the Lieutenant-Governor of North-West Provinces, who became Chief Commissioner of Oudh as well. In 1886 Upper Burmah was annexed and placed under the Chief Commissioner of Burmah, Lower and Upper; and in 1897 the province was raised to a Lieutenant-Governorship. In 1887, British Baluchistan was placed under a Chief Commissioner. In 1901, with a few districts detached from the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province was created and placed under a Chief Commissioner. In 1903 Berar was leased in perpetuity by the Nizam and attached to the Central Provinces. In 1905 several districts of Bengal with Assam were formed into a new province and East Bengal and Assam so carved out were placed under a Lieutenant-Governor. In 1912 Assam was replaced under a Chief Commissioner as it was since 1874. The Province of Behar, Chotanagpur and Orissa were detached from Bengal and made a Lieutenant-Governorship with a Council under the name of Behar and Orrissa, and Bengal proper was raised to a Governorship. In the same year, the city and district of Delhi were detached from the Punjab and placed directly under the Supreme Government as Metropolitan area.—“ Indian administration ”—Prof Kale.

INDIA
AND
HER PRESENT NEEDS.

BY

B. SASHAGIRI RAO,
HIGH COURT BAR, HYDERABAD, DN.



MADRAS:
HIGGINBOTHAM & CO.
1911.

INDIA AND HER PRESENT NEEDS.

The momentous event of a British Sovereign's Coronation Durbar on Indian soil as the Emperor of India in a city of historic associations naturally, raises in many thoughtful minds reflections of a complex nature. To the Indian more than to the English mind that event presents problems of the greatest significance in the actual present and the probable future of the Indian Empire.

In the following pages some endeavour has, been made to draw the attention of English Statesmen to a few of those problems. That endeavour has been inspired by sentiments of the deepest gratitude and devotion to the great people whom, Providence has entrusted with the destinies of this country.

By way of prefacing the consideration of those problems the condition of India will in a rapid survey be touched to shew what it was

- (a) during the pre-Mahomedan period ;
- (b) during the Mahomedan period ;
- (c) during the period of British rule through the East India Company until it was transferred to the Crown ; and
- (d) during the period of the Crown administration.

This method of treatment has, it is submitted, the merit of giving it, though within very small limits, some comprehensive character ; and of drawing attention to certain peculiarities of Hindu social structure, which have survived the long lapse of ages and which still possess the promise and potency of youth. The approach to so wide a subject-matter has the risk of decoying the indulgent reader into bogs of controversy where "armies whole have sunk." That risk will be avoided by the presentation of admitted facts or accepted solutions.

All the great religions of the world swaying the minds and hearts of millions of men ; the highest altitudes of philosophical speculation ; theories of right and wrong applicable to all departments of an organized social life ; political systems formulating a wise and equitable exercise of power and dominion, unsurpassed even by the best systems of ancient Greece and Rome ; all that may well constitute the imperishable intellectual glory of a people and its claim to the respect and admiration of mankind, have found their genesis and development in Asia ; and the best portion of it all belongs to that section of Asia which is called Hindustan : land, whose limitless material resources could well have organized and reared up a nation of bankers and traders commanding the wealth of the world, but which has founded its claim to the notice of mankind, not upon its being the fountain of gold and silver, but upon its being the mother of saints and sages. In no other section of the world, have its best men more persistently pro-

claimed the vanity of earthly pomp, the permanence of moral grandeur, and the immortality of spiritual greatness than in this great peninsula of India.

Under the Hindu political system, kingship was a sacred trust for the well-being of subjects. Great as were his privileges, the king was bound to regulate his conduct in accordance with the counsels of wise men and the public opinion of his country.

The success of his rule was measured by his contribution to the happiness and prosperity of his people. His subjects were, too, under similar obligation to prosecute their *dharma* or duty to their king and to their country. Their status as subjects was not the status of slavery. The king's power embodied the spirit of the written law, which ministered to the safety and permanence of the State. All conception of individualism, either for subjects to assert their rights or for kings to assert their privileges, was subordinated to the common obligation of both to do and to suffer for the security and perpetuation of the State. The highest purposes of individual and collective life were to be fulfilled through the performance of what was prescribed for the conservation of the State. All conception of *dharma* either of the king or of the subject was inspired by the institutional value of the State.

The primary function of kingship was to provide the subjects with all possible facilities to their willing fulfilment of the *dharmas* of their *varna* and

This method of treatment has, it is submitted, the merit of giving it, though within very small limits, some comprehensive character ; and of drawing attention to certain peculiarities of Hindu social structure, which have survived the long lapse of ages and which still possess the promise and potency of youth. The approach to so wide a subject-matter has the risk of decoying the indulgent reader into bogs of controversy where "armies whole have sunk." That risk will be avoided by the presentation of admitted facts or accepted solutions.

All the great religions of the world swaying the minds and hearts of millions of men ; the highest altitudes of philosophical speculation ; theories of right and wrong applicable to all departments of an organized social life ; political systems formulating a wise and equitable exercise of power and dominion, unsurpassed even by the best systems of ancient Greece and Rome ; all that may well constitute the imperishable intellectual glory of a people and its claim to the respect and admiration of mankind, have found their genesis and development in Asia ; and the best portion of it all belongs to that section of Asia which is called Hindustan : land, whose limitless material resources could well have organized and reared up a nation of bankers and traders commanding the wealth of the world, but which has founded its claim to the notice of mankind, not upon its being the fountain of gold and silver, but upon its being the mother of saints and sages. In no other section of the world, have its best men more persistently pro-

claimed the vanity of earthly pomp, the permanence of moral grandeur, and the immortality of spiritual greatness than in this great peninsula of India.

Under the Hindu political system, kingship was a sacred trust for the well-being of subjects. Great as were his privileges, the king was bound to regulate his conduct in accordance with the counsels of wise men and the public opinion of his country.

The success of his rule was measured by his contribution to the happiness and prosperity of his people. His subjects were, too, under similar obligation to prosecute their *dharma* or duty to their king and to their country. Their status as subjects was not the status of slavery. The king's power embodied the spirit of the written law, which ministered to the safety and permanence of the State. All conception of individualism, either for subjects to assert their rights or for kings to assert their privileges, was subordinated to the common obligation of both to do and to suffer for the security and perpetuation of the State. The highest purposes of individual and collective life were to be fulfilled through the performance of what was prescribed for the conservation of the State. All conception of *dharma* either of the king or of the subject was inspired by the institutional value of the State.

The primary function of kingship was to provide the subjects with all possible facilities to their willing fulfilment of the *dharms* of their *varna* and

their *asrama*. *Varna* denotes different divisions of Hindu society corresponding to different departments of labour; *asrama*, different stages of man's earthly life—single life, married life, retired life, life of complete self-abnegation and detachment from the world. The duty of kingship which was specially identified with the efficient working of the constitutional machinery, was to make it, for his subjects, as easy as possible to do right and as difficult as possible to do wrong. Strict conformity to prescribed duties was the common obligation of rulers and ruled. The lives of both were subject to moral restraints conceived in the loftiest spirit of service and sacrifice in the cause of public well-being. The Hindu monarchy of old was ideally more constitutional than any constitutional monarchy of our time. An absolute or arbitrary government is thus unknown to the Hindu theory of politics.

Representative institutions too, though in different forms, existed in ancient India. A variety of guilds or social organizations for the prosecution of common purposes was a marked feature of ancient Hindu society. Recognition of the authority of public opinion was a duty alike of kings and of his people; and no recognition could exist without an organized expression of public opinion. Under the Hindu political system, the supremacy of the moral law imposed common duties and responsibilities on sovereigns and on subjects and thereby bound them together as one corporate entity to work out the ideals of life.

Ancient India comprised many Hindu States of varying strength and extent. Their one bond of moral union was their common loyalty to the Hindu sacred scripture (the *Srutis* and the *Smritis*); their common inheritance to the language, literature and philosophy of Hindu society. This common loyalty and this common inheritance, naturally created a common conception of duty, of the aims and objects of private and public life, of the conditions of authority and obedience. Among the scattered principalities of ancient India, rulers of the largest States had the status of *Chakravartis* or emperors. That status was an index of their suzerainty over kingdoms of a smaller extent. But the political relation of a larger State with the smaller ones under its authority, was more a confederation than a federation of States. The great names of Harischandra, Nala, Sagara, Raghu, Dasaratha, etc., form a classic list of emperors whose lives embodied the loftiest dharmas of their exalted station, and whose memories still shine through the mist of ages and command the intellectual homage of their remote posterity.

No review of ancient India, however rapid or brief, can avoid a reference to the position of the Brahmin section of Hindu society. That section constituted its intellectual aristocracy, laid its foundation broad and deep, and left on its structure a stamp of individuality that no lapse of time has been able to efface. It was the sole custodian of the sacred language and the rich literature of ancient

India. Its pre-eminence in the Indian world of thought from the earliest down to our own time, stands without a challenge. The best part of the intellectual inheritance of modern Hindu society has been the achievement of the Brahmin mind. The greatest saints and sages; the best jurists and philosophers; the subtlest logicians and divines; the most learned grammarians and commentators; the authors of immortal dramas and epic poems; the founders of great schools of learning; the conductors of great researches and discoveries in science and philosophy; authors of profound works on astronomy, medical science, mathematics, political economy, politics, and other departments of knowledge; great preceptors, reformers, ministers, judges, councillors, warriors; men of distinction in every field of mental labour; all, all these were the members of the Brahmin community. Their contribution to the permanent literature of the world cannot but form a title to greatness all their own—the ethical code and the religious faith which the Brahmin mind developed and consolidated; has been the foundation of the social framework of some two hundred millions of the human race. Such in ancient India was the position of the Brahmins who in the old days in no way constituted a close corporation. Hindu literature abounds in instances of good and noble men of the other sections of Hindu society having been admitted into the Brahmin section.

It is a presumption of ignorance to suppose that the four original divisions of Hindu society were

inspired by feelings of jealousy and antagonism towards each other; and that the supremacy of the Brahmins was inspired by a love of power over the others. That supremacy was purely a moral one and was the outcome of intellectual strength. "He that thinks must govern him that toils." It was the operation of a natural law. The great social divisions of Hindu society were not the work of a particular body of men nor had they their origin at a particular stage of national life. They were the natural cleavages of a highly organized corporate life, created by natural differences between man and man, and moulded and shaped by economic exigencies. The social divisions of Hindu society were in fact the natural adjustment of men of different mental endowments to different spheres of activity and inclination. The adjustment was not due to any external force, moral or material. It was a spontaneous operation due to biological laws. Inherited instincts, acquired predilections, imbibed tastes, transmitted impulses, were among other causes responsible for the adoption by different men of different departments of labour. Ancestral partiality for one kind of work was transmitted as a pre-determining factor of its choice to the offspring. Inherited impulses were fostered and developed by social environment. As the acquired or the inherited aptitude for a particular labour of each section of Hindu society was one of the essential conditions of its normal existence, contributing as it did to the general happiness of the whole, these separate guilds or social corporations became the separate

cellular tissues of one and the same social organism. Their inter-relations were marked by a bond of sympathy and cordiality, respect and loyalty.

The thinker, the teacher, the actor, the priest, the soldier, the trader, the tiller, living on the same soil, subject to the same authority, sharing the same faith, benefiting by each other's works, ensuring the efficient discharge of each other's labour; looked upon each other as the natural and necessary parts and counterparts of one single, social corporate entity charged with the sacred, patriotic duty of maintaining and transmitting intact their common state, their common language and literature, their common religion and philosophy. No antagonism, no jealousy, was cherished by one towards another among the Brahmins, the Kshatriyas, the Vysias and the Sudras. They were and continued to be for the most part what they had made themselves. The great institution of caste confined the energies of each section to a particular area of labour and enabled it to specialize therein. It concentrated and focused the faculties, on the work, of that section; and thereby brought about its development to the highest possible degree of excellence.

The value of a man or the contempt that he draws upon himself from his fellow men, depends, not on the particular work which he does, but on his manner of doing it; on his general character; on the amount and quality of sense which he brings to bear on what he does in his private and public life. The reproach

of there being "depressed" classes in Hindu society cannot belong to its higher ranks, but must be of those that constitute those classes. Their "depression" is not the outcome of any hatred or antagonism or jealousy on the part of those ranks, but is brought about by their own conduct and character, their voluntary abstention from all useful and honourable activities, their disloyalty to all the sacred duties and responsibilities of life, to the low motives and animal impulses that have for the most part actuated their conduct and behaviour. To charge the Brahmin with the Pariah being what he is, is to seek the cause in the wrong quarter. The "depressed" community has produced great saints, sages, poets, philosophers, doctors and divines, who have commanded the unqualified respect and admiration of the Brahmins, and who have been ranked among the highest and the best of the land. The elevation or degradation of any one section of a composite whole largely depends on its inherent desires, impulses, its own inherent faculties of moral and intellectual perception and outlook.

The circumstances that naturally rendered the position of the Brahmin one of the highest importance and therefore of the greatest influence have been briefly adverted to. No one section of any organized society can possibly achieve pre-eminence over its other sections without real aptitude in itself and without a willing and loyal recognition of that aptitude on their part. As the inter-relations were those of mutual dependence in the several depart-

ments of labour for each of which, each section had by "hereditary drill" been specifically qualified, there could be no room for mutual jealousy and antagonism.

The vast area of time between the age of ancient India and the commencement of the Mahomedan dominion in this country, is covered with thick darkness. All accounts are mostly traditional or are matters of controversy. The only gleam of light through this period of darkness relates to the development of Buddhism, a product of the soil of Indian thought which now commands the spiritual allegiance of about a fourth of the world's population. This great religion of peace and humanity became the state religion of India and its greatest apostles were the Indian Emperors, Chandragupta and his still more famous grandson Asoka. One of Emperor Asoka's edicts records his contraction of treaties with five contemporary Greek kings. He sent missionaries to Siberia; Ceylon, China and Africa, Egypt, Syria, Macedon, Epiros. Magasthenes, the Greek ambassador at the Court of Chandragupta, has left authentic historical records of the condition of things, moral, material and political, of the Hindu society of this period. One might conclude that Hindu power and dominion of this time was perhaps even greater than what it had been in the ancient India of an anterior age.

Hindu society at the time of its early associations with Mahomedans who came for plunder and rapine, was essentially the same in its foundations and superstructure. Frequency of contact with Maho-

medan invaders, however, largely modified its social life. The original rigidity of communal existence, possible only in a condition of internal peace and external security, was relaxed by the periodical visitations of alien semi-barbarous races to rob and plunder, to impose a new faith by force and to desecrate the temples of the old. Order and good government were destroyed and with them disappeared whatever forces had co-operated to impart a character of immutability to the Hindu system of social and religious life. In the unsettlement of old moorings, men drifted into new grooves of activity. Hereditary divisions of communal labour were felt to be too rigid and inelastic to admit of the freedom required for adjustment to a new order of things still in the making. A radical revision of the time-honoured programme of Hindu corporate life, social as well as religious, was found indispensable to the maintenance of its individuality. Neither the Brahmin, nor the Kshatriya, nor the Vaisya could continue to do his appointed work in the new circumstances so little favourable to the pursuit of old ways and old ideals.

A departure from the written law relating to the temporal interests of Hindu society, departure that had commenced at the dawn and developed during the consolidation of Mahomedan power in India, acquired in the rapid succession of great political changes the strength of custom. In subsequent times, the law and the custom in respect of the same matter were brought into conflict, and each

exclusively claimed according to local exigencies the adhesion of the popular mind to its own mandates or sanction. It was about at this juncture that the age of commentators began; and the commentaries on the texts of Hindu civil and religious law acquired a degree of authority greater than that of the texts themselves. The homage, paid to the word of the law and the prophets, was transferred to the word of the commentator. This transfer of popular loyalty from the maker to the propounder of the law, incidentally led to a revival of the Brahmin influence whose foundations had been sapped in a preceding age. The authority that he had lost as the author of a system no longer suited to an altered state of things, was restored to him as its commentator when his commentaries recognized the existence of a custom at variance with the law and when he recognized its claim to over-ride the provisions of that law.

While the other sections of Hindu society were by changes of time drifting into spheres of activity not allotted to them by the social system under which Hindu society had been built up, the Brahmin found himself again in its moral headship; and his power, taken at the flood, has led on to that position of intellectual eminence which has survived all the subsequent vicissitudes of Indian society and has constituted a social force of immeasurable proportion and inexhaustible vitality.

When Mahomedan dominion became a permanent institution over the greater part of India, Hindu

society presented the characteristic feature of a corporate body, of which the Brahmin element alone retained its distinctive entity, while the other elements were in a condition of mutual fusion, scarcely, if at all, bearing any kinship to the original type.

During the existence of Mahomedan power, the Brahmins were not singled out for any exceptional treatment at the hands of the ruling race. But their moral and intellectual aptitude, inherited during the lapse of ages and improved and enlarged by a rigid system of discipline and industry during the lifetime of each generation, could not possibly fail to be laid under contribution by the best Mahomedan rulers of India, in the difficult task of administering its complex affairs.

The dominion of Tamerlane was accepted by the Hindus as that of "a conqueror coming in upon the terms of mixing his blood with that of the Native nobility of the country, making the Native princes the hereditary constables of the capital of the country, freeing the Hindus for ever from that tax which the Mahomedans had laid upon every country over which the sword of Mahomed prevailed, viz., a capitation tax upon all who did not profess the religion of Mahomedanism"—(Burke). ~~He~~ left for the instruction of his posterity in the government of his Indian Empire a body of rules conceived in a spirit of sagacity and statesmanship to which the history of his age can scarcely furnish a parallel.

In the preamble to these "institutes," the great Mahomedan Emperor remarks :

"Having established laws and regulations for the good government of my dominions, I have collected together those laws and regulations as a model for others ; to the end that every one of my children, descendants, and posterity, acting agreeably thereto, my power and empire which I acquired through hardships and difficulties and perils and bloodshed may by divine favour and by the holy religion of Mahomed be by them preserved."

"I carried on the business of my empire by complying with times and occasions and by generosity and by patience and by policy. By consultation and deliberation and provident measures, by caution and vigilance, I reduced kingdoms to my authority. By discipline and by order I so firmly established my authority that the Ameers, and the Vaziers, and the soldiers, and the subjects, could not aspire beyond their respective degrees, and every one of them was the keeper of his own station.

* * * I compassionated the lower ranks of my people and those who were distressed. I did not cause any one person to suffer for the guilt of another. * * * Those who had done me injuries and had counteracted my schemes and enterprises, when they threw themselves on my mercy, I received them with kindness and conferred on them additional honours and drew the pen of oblivion over their evil actions. * * * I associated with good and learned men, and I gained their affections and I entreated their support. I permitted not the evil and the malevolent to enter into my Council and I acted not by their advice. * * * I enquired of learned men into the laws and regulations of ancient princes, and

weighed their institutions, their actions and their opinions one by one, and from their approved manners and their good qualities I selected models. * * * I enquired into the causes of the subversion of their power and I shunned those actions which tend to the destruction and overthrow of regal authority."

The successors of Emperor Tamerlane conformed as far as possible to the spirit of his advice in the government of India. When that conformity ceased to operate, commenced the decadence of their power. In the words of Lord Lytton at the Imperial Durbar at Delhi, "sapped by incessant bloodshed and shaken by intestine broils the great house of Tamerlane crumbled to decay because it had ceased to be conducive to the welfare of the East." Under the rule of the best of Mahomedan Emperors all orders of Hindu society found large opportunities of serving the State in various capacities of trust and responsibility. "During a considerable portion" says Colonel Malleon "of the Moghul period from Akbar to Aurengazeb, as well as in some of the preceding reigns, the Courts of Agra and Delhi, alike in their magnificence and in the largeness of their public measures, did not merely rival, but surpassed the best European governments of the day. The institutions of Akbar, in particular, the very advanced principles of toleration and justice to the conquered race which he introduced into his Government, the influence of which was felt in several succeeding reigns, are worthy of imitation by the most enlightened Governments of any period. This great warrior, though belonging to an age which had but scarcely emerged from barbarism, recognized the sound principle that a government must rest on the

affections of the people. The measures which he adopted with this view for breaking down the barriers between the conquering and the conquered races, are worthy of all praise."

From the time of Aurengazeb began the period of decay and destruction of Mahomedan rule. A policy of iniquity and persecution was commenced; and all the sacred laws of human life were outraged in the exercise of power and dominion: exercise, against which the best Indian Princes of the period who had constituted the main stay of Mahomedan sovereignty, asserted their natural rights. Of the character of rule during this period no better evidence can be produced than the letter of indignant protest against the imposition of the poll-tax on non-believers in Mahomedanism, letter addressed to Aurengazeb by one of the noblest Rajput Princes that have ever adorned an Indian throne, Rana Raj Sing, Maharana of Udaipur. A few extracts from this great historical document may not be out of place in this rapid review of Moghul India.

"Your royal ancestor Mahumed Julal-u-din Akbar conducted the affairs of this empire for the space of fifty-two years, preserving every tribe of men in ease and happiness, whether they were followers of Jesus or of Moses, of David or of Mahomed. Were they Brahmins or any other sect they all equally enjoyed his countenance and favour in so much that his people in gratitude for the indiscriminate protection he afforded them distinguished him by the appellation of Jaggat Guru."

• • "His Majesty Mahomed Nur-ul-din Jehangir extend-

ed for a period of twenty-two years the shadow of his protection over the heads of his people." * * *

"Such were the benevolent inclinations of your ancestors. Whilst they pursued these great and generous principles, wheresoever they directed their steps, conquest and prosperity went before them. * * *

During Your Majesty's reign many have been alienated from the empire; and further loss of territory must needs follow since devastation and rapine now universally prevail without restraint. Your subjects are trampled under foot and every province of your empire is impoverished. * * * When indigence has reached the habitation of the sovereign and his princes, what can be the condition of the nobles? As to the soldiery, they are in murmurs; the merchants, complaining; the Mahomedans, discontented; the Hindus, destitute; and multitudes of people, wretched even to the want of their nightly meal, are beating their heads throughout the day in rage and desperation."

"How can the dignity of the sovereign be preserved who employs his power in exacting heavy tributes from a people thus miserably reduced? At this juncture it is told from east to west that the Emperor of Hindustan, jealous of the poor Hindu devotee, will exact a tribute from Brahmins, Sanoras, Jogis, Biragis, Sanyasis; that regardless of the illustrious honour of his Timurean race he condescends to exercise his power over the solitary inoffensive anchorite. If Your Majesty places any faith in those books, by distinction called divine, you will then be instructed that God is the God of all mankind, not the God of Mahomedans alone. The Pagan and the Mussulman are equal in His presence. Distinction of colour are of His ordination. It is He who gives existence, etc. etc. etc.

In fact, the tribute you demand from the Hindus is repugnant to justice; it is equally foreign from good policy, as it must impoverish the country. Moreover, it is an innovation and an infringement of the laws of Hindustan." * * *

"It is wonderful that the ministers of your Government should have neglected to instruct Your Majesty in the rules of rectitude and honour."

Mahomedan supremacy was not a supremacy of one race over other races in the same land; it was the supremacy of individual reigning families over their subjects alike Mahomedan and Hindu. The adoption by Mahomedans of India as their permanent home led to a community of interests in all the activities of life between them and the other communities.

The process of decay in the Semitic structure of imperial power in India worked fast. Where rulers and ruled constitute different races drawn together by no community of hopes, fears, or interests, the evils of political unwisdom do their deadly part when ideas of racial superiority militate against justice, equity and sympathy in the exercise of power and dominion. Macaulay described that process in the following words in the House of Commons:—

"We ought to compare India under our government, not with India under Akbar and his immediate successors but with India as we found it. The calamities through which that country passed during the interval between the fall of the Moghul power and the establish-

ment of the English supremacy was sufficient to throw the people back whole centuries."

"In what state then did we find India; and what have we made India? We found society throughout that vast country in a state to which history scarcely furnishes a parallel. The nearest parallel would perhaps be the state of Europe during the fifth century. The Moghul Empire, in the time of the successors of Aurengazeb, like the Roman Empire in the time of the successors of Theodosius, was sinking under the vices of a bad internal administration and under the assaults of barbarous invaders. At Delhi as at Ravenna, there was a mock sovereign, immured in a gorgeous State prison. He was suffered to indulge in every sensual pleasure. He was adored with servile prostrations. * * * While the Honori and Augustuli of the east, surrounded by their fawning eunuchs, revelled and dozed without knowing or caring what might pass beyond the walls of their palace gardens, the provinces had ceased to respect a Government which could neither punish nor protect them. Society was a chaos. Its restless and shifting elements formed themselves every moment into new combinations which the next moment dissolved. In the course of a single generation, a hundred dynasties grew up, flourished, decayed, were extinguished, were forgotten. Every adventurer who could muster a troop of horse might aspire to a throne. Every palace was every year the scene of conspiracies, treasons, revolutions, parricides. Meanwhile a rapid succession of Alarics and Attilas passed over the defenceless empire. A Persian invader penetrated to Delhi and carried back in triumph the most precious treasures of the House of Tamerlane. The Afghan soon followed by the same track, to glean whatever the

Persian had spared. The Javts established themselves on the Jumna. The Seiks devastated Lahore. Every part of India from Tanjore to the Himalayas, was laid under contribution by the Mahrattas. The people were ground down to the dust by the oppressor without and the oppressor within, by the robber from whom the Nabob was unable to protect them, by the Nabob who took what the robber had left to them. All the evils of despotism and all the evils of anarchy pressed at once on that miserable race. They knew nothing of government but its exactions. Desolation was in their imperial cities, and famine all along the banks of their broad and redundant rivers. It seemed that a few more years would suffice to efface all traces of the opulence and civilization of an earlier age."

"Such was the state of India when the Company began to take part in the disputes of its ephemeral sovereigns. About eighty years have elapsed* since we appeared as auxiliaries in a contest between two rival families for the sovereignty of a small corner of the peninsula. From that moment commenced a great, a stupendous process, the re-construction of a decomposed society. Two generations have passed away and the process is complete. The scattered fragments of the empire of Aurengazeb have been united in an empire stronger and more closely knit together than that which Aurengazeb ruled."

Thus passed away, as the baseless fabric of a vision, to a past that cannot come back, the empire of the great Tamerlane. India's gratitude to fortune for being transferred from the sway of the Moghul to

* The speech was delivered in 1838.

the sway of the English has become the most solid foundation on which her claim to the respect and sympathy of her present rulers is based.

From the period of rule by the East India Company began the improvement of Indian society in all respects except its material condition. In the words of an eminent Indian administrator, "Englishmen have conferred on the people of India what is the greatest human blessing—peace. They have introduced western education, bringing an ancient and civilized nation in touch with modern thought, modern sciences, modern institutions and life. They have built up an administration which, though it requires reform with the progress of the times, is yet strong and efficacious. They have framed wise laws and have established Courts of Justice, the purity of which is as absolute as in any country on the face of the earth."

During the existence of the East India Company, the periodical renewal of its charter furnished the occasion for a thorough examination through an independent tribunal created in that behalf, examination of the past administration of India with a view to any desirable modification or improvement of the existing machinery. In the government by one nation over another nation, each radically different from the other in some of the fundamental conceptions of human life, nothing can possibly contribute in a greater measure to its stability and efficiency than the permanent creation of some agency whereby to examine its past handiwork and to

prescribe its future activity. That Government is in the very nature of things bound to be swayed by motives of self-interest incompatible with the highest good of the subject communities of a different race. The machinery by which the play of those motives can be brought under some degree of restraint and control, and by which an alien dominion can be rendered the least bad to the governed races, is perhaps the greatest achievement of political wisdom and practical experience. During the entire period of the East India Company's sovereignty, India had the inestimable privilege of being governed by a body of men whose political existence for ruling purposes was conditioned by the favourable event of a periodical examination through an independent tribunal.

Those tribunals consisted of select committees of both Houses of Parliament. The evidence taken before them was published in Blue Books whose diffusion spread far and wide among the Indian educated classes whatever wise political conceptions have been associated with great English political thinkers, administrators and statesmen. The witnesses, examined before the select committees of the House of Lords in 1852 and 1853, included John Stuart Mill, Lord Hardinge (grandfather of the present Viceroy), Sir Charles Trevelyan, Frederick Halliday, Sir Erksine Perry. The select committees of the House of Commons in 1852 and 1853 were constituted, among others, by Lord John Russel, Mr. W. E. Gladstone, Mr. R. Cobden, and

Earl of Halifax, Macaulay, Lord Stanley, Lord Palmerstone; and the witnesses examined were Lord Elphinstone, Lord Ellenborough, Lord Ha-
dinge, and other eminent Englishmen who had been closely associated with Indian affairs.

The opinions of men who had given from twenty to forty years of their lives to the work of Indian administration, opinions deliberately formed and publicly expressed before the Committees of Parliament, constitute in themselves a review of that work, best calculated to suggest any desirable modification either of the structure or of the functions of the existing political machinery for the better government of India. Under the new order of things the Indian as well as the English world was deprived of the access to the best possible information in respect of the nature of government administered to the teeming millions of India during a period under review.

Besides this periodical examination, the Indian administrative machinery consisted of a double compartment. The powers of administration rested with the twenty-four directors of the East India Company; and the powers of control, with the Board of Control constituted by men nominated by the Crown and presided over by a member of the Cabinet. The directors were subject to the Board, the former initiated and the latter controlled. But in respect of "all proceedings of a great political nature involving peace and war", the directors had not even the power of the initiative; and the Presi-

dent of the Board (a minister of the Crown) conducted those proceedings and communicated with the chief authority in India through a secret committee, which, though constituted by a small number of the directors, was for such purposes entirely independent of the general body of the directors.

This double system of rule, prevailing for more than seventy years (1784—1858) was to India both a benefit and an evil, but more the former than the latter. It imposed a much-needed control over the actual rulers, and it conferred no arbitrary power on the minister of the Crown. In the opinion of Lord Hardinge ("the wisest and the ablest Governor-General of the period"), opinion recorded by the Select Committee of the House of Commons (1852), "the system of double government is much wiser than bringing the Crown more prominently forward" John Stuart Mill, who for thirty years had been in the service of the East India Company, gave his evidence in the following words:— "It is next to impossible to form in one country an organ of government for another, which shall have a strong interest in good government; but, if that cannot be done, the next best thing is to form a body with the least possible interest in bad government; and I conceive that the present governing bodies in the country for the affairs of India have as little sinister interest of any kind as any Government in the world."

"The Court of Directors, who are the initiating body, not being the body which finally decides, not being able to act but by the concurrence of a second authority, and

having no means of causing their opinion to be adopted by that authority except the strength of their reasons, there is much greater probability that a body so situated will examine and weigh carefully the grounds of all proceedings than if the same body which had the initiative gave the final order.—(Mill).

In the petition framed by the great philosopher, J. S. Mill, on behalf of the East India Company, occur the following observations:—

“That your petitioners cannot conceive a worse form of government for India than a minister with a Council whom he should be at liberty to consult or not at his pleasure. That any body of persons, associated with the minister, which is not a check, will be a screen. That your petitioners find it difficult to conceive that the same independence in judgment and act which characterise the Court of Directors, will be found in any Council all of whose members are nominated by the Crown.”

“It is considered an excellence and not a defect in the constitution of Parliament, to be, not merely a double, but a triple government. An executive authority, your petitioners urge, may often with advantage be single, because promptitude is its first requisite. But the function of passing a deliberate opinion on past measures and laying down principles of future policy, is a business, which, in the estimation of your petitioners, admits of and requires the concurrence of more judgments than one. It is no defect in such a body to be double and no excellence to be single.”

Whatever wisdom and equity have since the abolition of the East India Company been brought

to the conduct of Indian affairs in England, have been the personal attributes of individual Secretaries of State for India, and not the invariable attributes of the incumbent of that office, logically resulting from the character of the system inaugurated in 1858. The Indian Secretary's responsibility to Parliament is made to provide for all the benefits that under the old order of things prior to 1858, used to result from the existence of the Board of Control supervising the Court of Directors. But efficient parliamentary control over the conduct of the Indian Minister in London is only a provision in theory. It has not existed in practice. The government of the Indian Empire, directly carried on by a democracy having its own absorbing problems of social and political evolution, is a Government under which the subject communities of a distant and detached empire like India, cannot have the benefit of all that is best in the intellectual and emotional composition of the ruling nation. Such benefit to any large extent, is only possible under a competent system of delegation or devolution. Direct parliamentary control in London over the affairs of a distant Continent in Asia, peopled by three hundred millions of men forming different races and communities, is bound to be or to become an experiment of doubtful wisdom. The nascent forces that in the fulness of time will probably render the conditions of success under that experiment more and more difficult, will demand in the years to come all the wisdom and statesmanship, all the best and the highest impulses that constitute the mental equipment of the English race in their wise adminis-

tration of Indian affairs. If parliamentary institutions are not suited to the Indian soil, the direct conduct of Indian government by the English democracy in England, is equally so to the Indian type of human nature. Ministerial responsibility so far as India is concerned is a reality only to the extent to which the Indian Secretary's sense of rectitude and his power of wisdom and foresight are also a reality.

Some great organic change therefore is obviously called for in the structure and functions, not only of the India office in England, but of the administrative machinery in India. That change which should be the outcome of great deliberation, would appropriately synchronise with the historic event of which the prospect has so abundantly appealed to the sentiment and stirred the imagination of more than three hundred millions of men whose destinies, it is calculated, for good or ill, to influence. If the forthcoming Indian Coronation of His Majesty King George is intended to be a great political event of far-reaching consequences, instead of a mere social function, a nine days' wonder, in the public life of Indian society, it should be associated with some measure of wisdom of a permanent nature; which would signify to the present and future generations of his Indian subjects that their highest interest in every sense of the term has thereby been for the years to come, as amply provided for as human forethought and sagacity could devise. The need for such measure is almost an imperious need. India's

obligations to England are great beyond expression, and have, in the minds of the best of her sons, inspired an abiding sense of gratitude. Nor are England's obligations to India of less authority and magnitude. If India cannot be what it is without England, where would England be without India? This is a matter of cold calculation in the dry light of the intellect, beyond the domain of feeling and sentiment. Both sides of the question must be faced alike by Englishmen and by Indians. In the wise elaboration of such measure, the obligations of each to the other would be adequately demonstrated. The time best suited for such demonstration would be a time when the world would behold the grandest symbolization of the dominion of one branch of the great Aryan race over another branch in a land rich with the associations of all that has been the highest and best in human life.

The Company's charter was renewed by the Act of 1853. The number of Directors was reduced from 24 to 18, six of the reduced number being appointed by the Crown. The Board of Control continued its functions. The Council of the Governor-General was expanded for legislative purposes. The right of patronage to Indian appointments was transferred from the Company to the Crown, for being exercised in conformity with regulations framed by the Board of Control. Those regulations prescribed recruitment of the Indian Civil Service through competitive examination. The system of double government, which John Stuart Mill had so strongly supported,

continued a few years longer, till the Indian Mutiny brought to a permanent close the sovereignty of the East India Company.

This great historic transfer was not merely a transfer of political power; it was a transfer of a great material burden. The greatest part of that material burden is what is called the Home charges. What are they? They consist of dividends of East India stock; interest on Home debt; the salaries of officers and establishments and cost of buildings connected with the Home department of the Indian government; furlough and retired pay to members of the Indian Civil and Military Services when at Home; charges of all descriptions paid in England connected with the British troops serving in India; and a portion of the cost of transporting British troops to and from India.

Dividends on East India stock signify payments out of the revenues of India the dividend on the capital stock belonging to the East India Company, which still exists for the purpose of receiving that dividend. Next comes Home debt. This consists of the territorial and other debts of the Company, and of the public debt of India. The public debt of India had been built up during a hundred years of the Company's rule by debiting India with the expenses incurred by the Company in England. It was 7 millions in 1792; 10 millions in 1799; 21 millions in 1805; 27 millions in 1807; 30 millions in 1829; and in 1836 was brought down by Lord William Bentinck to nearly 27 millions. From 1836 to 1858 (the date

of the transfer) the debt had risen from 27 to more than 60 millions. The territorial and other debts of the Company in England rose from more than 3 millions in 1836 to more than 8 millions in 1858. The aggregate Home debt in 1858 stood at 69½ millions.

This colossal Indian debt was not the outcome of any capital spent by England either for the conquest and administration of India or for the development of her resources. It graduated from the deficit year after year in her resources to meet the growing proportions of the other items of the Home charges. It also included the cost of all wars in and about India from the time of Lord Auckland to that of the Indian Mutiny whose cost of 10 millions was added thereto. This Home debt when the East India Company was abolished stood at 70 millions; and, in 19 years after the abolition, when the Queen assumed in 1877 the title of Empress of India, was doubled up to 139 millions.

The abolition of the East India Company meant the purchase of the empire of India by the Crown from the Company for a sum of money paid by the people of India. The value received by the shareholders of the Company's stock was added to the Indian debt, the interest on that debt being made a charge on the revenues of India.

A substantial portion of the Home debt of India arose from the prosecution of English purposes unconnected with Indian interests; and, if wisdom and

equity should prevail in the counsels of the great people of England, ought not to constitute an Indian obligation. At the sacrifice of her countless treasure England has stood up in other parts of the world for the claims of justice and humanity. The liberation of the African slave has cost her more than would be the addition to her burden by meeting the equitable demands of India; and her possession of the Indian Empire constitutes the major portion of her title to be the greatest imperial power on the face of the earth. When in the great proclamation of 1858 Queen Victoria assured the princes and people of India: "We hold ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects, and those obligations by the blessing of Almighty God we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil"; she inspired a profound sense of gratitude in their minds; and her position as henceforth the direct arbiter of India's destinies was thankfully accepted as a magnificent gift of fortune. This closer proximity between the Crown and her Indian people was looked upon as an additional security for England's treatment of Indian affairs in accordance with wisdom and equity. The assurances of rulers and the expectations of subjects form in themselves a moral bond of union. To strengthen that bond is true statesmanship. Any statesmanship worth the name, is but an expression of the eternal moral law.

India is essentially an agricultural country; and the land revenue of the State forms the largest item

of its income from all sources put together. An industrial India did exist and might again come into being, but an agricultural India is an eternal fact. No development of her commerce and her industry under the most favourable circumstances can ever either arrest or annihilate the dedication by the largest section of her population of their energy and their capital to agricultural pursuits. In India power and dominion of sorts and sizes came, flourished, decayed and disappeared, destroying her commerce, dissipating her wealth, disturbing her peace, outraging her religion, and trampling out her freedom. But the one condition that no earthly vicissitude could overthrow or modify was the condition that bound the Indian to his soil.

When that condition forms the fundamental characteristic of Indian life, no permanent empire over the vast expanse of India is possible which does not bring its highest wisdom and statesmanship to the duty of conserving and improving her agricultural resources, and of securing and developing the prosperity of her agricultural population; in other words, to the imperious problem of her land system. In no direction can power be more beneficially exercised, beneficially alike to rulers and ruled, than in the adoption of a land system generously elaborated and equitably administered.

If India has been a land of agriculture, India has been a land of famine. Dependence upon the soil means starvation from the scantiness or cessation of her yield or from the margin of outturn insuffi-

cient to maintain existence after the satisfaction of the state or any other demand. In all the great famines of India, it is her agricultural population that has directly suffered most; her commercial and industrial communities have indirectly suffered from either the arrest or the imperfect transport of her agricultural produce. When agriculture and famine bear a permanent relation of some kind in a country where the soil comes in for the largest share of man's energy and activity, it becomes the obvious duty of the State to create all possible facility for the one and all possible insurance against the other.

The social fabric of Indian society is intimately bound up with the material condition of the agricultural classes, whose prosperity or the reverse influences the trade and commerce and the general wealth of the country. In this condition of things the state is obliged to participate. The greater the increase of private property, wider will be the expansion of public resources. The land system, established in the major portion of the Indian empire, has not conserved in the agricultural classes the power of resistance to periodical famines. Agricultural property cannot under the present system be easily converted or transferred. The expenditure of periodical settlements is a burden on the public revenue. They are a source of annoyance and vexation to the people and bring about great depreciation of estates at the close of each temporary settlement.

Of the opinions called for by the government of Lord Canning on Colonel Smith's report, in respect

of the wisdom of granting a permanent settlement to India, the views of his Finance Minister, Mr. Samuel Lang, were the best contribution to the discussion of a subject of imperial importance.

"We do not," observed Mr. Lang, "exist as a government merely to get the largest revenue we can out of the country, or even to keep the mass of the people in a state of uniform dead level, though it should be a tolerably happy and contented one as a peasant tenantry under a paternal government."

"If we give a permanent settlement as Mr. Beadon (Lieut.-Governor of Bengal) proposes, we lay the foundation for a state of society, not perhaps so easily managed, but far more varied and richer in elements of civilisation and progress. We shall have gradations of society, from the Native nobleman of large territorial possessions down, through the country gentlemen of landed estate, to the independent yeoman, to the small peasant proprietor, the large tenant with skill and capital on a long lease, the small tenant on a lease, the tenant-at-will, and the day labourer."

Sir John Lawrence as a Member of the Secretary of State's Council cordially supported the grant of permanent settlement to the whole of India.

These views were fully accepted by the Secretary of State for India (Sir Charles Wood) in his memorable despatch of July 9, 1862. The following are a few extracts which speak for themselves:—

"Her Majesty's Government entertain no doubt of the *political* advantages which would attend a permanent settlement. The security, and, it may almost be said,

the absolute creation of property in the soil, which will flow from limitation in perpetuity of the demands of the state on the owners of land, cannot fail to stimulate or confirm their sentiments of attachment and loyalty to the government by whom so great a boon has been conceded and *on whose existence its permanency will depend.*" (The italics are ours.)

"It is also most desirable that facilities should be given for the gradual growth of a middle class connected with the land without dispossessing the peasant proprietors and occupiers. It is believed that among the latter may be found many men of great intelligence, public spirit, and social influence, although individually in comparative poverty. To give to the intelligent, the thrifty and the enterprising, the means of improving their condition by opening to them the opportunity of exercising these qualities, can be best accomplished by limiting the public demands on their lands. When such men acquire property and find themselves in a thriving condition, they are certain to be well affected towards the government under which they live. It is on the contentment of the agricultural classes who form the great bulk of the population that the security of government mainly depends. If they are prosperous, any casual outbreak on the part of other classes or bodies of men, is not likely to become an element of danger and the military force and its consequent expense may be regulated accordingly."

"That this general improvement will be accelerated by a permanent settlement, Her Majesty's Government cannot entertain any doubt. A ready and popular mode of investment for the increasing wealth of the country will be provided by the creation of property in land, and all classes will benefit by the measure. On the

agricultural population the effect will be . . . the elevation of the social condition of the people and their consequent ability, not only to meet successfully the pressure occasioned by seasons of distress, but in ordinary times to bear *increased taxation in other forms without difficulty*: the feeling of ownership, or in other words, the absolute certainty of the full enjoyment of the reward for all the labour and capital which they may invest in the land, will be sure to call out all their energies for its improvement. Her Majesty's Government confidently expect that a people in a state of contentment and progressive improvement, will be able without difficulty to *contribute to the revenue in other ways to such an extent as more than to compensate for the disadvantage of foregoing some prospective increase of that from land.*" (The italics are ours.)

"After the most careful review of all these considerations Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that the advantages which may reasonably be expected to accrue, not only to those immediately connected with the land, but to the community generally, are sufficiently great to justify them in incurring the risk of some prospective loss of land revenue in order to attain them, and that a settlement in perpetuity in all districts in which the conditions absolutely required as preliminary to such a measure are, or may hereafter be, fulfilled, is a measure dictated by sound policy and calculated to accelerate the development of the resources of India and to ensure in the highest degree the welfare and contentment of all classes of Her Majesty's subjects in that country."

"They consider that the direct mode of making a permanent settlement is preferable to the indirect one of obtaining a similar result by conceding to the land-holders

the right to redeem their assessment. They do not believe that the power to redeem the land revenue is necessary to induce the land-holders to incur expenditure in the improvement of their property. What is really required, in order to call into effective action their enterprise and capital, is, *not an exemption from all payments to the government on account of their estates, but the fixing of those payments in perpetuity, at a moderate and certain amount.* In Bengal where a permanent settlement was made with the Zamindars seventy years ago, the general progress of the country in wealth and prosperity, notwithstanding the depressed condition of the peasantry caused by errors and omissions in the mode of making the settlement, has been most remarkable. Such errors, in the existing state of our knowledge, regarding the rights and interests of the subordinate occupants of the soil, would not be permitted to recur."

In March 1864 Lord Lawrence, who had before been appointed Viceroy of India, intimated to the Secretary of State for India in general terms the course he intended to pursue respecting the introduction of a permanent settlement in Northern India, Oudh, and the Punjab. On March 24, 1865, the Secretary of State for India in his reply divided for purposes of permanent settlement, Indian districts into three classes:—

- (a) Districts where agriculture was backward,
- (b) Districts fairly cultivated and fully developed,
- (c) Districts with estates fairly cultivated and also estates imperfectly developed.

The Secretary of State decided that a permanent settlement should be introduced into the second class of districts and refused in the first class. In the third class of districts, "Her Majesty's Government," he stated, "are prepared to authorize an immediate settlement on perpetuity, after revision, for all estates in which the actual cultivation amounts to 80 per cent. of the cultivable or malgoozaree area."

On March 17, 1866, Lord Ripon who had succeeded Lord Halifax in the office of Secretary of State for India, added a fourth classification of districts which are associated with canal irrigation; and suggested the following rule:—

That no permanent settlement should be concluded for any estate the assets of which would, when canal irrigation shall have been carried to the full extent at present contemplated, exceed, in the opinion of the officers of the settlement and irrigation departments, the existing assets in a proportion exceeding 20 per cent.

Sir Stafford Northcote who succeeded Lord Ripon as Secretary of State for India, re-affirmed the decision of Her Majesty's Government to introduce a permanent settlement. He informed the Government of India that Her Majesty's Government were prepared to sacrifice the prospect of an increase in land revenue, "in consideration of the great importance of connecting the interests of the proprietors of the land with the stability of the British Government."

He described in modified terms the fourth class of estates that Lord Ripon had suggested to be excluded from permanent settlement and laid down :—

No permanent settlement shall be concluded for any estate to which canal irrigation is in the opinion of the Governor-General in Council likely to be extended within the next 20 years, and the existing assets of which would thereby be increased in the proportion of 20 per cent.; in other words : the permanent settlement should be deferred as long as the land continued to improve in value.

The problem of giving the Indian agricultural classes the benefits of a permanent settlement, subject to well-defined conditions, had engaged the consideration of two Viceroys, three Secretaries of State for India, and had received the assent of the British Cabinet. Those benefits, alike to the people and to the state, were carefully examined and deliberately recognized, in every conceivable aspect in which the problem could present itself to the wisdom and statesmanship of some of the best administrators that England has produced in the 19th century. Every consideration of policy and profit had been approached and provided for. The prospective loss of revenue to government from a permanent settlement had been clearly foreseen ; and the remedy for that evil had been wisely conceived to lie in new sources of increased taxation in other forms ; and in the expected willingness and assured prosperity of a grateful population " to contribute to the revenue in other ways to

such an extent as more than to compensate for the disadvantage of foregoing some prospective increase of that from land"—(Lord Halifax). Even the calamity of a depreciated rupee, likely to upset the calculations of financiers and statesmen and to present serious difficulties in the way of granting a permanent settlement, had been anticipated by Lord Halifax when conveying the sanction of Her Majesty's Government to that measure. In spite of all this, another Secretary of State in his Despatch No. 24, dated March 28, 1883, set aside the recommendation made by Lord Canning twenty-one years before; and set aside in the following words: "I concur with Your Excellency's government that the policy laid down in 1862 should now be formally abandoned."

To the long list of good purposes, begotten of sympathy and generosity, developed with caution and policy, proclaimed with courage and deliberation, but abandoned from considerations of no great moral authority and from a deficient conception of the true interests of England as well as of India, was added another good purpose; and the opportunity was lost of strengthening the foundations of empire by the surer means of moral than of material power.

Another matter of supreme importance is the problem of the industrial and commercial well-being of India. The doctrine of free trade shares with the dogmas of Christianity the intellectual homage of the average Britisher. The largest portion of England's material prosperity is rightly or wrongly ascribed to

the beneficent operation of the principles of free trade. If England is to be commercially benefited by her supremacy over India, India should become a country of both consumption and production. India's material condition should therefore improve in order that she can have money to buy and money to make the article that she can sell for its highest value. The more India can buy, the better for England. The more India can sell the better for herself. In the former case, England is directly interested; in the latter, England as her ruler is interested in the interests of India.

The India of our day is more a land of the raw material than of the finished article. Her ancient industries that had once been the world's attraction have practically disappeared. Their revival if possible, has been a cherished object of Indian patriotism. The development of new industries with abundant raw material in India has engaged the earnest attention of Indian capitalists. But neither the revival of the old, nor the development of new industries can be provided for without a system of protection by the state, adopted at least for the period required for either operation to reach a satisfactory stage. Highly advanced Indian industries of the present time need no protection. In the case of Indian industries not highly developed, an increase of import duties on foreign manufactured articles of similar description, is expected to stimulate local production and to diminish the consumption of those articles. Export duties on raw material not absorbed by any existing indus-

tries merely tend to its accumulation. Export duties on finished products prevent access to the best market. What India needs for her industrial prosperity is the prevention of the export of raw material required for her industries ; and prevention of the import of foreign manufactured articles until her capacity to produce similar articles is fully developed. An import duty on foreign article is a protective duty for an infant industry ; and an export duty on raw material is a stimulus to a new one.

There cannot be a greater industrial calamity to India so rich in raw material than its unchecked export, and the consequent starvation of whatever industries might be fostered by that raw material. Indian exports have been on the increase since the abolition of the East India Company. The stages of India's economic drain have been of this order : during the first two years after the mutiny India's imports were greater than her exports ; then her imports and her exports equalled each other ; in the year ending 1863, the exports were greater than the imports by 6 millions sterling. That difference rose to 16 millions in 1864 and to 20 millions in 1865 ; but, after 1870 it assumed a position generally between 15 and 20 millions sterling a year. This great economic drain was one of the co-operative causes of Indian poverty. England herself had to suffer from a deficient market for her produce in India.

A great Indian scholar and administrator, in whose death India sustained an irreparable loss when she

could ill-afford to lose her men of wisdom and experience, says concerning this matter :—

“The annual economic drain to Great Britain is met directly from the revenues of India. A great part of the revenues of India is derived from the soil in the shape of the land revenue. The land revenue is raised generally from cultivators in Southern India, and from landlords in Northern India who in their turn exact rents from their tenants. Cultivators pay their revenue or their rent by selling a large portion of the produce of their fields, keeping an insufficient stock for their own consumption. Exporting merchants have their agents all over the country to buy what the cultivators are compelled to sell, and railways rapidly transport these purchases to seaports, whence they are exported to Europe.”

To meet the demands of land revenue, food is exported even during the season of famine as it happened during the greatest famine of the 19th century (1876-77). This great demand for food-grain if it should result in extended cultivation, is a good where land revenue is permanently settled ; and is an evil, where land revenue varies with the rise of prices and increase of cultivation.

A radical change is therefore needed in England's treatment of India's industrial and commercial interests. Her dormant industries should wherever possible be revived and developed, and protected for the purpose of that revival and development. Import duties should be raised or imposed to prevent the influx of the finished products of foreign countries. In February 1857, Lord Canning had re-

commended to the Court of Directors the augmentation of import duties and the abolition of export duties. When Lord Stanley became the first Secretary of State for India under the Crown, he sanctioned among other things the increase of import duties, but not the abolition of export duties. The large import of cotton and silk goods into India during the ten years after the mutiny almost destroyed the weaving industry of India and "millions of weavers sank to the level of agricultural labourers and increased the pressure on the soil."

The existing industries of India, starved and hampered by unfair competition with foreign articles, need all the help of a protective tariff for their restoration or development to a normal strength. A system of state bounty should operate to revive some of her valuable industries that have practically disappeared.

Another subject of great importance to the well-being of India's teeming millions is the need of an institution, possessed of the faculties of affording relief to people who have suffered from the imperfections of the existing civil and criminal law of India, and from the disposal by administrative and political officers, of matters that cannot appropriately fall within the province of judicial tribunals. Such institution might be converted into an Indian section of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, located in India as the highest court of appeal for judicial causes; and also as a tribunal authorized to decide in the name of His Majesty the Emperor all those

causes of a political nature which are now disposed of by the Viceroy and by the Governors of Madras and Bombay in their purely political capacity. The functions of such a tribunal would be twofold :— They would comprehend the work of finally deciding in the name of the Emperor, as the highest court of appeal,

(a) all causes judicial,

(b) all causes political.

As regards judicial causes : The Indian work of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, now done in England, would be transformed into the function of one compartment of this Indian Judicial Committee with the same powers and privileges. In the matter of civil jurisdiction, the money value among other things, of suits in appeal before this tribunal, might be brought down from Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 5,000. In the matter of criminal jurisdiction, where the lives and liberties of human beings are at stake ; where the existing imperfections of the criminal law prevent the administration of justice to the fullest possible extent ; where the innocent suffer and, owing to legal technicalities, the guilty either escape suffering or do not suffer enough ; where the Sovereign's prerogative of mercy is appealed to and the time at the disposal of the Viceroy, or the Governors or Lieutenant-Governors of the presidencies and the provinces is insufficient for a calm, judicial consideration of all the facts and circumstances of the case ; where in times of political anxiety and stress, administrators cannot make good judges, judicial and

administrative functions demanding mental equipment of a radically different nature ; where it is the highest object of statesmanship that the name of the Lord Paramount of the Indian Empire should not, in popular estimation, be found associated with any injury, any injustice, caused to any man, woman, or child, by the law made in his name, administered on his behalf through tribunals established under his authority ; one supreme tribunal to discharge the needed functions of administering equity and granting relief, thereby relieving the present judicial and administrative authorities of an appreciably large portion of their judicial labour, would be a most appropriate manifestation of a devotion to the loftiest conception of justice on the part of the Supreme Magistrate of his Indian Empire.

As regards political causes : (1) The aggregate territorial extent of the Indian Native States in subordinate alliance with the Government of India, and under the system of Imperial protection, is about 741,000 sq. miles, being nearly four times the size of France or of the German or Austrian Empire ; and contains an aggregate population of 63 millions being larger than the population of France, Germany or Austria.

Each of the provincial Governments of Bengal, Bombay, Madras, the United Provinces, the Punjab, the Central Provinces, as well as the Government of India directly through the Viceroy who is in charge of the portfolio of the Foreign Office, exercises supervision, sometimes control, over a

group of Native States having different degrees of autonomy, but subject in their internal management to the veto of the Supreme Government in all cases of departure from the recognized principles of justice and humanity. The total area of the Madras group is very nearly 10 thousand square miles with 4 millions of people; of the Bombay group, 65 thousand square miles with nearly 7 millions; of the Bengal group, 38 thousand square miles with nearly 4 millions; of the Central Provinces group, 29 thousand square miles with nearly 2 millions; of the United Provinces group, 5 thousand square miles with 800 thousand people; of the Punjab group, 36 thousand square miles with $4\frac{1}{2}$ millions. The States in direct political relation with the Supreme Government through the Viceroy are Hyderabad, Mysore, and Baroda.

The subject population of these Native States, and the subjects of British India, are by community of race, language, religion, social system, constitute the Indian society of the Indian empire. The good or ill of its smaller section affects the good or ill of the larger one; and, all the more so because of improved and improving facilities of transit and communication between both. Proximity of situation brings about an easy comparison of each other's experience; and whatever misery or happiness would result from the character of rulers and from the political system under which they rule, in the Native and in the British territory of the Indian empire, would become the common experience of its subject

communities and would tend to unify their feelings and sentiments towards the supreme arbiter of their common destinies. What those feelings and sentiments so unified may be, will largely depend on the manner in which power and patronage are exercised.

From the political fusion of these Indian races and communities occupying different portions of the same country; from the administrative control which that fusion brings about over the persons and properties of men who occupy the border land between British and Native India, control exercised by political officers discharging administrative and judicial functions; and from a complication of proprietary and other interests of British Indian subjects in Native States and vice versa, British political officers have to undertake the disposal of matters in dispute, sometimes of a purely judicial nature, sometimes of a purely administrative or political character; from these and other circumstances, arises a class of injuries, grievances, wrongs, miscarriages of justice and equity, for which, the remedy available under the present system ends with the decision of the political officer who is empowered to judge them. From that decision however erroneous, there is no right of appeal except if at all the head of the province or the presidency to which, the Native State or the section of British India where the property may be situate or the aggrieved person may reside, belongs politically or territorially. The decision of such matters in appeal before a Chief Commissioner, a Lieut.-Governor or a Governor cannot be expected

to be the outcome of a careful, impartial and equitable consideration of the matter in dispute, on the part of men whose administrative functions engage the largest part of their time and render their judicial labours not infrequently narrow in scope and erroneous in result.

All this class of work—revision, modification, reversal or confirmation of the decisions of political officers in respect of such matters,—done by the heads of presidencies and provinces in the capacity of a quasi-judicial tribunal of appeal, may be transferred to the Indian section of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, whose discharge of such appellate labour would render it as thorough and equitable as possible under any human arrangement.

(2) Another class of cases, purely political, relates to the conduct and character of those Native princes and chiefs whose abuse of power, whose disregard for the well-being of their subjects, and whose incapacity to realize the responsibilities of their station against the rapid development of a spirit of individualism, a sense of popular rights and privileges, not only in the minds of their own subjects, but in those of the subjects of British India, both sections constituting the component parts of the entire Indian society, render them unfit to be entrusted with responsible administrative functions. A tribunal to examine into their conduct and character and to arrive at a wise and politic decision upon the merits of the case under consideration, is a much-needed institution. The functions

of such an institution are obviously political, and must needs bear the character of acts of State. Those functions must be regarded as being in exercise of delegated authority from His Majesty the King-Emperor or his Viceroy of India. This detachment of a portion of the present, multifarious functions of the Supreme Government is likely to result in the greater efficiency of its administrative labours, which in the years to come are expected to engross all its time and its energy. The proposed tribunal would appropriately form part of the Indian section of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

As regards the constitution of this Supreme Court of Appeal of the Indian Empire the most obvious sources of recruitment would be—

- (a) from among the retired Indian Judges of the Indian Chartered High Courts; retired Dewans of the first class Native States; occasionally Native Princes of culture whose knowledge of mankind would render them capable judges of great matters in issue;
- (b) from among retired Chief Justices of Chartered High Courts who may be willing and able to serve India for some time after their retirement; English civilians of mature age and sound judicial capacity whose promotion to the High Court Bench has been blocked by

absence of vacancies ; men in the forefront of the legal profession in England.

One great advantage of this scheme is the opportunity thereby created for the employment of the unrivalled scholarship, profound knowledge of law, habitual faculty of appreciating evidence, great social and moral influence in Indian society, all of which are possessed by our retired Indian Judges of the High Courts. Most of these eminent men are not able to visit, fewer still to reside in England, while all of them with few if any exceptions are capable of usefully serving on the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. To the wise solution of purely Indian problems requiring a high order of judicial equipment, none can bring higher capacity and character.

As regards the localization of the proposed Supreme Court of Appeal of the Indian Empire :

A great majority of considerations, inspired alike by policy and sentiment, would commend the choice of Delhi as the sacred ground on which to erect and establish the highest temple dedicated to justice, temple where the supreme functions of the Supreme Magistrate of the Empire have to be discharged in his name and on his behalf. That city is both to the Hindu and to the Mahomedan full of the richest associations of a great past. It is the eternal city of India. Since the consolidation of British Indian suzerainty, it has been the chosen scene of two Imperial Durbars. It was at Delhi that an English

Queen was proclaimed as the first Indian Empress, and an English King as the first Indian Emperor. It is at Delhi that the first Coronation Durbar of an English Emperor of India attended by him in person, is appointed to constitute a new chapter in the annals of the Indian Empire. What other Indian city can have a higher claim to enshrine the visible embodiment of British wisdom and statesmanship ?

THE CONCLUSION.

The problem of how best to commemorate the first Coronation of His Majesty the Emperor on the Indian soil ; how best to bind up the event with the traditional memory of unborn generations to the remotest posterity of Indian society ; how best to foster and to consolidate an eternal kinship between sentiment and self-interest as the bed-rock of Indian loyalty and devotion to the throne and person of the Sovereign of the Indian Empire ; how best to nationalize an alien dominion and to transform its offensive aspect of racial supremacy into the grateful complexion of moral ascendancy in the domain of knowledge and civilisation : is the problem of the hour. One solution of that problem, calculated to appeal to all that is best and highest in the subject communities of the Indian Empire over which His Majesty has decided to symbolize his presidency and patronage, would lie in the following direction :—

- (a) A close and impartial investigation into the causes and circumstances of the origin and development of the huge

Indian debt; with a view to an equitable distribution between the English and the Indian treasury of the burden of that debt; and to the consequent partial relief of the Indian tax-payer from an obligation, created as much for England's benefit as for the benefit of India, but imposed upon India without participation by England.

- (b) The institution of a permanent settlement in portions of British India where the conditions precedent to that institution, exist. The circumstances in which a permanent settlement can be safely introduced have been already adverted to; and its probable benefits have been discussed and admitted by the many eminent Statesmen who have been associated with the Indian administration.
- (c) The adoption of a fiscal policy best calculated to create and develop new and existing Indian industries by means of a system of bounty or protection, at least until such industries reach a degree of perfection at which they can compete with the developed industries of foreign countries.
- (d) With a view to secure to the teeming millions of the Indian Empire every

possible insurance against injuries or hardships, at present unredressed or unredressable, the institution of a Supreme Court of Appeal for the Indian Empire having its local habitation at one of its great cities. The structure and functions of that Court have been discussed at length.

- (e) A provision for the active participation on the part of the Native Indian Princes and Chiefs in the common concerns of the Indian Empire as a whole, otherwise than by their contribution to its military resources. The obligation to contribute to the military efficiency of the empire naturally creates certain equities in their favour, equities whereby they have a natural interest in the well-being of the State whose safety they have to provide for. From this participation; will result an enhancement of their personal and institutional value as co-operative factors of the common welfare of its entire population; a higher sense of responsibility for their direct duties towards their own subjects and for their indirect duties towards the larger society of the empire to which they belong; and development of a powerful stimulus to their zeal and ambition to adopt with-

in the limits of their States methods of exercising power and patronage in accordance with wisdom and equity. The Indian Native Princes constitute the largest conservative force available for the safety and permanence of British supremacy in India. The efficiency of that force is the outcome of a twofold cause. It arises partly from their being placed under an obligation to justify their existence as political institutions by equitable methods of rule within their own States; it arises partly from their active co-operation with the Supreme Government in conducting the general affairs of the Indian Empire. In either case it is a matter of discipline and discipline to be salutary must be severe. In the evolution through such discipline of each Native Indian Prince into an administrator of a higher order of capacity and character, His Majesty the King-Emperor will find himself surrounded by a body of well-trained Statesmen to assist him in the promotion of the common well-being of this ancient empire and in its restoration to a position of glory.

His Majesty's Coronation on Indian soil as Indian Emperor closely associates him with the best interests of his Indian subjects. If power carries responsibi-

lity, if dominion postulates obligation, if privilege implies duty, His Majesty will find that the problem of India's material, moral, and political advancement in the years to come is an unfinished question having no pity for his repose ; that, upon the broad-based foundation, laid by the first British Empress of India -Victoria the good, the just, and the merciful, and confirmed by the first British Emperor of India -Edward the peacemaker, worthy son of a worthy mother,—the first compartment of an Imperial superstructure to endure for ages to come, has to be erected ; that this great measure of wisdom, equity and goodwill to a fifth of the human race who own him as their sovereign lord, should assume an appropriate form and seek an auspicious occasion ; that the form most appropriate because contributive to their greatest happiness, for it to assume, is the grant of the blessings under the five heads before mentioned ; and that the occasion most auspicious for it to seek is the occasion of the Coronation of His Most Gracious Majesty George V at Delhi.

The Unrest in India

and

Political Agitation:



An Appeal to the Commonsense of
the People of India and Ceylon.

BY

W. S. GOONEWARDENE, B.A.,

*Late Principal, Prince of Wales' College, Moratuwa, Ceylon, and
Tutor to the Sons of
Kamwar Sir Harnam Singh Ahluwalia, K.C.I.E., Simla ;
Honorary Secretary of the Chilaw District Planters' Association.*

Price : Rs. 1.50 (Rs. 8 annas.)

THE MESSENGER PRESS, COLOMBO.

1911.

THE UNREST IN INDIA

AND

POLITICAL AGITATION.

CONTENTS.

CHAP.	PART I.	PAGE.
I.	Reciprocity. India and Ceylon : Their Interdependence	1
II.	Ceylon: Its Advantages over India ...	7
III.	The Breakdown and Revolt of the Indian Student Class	14
IV.	Causes of Sedition, Anarchy and Murder ...	22
V.	Self-Help : Caste	27
VI.	Local Politics and Reform ...	36
VII.	Agriculture	39
VIII.	Bribery and Corruption	43
IX.	The Headmen System	48
PART II.		
I.	East and West : Mutual Influence and Obligations	67
II.	The Situation in India	71
III.	The Crisis in India	76
IV.	The Rulers and the Ruled : Their Duty. ...	84
V.	The Awakened East	91

INTRODUCTION.

THE following appeal to my fellowmen of India and Ceylon had been written long before the Empire to which we belong was plunged into grief by the death of its beloved King-Emperor, His Most Gracious Majesty Edward VII.

The real and universal sorrow evinced both within and without the limits of the Empire but adds greater weight to what I have already written. King-craft, as a theory of Government, far from becoming obsolete, has been further developed and strengthened by the ten years' beneficent rule of Edward VII. of Blessed Memory. Surely, then, we Orientals, monarchical in sentiment to the very core, must admit that the glory of the best of our past Emperors will fade before the *halo* which encircles the brow of the greatest Peace-maker of the World, the Constitutional Sovereign of the largest Empire, the arbiter and counsellor of Europe, and the friend of humanity.

May his beloved illustrious son and successor, and grandson of the greatest Monarch that ever wielded an earthly sceptre,—His Most Gracious Majesty George V. who has already endeared himself to us—be spared with Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Mary and the Queen Mother to reign long over us and extend the Empire in the hearts of their loving and loyal subjects.

I submit that my personal contact with divers nationalities, and life among different classes and grades of people both in India and Ceylon, and my long life among the local peasant class have helped to enlist my sympathies in their cause, and keep me from being alienated by Western education.

II.

I feel it my duty here to express my deep debt of gratitude to India, as well as to my native land : and I trust I do not look in vain for the indulgence of the public at my very feeble attempt at discharging that debt.

Having been no unconcerned spectator of events going on around us for over quarter of a century, while engaged in educational work, and having enjoyed the privileges of a British subject under three successive Sovereigns of England, and under the administration of several successive Rulers of India and Ceylon during the same period, I feel I am doing a duty to my Indian and Ceylonese fellow subjects, in conveying my humble message, thereby discharging a duty which I feel is incumbent on me as a citizen to perform. More capable and competent hands will, it is to be hoped, develop and do full justice to the subjects treated,—subjects which appeal to me as being of vital interest to the Empire at large, and of supreme importance to the particular communities concerned.

In conclusion I take the opportunity of acknowledging my gratitude to my several friends who have rendered me assistance in various ways, and of tendering my apology to my readers for the delay in presenting an appeal which it was intended to publish more than a year ago, but through illness and other causes beyond my control was prevented from seeing the light. For this reason some of the events touched upon may seem out of date, which it will be well if the reader will kindly bear in mind.

W. S. GOONEWARDENE.

Marawila, Ceylon.

AN APPEAL

TO

INDIANS AND CEYLONESE.

I.

RECIPROCITY:

A PLEA FOR FREER INTERCOURSE AND BETTER UNDERSTANDING

I THINK the present a most opportune moment to press the claims of India and Ceylon on the attention of those most concerned. The situation is of deep interest and one which will appeal to every true lover of India and Ceylon.

Though forming politically two separate units, we are bound to each other by so many ties and dependent on each other in so many ways that our fortunes must necessarily act and react on one another.

What reciprocal influence India and Ceylon may have on each other cannot but be a question of deep importance, and more so after the linking up of Ceylon and India by a Railway, which is now being pushed on on either side and will soon be an accomplished fact. Indians love our fair Island, but their caste prejudices have prevented the best of them from making a nearer acquaintance with Ceylon.* Through railway communication will

* A Brahmin is said to lose caste by crossing the seas.

help to remove this barrier to a great extent, and vastly increase facilities for transport and communication between peoples of allied races who have had such close intercourse in the past, but who for many centuries have had separate histories and separate fortunes. Indians look upon Ceylon in every way, except politically, as part and parcel of India, and have shewn the greatest sympathy and interest in matters relating to Ceylon. The Rama-Ravana tradition is familiar to every man, woman, and child in India, and the report of the fabulous wealth of Lanka has reached the furthest corners of India. Indians know more of Ceylon than Ceylonese know of India. Their interest seems to be only deepened by distance and continued estrangement. There is truly a noble side of India—an *India within India*—which any nation may be proud to be associated with, and Ceylon is the poorer for want of opportunities of social and intellectual intercourse with the upper layers of Indian Society.

We have never been wanting to India in all her needs and trials as far as our ability and means permitted. We have rejoiced with India in her joys and sympathised with her in her afflictions. Our hospitality has been worthy of each other.

ANCIENT LITERATURE, SCIENCE, &C., OF THE EAST.

There is an inexhaustible mine of wealth in Indian literature, poetry, and scientific lore. The works of the ancient Rishis and sages which still form the foundation of the Indian Ayurvedic system of medicine and of the Indian Sciences will fully repay the labour spent on their study by the modern student. Sanskrit and Pali languages which constitute the chief elements in our vernaculars are neglected for other languages which have played so little part in moulding our thoughts and aspirations, with the result that our vernaculars have degenerated and are now become

incapable of interpreting the lofty ideas of religious and intellectual thought of the present day, and the masses of the people are poorer because of the poverty of their language to adequately convey these ideas. The neglect is bordering on criminal.

MODERN EDUCATION : NATIONAL STUDIES.

Would that our educational system were more alive to a sense of their responsibility to the nation in this respect and encourage the study of these two languages with a view to the enrichment and improvement of the vernaculars in order to keep pace with the present rate of progress in nearly every department of knowledge. A start has of late been made, thanks to the enlightened policy of our Rulers and the Department of Public Instruction and the example set by some of our leading educational Institutions, and the activity of some of our local Associations and Religious bodies.

The geographical, social and economic conditions of Ceylon and India should prove profitable and interesting studies and these should find a prominent place in the curriculum of our schools.*

FOREIGN INFLUENCES FOR GOOD.

The enterprising foreign trader and settler and the European Missionary—be it said to their credit—have shewn more diligence and interest in these matters than the natives of the soil who are most concerned. They have been early on the field and profited by their opportunity, and we are now glad to participate with them, having only recently realised the opportunities for

* A series of English Readers adapted to the wants of Ceylon students, and a good Text Book on Ceylon History are among the urgent needs of the Ceylon school-boy. Miss Gibbon deserves the thanks of the Ceylonese for her Text Book in Geography, Mrs. Higgins for her "Popular Stories from the History of Ceylon," and Mr. L. E. Blazé, for his "History of Ceylon."

enterprise, social contact, and exchange of services nearer home which we have long neglected to our mutual loss. Better late than never! Let us go in for a full share of the vast prospects to which our friends have so largely contributed and, while doing ourselves and them justice co-operate with each other in developing our natural resources in which they have so nobly led the way and shown us how we may help ourselves and our community.

STUDY OF HOME SUBJECTS.

Had we taken half that care and trouble to become acquainted with our own conditions, and to study our own history and literature, that we have taken in studying the literature, history and circumstances of nations and countries which have little or nothing in common with us,* we should not have lagged behind to find ourselves so slavishly dependent on others to help and direct us at every step in our movements.

We have been separated long enough from India to develop a separate and distinct species. The shock of strangeness is always interesting. Let us see what *the red-lock of India and Ceylon* may result in.

THROUGH COMMUNICATION.

The Indo-Ceylon Railway over the historic Adam's Bridge will be the key-stone in the arch of Railway Progress in India and Ceylon and will be hailed as the precursor of a new order of things.

It may possibly affect our political relations and render it necessary hereafter to consider the question whether we are to be absorbed into India, or whether a slice of that

* "Stories from the History of Ceylon" is most suitable for a school text-book, and the author, who has shown great aptitude in the task undertaken, ought to furnish more of the same series which should be adopted in all Ceylon schools, and thus supply a long-felt want.

vast Continent may not be marked off and added on to Ceylon to enlarge the limits and scope of the Ceylon Government. In such an eventuality the latter alternative would suggest itself as the more natural course of developing the interests both of India and Ceylon. Whatever may happen, we cannot have a great neighbour like India without being affected by what takes place there. And as we must ultimately stand or fall together, we cannot do better than watch the march of events and see how we may be of service to each other as integral parts of a common Empire.

A POLICY—THE RIGHT PROCEDURE.

The past has been one of both encouragement and warning, and the future is bright with opportunity and full of promise—if we would only be true and honest to ourselves. Let the time suffice that we have wasted in our favourite occupation of turning our arms against ourselves—making mountains of mole-hills while overlooking matters of infinitely greater moment that demand our attention nearer home, emphasising our differences wherever we can—rather than helping each other in an earnest effort to secure any serious reform or solid advantage.

A TRUCE TO FANATICISM AND ALL PETTINESS.

Let us be done with illusions, superstition, ignorance and unreasoning prejudices which rob us of our chances of success; let us beware of engaging in visionary schemes or of doing anything which would seem like playing into the hands of our enemies. Let us be *ourselves* before we can claim to belong to others. If we are true to ourselves it will follow as the night the day that we are true to our fellows. Profiting by past experience, let us manfully face our responsibilities and press

(6)

forward to win our right place among the progressive peoples in the world. Thus shall we be found helping to build up our own fortunes and taking no mean part in strengthening and consolidating The Empire.

"'Tis not in mortals to command success
But we'll do more we'll deserve it."

II.

CEYLON : ITS ADVANTAGES OVER INDIA.

Though left behind India in diverse respects, we occupy a vantage ground here in Ceylon from which we can do yeoman service to India. Our insular position, our immunity hitherto from plague, famines, earthquakes; disastrous floods and other scourges that frequently visit India and disturb the peace, comfort and security of so many of our neighbours; our growing popularity as a health resort; our favourable situation on the great commercial highway of the East; our contact with three European Civilisations; the absence of anything like the religious fanaticism and the strong and inveterate feeling of caste and racial antipathy that prevails in India; the march we have stolen on India by the slow but steady progress we have made towards the realisation of the true ideals of education; the energy, courage and enterprise of our planting and mercantile communities—all these and more give us a position and prestige of our own.

CAUSES OF INDIA'S EMBARRASMENTS.

We are in a fair way of solving some of those problems which present so much difficulty in India and elsewhere. Differences of caste, class, creed, race, colour and language, are not quite non-existent here, but these do not form the insuperable barriers that they are in other parts of the Empire, and do not stand in the way of our free intercourse. Here I think lies the chief source of our strength as a colony which we should try to maintain at any cost. We have not been altogether

without our reward for having been less clamorous than India for political reform. It has given us time to attend to weightier matters, and we are to-day in a position to read a lesson to India in the matter of political agitation.

POLITICS AND INDIA'S ENEMIES.

Now that an enemy has appeared on Indian ground greater than any India has yet known, it is our duty to stand by her and aid her in her efforts to fight this enemy, while doing all we can to protect ourselves from the danger of any possible surrender.

A wrong impulse has been given to the energy of Indian youth. It requires all the moral courage of which the nation is capable and the magnanimous services of all their kind friends to help her to resist it and to recover her normal health and vigour.

MISAPPLIED ZEAL.

India affords the best example to-day of what misguided zeal and misdirected energy could do to divert a people from their true interests. If we can contribute our mite to help those engaged in the task of freeing India of a scourge which has given so much pain and anxiety to all, and to see her taking the lead which she in every way is qualified to do in the march of education in the East, we shall be discharging a duty we owe to ourselves and to our mother-land.

We have learnt better than to measure India by what we know and see around us in Ceylon. It is impossible from the limits of our small island to conceive what India is, or to form any adequate idea of the forces at its back which cause those mighty upheavals not only in nature, but in the different strata of Indian life. They simultaneously do the work of destruction as well as

construction in its physical, social, religious and political conditions, blending and moulding its thousand forms of energy and tending to evolve order and unity from the conflicting elements that go to form that seething mass of humanity known as the Indian Community.

Under these circumstances it is no insult to its people or want of reverence to its rulers to say that there are gaps and fissures, and much that is faulty and imperfect in what has been done. The recent crisis has helped to bring out all this, as was never done before, and must have convinced the actors on both sides that they were merely human. The progress, however, such as it is, will stand comparison with any work of similar dimensions or magnitude that has been accomplished by any nation, or recorded in any history, within the same interval.

A LOST OPPORTUNITY.

What an opportunity was lost by the young Indian party, who cut themselves off from the State and took counsel with those who taught them to call *evil good and good evil*!

No power on earth or Heaven can help us so long as we choose to remain in our ignorance and perversity, and refuse to see. Independence does not consist in defiance of all authority. That will be another word for chaos and anarchy whether in religion or in State. So long as men are impatient of all control and wholesome discipline and will be a law unto themselves, the best of Governments will not avail. This is the spirit which has always been in rebellion with the spirit of Truth, Justice and Mercy.

REFORMS AND PROGRESS IN INDIA.

There is no one but would rejoice with India at the change of policy that has been lately declared and the

reforms that have been initiated to meet the changing conditions of an ever-advancing and ever-increasing community. Something of this sort was long expected since the Proclamation of 1858, and hopes were revived at the Proclamation, in 1877, of the late Queen Victoria, as Empress of India. If India has had to wait, it has also been long preparing for the change. The people began to avail themselves of the facilities for travel and of the remarkable expansion of commerce, promoted technical and general education and developed trade industry and art. The enterprising genius and energetic spirit of the conquerors—combined with a kindred spirit in the conquered races—helped to change the face of the country, and gave a mutual impetus to their native energies. The magnificent endowments that are found scattered up and down the country—the numerous factories, mills, docks, harbours, industrial and manufacturing towns, the net-work of roads, railways, canals, bridges and tanks and other engineering works, the Postal and Telegraph systems, the extension of steam and electric communication and locomotion—bear testimony to the restless energy of these two great representatives of the Aryan stock.

While all this marvellous expansion was going on and the ends of India were being linked together, and the people who had been strangers to each other in their own native land were brought into contact with each other, and with the rest of the civilised world, it was but natural that the educated classes should have some of the aspirations and ambitions which advanced communities everywhere have, and they as a matter of course looked to the West, which had been responsible for this onward movement, to help and guide them in the future.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

The Indian National Congress was the first general movement in this direction. It met with an enthusiastic reception in the country and was supported by all educated sections of the community. Its Presidents were among the foremost of India's sons. It was a safety-valve for the expression of the mind of the people. Worked with skill and under proper control, the Government would have found in the Congress a valuable ally and a powerful lever in uplifting the nation. It materially helped to unite the various sections of the communities hitherto unfriendly and hostile to each other by common interests and common aspirations. It held its sessions first in the Presidency towns, and then in Allahabad, Lahore, Poona, Umritsar, Bangalore, Surat, &c., and thus trained the country from Peshawar to Cape Comorin to take an interest in a national cause. Many a good and great man who sympathised with it, foresaw the dangers inseparable from such vast organisations and, knowing the conditions of the country and the element in which this ship of the nation was to sail, counselled caution and moderation. The temper of the people made it difficult for them to use proper restraints and keep within bounds. They allowed themselves to be carried away by the first outburst of enthusiasm and began to trespass dangerously on the domains of Government. Government and its policy became the theme of declamation; the younger members soon caught the infection; party feeling ran high, and chaotic disorder prevailed, leading to serious divisions.

INDIAN HISTORY IN A NUTSHELL.

The history of the Indian National Congress indicates the history of the Indian people. They had not sufficiently

profited by the lessons of the past and had not taken sufficient note of the dangers and rocks ahead. "What a horse," may not one say, "they were going to lose for want of skill and spirit to manage him!" Would that an Indian Alexander rise and do with the National Congress and similar institutions in the East what Alexander did with Bucephalus! It was *its own shadow* which stood in its way and caused all the trouble. No wonder they condemned the animal. But one man saw the secret and persisted in trying it again, and proved to the satisfaction of all gazers that the horse was worth its value, as he calculated, and more. The story being very suggestive, I offer an apology for quoting it in this connection. "Alexander ran to the horse, and, laying hold of the bridle, turned him to the sun, for he had observed that the shadow that fell before the horse, and moved wherever he moved, greatly disturbed him. While the horse's fierceness and fury lasted, Alexander kept speaking to him softly and stroked him, after which he gently let fall his mantle and leaped lightly upon the horse's back. Then, without pulling the reins too hard, or using either whip or spur, he set him going. As soon as he perceived that he was quiet he put him to a full gallop, and pushed him on both with voice and spur."

POLITICS.

Politics is a charming thing. There is something in politics which draws students to it as the magnet draws the needle. Students, generally, if given the opportunity, will revel in it as if there was no more serious employment or pleasanter occupation. Need I say that it is to a far greater extent so with the Indian student? There is always a tendency to make too much of it. It is often followed as an end in itself, and is apt to be divorced from its true aim. Patriotism is at times mostly politics, and,

in so many cases, a cloak for self-interest. Those countries which have the longest enjoyed political freedom will be the loudest in confessing that it is not a panacea for all ills. The student class have proved all the world over to be the most unfit to enter the arena of politics. To my mind no greater harm could have been done than to fire young Indian minds with a desire to dabble in politics and make Government their business. India, I trust, as the result to-day shows, will in this respect ever be

A WARNING TO CEYLON.

III.

THE BREAKDOWN AND REVOLT OF THE
INDIAN STUDENT CLASS.

The present writer has known India more than in name and has had opportunities of moving freely among Indians for a considerable period, and his associations do not allow him to think that Indians have done justice to themselves. It did one good to see the Hindu, the Mohamadan, the Parsee, the Jew, and the Christian working side by side and fraternizing with each other. The rigid caste system was being slowly but steadily undermined, and the emancipation of the lower classes was going on rapidly. Christianity was doing its work slowly and imperceptibly, leavening the whole lump and raising the down-trodden and the oppressed outcasts, and making it possible for them to take their places among the most favoured and enlightened in the land.

There were signs of the most loyal and unswerving attachment to the Crown and to the person of the Sovereign and his representatives. There was nothing but the most unqualified appreciation of the services rendered by Government, Missionary, and private educational agencies, and a sincere affection and gratitude to those engaged in the work.

CAUSES OF DISCONTENT.

There was also side by side with this an under-current of dissatisfaction and a feeling of estrangement on the part of the masses,—due among other causes to the exclusiveness begotten of caste and class, to the want of

contact between the rulers and the ruled, and between the educated minority and the uneducated majority, and to a feeling on the part of the aristocracy and the more favoured classes that their high position would be compromised by mixing and making common cause with the people.

There were excesses on the part of individual representatives of each class which rankled in their minds and bred deep personal feelings of hatred, and to add to it all there was one long series of successive bad years. War, famine, plague, religious riots, floods, and earthquakes, followed one upon the other. It was a time of trial to everyone, and the Government of the time did its best to cope with the situation, ably supported and seconded by the native rulers, wealthy zemindars, and the missionary bodies, who placed their purses and their persons at the service of their country and Government, while we in Ceylon had the privilege on more than one occasion to contribute our mite.

SEDITION AND REVOLUTIONARY CRIME.

The enemy may have found this a convenient time for sowing sedition and fanning the flames of discontent. Then there rose up simultaneously in different parts of India, as under a magician's wand, an army of " patriots " who let their zeal get the better of their reason and launched out in a campaign of unmeaning opposition to Government; and, under cover of a national boycott, roused in the people the spirit of bigotry and fanaticism, and hatred towards everything foreign. The mill hands, who were the first to be tampered with, did not espouse the cause. They found, after a little foretaste and experience, it did not pay them to follow their " leaders " into politics. The full extent of the plot was not revealed till after the poison had had time to act. The student class

formed the fruitful recruiting ground for these political agitators and fomentors, who found them easy victims to the insidious influences of sedition and anarchist doctrines preached from pulpit, press, and market-place. They took a leaf from their more advanced Western type and imitated some of the worst instincts of Western nations. Crime followed upon crime, outrage upon outrage, until the leaders themselves stood aghast at the result of their own actions; and the misery, shame and loss of prestige they had, perhaps unintentionally, been the means of heaping upon themselves and upon their country.

We shall not be true to the salt we have eaten if we do not tell them frankly that the action of that party among Indians who helped to bring about this state of things which culminated in their political degeneration, has *no sympathy on this side of the waters.*

FANATICS AND THEIR WORK.

Much as the defective system of education in vogue in India has had to do with this mischief, it could not have been solely responsible for this revolt among students which made them unconsciously betray their country and their dearest interests at a crisis when—if they had been true to themselves—they could have turned the tide in their favour and gained the respect of their rulers and of the neighbouring nations. It was a temporary wave of blind fanaticism and racial prejudice, to which India is so prone, which led them to conspire with those who were working for the downfall of true independence and of the powers that be for good in the world.

They had not the moral courage to resist the allurements of the enemy, who came in the guise of a friend—offering them *liberty, independence and, all other good things*—if they would for the time being forget that they were Indians

and men—men, nursed from their cradle in filial duty, reverence to superiors, tenderness for life, a regard to the lofty, sublime, and spiritual, obedience to law, loyalty to their King, and the acknowledgment of a Supreme Power to whom they bowed in abject adoration.

This was your opportunity, fellow Indians, to have asserted yourselves and shewn your mettle, but you allowed yourselves to be completely overpowered and to become a danger to yourselves and a menace to Society. You lost all self-control and betrayed an impatience under trial and an eagerness to command before you had taught yourselves the very first lesson *to obey*.

History will ever repeat itself and men and angels will rue to the end of time the moment they parley with the enemy at the gate and consent to betray their fortress within. I repeat, your education should have saved you from such a disaster.

The more sober and well-intentioned among those who have led on this agitation must, I am sure, be convinced that whatever their grievances were, this was not the way to set about securing any true redress or permanent reform. You have only tightened your fetters, and made your yoke a thousand times heavier; and, even though you had, by the means you have adopted, succeeded in securing all that you wished, or your friends had promised you, as far as *you* were concerned (and let me say it as a friend, well-wisher and sympathiser), you would not have been any the better for it. If anyone had told you this was how other nations made their way to the eminence that they have attained to-day, or they had ever reached in the past, I emphatically deny it, and beg them to read history over again, and try to discover one nation, or community, or race which achieved a greatness worth the name on the principles you have

mapped out for yourselves or others have mapped out for you.

LESSONS OF HISTORY.

"LEARN BY OBEDIENCE TO AUTHORITY TO COMMAND IN FUTURE."

If history is to be our guide, let us by all means take our stand on it; and I am satisfied, if we read it without prejudice, we shall think and act differently, and be able to define more and more clearly the dividing line between good and evil, right and wrong, truth and error, and differentiate between the reality and the sham which passes for the former and is mistaken for it. That evil has often been overruled for good is no argument that we should do evil that good may result. Evil may have its part to play, we may not know how or what, in the evolution of our race and our national character. That it has done so is undeniable. But that is not our province. It is ours only to eschew evil and do good leaving the results to the Disposer Supreme.

SEDITION AND ANARCHY MORE DREADFUL THAN PLAGUE, &c.

After all, the real question should be, not what others have done, or been, but what is best for us. It will not put back the hands in the clock of our progress, or retard the course of the world's history, if we stop and think and take a calm view of the situation. Pardon my importunity, dear friends. Plague in India against which we have fought so long and taken so much precaution here and in India; tropical diseases which have engaged the attention of philanthropists, savants, and experts of the world; the leaf diseases or blights that destroy our crops; or rinderpest—that latest enemy of our dumb cattle, the best friend of our poor peasant; none of these could be nearly

so dangerous, or far-reaching in their baneful issues as the effects of a poison that is permeating the West and is flowing into India from the four quarters of the world. Let us do what we can to make this tide recoil on itself, and from our watch-tower in this most southerly Indian isle give the warning signal to the East and the West. Let all hands join in keeping down this enemy and vanquishing it as far as lies in our power.*

There is this difference, however, in the present case. The anti-dote has been long known and accessible to the highest and the lowest. We need use it more than ever to-day to resist the growing tide of materialism, anarchism, sedition and revolutionary crime, generated in some of the laboratories of Europe and America. I ask my friends: Is there no necessity for us to be on our guard against the approach and menace of such an insidious enemy?

THE SCHOOL OF EXPERIENCE.

Oh! let us see the silver lining in all that we have ever been called upon to go through. Let us make all this the handmaid, the means, to lead up to our true destiny and turn our very misfortunes and our trials to our gain. It is the school in which our character has to be formed. Do not dangle before us the bait of the material prosperity of nations. If anything has made them "great" without religion, it can also lower them below brute creation without the Power that is at the back of it. Let this Force wane and decay, and you will see the glory

* "It is a significant fact that *Kali* is the tutelary goddess of extremist politicians whose minds are prepared for the acceptance of anarchism by the ever present ideal of destruction." The blood-thirst is in the rice, since Cain—more in some than in others; but it *can be and has been* conquered when "nature is converted by the energy of Grace."

of these nations fade, and their empires inevitably share the same fate as has attended the once famous empires of the East. Do let us see to it that we are not living in a Fool's Paradise.

"Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's." Reverse this order, and you will see the arrest of the progress of religion and the progress of the human race.

MATERIAL PROSPERITY ONLY A MEANS
TO AN END.

Material prosperity is a good thing, but it is a low standard whereby to judge man and the religion in him which seeks to regenerate and elevate the soul while it feeds and cares for the body. If man is stomach only we would probably be able to live by bread alone. But he is something infinitely more. Man is a creature of two-fold nature, body and soul. These should go hand in hand.

"Sabbha Satta' abarat tithica" (all animals need food); a great truth and greatly expressed. The sufferings, the cares, and the miseries of poor dumb animals as well as of the starving "multitudes" around us have always appealed to the highest instincts of man in all ages, and they are the Sacred charge of man as highest in the scale of creation. But sometimes "Who cares?" seems to be the expression of the sighs and cries that heave from man and beast. The poor are God's first charge. Where is the man who acts the good Samaritan to his fellow always? Is he becoming a rarer and rarer class? Speculation and materialism are killing the heart of the nations of the world and "Commercialism is spreading from the market to the Sanctuary." The Golden Rule if translated into deeds, will work reforms and revolutions greater than any yet seen, or you may wish to see in the future.

“THE INFINITE CANNOT BE WEIGHED IN THE
BALANCE OF HUMAN REASON.”

“It is when God’s judgments are abroad, when they are presented vividly to the contemplation of men, whether in communities or individuals, that the inhabitants of the world learn

RIGHTEOUSNESS.

These judgments are to moral righteousness, at least in part, what miracles are to revealed doctrine: they arrest *attention* first, and next they imply the reality of that to which they call it. This is the true and highest work of great public calamities, of famines and revolutions, as well as of private suffering, disease and death.”

So long as we look to man and try to measure by the range of our poor distorted vision, Infinite Power, Infinite Wisdom, Infinite Love, the gloom will become thicker and thicker until we find ourselves in a total eclipse of Light and Hope—the inevitable result of men acting against the light that is given them for a higher destiny.

IV.

CAUSES OF SEDITION, ANARCHY AND
MURDER.

Let us probe the truth, the whole truth, about human character and try to get at the root of these evils. The anger which zeal for justice excites in us is a far different thing from what impatience provokes us to. How often do we let anger get the mastery over our reason and govern 'it instead of being governed by it. "This passion," to quote the words of a Christian Father, "extinguishes compassion, respect and duty. Brothers know not brothers, nor children their parents, like a fierce torrent they overrun all and spare none that come in their way. Neither the veneration due to age, dignity or worth can stop their fury, nor respect to kindred, gratitude to Benefactors, no obligations whatever could work on them. Even their own interests have no power with them, for many times in the heat of their passion they say or do things of which they are sensible as soon as they are cool." Isn't this a picture true to life of what we find to-day in India and Ceylon and wherever this passion holds way?

Let me, at the risk of tiring you, quote also from a work with which you are all familiar—Todd's Students' Manual. "From the earliest dawn of reason to the hour of death when we reluctantly take the last bitter medicine we have to submit our wills more or less to the will of others. We cannot in childhood see that the motive which induces our parents to lay us under restraint is a regard to our future happiness. It seems to be caprice or at least arbitrary dictation. But we learn to submit our wills to

theirs and here is the foundation of Government, and here commences a system of bonds and obligations which abide on us through life. As we advance in life, we see that the reason of family government is not a love of authority, or an infliction of punishment ; but it arises from compassion to our ignorance and a desire to form our character for the world in which we are to live and die. As we leave the paternal roof, the laws of the State reach us and throw their obligation around us. If we violate them, the laws which we have all agreed to abide by get hold of us. The judge is only the *mouth* of the law, the magistrate who punishes only the *hand*. But it is *the law, the naked law* which no one or two can alter which reaches the highest and lowest in the community with entire impartiality that compels us to bow our wills to its mandates. Without this no community could be safe or prosperous. Life, character, property would alike be a prey to the wicked without this power and majesty of law. You meet law wherever you go, in the home, in the street, in the workshop, in the church, in your friendly societies. The most delicate and fine laws must be obeyed if you would have friends. *The cords are silk, and the first thread that is broken will bring retribution upon you.*"

Let me plead with you, dear friends.

No temptation has overtaken you which has not come to every human being at some time or other in his experience. This is our true warfare for which all our energies should be reserved. Are we going to conquer or to be vanquished? The forces that are for good are greater than those that be for evil ; and none need despair.*

* Read and ponder over the temptations of Christ in the wilderness before He entered on His public ministry. Our Blessed Lord said to the Evil Spirit : (1) Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word

MURDER.

A word, in passing, on the subject of *murder*. The awful crime of making away with one's own life or of taking the life of another has come to be looked upon with little abhorrence, and it behoves every man, woman and child to see that the race of Cain does not multiply in our midst as it is to-day. We have fair ideas of the value of money, of land, corn, cattle, and of nearly everything that has an exchange value, but that which makes everything else of any value (*man*), seldom enters into our calculations while casting up our profits and losses. A human life often counts less than the life of a lower animal, or is thought very little different from it. We Sinhalese have been known to be a quick-tempered people and impulsive by nature, and have been told we are a "nation of murderers." Violent crime, including murder proceeding from the most trivial causes, the dacoities of India, murder of parents by children and children by parents, brothers at the hands of brothers, wives by husbands and husbands by wives, the number slain by the traitor's arm or the coward's blow, and the still larger numbers that die by the slow tortures of scandal, injustice and detraction,—these are stains upon the scutcheon of Ceylon and India that it concerns the highest and lowest in the land to wipe off. True we may not have a hundredth—perhaps not even a thousandth—part of what may be found elsewhere, and other countries are responsible for crimes the atrocity of which baffles description and happily for us are rare in our midst. That others are in a worse plight than ourselves will not in itself tend to make the case less pitiable.

What does it matter to us what others are if we are not

that proceedeth from the mouth of the Lord. (2) Thou shalt not tempt the Lord, thy God (3) and lastly, "Get thee behind me Satan." We are not only bidden, but *directed how* to overcome temptation.

what we ought to be? Let us judge ourselves before we sit in judgment over others and not attempt to clean our blots with the stains of others.

We cannot think of ourselves as isolated units while forgetful of other men. The faults and shortcomings of the weakest among us should be looked upon as our own for which we are individually and collectively responsible. If we are members of one body, as it is our boast, and if one member suffers—be he the humblest—the whole body must feel it, and if that which causes the trouble affects a large number, threatening to poison the very springs of life around us, it were time that we awoke to a sense of our danger and took concerted action. All races now occupying our island or India and calling either their home are concerned in it, and should deal with it as a personal question.

A clear statement of the facts and circumstances connected with specific cases will supply food for reflection, and in many cases for *self-accusation*, which should be the first step toward any reform. *Self-examination* to discover not only instances but principles which underlie them, and *self-discipline grounded on self-knowledge*, will lead to *self-confidence*. Let us find out what precept, moral or spiritual, we have violated and make that our study. This will lead to more permanent results. Let us add to the good that we *do* and cultivate our right affections more. These will be safe-guards against the insinuations of the Tempter. *Love things really worth loving*. It will expand and deepen your sympathies, and your prejudices will fall away gradually. Let us credit people with better motives of action than are apparent on the surface—give them the benefit of the doubt and put the best construction on a matter which appears doubtful and make allowance for temper, feeling, &c., of others.

Do not give needless provocation to your weaker and ignorant brethren. Remember that *a soft answer turneth away wrath.*

SPIRITUAL AID.

Let our love cost us some thing. *He that hateth his brother is a murderer. If any man says he loveth God and hateth his brother he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother, whom he seeth, how can he love God, whom he seeth not? (1st of St. John, ch. IV., 21).*

What will you not do to avert this act of madness on your part or on the part of another! Patience,* like faith, has removed mountains. May we have the grace more and more to cultivate this virtue. The next step is submission to the inevitable results of our acts. The mercy or pardon that we expect from God or man comes in here when true contrition is felt with a determination to improve.

A healthy public opinion will be a powerful help to save people from themselves, and prevent the waste of precious lives daily sacrificed to the lust, passion, and jealousy of an unthinking and thoughtless people. We are guilty of the blood of others if we do not ourselves set the example, and do all we can to wean people from these and like uncontrollable passions.

A high sense of individual responsibility as well as of national duty and national honour is the tribunal to which an appeal of this nature should be addressed. I leave the case in the hands of the true lovers of the country.

* Lord, (said Peter to Jesus,) how often shall my brother offend against me and I forgive him, till seven times? Jesus saith to him, I say not to thee, till seven times, but till seventy times seven. St. Matthew XVIII—21 & 22.

V.

SELF-HELP :

REFORM SHOULD BEGIN AT HOME.

If true progress is to be made in the great cause of human freedom, it must *follow*, not precede, our efforts to reform ourselves. "Political independence cannot be given. It must be grown into and then taken."^{*}

There are things which we must do for ourselves which others cannot do for us even if they wished. If we are interested in keeping up systems and institutions that have had their day, that exist now merely in the shadow, and have no application to the conditions prevailing in an enlightened age, nobody can help us, and we are not to complain that we are making little headway. Take the question of caste, for instance.

CASTE : ITS BANEFUL EFFECTS.

In touching on this painful but important subject, I cannot do better than quote from Blanford's Geography in so far as it affects Ceylon and India.

"...The Sikh religion was founded as late as the end of the fifteenth century, and is almost restricted to the Punjab; like Buddhism, it rejects all caste distinctions.

"Among all Eastern nations religion dictates the practice and observances of daily life to a much greater extent than does Christianity those of Western nations; but

* Mrs. Besant.

Hinduism differs from all other modern religions in the degree in which it does this—in which it penetrates into and regulates the social relations and domestic habits of its adherents, and the rigour with which it enforces its decrees. Especially does it prohibit intermarriage and eating in common by members of different castes, and thus the Hindus instead of forming one community bound together by a common faith, are parted from each other and split up into a vast number of distinct units or castes, the limits of each of which are those of the social life of its members. The ancient writings of the Hindus speak of four castes only—the Brahmins or literate caste, the Kshetryas or warriors and rulers, the Vaisyas or trading caste, and the Sudras or labourers. But of these only the first is distinctly recognised among the modern inhabitants of India. It is true that the Rájputs and Khetris of to-day claim to be the descendants of the ancient Kshetryas, the Banias and Chettis those of the Vaisyas, and others those of the Sudras (probably the aborigines of ancient India); and it is very likely that in many cases these claims are well founded, but they are not universally recognised. At the present day the two highest castes are the Brahmins and Rájputs. In theory, a member of a lower caste cannot pass by adoption into one that is higher; but there can be no doubt that in past times, and to some extent even at the present day, additions have been and are made to both these castes by such transfers, though they are not recognised as equals and caste-fellows by the original communities of pure blood. On the other hand, members of the higher castes who have failed in certain caste observances have sometimes segregated as a sub-caste, while retaining their original appellation; and thus it has come about that these great castes include a very large number of sub-castes of very different degrees of social standing, fenced

off from each other by disabilities similar to those that distinguished the original four castes.

"The original castes were probably, in part, distinct tribes or races, and many of the modern castes must have had a similar origin. . . . Again, almost every trade has its caste, and is practically in the hands of its members, though they are by no means necessarily restricted to it for their livelihood. These castes were probably, in their origin, associations of workmen having interests in common, like the trade guilds of Europe.

"In addition to caste distinctions there are those of sect, and Hindu sects are very numerous. Some sects indeed reject all caste distinctions, but though this rejection may hold good among its own members, all such bodies are prone to separate as a distinct caste from the rest of the community.

"Thus caste, as defined by competency to intermarry and to eat in company, is a form assumed by communities that have originated in many different ways, the result being that social isolation which is peculiarly characteristic of the people of India. In Burma, *where there is no caste*, the difference in this respect is very marked."

Caste, wherever and in whatever form it exists, is a *symptom of arrested social and religious development*. India presents a unique example of a continent within a continent marked off and fenced as it were from the rest of the world by an insurmountable mountain wall on one side extending almost the whole length on the north from west to east, and on all other sides by a water barrier—the deep Indian Ocean. In India everything is on a grand scale, appealing to the imagination and calling forth the highest flights of poetic invention and imagery and philosophic speculation. Secure within its natural de-

fences it had, like Egypt, Babylonia, and China, early developed a highly advanced system of thought and civilisation according to its own genius and the peculiar physical and geographical conditions of soil, climate, means of communication, &c., and contact with races, languages and creeds of the earliest invaders and immigrants who poured in from the north-western and eastern passes. Caste had no place in the religious or social system of the earliest Hindus, but was imposed on India at a comparatively recent date by the influence of the priestly class who formed themselves into a separate caste, we learn from history, and who in their conflict with the warrior caste proved

**THAT THE PEN WAS MIGHTIER THAN THE SWORD
AND
BRAINS MORE POWERFUL THAN THE MAILED FIST.**

From the authority quoted above, it will be noticed that the Brahmins, the literate class who long wielded the ecclesiastical sceptre in India, became the dominant caste and the only caste acknowledged by all. They found it to their interest to draw the lines of demarcation between different trades, arts and occupations. Each caste began to pursue its own interests at the expense of others and thus caste has to this day been the fruitful cause of strife, jealousy and hatred. Education and religion combined to undermine these artificial barriers and produced new principles of classification and new combinations. As industries and education developed, the productive and literary classes in all castes soon began to coalesce and form a new aristocracy—that of wealth and intellect; and thus the process of evolution goes on, and these in their turn have to acknowledge and make way for the highest aristocracy—

THE ARISTOCRACY OF THE HEART,

the only one recognised by God. Caste as caste may be said to be doomed. The apologists for caste are getting fewer and fewer to-day. But the old system has left its trail. The tyrannies of caste prejudice, the petty and unreasoning jealousies that tear and rend asunder even such small communities as ours—who are devoid of such elaborate self-imposed divisions—help to keep India and Ceylon in the back-ground of civilisation; while less favoured communities have outstripped us and achieved a moral and political prestige, with so much material prosperity into the bargain, in a marvellously short space of time. Where caste disappears class succeeds. We are a great way yet from learning to unite truly in a common cause; unity of action is impossible where mutual jealousies check the growth of a national spirit. But a good understanding is possible. Let it not be imperilled by the curse of political agitation. A mere outward union without the union of hearts is a feeble weapon and a dangerous one at times in dealing with our common enemies. But we need not despair. Great progress has been made, and we have only to persevere.

Let caste and class rise above themselves in matters of common interest. Much as we may love our caste or class, let us learn to love man more. Be *men*, and your *caste* is *what you are* as men among other men, higher or lower, than the place assigned to you by chance, accident, heredity, custom, patronage, or long tradition which all vanish like the dew before the sun by your own worth and character.

“ And I ask not for his lineage,
 I ask not for his name ;
 If manliness be in his heart,
 He noble birth may claim.”

What excuse could we have for tolerating a system which is absolutely against the spirit of all the religions professed in the East, (not excluding Hindnism itself in its pure form) and an enemy to human progress and development? It is the highest insult we could offer to our religions and common humanity, and to the Author, Redeemer, and Sanctifier of our race.

He that humbleth himself like a little child, we are told, is to be the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven.

This is the true infallible test of a gentleman—the hallmark of superiority and true nobility. Buddhism, which swayed the destinies of India for three or four centuries, was a strong protest against caste and all but gave the death-blow to Brahminical pretensions, but it failed to gain ultimate ascendancy in a land where monotheism had taken root.

JESUS THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD.

In the fulness of time, God sent His only Son, the Messiah promised and long expected—

JESUS CHRIST—

The Way, the Truth and the Life, who revealed the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man in a sense never before unfolded except to the eye of Faith. Himself the God-man, who by Death conquered Death and for ever broke down the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile, by His One Atonement—the greatest Sacrifice the world has ever witnessed—He reconciled the utmost claims of Justice and Mercy—who ever liveth to make Intercession for us.

Caste distinctions are to be further levelled and obliterated by the reconciling and combining influence of the Chris-

tian Faith.

A Spiritual Ideal! at once satisfying the highest cravings of the human soul as well as the purest and noblest intellectual, moral, social and political aspirations of man, *the one all availing remedy* provided in the Eternal Counsels of Providence for the unrest and misery caused by sin in man fallen from his high estate. This is our high calling, this is the divine work and mission of Christ and of His Church, His perpetual witness on earth, which awaits His second advent when every eye shall see Him, *even they also that pierced Him.*

A day will come when there will be no Jew and Gentile, no European and Asiatic, white and coloured, no *mlecchas and natives*, rich and poor, high and low; no north—south—east—west; but all alike will stand before the Great Judge of Heaven and Earth.

Fellow men! what can I wish for you and myself better than this, the dearest and most precious of all gifts—of more value than silver and gold—the three-fold gift of Faith, Hope and Charity. God grant it to you and me!

CASTE THE ENEMY OF PROGRESS AND CIVILISATION.

I cannot conclude without touching on the local situation as affected by caste. Caste has done more to mar our progress as a nation than anything else; and it is the more regrettable when we consider that it has no place in our predominant religions or customs, Ceylon is essentially a Buddhist country, and as such caste has no true place here; no true Buddhist will ever attempt to remain a sinner all his life by discarding the sacred precept—

නපච්චා වසලො හොති
 නපච්චා හොති බ්‍රාහ්මණේ
 කමමනා වසලො හොති
 කමමනා හොති බ්‍රාහ්මණේ.—*Vasala Sutta*

Najachcha vasalo hoti *“ Not by birth does one become low caste.*
 Najachcha hoti brahmano *Not by birth does one become a Brahman*
 Kammana vasalo hoti *By his deeds he becomes low caste.*
 Kammana hoti brahmano. *By his deeds he becomes a Brahman.”*

Christianity, as above demonstrated, does not prescribe caste, nor Mohamedanism, Confucianism, Zoroastrianism, Sikhism, nor Jainism. If a lower form of Hinduism or a minority of its followers tolerates it—it has already been shown that the higher form *does not*—there is no earthly reason why the vast majority of Christians, Buddhists, Mohamedans and other religionists should display such wanton mental weakness amounting to irrationalism in taking an example from a handful of men who have displayed no faculty for improving on primitive customs of centuries ago when modern civilisation was less than a mere dream. If old institutions deserve respect and that is sought to be an excuse, those apologists will not be slow to admit that we have moved along and shaped ourselves to new grooves that fit us with the modern advancement and civilisation of an enlightened age that naturally now misfit us in the far forgotten ill-shaped ones we have seen fit to discard; and as we have seen the process of moult in every respect in the developments that are evident all round, is it not as well to emerge clean and save ourselves from a social suicide which has helped to keep us at the bottom rung of the ladder while those divested of its burden are looking down upon us from the top, having stolen a march on us

before our very eyes! If we were addicted to customs and observances forced on us by various dynasties, circumstances, and vicissitudes of centuries ago, that should be the very reason, now that we have the choice and the enlightenment to discern good from bad, for us to adopt customs adapted to the present, and leave behind with the rest of the objectionable heritages the baneful practice which only helps to destroy our unity and progress and with them our place in the world as a Nation.

“ Churches and Sects, strike down
Each mean partition wall!
Let love each harsher feeling drown
And men be brothers all!

Truth and right alone
Hold human hearts in thrall,
That love its work at length may own
And men be brothers all.”

VI.

LOCAL POLITICS AND REFORM.

**"IN POLITICS ONE MUST BE OFTEN CONTENT WITH
THE SECOND BEST"**

Simultaneously with India, but under vastly different circumstances and conditions, we have reached that stage of progress and development that has justified our being allowed to participate in the general policy of reform inaugurated by a liberal Government, and we have been given a small measure of representation and responsible Government—a *very, very small measure* compared with that of India. So far from grudging our neighbours their happier lot, we willingly acquiesce in the bare measure of justice meted out to them—not a day too soon. Though not exactly in the same predicament, we are in a position to sympathise with each other in the circumstances which have delayed the inauguration of the new era on which we are both entering. We have pushed our way as best we could in spite of serious drawbacks and obstacles and it rests with us more than with Government to show, *by putting our own house in order*, that we are deserving of more than we have got; and thus make it easier for those in power to concede further privileges with better assurance and better prospects of serving the true interests of everyone concerned.

We are no less on our trial here to-day than India, in respect of politics and reform. Let us show that we are sincere and are in earnest about the reform that we have asked for and partly secured. In Western countries

open enemies sit on the same platform when they are on a common cause. Let us show it possible in enlightened India and Ceylon. Let me here sound a note of warning. "Unity of action is impossible where mutual jealousies check the growth of a national spirit. But a good understanding is possible. It is imperilled by the curse of political agitation." My appeal may sound impertinent; but I sincerely trust that the spirit of narrow-mindedness, of partizanship, of bigotry and readiness to take undue advantage of the accident of one's position may give way once and for ever to better judgment and sounder principles of action in matters of public importance fraught with issues reaching far beyond the community or communities particularly concerned. Say what we may, we have shown an inclination to push an advantage too far and consult our particular interests at the expense of others, and leave the door of distinction ajar and not throw it wide open to *talent* and *virtue*. Our individual gain has been a loss to the general community, and to the Sinhalese Nation.

UNION IS STRENGTH.

Let me at this particular juncture call upon our leaders and representatives in Council to remember that their interests are larger than the interests of the particular classes and sections of the island community they are called upon to represent. The Sinhalese, Tamil, Mohamolan, Burgher, and European representatives, and the new Educated Ceylonese representative whom we shall duly return to the Council, while being true and faithful to their constituents, have each a duty to the colony and the community as a whole, whose interests must not be sacrificed to the interests of any particular party or class. It is to be regretted that it has been considered a necessity, that the principle of

representation among us should be one of race. How long and how far it is going to be so is a question we must put to ourselves. Not England, but India and Ceylon, must answer that. In the meantime let us secure by mutual self-sacrifice what we have so long enjoyed without prejudice to any interests—our planting and mercantile representatives.* Were our interests combined, instead of losing we should have been able to secure an additional planting seat in the Council, and—what was even more urgently needed, and would have served the interests of *all* sections of the Community—should have been in a position to press the claims of the Educational Service of the Premier Crown Colony of the Empire to be represented on its Legislative Council by the

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

This, I humbly submit, is not too much to ask or hope for from a benevolent Government. In the meantime, let us receive the concessions granted to us in the spirit in which they have been given, and make the best of the situation. If we cannot appreciate little acts of kindness, little deeds of mercy, we cannot be truly grateful when we get more.

* It is to be hoped our Planting Associations have taken to heart the lesson they have been lately taught. It is a rude awakening we have all had. Never before has the lesson been forced on us, as has been done lately, that the Europeans and Natives are indispensable to each other, and that if we are to be a go-ahead colony, *Racialism* must be allowed to die, and the sooner the better. Will the First of Crown Colonies lead?

VII.

AGRICULTURE.

This is a subject of such vast importance that it is hardly possible in these pages to give it adequate notice. But I must not omit to set forth our backward position in this matter, compared to the forward progressive movement in India in every direction. There, Departments have been formed in every Presidency, Experiment Stations established in every centre, Colleges organised with staffs of Scientific Officers, involving the expenditure of millions of money—in fact everything is being done in all directions to advance the agricultural prospects in the Continent. Can the same be said of Ceylon? In another place the many advantages of Ceylon over India have been enumerated, but in this respect—the most important to a prosperous agricultural colony like ours—alas! Ceylon is centuries behind India.

THE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY.

Be it said to the credit of our late Governor, Sir Henry Blake, the Ceylon Agricultural Society was inaugurated in 1904—everyone thought as a precursor to a regular Department of Agriculture: in fact a year later the Governor himself declared the intention of organising a Department, but for some unknown reason, the Department has been long in coming to actual realisation. As one who has closely watched the operations of the Society, I am happy to be able to say that it has done, and is strenuously doing, everything that lies in its power for the good of the people; and I have seldom come across any

official who takes a more personal interest in his duties than its indefatigable Secretary. But it must be remembered that it is only a *Society*, and not an *official department* that could effect reforms to order! If anybody feels that the Society has not done enough, I can unhesitatingly say that it has done a great deal more than could have been legitimately expected of it under the circumstances controlling its operations. It is a useful body which is doing useful work. But the fact remains that a Department so essential to progress has still to be organised, and it is a question how long the authorities will shut their eyes to the necessity. It cannot be that they have failed to realise the need, seeing that a Colony like Mauritius can now boast of a regular

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

nor can they be awaiting a disaster like that of the seventies—the crash that killed King Coffee—to awake to a sense of their duty. That the Colony is to-day in a state of prosperity is mainly due to the peculiar agricultural advantages the island is blessed with. It is the bounden duty of the Government to establish a Department and that without further delay, and place this fair Island,

THIS EDEN OF THE EASTERN WAVE,

on a par with the less important Colonies, and advance the agricultural possibilities which await development. I emphasise the fact that nothing short of a regular Department can do this fully.

A DEPARTMENT ESSENTIAL.

To His Excellency Sir Henry McCallum we owe a deep debt of gratitude for the interest he has evinced in matters agricultural. Almost within the second month of his arrival, he avowed his intention of emancipating the

peasant cultivator from the thralldom of indebtedness; and the Commissions appointed in this connection and on the question of Agricultural Training—subjects of most vital interest to all—are matters of history; and the results ought to be fruitful of good to the Island. Delays over schemes of such vast importance are natural; but it is to be hoped the people will soon have the gratification of knowing something definite about loans to the cultivator and agricultural education for his children. Co-operative credit organisations have proved a success in other lands, and only a start is necessary in this Island to make it a success. Voluntary action is not a characteristic of the *goiya*, and he is too slow to change his methods, however convincing the results may be. This is a very strong plea for a Department of Agriculture which can direct people to adopt methods that would benefit them and the country, which a Society—however anxious and energetic it may be—cannot insist upon (but it must depend upon the voluntary co-operation which ignorant cultivators fail to see the value of). A Department will be in a position to direct headmen, whose co-operation is essential in popularising any movement among villagers; but a Society must leave it to their sweet will and pleasure.

MAKESHIFTS IMPRACTICABLE.

As the Governor so promptly grasped the situation in different aspects as it affects agriculture, there can be no doubt he has realised the necessity of a Department of Control; and it is the fervent hope of the writer and the whole country that His Excellency will show his sagacity by providing this Island with a fully equipped Department of Agriculture, and leave behind him a lasting monument for posterity—thus completing the scheme his predecessor most dearly cherished.

(42)

Sir Henry McCallum has been long known as the strong Governor who will not be content with doing things by halves. As a military tactician His Excellency surely will not be content with leaving a tiny gun-boat to guard our Agricultural interests when nothing short of a " Dreadnaught " is needed !

VIII.

BRIBERY AND CORRUPTION.

Dare to be true, nothing can need a lie
 The fault which needs it most grows two thereby.

There are individual acts of injustice, spoliation and oppression which it would serve no useful purpose to mention here. These happily are not the rule, and are almost invariably visited with the consequences they deserve. But there is an evil whose insidious character demands some notice, if it were simply in the interests of those who are immediately concerned. It is largely prevalent here and in India. I mean the practice of offering and receiving bribes. Nothing destroys the status and influence of public men as bribery—which is regarded by the average ignorant victims as the key-note of official recognition. It injures him that gives and him that receives. It encourages a disposition to make short cuts to fortune and evade the honest labour necessary to secure one's legitimate ambitions. Offices go in most cases to the highest bidder. Justice is at times literally sold or delayed and, as is often the case, defeated. Vague information is given to put the whole detective machinery off the scent and false evidence manufactured against innocent persons. Evidence leading to the detection of serious crime and irregularities is suppressed, and men are often screened from the effects of their high-handed doings. *It is one of the direct causes of crime and the impoverishment of the country.* The poorer and ignorant classes are the worst victims. They have come to look upon it as a solemn duty to make offerings to

appease the Powers. What department of the Public Service could be said to be wholly free from this taint? * The cases that have been brought to light do not give any idea of the extent to which the evil exists and is secretly encouraged. Temptations to bribery, corruption and intimidation are as strong in the East as they are in the West, and furnish some of the greatest and decisive tests of character. Many, it must be said to their honour, among foreigners and natives, have been proof against it, and have nobly stood the test. Though poorer, perhaps, to-day, they are happier and generally more honoured and respected. Let me ask those who are trading upon their influence, and are making capital of the ignorance and unfortunate circumstances in which their poorer and weaker brethren are placed, whether they are not doing themselves injustice and accumulating on their heads the curses of future generations.

There is a wholesale and systematic deterioration going on in our midst which can be said to be in open daylight, which it behoves Government and the people to promptly take vigorous measures to check. Education has done a great deal to mitigate these evils, and would have done more if it had always been of the right kind. Sham education, as well as hollow profession, is worse than no education. We live in glass houses and know it not.

ABSENCE OF PROSPECTS OF IMPROVEMENT.

While there has been reform in many important directions in Ceylon, this matter which touches so

* Honourable professions and time-honoured national institutions are prostituted and degraded by unscrupulous and unprincipled men who seek their own private and selfish interests when clothed in temporary authority of office—regardless of the injury they do to themselves, their posterity, and to the Commonwealth.

closely the credit and welfare of the community as well as of the administration—this plague-spot of the East—has either escaped observation, by being too common, or the authorities, acknowledging it to be an open secret, find themselves unequal to deal with and evil so deep rooted. The old system of “small salaries and large perquisites”—the former from Government, and the latter from the people—served to vitiate the whole system of Government in India for many years, till different Administrators from time to time fearlessly and courageously set themselves to the task of correcting glaring abuses, and succeeded to a great extent in abating the scandal. A great deal more remains to be done here and we look forward to the present strong administration, with the whole-hearted co-operation of the people, to put forth a gigantic effort to remove this evil. I humbly submit that a rough estimate by means of commissions of enquiry of how manifold the irregular incomes † and emoluments yet exceed the salaries of a certain class of Public Servants would give a tolerably sound basis to go upon and arrive at some fairly satisfactory solution.

THE BLAME LIES LARGELY AT OUR OWN DOORS !

These are some instances of suicidal folly in which we have no one but ourselves to blame. With our eyes open and in the broad light of day we walk into pits and snares from which there is no escape.

* “The best perquisites of a place are the advantages it gives a man of doing good.”—*Addison*. A spontaneous gift, in appreciation of honest and disinterested services, and as reward for genuine merit, sanctioned by the authorities, cannot be as illegal and obnoxious as the practice obtaining everywhere—of expecting or offering bucksheesh or exacting it *volens nolens*, for simply doing what is one's legitimate duty—for which he is well paid and to do which he holds his position.

† It is an *indirect levy* on the resources of the people, compared with which *fresh taxation will be an evil more tolerable and far less burdensome*.

Why, oh! why is it necessary to have to point out these evils which are on the surface, and so much time, money and energy spent to make us see what we all see and know, and what we would fain have ourselves and others believe that we don't see! Shall we glory in our shame and be content to go on as if there was nothing seriously wrong? Let us rather consent to be searched by the fierce searchlight thrown upon us from every side, and submit to the probing knife willingly so that we may have these open sores of the country healed and not leave room for others to think us insensible to pain. What is wanted is a little *earnestness* and *honesty* in tackling the problem.

It is the imperative duty of Government to remove as far as they can causes that act as incitements to these crimes. Punitive measures often fail to have their desired effect when the causes of evil are allowed to remain. The remedy often does more harm than the disease when it only touches the surface.

**THE GREAT NEED OF THE DAY IS THE SPIRIT OF
THE THINKER.**

"To teach people how to think is perhaps the highest end of education and, to learn to think the most difficult thing a man is called upon to do."

The happiness of individuals, the peace, security and well-being of society constitute the great ends of Government. If the initiative be taken by ourselves we can make Governments go any length, as we progress. Governments must grow and expand with the growth of the people. They cannot do otherwise. They have their limitations, like the subjects; but they are also, like the subjects, capable of infinite expansion. God

* Warden Stone of St. Thomas' College, Colombo.

grant it may ever be so with the British Government, and with all other Governments associated with it in promoting the great cause of human liberty, peace, contentment, and of willing, loyal service to God and man.

The turning point has been reached in India and Ceylon, and what shall keep them back from being what they might be—and their own interests and the interests of Government and the Empire demand that they should—if their sons and daughters are true to themselves and rise to their opportunities and prove worthy successors of worthy forefathers?

"This above all: to thine own self be true
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man."

IX.

THE HEADMEN SYSTEM.

The great vital virtue of honesty is of prime necessity for national success.—*Roosevelt.*

The system of headmen in Ceylon is a corruption of that of the Indian Chieftains. In the time of the Singhalese dynasties that system prevailed in Ceylon—no doubt copied from India. The survival of that is what is now recognised as

THE HEADMEN SYSTEM

which stands self-condemned in the practice obtaining at present. It is an Eastern habit to venerate old institutions because they are old, irrespective of merits: and the headmen system is one that is dying a natural but prolonged death, contrary to circumstances. The system is self-condemned inasmuch as it is inconsistent—for instance, a few of the higher posts are salaried while the minor appointments carry little or no remuneration whatever.

The old chieftain system was far superior, because it was uniform, if for no other reason. Each post-holder was entitled to grants of land adequate to his service, and his revenue was derived from cultivating the land along with other inhabitants, with the result that each chieftain had to use his energy to create wealth commensurate with his position and influence and thus look to prosperity from the land instead of attempting to accumulate wealth at the expense of others whose unfortunate position of voiceless

majority enabled him to rob them unmercifully under the

CLOAK OF AUTHORITY.*

It did credit to the sagacity of the earlier native rulers to recognise the common bond of land which held both the rulers and the ruled together as nothing else did. (This was retained in a modified form under the Dutch in the shape of *Accommodasan*.) The principle of joint-family ownership lies at the very root of the older Headmen System and runs through the whole social and economic polity of the East. It is the non-recognition of this principle due to ignorance or imperfect acquaintance with oriental character and traditions at the source which is largely accountable for the failures and errors in the administration of later years and is the cause of so much mischief and misery to-day among the rural population, presenting in this respect a marked contrast to the condition of things existing under the earlier Sinhalese Kings.

When what seemed the very foundation of the Headmen System was removed in the course of years, the communal interest and the motive of service were undermined

* "It is not good economy," says Mr. John Ferguson, a Journalist and a true friend of the Ceylonese, "to put men into places of the greatest confidence, where they have it in their power to make their fortunes in a few months without giving them adequate salaries."

"The Sinhalese," says Justice Clarence, "are very strongly attached to their family lands. Throughout a great part of India, the people regard their lands as belonging not to individuals but to families,—joint-family ownership; and the Singhalese who are of Indian origin have had much the same way of regarding it. The Indian Government wisely and humanely recognised this ancient tradition, but the Government of Ceylon partly perhaps from 'Colonial traditions,' and partly from a lack of knowledge of the people, largely ignored it. The result is endless quarrelling and litigation about lands" —Justice Clarence, *British Empire Series*, India, Ceylon, Str. Settlements, British N., Borneo, Hongkong.—p. 432.

and weakened and the structure that was built on the policy of later years retained the name and the form but minus the vitality and dignity of the earlier chieftain and native Headmen System. Ceylon being essentially an agricultural country, land was an indispensable factor in the development and progress of the people. It was a recognised duty of the King and the native chieftains down to the very lowest officer to promote agriculture and cultivation. But when this was replaced by a system more or less unnatural and open to abuse, agriculture—the mainstay of the country—was neglected with the result now apparent all round, viz.—headmen who practise all manner of devices to take everything unto themselves and leave the village to take care of itself. “Royal and feudal grants of land made in the earlier times by a chieftain or king to his officers or companions were grants of *dominion over populations, not grants of property in land*, as we now understand it, which in truth is, comparatively speaking, the conception of a relatively modern stage of society.” (says Sir John Budd Phear”).

“The primary result of these feudal grants was to confer upon the grantee the chieftain’s customary rights over the grant; and so doubtless, arose the Nidegama (or village under private ownership) as opposed to the royal (Gabadagama.)

“Sub-infeudation never seems to have had place in Ceylon to any considerable extent. In this respect the Sinhalese land system offers much contrast to that of Bengal. But there seems to be difference enough in the data of the two cases to account for this diversity of consequence.

PERSONAL SERVICE.

“which was the ordinary tenure obligation of the Sinhalese cultivator, is not so readily retransferable as a debt of

money or of contribution in kind such as the Bengal ryot owed to his village chief. And moreover the Bengal Sub-tenures did not attain their extraordinary modern development until after the Permanent Settlement had given Zemindars an absolute right of property in all the land of their Semindaries--a right which is without parallel in Ceylon. Both the royal and the private signior, however, in the latter Island, made immediate grants of unappropriated or waste land. Some of these became cultivating settlements, having the grantee (not, be it observed, the grantor) at their head, the grantor having no other connection with the new community than the link of service which bound the grantee to him, and which often in course of time wore out, or became unenforceable. The joint-family system is as conspicuous in Ceylon as it is in Bengal.")—*Sir John Bull Phear* in "The Aryan Village, p. 198.

The secret of the existence of unpaid headmen is not far to seek. These are as a rule men who volunteer to work at no cost to Government, knowing full well that they can prey upon the poor voiceless villager and render it worth their while to serve the King free, gratis, and for nothing,—in return for the license they obtain to use sharp practice on the unfortunate populace. The fact that headmen of the first and second rank are paid is proof enough that Government and its executive officers are not unaware of the pernicious effect of the unpaid system, and it is a frank admission by Government that it is not worth anybody's while to work for nothing, and that those who do so know that in the very act of doing a turn at their own expense for Government they pave the way for serving themselves at the expense of the masses, from whom they exact the cost of their time with thousand-fold interest on every imaginable occasion, in one form or another, and under various pretexts. Yet

THE GOVERNMENT GAINS AN OBJECT

in perpetuating the system, viz., it saves itself the cost of maintaining a salaried staff by employing men who willingly offer their services at the expense of the populace, who are thus subjected to an indirect taxation which in many cases proves beyond the capacity of the individual to bear and results in pecuniary hardship leading to deeds of crime. Instances are not wanting in almost every headman division of once respectable, peaceful, law-abiding inhabitants being driven by the circumstance of having once come under the evil influence of unscrupulous headmen on trivial matters of neighbourly differences or misunderstandings, to stoop down to actions at which they used to look with abhorrence.

That there are

A SCRUPULOUS, GOOD, ESTIMABLE FEW

even among the unpaid headmen—a very meagre percentage—is admitted : these are to be traced to intelligent, wealthy, generous men who by their position, irrespective of a Government mandate and prior to such appointment, had come to be regarded by the residents as their chiefs, and who by nature are fitted to guide their less intelligent and less fortunate brethren. But the system now prevailing precludes the choice falling always on the most eligible who naturally rely on their merits for recognition but fail to obtain *that recognition of merits* (which alone fits a man to the leadership,) in the absence of the rupees which the unscrupulous dazzle before the eyes of the hungry-faced, ill-paid, rapacious official, whose position demands the expenditure of 250 out of a 100 he gets in the shape of emoluments, and on whose recommendation depends the choice ! So the highest bidder becomes the purchaser, in whom very generally is discovered the worst hooligan of the place. Such a person who was all along regarded as

a terror by the meeker, law-abiding people, very naturally finds himself transformed into

A TYRANNICAL POWER

clothed with authority for official dictation of law, and his evil influence can better be imagined than described. The existence of protected gambling dens, stations for illicit sale of arrack (the rendezvous of the unemployed and the criminal,) incrimination of innocent people, suppression of evidence against the actual criminals, who in some cases happen to be the former select friends and associates of the local power—to mention only a few of the evils—are the result. Under such circumstances the welfare of the country with industrial progress for honest living stands at a discount.

The affluence of the men with a weakness for drinking and gambling finds a tide in the direction of the once insignificant *chandliya*, who perceptibly grows richer day by day and finds himself well recompensed within a few months for the initial purchase money of his power, and in a few years he is recognised as *one* of the richest—if not *the* richest—in the locality.

The class of headmen who attain to their positions by offerings and pecuniary sacrifices is extremely servile and devoid of self-respect. They will not hesitate to stoop to any mean action if that will satisfy the superior officer.

To give only one or two instances by way of illustration. A house is being built for a mudaliyar. I say for, because, though the mudaliyar is having it built on land acquired by him, all he has to do is to get the plan. His minor divisional officers are to supply the materials, beams by an aratchi, rafters by a vidana, windows by a police officer, doors by a velvidana, and so on; and he soon stands to get a house free of cost which would cost

one ordinarily a great deal more than Rs 20,000. The reader may think that the servile subordinates would be ruined in the attempt to secure these. Nothing of the sort. They annex the trees belonging to the villagers and even commandeer the services of carpenters, masons and other workmen in the village who are compelled to render *rajukari* (?) labour.*

PURCHASE OF RANKS.

A registrarship is vacant and the Government Agent will be at a loss to select the most capable man who can never depend on getting a nomination because the Mudaliyar stands between his duty and a sum of Rs 2,000. It will not be a surprise in the village to know that the latter secured the post to its owner.

The custom respecting these appointments is established to such an extent that prices have come to be fixed on minor appointments. If it could be ascertained what native appointments and ranks have ordinarily cost the successful candidates, the drain on the resources of the people which go to supply the luxury and serve the lust of gain of the higher officials—who ought to know better,—could be estimated by lakhs.†

* The *modus operandi* varies in different places and under different circumstances. The practice of offering $\text{₹} 200$, *dekum* or presents by villagers and petty headmen, (a harmless and unobjectionable practice as long as it was a sign of good-will and fealty to the superior officer.) has degenerated in later times and become a standing habit: when a President or Mudaliyar assumes duties or goes into occupation of a new house, such occasions become the means of re-imbursing a good portion of the personal expenses of these officials—the very reverse of what used to be the practice of the independent and sturdy Chieftain of old who helped the villager out of his ample means.

† The indebtedness of public servants leads to serious miscarriage of Justice and is often the result of lavishness, the first cousin of avarice and greed. The personal example of revenue officers of Government has a great influence over the headmen and the people and cannot but be of great concern to Government and the Empire. Interrogatories should be circulated with the view of obtaining the necessary information, and the policy and conduct of public servants might with advantage, as in India, be made the subject of official attention in view of the tremendous issues involved.

Instances and testimonies could easily be multiplied to shew how greedy officers on a nominal salary waxed rich on what they stole from their master and plundered from the people. The practice obtaining in the case of appraisement of land for land sales, or for purposes of security, or in testamentary suits, and of encroachment on Forest or Crown land, with the connivance of headmen, are too well known to need any detailed mention here.

These are open secrets known to almost every resident in the village. The headmen know them and would fain have them all taken *us confesses*. Like the germ of malaria, or the microbe of Asiatic cholera, or that more insidious and fell disease of tuberculosis, the evil of bribery with the connivance of headmen is *known* to exist, and, not unlike these and other ills to which the human subject is heir, grows and fattens by concealing and covering.

But is it possible to expose any such to the satisfaction of the authorities ?

IT IS ABSOLUTELY IMPOSSIBLE,—

because the very men who *volunteer*, and those who accept, the gratifications know that it is a transaction in which their mutual interests are at stake and when interrogated totally deny the existence of any grievance.

To expect such oracles to speak the truth always or give no uncertain clue to trace and remedy the evils is as reasonable as, and tantamount to, *Horagey ammajon penu ahanawa*, ಹಾಜರಾದ ಇವೆಲ್ಲವರೂ ತಿಳಿದು ಹೋದರು.

When a complaint is made to the nearest headman, in 99 cases out of 100 it is instantly communicated to the parties interested, and instead of punishing the evil-doer, he is enabled to escape punishment by either suppressing or

suspending the cause of complaint for the time, only to be repeated in a few days, or the evils will be found transferred to another locality. Could anything be conceived more detrimental to the interests of the public and subversive of all rudimentary principles of Government than that the officers who are commissioned to put down and prevent crime should be found in league with the very men whose interest it is to promote it, and having, as is well-known, a large stake in the ill-gotten gains and profits accruing from these questionable sources at the expense of the very life-blood of the country?

WHERE LIES THE BLAME ?

It is idle to inquire where the mischief lies or to try to trace its origin. The Government, which tolerates a system which is open to such scandal, the system which robs the self-respect and credit of common-sense of a community, and the community which tolerates and contributes to the continuance of these evils are all alike to blame ; and

THE PEOPLE OF AN ENLIGHTENED AGE

naturally look to Government to put an end to this system and initiate measures to effectively remove the barnacles of ages. These can never be removed in deep waters, and the only means lay in moving the vessels into dry-dock before any attempt at the cleansing process is made. The village being the smallest administrative unit of the Island, what affects the village must necessarily tell on the whole administration just as the strength of the chain depends on the weakest link. Devolution of authority, to whatever extent it may be carried, cannot totally exonerate the central Government from responsibility or render it immune from sharing the odium of unpopularity and mistrust which this institution, more than any other, has

unfortunately come to acquire by the fact of having men invested with irresponsible authority without adequate safeguards, and a more efficient system of control and direct responsibility than seems possible under the existing condition of affairs.

No amount of patching and white-washing will avail so long as the radical defect in the system is allowed to remain. Weeding, careful selection, and exercising adequate control over these officers, will go a great way to counteract these evils, but cannot at the best be anything more than

MERE TEMPORARY EXPEDIENTS.

What are these headmen (and I may couple with them two other classes closely allied and inseparably connected, viz.,—the Presidents of Village Tribunals and our Regular Police)—what are they but the accredited instruments of Government, without whom the whole machinery of Government must be inoperative and ineffectual. Under the old patriarchal village system which regulated the organisation of agriculture so highly developed in India, the unit was the village, with the king at the head of all, the chief Headman and Paramount hereditary Over-Lord. His ministers and the officers under them, while enjoying the prestige and authority of the Sovereign, in their own spheres, had besides endless resources at their back which helped them to keep up their status and dignity. They were the true Government Agents, the Elders, the Masters, the Registrars, the conservators of Forests, Revenue and Judicial officers, the social as well as the official Heads of the different divisions and sub-divisions of the community. The King's interests were theirs and *vice versa*, and Government officials were the servants as well as

the masters of the people. The result was mutual confidence and sympathy and loyal and reciprocal service; *rajakariya* රජකාරිය was a labour of love and not the forced service which it came to be later on ; and *chei hamuluruwane* ජයෙහි කැමැත්තෙන් (yes milord !) had a meaning totally different from that often conveyed by it to-day. To attempt to compare this with the state of things that has since come into existence and is seen even down to the present day would be as futile as it would be unreasonable. The relation of master and servant has changed and changed materially. The masses have become so servile and subservient and innured to oppression and petty tyranny that they offer no resistance. The rulers have not only neglected to take interest in acquiring a competent knowledge of the vernacular and the history of the people they have to govern and establishing intimate relations of friendship and bonds of sympathy with the ruled, but for a long time have discouraged and discountenanced them, with the result that enthusiasm has almost vanished. "The standard of truth and honesty is that of all races ground under heel for ages: deception is a weapon of weaklings and slaves. Perjury has become a fine art, because our legal system fosters the chicane which is innate in quick-witted peoples. The same man who lies unblushingly in an English Court will tell the truth to an assembly of caste-fellows, or to the *Panchayat* (a committee of five, which arbitrates in private disputes.)"

* Mr. F. H. Skrine, I. C. S., Editor, of the "Tales of Bengal" by Mr. S. B. Bannerjee. Justice Clarence bears the same testimony:—

"The people of Ceylon like those of India are difficult for Europeans to understand. Their character and traditional institutions are unlike ours and are fenced in with exclusiveness. Like other people they have their good as well as bad qualities. * * * They display a disposition to fraud, chicanery, and an unhappy persistence in using law-courts, civil and criminal, as a means of harassing and

With traditional subserviency to conventional authority, the poor, ignorant villagers subject themselves to this system of veiled tyranny and come to look upon it as a solemn duty to bring some offering to appease the powers, which, to the recipient may appear to be a voluntary offering, but to the poor, ill-fed half-starved villager (already burdened with debt and in the grip of the money-lender and the land-grabber,) to whom his half-acre or so of paddy or coconut or bit of chena land is his *all*—to him it is,

ANYTHING BUT A PAINLESS AND HARMLESS PROCESS.

But they prefer it to the alternative of being subject to endless worry and expense in dancing attendance at

oppressing each other with false proceeding. I am sorry to say that these faults which cause so much misery are largely fostered by defects in our legal system. One word more, Ceylon, beyond question, is a very valuable possession to England. Are they the better for our presence? * * * Have we done for them all we might and should have done? No doubt many material advantages are now enjoyed by the people, * * * Yet we have not sufficiently adapted our law, substantive as well as procedure, to the conditions of the native community. Three serious evils have grown up under our rule: *drink, gambling, and a disastrous passion for mischievous and fraudulent litigation.* The last of these is a part of Oriental proneness to untruth, but it has been largely fostered and encouraged by defects in our administration of Justice. Our law fails to effect justice: The Judiciary is pure and fearless but the machinery is defective and not sufficiently accessible to the people. Failures in the Civil Courts largely contribute to crime. We are accustomed to believe that the people lie under our rule in security from oppression and no doubt security is greater than, at all events, in the later years of the native government but a great deal of insecurity still subsists. Added to this it is not too much to say that under our rule a new horror has come into existence, armed with fangs derived from the very strength of our executive authority, and the weakness of the administration of justice. No native, however blameless be his life, is safe from the success of false and malicious accusation. There has been improvement from time to time. Much still remains to be done, and with a Government genuinely desirous to do the right, let us hope that further ameliorations will yet take place."

Justice L. B. Clarence.

courts and in multiform annoyances at the hands of petty officials and "the guardians of the law." During the respite thus obtained they lapse into a life of listless apathy and idle ease, neglecting evident duties, paying off old scores, and scheming and plotting against each other and against the offending headmen. False allegiance, feigned loyalty, with want, infamy, and a degrading servility are the legitimate offspring of this vicious and antiquated system. The villagers live and move and breathe in this corrupt atmosphere, helplessly imbibing these qualities and transmitting them to posterity. Perjury and prevarication and a litigious spirit find a good breeding ground in such soil. That this is no exaggerated picture of what is going on around us my countrymen must sadly admit, and it cannot but be true cause for regret and just ground for intervention on the part of Government.

The subject of revolutionising the system which must occur to every student of the question is one which Government should seriously consider and in which they should seek the assistance of a Commission of Enquiry who could advise *ways and means* for the inevitable drastic change which can no longer be withheld.

The subject is of sufficient importance to demand a commission, as suggested, and such a body should be the most competent to advise.

Till such measures are adopted, Government will not find it difficult to reorganise the system as a whole, beginning with the abolition of the much abused unpaid headmen system and in its place creating salaried posts proportionate to the respective duties. This will at once create a class of *public servants* who are remunerated for their services, and who will therefore make it their duty to discharge their obligations to the Government, and the public and not try to "lord it over" all their fellow villagers, as the present

headmen almost invariably do, immediately they get the official mandate. A system of paid men will create a healthy competition among eligible, self-respecting, educated men deserving of trust who naturally may not now come forward to be humiliated in being passed over in favour of a rival who outbids him by offers of financial gratifications which throw all other qualifications to discount. The alternative solution that would suggest itself would be the policing of all the present headmen divisions under the rural police system of Station Houses with the *personnel and prospects greatly improved* and under efficient supervision. This will not only facilitate the work of the regular police but will remove one of the greatest obstacles the police experience in rural duties. Any special levy on the villages necessitated by such a department will, instead of proving, as one might imagine, a burden, in the long run prove a form of subsidy—as the blackmail constantly levied by the headmen (referred to in a previous page) will disappear, and the people will begin to feel the freedom which a benign Government like the British Rule are supposed to confer on them, but which hitherto has been in the palm of the so-called *chief headmen* who have no genuine sympathy with the villagers, and whose interest it is to keep them in ignorance. Instead of protecting the weak against the strong they are often seen siding the strong against the weak, thereby intercepting the pure light of Love and Justice and Fairplay that emanate from the Throne and preventing the masses from ever realising that liberty which was theirs under the British Raj.

When Government had done their part of the duty it is for the people to do the rest and do justice to themselves ; for, depend upon it, no amount of Reform, no order of parliament or Rule of the Legislative Council could make us moral, honest, straightforward without our consent and co-operation, and against our wish. It is

of the highest importance that a healthy, educated public opinion should be created strong enough to condemn the malpractices now so common and so freely indulged in, without a word of protest, without the ban and with the tacit consent of Society at large. Let every effort be made to improve the environment of the men, and every chance given in all charity to the recalcitrant chiefs and headmen to improve and mend if they indeed care to be what all expect they should be—the real representatives and servants of the King and Government and therefore the true representatives and servants also of the people. In the meantime let us as becomes our duty render every help which we may legitimately be expected to render in their trying and arduous duties, and prove true to the sentiment of

LOYALTY TO THE SOVEREIGN POWER

even when it is vested in weak and unworthy hands.

What I have been feebly attempting to place before my readers is only the effect of a series of causes of a complex and complicated character acknowledged by the highest authorities among Administrators, Judges, Heads of Departments and Publicists who have had their attention drawn to the subject. To try to change the effects without removing the causes would be a fruitless task ending in disappointment and involving further loss and damage to the interests concerned. A more liberal, righteous, and generous policy in remunerating the services of the native officers must appear a *sine qua non* in any movement towards reform. If the *morale* of the lower officers is to be improved it must be by those at the top setting the example. The ill-results of favouritism, self-aggrandisement, and a weakness to accept eastern gold and sacrifice independence of thought and action have played a not-inappreciable part in making the average

native official what he is. These instances, though they may be rare in high places, are apt to be placed in strong relief and to influence the conduct of the subordinate officers. Where the Judge, or the Revenue Officer or Head of a Department is known to be strictly upright and proof against bribery and corruption, it is noteworthy how things go on satisfactorily and, how it is felt in the remotest parts of the district or village. Rowdyism, highhandedness, and fraudulent practices hide their faces and the law-abiding and industrious poor are free to pursue their honest and peaceful avocations. Such officers are remembered with gratitude in the districts and Departments long after they have left the scene of their labours.

We cannot but thankfully acknowledge a growing spirit of unselfishness, the high ideals, and the honest self-criticism and efforts at true reform, and a genuine wish to do the right and make amends for the mistakes of the past which characterise the present imperial policy of England and are beneficially affecting her dominions in the far East. Ceylon while forming the link between the West and East is yet more Indian than Western or European. Through nearly five centuries of foreign occupation she still claims to be pre-eminently the land of the Sinhalese, "**Sinhaladweepa**". It is in fact a colony of India and will be so in spite of all efforts to westernise it to the extinction of everything Indian and Oriental. Those who know India and Ceylon sufficiently must recognise in Ceylon,

AN INDIA IN EPITOME

minus sedition. If Ceylon is to rise to the pre-eminence which it once enjoyed it must be by being left to develop its own national ideal and recover her lost prestige among her own *kith and kin*, by getting rid of the excrescences and extravagances that have clung to her through ages of

oppression and tyranny under her rulers of a later corrupt age, and under the foreign methods and institutions which, however advantageous in their right place and in the right time, have had the effect of killing their military spirit and enthusiasm and native energy which enabled them to unite and co-operate in the giant works which made the Island once **the granary of India** and compelled neighbouring nations to respect her wealth, her arms, and her skill in useful arts and industry. To suit the policy of successive European nations who have exploited her by turns, foreign customs and Institutions have been engrafted on her, not altogether suited to her healthy development, and the result is they have dropped nearly everything that was good and manly and intended to elevate them as a nation, in their own native systems and earlier traditions, and aimed at merely aping and imitating the foreign article, often satisfying themselves with the outward veneer and form of civilisation without the reality and substance they thus entailed on themselves and on succeeding generations conditions which brought upon them all the evils of *inertia* and listless apathy, while so many of them play the part of hypocrites, sycophants and liars and give rein to their unbridled passions which have brought on them an unenviable notoriety in so many directions—complained of by friend and foe alike. Causes must generate effects and effects confirm causes. We have progressed in many ways in spite of counteracting causes and our progress would have been phenomenal had it been always in the plane of least resistance, from the known to the unknown, from the simple to the complex, and not, as so much of it clearly has been, the other way about. It is not too late to realise our position and move the car of progress back in order to get on the proper lines. In our anxiety to keep pace with the times we have allowed the village and the masses to be neglected. The development of the Arayan village is the true secret and

strength of a progressive administration and will for a long time remain the greatest problem for the Government; and the more attention, the more money, the more talent and the more energy spent in reclaiming the villages and re-peopling the waste lands of Ceylon, now a prey to malaria, the more reason will England have to be proud of this Island

“ Confess'd the brightest gem
In Britain's orient Diadem.”

Happily for us probity and a high sense of honour and duty have not quite disappeared from our midst, thanks to the priceless blessing of education and the influences of religion by which we are surrounded. There are those among the natives of Ceylon who can take rank with the best of their European brother officers. Given the opportunity and the environment, the native of Ceylon, (not excluding the headmen) can compete successfully in the responsible positions of trust and authority now generally held by the more privileged European compeer. It is hardly doing justice to the former, if he is as capable, hard-working, and deserving of trust, to be treated differently and be gauged by a different standard or measure of appreciation. He bears the heat and burden of the day and exposes himself often to greater trial and personal risk, and his work among his countrymen is after all what decides the strength and value of the whole administration, and therefore is entitled to at least the same consideration and respect.

REFORM NECESSARY.

It has not been the purpose of the author to refer to this subject with a view to setting forth an alarmist description of a crisis. Jeremiads are as cheap as they are useless. Anyone can gather statistics to prove anything, especially anything pessimistic; nor is it the author's purpose to make out that the times are evil and that *everything*

oppression and tyranny under her rulers of a later corrupt age, and under the foreign methods and institutions which, however advantageous in their right place and in the right time, have had the effect of killing their military spirit and enthusiasm and native energy which enabled them to unite and co-operate in the giant works which made the Island once **the granary of India** and compelled neighbouring nations to respect her wealth, her arms, and her skill in useful arts and industry. To suit the policy of successive European nations who have exploited her by turns, foreign customs and Institutions have been engrafted on her, not altogether suited to her healthy development, and the result is they have dropped nearly everything that was good and manly and intended to elevate them as a nation, in their own native systems and earlier traditions, and aimed at merely aping and imitating the foreign article, often satisfying themselves with the outward veneer and form of civilisation without the reality and substance they thus entailed on themselves and on succeeding generations conditions which brought upon them all the evils of *inertia* and listless apathy, while so many of them play the part of hypocrites, sycophants and liars and give rein to their unbridled passions which have brought on them an unenviable notoriety in so many directions—complained of by friend and foe alike. Causes must generate effects and effects confirm causes. We have progressed in many ways in spite of counteracting causes and our progress would have been phenomenal had it been always in the plane of least resistance, from the known to the unknown, from the simple to the complex, and not, as so much of it clearly has been, the other way about. It is not too late to realise our position and move the car of progress back in order to get on the proper lines. In our anxiety to keep pace with the times we have allowed the village and the masses to be neglected. The development of the Arayan village is the true secret and

strength of a progressive administration and will for a long time remain the greatest problem for the Government; and the more attention, the more money, the more talent and the more energy spent in reclaiming the villages and re-peopling the waste lands of Ceylon, now a prey to malaria, the more reason will England have to be proud of this Island

“ Confess'd the brightest gem
In Britain's orient Diadem.”

Happily for us probity and a high sense of honour and duty have not quite disappeared from our midst, thanks to the priceless blessing of education and the influences of religion by which we are surrounded. There are those among the natives of Ceylon who can take rank with the best of their European brother officers. Given the opportunity and the environment, the native of Ceylon, (not excluding the headmen) can compete successfully in the responsible positions of trust and authority now generally held by the more privileged European compeer. It is hardly doing justice to the former, if he is as capable, hard-working, and deserving of trust, to be treated differently and be gauged by a different standard or measure of appreciation. He bears the heat and burden of the day and exposes himself often to greater trial and personal risk, and his work among his countrymen is after all what decides the strength and value of the whole administration, and therefore is entitled to at least the same consideration and respect.

REFORM NECESSARY.

It has not been the purpose of the author to refer to this subject with a view to setting forth an alarmist description of a crisis. Jeremiads are as cheap as they are useless. Anyone can gather statistics to prove anything, especially anything pessimistic; nor is it the author's purpose to make out that the times are evil and that *everything*

is rotten in the State of Denmark. The author is fully aware of the difficulties in the way of the sincere reformer. It takes a wise physician to diagnose a disease and a wiser still to detect the more subtle maladies of a decadent and moribund system. I have only made a humble effort to draw attention to the necessity of reform and to locate the evil, and it is for others more competent to discover the real factors of solution and follow them up, and raise this question from the mere plane of a paper problem, which it has hitherto been, to a practical and happy solution in view of the grave issues involved.

PART II.

I.

EAST AND WEST.

MUTUAL INFLUENCE AND OBLIGATION.

We have given of our best to the West which they have returned to us a great deal improved and refined. While gratefully acknowledging what we owe to the West, we at the same time recognise in it something which we had long lost, and which the East is still capable of reproducing.

With the gold there may yet be the dross and the alloy which has to be put through the crucible, and the West may still find, if it will only persevere in the search, that the East is admirably qualified to supply what is wanting in the West and that the one is but the necessary complement of the other. Never was a sentiment uttered more misleading and capable of misconstruction than that conveyed in the hackneyed lines "East is east and west is west, and never the twain shall meet." That *Civilisation* not *Western* or *Eastern*, is the result of mutual contact of the West and the East is the teaching of history. Read in this light, oriental character will not be the enigma that it is to the generality of Europeans.

INSENSATE RUSH TO THE WEST.

We cannot all go, and it is not expected we should, to those popular centres of Western culture where, if one is

only so bent, one may profit by the rich stores of learning and knowledge, and all those invigorating influences that go to form true manliness and nobility of character. But alas! what have so many Indian students done but made a convenience of these institutions, and disappointed their own countrymen and those who had freely given them the hospitality of those great Halls and Sanctuaries of learning! What did they not do which they could have done to show their sincerity and disinterestedness, and how have the Indians repaid their debt of gratitude? Let not Oxford and Cambridge think that India does not know and Ceylon does not feel; both may yet prove, if proof were needed, that whatever else is, *ingratitude is not* the Eastern characteristic—a few cases to the contrary notwithstanding.

OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE.

Those of us who have never seen the Isis or the Cam, and cannot claim to be alumni of these or any of the other great English or Continental Universities, have yet had the privilege of coming in contact with their alumni, in School, in Commercial, Political, and Professional life, and we have learned to know and value them. It is their opinion, and the testimony and experience of others competent to judge, that while those who enter the Public Service through *these doors* have superior advantages, a high sense of Honour and Duty which qualifies them for such service is

NOT AN ACADEMICAL CULT,

but one that could be acquired within the four walls of any country-school or study.

Let us create the environment if we have not got it, and avail ourselves of those influences nearer home that go to inform the mind and cultivate the affections and make us

fit to be members of Society and to do our duty to God, our King, and our Country. This can be done without changing the clime. There is no better direction in which the locked-up wealth of India may be applied than in securing to India educational advantages of the highest order tending to improve the moral and material well-being of the masses, and developing its natural resources, thus bringing it into line with the other advanced countries in the world without forfeiting its title to remain *the Idolist in an age continually dragged down by the material*. It is, I humbly submit, to the interests of Britain and her subjects beyond the seas to strengthen and increase the efficiency of local institutions, to recognise local merit, local effort, local excellence, and make it less and less imperative for Indian and Colonial youth to go to distant lands to secure a pass-port for admission into the higher grades of the Public Service.

Ruling chiefs of India, and citizens of the Indian Empire and all whom God has blessed with wealth and opportunity ! It is your privilege, as it is the duty of all who are set over us, to admit the less favoured classes to a share of the blessings you enjoy, and to throw the doors of opportunity open *To Talent and Virtue*.

WE ALL OF US, YOUNG AND OLD, NEED AN IDEAL.

We are proud to be members of the British Empire but we cannot be Great Britain. Do what we may, we cannot make the ideal of one nation or country exactly fit that of another. We have all our individual *destiny* to work out, which we alone are best qualified to do, and it is at once England's duty and privilege to make us fit to take up our burden and thus discharge

A DEBT WE OWE TO OURSELVES AND TO ENGLAND.

Only let us have the courage of our convictions and go

on doing *right*, and we shall know the *Truth—and the Truth shall make us free.*

That and nothing less, I take it, is the goal to which our best efforts should be directed ; all other ground has proved all the world over to be but shifting sand.

God forbid that Britain should ever forget her high calling or allow any considerations not in accordance with what she knows to be the Divine will and the fundamental principles of equity to influence her in her policy at home, or in her dealings with the subject-races abroad.

II.

THE SITUATION IN INDIA.

“The heroic example of other days is in great part the source of the courage of each generation.”—*Helps*.

To return to my main theme. We have followed with painful interest the long catalogue of crime and atrocities that have darkened the page of Indian history during the last two or three years, and the black record is daily growing of wanton waste of precious lives—lives that India could ill-afford to lose—cut down while engaged in the act of discharging the highest duties to the country and the State. What could have produced a change in the attitude of students towards themselves and towards their betters in less than a decade is most painful to think.

Nobody is more sorry or grieved at the atrocious acts of inhumanity perpetrated by her sons than their fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, who deplore and lament the loss of those precious lives cut down in the act of discharging the highest services to the country and the State. Sons and daughters of India! show your execration of such senseless deeds and dissociate yourselves from those who have brought this disgrace and dishonour on your name and on your Country.

You have enough of charity left in you to see what you have done in shedding the blood of some of your best friends. If they have died to save you from yourselves and from those who have inveigled you into these crimes they would not have died in vain.

Let the blood of Sir William Curzon-Wylie, Dr. Lalcaea, Mr. Jackson, and Inspector Shams Ul Alum, C. I. D., and the blood of all the innocents that have been sacrificed for the last two or three years call you to give up this bootless warfare and return to your homes and begin to rebuild the places you have laid waste, and the *sanctuary* you have wantonly pulled down.

Indians have belied their best traditions. Not to go very far back, how far has India drifted from the India of Keshub Chunder Sen and Raja Rammohun Roy ! Have such names as Dr. Duff, Mr. Trevellyan, Drs. Wilson, Miller, Macdonald, Mackican, Whitehead, and Murdoch, Father Lafont, C. I. E., Principals Fyfe, Hector, Dyson, Morrison, Drs. Thorburn, K. M. Bannerjee, Rajendra Lal Mitter, Rash Behari Ghosh, Mr. R. C. Dutt, Mr. Bethune, Babu Dwarknath Tagore, Babu Kali Churn Bannerjee, Sir Salar Jung, Sir K. Sherhadri Ayar, Pandits Iswar Chandra Vidyasagara, Kesari Mohun Ganguli, Nanabhai Hari Das Gawrisanker, Ganesh Wasadeo Jhosi, Mr. Justice Ranade, and a thousand others that you can recall, ceased to speak to you? Did that band of educational Missionaries who have been hitherto your best friends suddenly prove inaccessible to you? Your trusted leaders, Mr. Justice Guru Das Bannerjee, Mr. Justice Telang, Mr. Justice Tybaji, Mr. Dadabhoj Naoroji, Maharaja Sir Jotindra Mohun Tagore, H. H. Sir Aga Khan, Kanwar Sir Harnam Singh, Sir Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy, Sir M. Bhowanagree, Sir Cowasjee Jehanjir, the Tatas, Sir Dinshaw Petit, D. E. Wacha, Sir Cowasjee Readymoney, Sir Ferosha Mehta, Sir Mangaldas Nathubhai, Sir William Wedderburn, Sir Balchandra Krishna, Raja Benoy Krishna, Amir Ali, Surendranath Bannerjee, K. G. Gupta, M. L. Ghosh, A. M. Bose, S. H. Bilgrami, G. K. Gokhale, Umesh Chandra Bannerjee, S. P. Singh, W. C. Bannerjee, S. R. Sayani, S. S. Bengallee, Bepin Chandra Pal, Pandit Madan Malaviya, Pandita Rama Bhai, Mrs. Sorabji,

Mrs. Annie Besant (to name only a few); your Ruling chiefs, your brave and gallant soldiers; —how would they have characterised your acts? and how have they been miscopied!

BLIND FOLLY OF THE STUDENT CLASS.

Have all these laboured in vain, and is the work of generations of good and great men, and women who have helped to make your name honoured and respected, to be undone by the action of a handful of misguided young fanatics and would-be reformers of this day?

Do you find anything in the lives of your great men which would have in the least justified the actions of some of the present generation of students? Have you thrown biography to the winds, and learnt to look upon yourselves as the best patterns and models for imitation? How have you read your sacred works, *your Shakespeare*, or any of your ordinary English or Indian classics?

With such guides as you have, are you content to live and die in this cult, and hand it down to posterity along with the traditions that have made India a name to be loved, and Indians, the people that they are to-day in the world? You must confess that you have had neither confidence in yourselves, nor in the Government of the land, and that you are all wiser and sadder men to-day.

EARNESTNESS MISDIRECTED.

I cannot help thinking you have displayed a zeal worthy of a better cause. Martyrs indeed, and more than conquerors, you shall be if you strike for true liberty. You have been known to be searchers after Truth. This is not the road likely to lead you to it. You have wished to be a free people, but, instead of freedom, you have

been led to a delusion which you now realise is mocking you like the mirage.

MORE LIBERTY, MORE RESPONSIBILITY.

A FALSE CONCEPTION OF LIBERTY.

The perfection of liberty is not the license to pull down conscience and set up in its place our animal nature and to hold whatever opinion one pleases. That will not be a commonwealth of reasonable human beings but something like a *menagerie of wild beasts* or worse, for even wild beasts are not devoid of natural love, and they discern their prey. The violent and seditious party will find this an abyss in which they can discover greater depths and bring out treasures new and old. Unfortunately for them they find themselves sooner or later brought to a stand-still in their career. The sword of justice which is suspended over them overtakes them suddenly, and that perhaps at the very moment they flatter themselves that they have attained the goal of their ambition.

They have poisoned the very springs of thought and action of young India, and have sown the seed which will yield a rich harvest of woe in time to come.

What, I ask, would the independence of India be worth at the expense of all that is best and dearest in the land? Indian fellow-students! prove yourselves reasonable and do not invite the fate that must fall on those who act otherwise, and show that your religious instincts, your education, your breeding, all point to

A BETTER GOAL.

Do not let your neighbours see that you are incapable of better things, and that this is going to be the highwater mark of your education and religion.

Resist this downward tendency of the age, that has led

to the degeneracy of Western nations and threatens to involve the East and West in one common wreck.

You are of the stuff that made your Rishis, your Lawgivers, your Priests, Poets and Reformers, your Warriors, your Kings and Statesmen, who extended your name and your fame to the farthest corners of the earth. Sons of sires that have made India Great in their day ! use other weapons, than those you have used, to achieve your salvation and the salvation of your country on lines marked out for you by all who have gone before, and by assimilating what is good in all who are around you.

Bring your circumstances to your aid and make the most of them. But don't expect more from them than they can give. Use them as landmarks of your progress, but they cannot of themselves maintain that progress. Prudence goes very far : but it is not everything. Our very transgressions, instead of leading us farther and farther away from the right path, should show us our weakness and point to the proper remedy. Prayer—effectual, sincere, intense, watchful prayer—would put you on the right track. You will find it an unfailing tower of strength in your trials, and sorrows. Try it, as you have never before done.

“One may conquer a thousand, thousand men in battle,
But he who conquers himself is the greatest victor.”

III.

THE CRISIS IN INDIA.

"GREAT EMPIRES AND LITTLE MINDS GO ILL TOGETHER."

The sole proof of commanding power is in the power repressed — *Browning*.

Stern daughter of the voice of God, O Duty! — *Wordsworth*.

"Many a young man," says Liddon, "would go bravely through fire who cannot stand ridicule, and ridicule is the greatest weapon by which a narrow and rude public implacably asserts, or tries to assert its Empire.

THEY SHALL GUIDE LIVING MEN WHO AT ALL COSTS ARE LOYAL TO
TRUTH
OR WHO DO THEIR DUTY UNDER CIRCUMSTANCES OF DISCOURAGEMENT."

England was no less on her trial than India. It was the hardest position in which England was called upon to act. On the one hand she had to put down sedition and anarchy, and on the other to protect the weak and do her duty by those who deserved well of her. The civilised world was looking on while this conflict was going on. Lord Morley rose to the occasion and, undeterred by crime, set to work to carry out the policy of reform. To quote his own words as wired by Reuter—"There was no choice but to persevere in the path of progress. The longer reforms were postponed the greater was the ultimate danger. We cannot," he said, "escape our own history. We cannot leave the course marked out by the conscience of Britain in dealing with an alien race. If we took our hands from the plough now, we would not only be exposed to the blind verdict of extremists and the lamentations of the moderates, but we should be disappointing the great mass of Anglo-Indian opinion." Lord Morley and his *alter-ego*, Lord Minto in India, brought England out of the position with honour and glory. The genius, tact, patience, and courage of these two statesmen who seemed to have been born for the occasion stand out as an example and inspiration to all in similar

positions and command the gratitude and admiration of all civilised states and of the countless millions of human souls entrusted to their care. By this action England once more disappointed her enemies, and once more proved her title to hold India and lead the destinies of that vast Empire.

It must have been a discovery to many to know that there was

AN INDIA WITHIN INDIA

that proved true to herself and the best traditions of the country, and showed by the stand they took for *law, order* and *good government* that the British administration of India was not the failure that its enemies would have us believe.

India was knocked down as a prize to the most commercial and enterprising nation on the face of the earth, and no nation has given a better account of its charge or put it to a more beneficent use than the English.

It is too late in the day to seek to alienate India from Great Britain. The foundations of a firm and stable Government have been laid deep in the soil, and the loyalty of the more manly and the intelligent masses was one of which any nation may be proud.

We have no respect for persons who have no respect for themselves, *be they who they may*; but let us not be found guilty of cowardly ingratitude to those who have deserved well of us.

The Anti-English propaganda at which a section of the Indians have been at work is a menace not only to India but to civilisation : while that other cry—*Anti-Indian* and

on doing *right*, and we shall know the *Truth—and the Truth shall make us free.*

That and nothing less, I take it, is the goal to which our best efforts should be directed; all other ground has proved all the world over to be but shifting sand.

God forbid that Britain should ever forget her high calling or allow any considerations not in accordance with what she knows to be the Divine will and the fundamental principles of equity to influence her in her policy at home, or in her dealings with the subject-races abroad.

II.

THE SITUATION IN INDIA.

“ The heroic example of other days is in great part the source of the courage of each generation.”—*Helps*.

To return to my main theme. We have followed with painful interest the long catalogue of crime and atrocities that have darkened the page of Indian history during the last two or three years, and the black record is daily growing of wanton waste of precious lives—lives that India could ill-afford to lose—cut down while engaged in the act of discharging the highest duties to the country and the State. What could have produced a change in the attitude of students towards themselves and towards their betters in less than a decade is most painful to think.

Nobody is more sorry or grieved at the atrocious acts of inhumanity perpetrated by her sons than their fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, who deplore and lament the loss of those precious lives cut down in the act of discharging the highest services to the country and the State. Sons and daughters of India! show your execration of such senseless deeds and dissociate yourselves from those who have brought this disgrace and dishonour on your name and on your Country.

You have enough of charity left in you to see what you have done in shedding the blood of some of your best friends. If they have died to save you from yourselves and from those who have inveigled you into these crimes they would not have died in vain.

Let the blood of Sir William Curzon-Wylie, Dr. Lalcaen, Mr. Jackson, and Inspector Shams Ul Alum, C. I. D., and the blood of all the innocents that have been sacrificed for the last two or three years call you to give up this bootless warfare and return to your homes and begin to rebuild the places you have laid waste, and the *sanctuary* you have wantonly pulled down.

Indians have belied their best traditions. Not to go very far back, how far has India drifted from the India of Keshub Chunder Sen and Raja Rammohun Roy ! Have such names as Dr. Duff, Mr. Trevelyan, Drs. Wilson, Miller, Macdonald, Mackican, Whitehead, and Murdoch, Father Lafont, C. I. E., Principals Fyfe, Hector, Dyson, Morrison, Drs. Thorburn, K. M. Bannerjee, Rajendra Lal Mitter, Rash Behari Ghosh, Mr. K. C. Dutt, Mr. Bethune, Babu Dwarknath Tagore, Babu Kali Churun Bannerjee, Sir Salar Jung, Sir K. Sherhadri Ayar, Pandits Iswar Chandra Vidyasagara, Kesari Mohun Ganguli, Nanabhai Hari Das Gawrisanker, Ganesh Wasadeo Jhosi, Mr. Justice Ranade, and a thousand others that you can recall, ceased to speak to you? Did that band of educational Missionaries who have been hitherto your best friends suddenly prove inaccessible to you? Your trusted leaders, Mr. Justice Guru Das Bannerjee, Mr. Justice Telang, Mr. Justice Tybaji, Mr. Dadabhoy Naoroji, Maharaja Sir Jotindra Mohun Tagore, H. H. Sir Aga Khan, Kanwar Sir Harnam Singh, Sir Jamssetjee Jeejeebhoy, Sir M. Bhowanagree, Sir Cowasjee Jehanjir, the Tatas, Sir Dinshaw Petit, D. E. Wacha, Sir Cowasjee Ready money, Sir Ferosha Mehta, Sir Mangaldas Nathubhai, Sir William Wedderburn, Sir Balchandra Krishna, Raja Benoy Krishna, Amir Ali, Surendranath Bannerjee, K. G. Gupta, M. L. Ghosh, A. M. Bose, S. H. Bilgrami, G. K. Gokhale, Umesh Chandra Bannerjee, S. P. Singh, W. C. Bannerjee, S. R. Sayani, S. S. Bengallee, Bepin Chandra Pal, Pandit Madan Malaviya, Pandita Rama Bhai, Mrs. Sorabji,

Mrs. Annie Besant (to name only a few); your Ruling chiefs, your brave and gallant soldiers; —how would they have characterised your acts? and how have they been miscopied!

BLIND FOLLY OF THE STUDENT CLASS.

Have all these laboured in vain, and is the work of generations of good and great men, and women who have helped to make your name honoured and respected, to be undone by the action of a handful of misguided young fanatics and would-be reformers of this day?

Do you find anything in the lives of your great men which would have in the least justified the actions of some of the present generation of students? Have you thrown biography to the winds, and learnt to look upon yourselves as the best patterns and models for imitation? How have you read your sacred works, *your Shakespeare*, or any of your ordinary English or Indian classics?

With such guides as you have, are you content to live and die in this cult, and hand it down to posterity along with the traditions that have made India a name to be loved, and Indians, the people that they are to-day in the world? You must confess that you have had neither confidence in yourselves, nor in the Government of the land, and that you are all wiser and sadder men to-day.

EARNESTNESS MISDIRECTED.

I cannot help thinking you have displayed a zeal worthy of a better cause. Martyrs indeed, and more than conquerors, you shall be if you strike for true liberty. You have been known to be searchers after Truth. This is not the road likely to lead you to it. You have wished to be a free people, but, instead of freedom, you have

been led to a delusion which you now realise is mocking you like the mirage.

MORE LIBERTY, MORE RESPONSIBILITY.

A FALSE CONCEPTION OF LIBERTY.

The perfection of liberty is not the license to pull down conscience and set up in its place our animal nature and to hold whatever opinion one pleases. That will not be a commonwealth of reasonable human beings but something like a *menagerie of wild beasts* or worse, for even wild beasts are not devoid of natural love, and they discern their prey. The violent and seditious party will find this an abyss in which they can discover greater depths and bring out treasures new and old. Unfortunately for them they find themselves sooner or later brought to a stand-still in their career. The sword of justice which is suspended over them overtakes them suddenly, and that perhaps at the very moment they flatter themselves that they have attained the goal of their ambition.

They have poisoned the very springs of thought and action of young India, and have sown the seed which will yield a rich harvest of woe in time to come.

What, I ask, would the independence of India be worth at the expense of all that is best and dearest in the land? Indian fellow-students! prove yourselves reasonable and do not invite the fate that must fall on those who act otherwise, and show that your religious instincts, your education, your breeding, all point to

A BETTER GOAL.

Do not let your neighbours see that you are incapable of better things, and that this is going to be the highwater mark of your education and religion.

Resist this downward tendency of the age, that has led

to the degeneracy of Western nations and threatens to involve the East and West in one common wreck.

You are of the stuff that made your Rishis, your Lawgivers, your Priests, Poets and Reformers, your Warriors, your Kings and Statesmen, who extended your name and your fame to the farthest corners of the earth. Sons of sires that have made India Great in their day ! use other weapons, than those you have used, to achieve your salvation and the salvation of your country on lines marked out for you by all who have gone before, and by assimilating what is good in all who are around you.

Bring your circumstances to your aid and make the most of them. But don't expect more from them than they can give. Use them as landmarks of your progress, but they cannot of themselves maintain that progress. Prudence goes very far : but it is not everything. Our very transgressions, instead of leading us farther and farther away from the right path, should show us our weakness and point to the proper remedy. Prayer—effectual, sincere, intense, watchful prayer—would put you on the right track. You will find it an unfailling tower of strength in your trials, and sorrows. Try it, as you have never before done.

“One may conquer a thousand, thousand men in battle,
But he who conquers himself is the greatest victor.”

III.

THE CRISIS IN INDIA.

"GREAT EMPIRES AND LITTLE MINDS GO ILL TOGETHER."

The sole proof of commanding power is in the power repressed.—*Browning.*

Stern daughter of the voice of God, O Duty!—*Wordsworth.*

"Many a young man," says Liddon, "would go bravely through fire who cannot stand ridicule, and ridicule is the greatest weapon by which a narrow and rude public implacably asserts, or tries to assert its Empire.

THEY SHALL GUIDE LIVING MEN WHO AT ALL TIMES ARE LOYAL TO
TRUTH
OR WHO DO THEIR DUTY UNDER CIRCUMSTANCES OF DISCOURAGEMENT."

England was no less on her trial than India. It was the hardest position in which England was called upon to act. On the one hand she had to put down sedition and anarchy, and on the other to protect the weak and do her duty by those who deserved well of her. The civilised world was looking on while this conflict was going on. Lord Morley rose to the occasion and, undeterred by crime, set to work to carry out the policy of reform. To quote his own words as wired by Reuter—"There was no choice but to persevere in the path of progress. The longer reforms were postponed the greater was the ultimate danger. We cannot," he said, "escape our own history. We cannot leave the course marked out by the conscience of Britain in dealing with an alien race. If we took our hands from the plough now, we would not only be exposed to the blind verdict of extremists and the lamentations of the moderates, but we should be disappointing the great mass of Anglo-Indian opinion." Lord Morley and his *alter-ego*, Lord Minto in India, brought England out of the position with honour and glory. The genius, tact, patience, and courage of these two statesmen who seemed to have been born for the occasion stand out as an example and inspiration to all in similar

positions and command the gratitude and admiration of all civilised states and of the countless millions of human souls entrusted to their care. By this action England once more disappointed her enemies, and once more proved her title to hold India and lead the destinies of that vast Empire.

It must have been a discovery to many to know that there was

AN INDIA WITHIN INDIA

that proved true to herself and the best traditions of the country, and showed by the stand they took for *law, order* and *good government* that the British administration of India was not the failure that its enemies would have us believe.

India was knocked down as a prize to the most commercial and enterprising nation on the face of the earth, and no nation has given a better account of its charge or put it to a more beneficent use than the English.

It is too late in the day to seek to alienate India from Great Britain. The foundations of a firm and stable Government have been laid deep in the soil, and the loyalty of the more manly and the intelligent masses was one of which any nation may be proud.

We have no respect for persons who have no respect for themselves, *be they who they may*; but let us not be found guilty of cowardly ingratitude to those who have deserved well of us.

The Anti-English propaganda at which a section of the Indians have been at work is a menace not only to India but to civilisation; while that other cry—*Anti-Indian* and

Anti-Asiatic—is one which no nation with any self-respect can ever seriously countenance.*

England—foster-mother of nations! which had so far led the destinies of India and united under one flag a people divided among themselves and a country torn asunder by internal discord, jealousies, and fanatic disturbances—is the callousness and ingratitude of a handful of her unnatural sons going to deter you from pursuing your benevolent mission!

MUTUAL SHORTCOMINGS.

Heaven knows there are wrongs on either side! Let us remember that while we have rights we have also mutual obligations. Let us not expect too much. Shortcomings there are, and always will be. With better knowledge and mutual sympathy, a better understanding is not an impossibility.†

The faults of individuals must not be laid at the door of a community or a Government. There will always be in every community a set of lawless, wreckless men with whom there can be no compromise. But let those who have deserved better at the hands of Government and the Rulers be not left behind in the evolution of the Empire. There can be no doubt that this is the best material to work with. An Indian knows his fellow and has an advantage over a foreigner in guiding and influencing the masses. Indians are a nation of Hero Worshipers. When they see one of their number with the capacity of being a leader placed in his proper position they will instinctively follow his leading. This has been

* Let us base our political aspirations on the basis of a common humanity. "Born for the universe let us not narrow our minds, and to party give up what was meant for mankind."

† "The doctrine of the *open door* hardly applies to the peopling of a colony—at least at the beginning of its existence."

the history of India ; the Hero need not always have been of their own race, or caste or creed: but it *was necessary* that he should invariably have been one who stood to them truly and really

IN LOCO PARENTIS.

Amidst the conflict of religions, races, tongues and interests, the evolution of a common purpose, a common ambition, a common national cause, a common destiny is going on, thanks to a liberal government and the effects of education and religion.

What is best in natures the most opposite and customs the most various is bound to meet and recognise their kinship and contribute to correct and reform each other.

The conflict that is going on in India and outside between the two great branches of the Indo-European family is an event to be looked forward to in the history of civilisation. Their contact should result in a mutual advantage and training, if they knew to value each other rightly. Instead of repulsion there should be mutual attraction. When they come to recognise their affinity, after long ages of separation, they will lay down their mutual jealousies and suspicions and take up a greater responsibility than

THE WHITE MAN'S BURDEN.

May the colonies and the countries wherever the Anglo-Saxon race predominates come to realise more and more the importance of such an issue, and co-operate with each other and with the mother country to carry out in the providence of God a mission of such deep interest to humanity.

The time is happily past that *might* was considered *right*. Such doctrines may serve to flatter individual pride or personal malice, but can never operate to secure any solid good. There is more in Truth, Honour, Justice and mutual confidence and sympathy than in all the contrivances of human ingenuity put together. If the sword *must* keep what the sword has won, these qualities will give edge to it and make it more effective, and should be placed in the forefront of the new chapter that has now been opened in Indian history.

It was left to the successor of Sir Edward Fraser to give the keynote of the future policy of Government in his appeal to civilians and all officers of Government to use *reconciliation* and *persuasion*, and begin to work *through* the people and their representatives, as they had attempted hitherto to work *for* them. This should go a great way to allay discontent and disarm opposition, as is already happily being witnessed in all parts of India.

Here is a call to every Englishman and every Indian to do his duty given by Sir Edward Baker on behalf of England. There are victories yet to be won on Indian soil, far excelling Trafalgar or Waterloo, Plassey or Guzerat, or Kandahar, which will affect the destinies not of one race or of one united Empire, but of the whole Civilised World.

- Those who have led the people to the verge of committing an act of national suicide should lead the van in helping the country to recover itself and to carry into effect the reforms already granted in the face of their opposition, and prove the true saviours of their country not by joining

its enemies but by putting their own house in order, which they know is dearer to them than the best constitution the world has yet seen.

It is a good augury in every way that amidst the conflict of party interests, and when the strife was at its fiercest at home, British statesmen were not wanting who could calmly and deliberately weigh the claims of the Indian Empire on its own merits and faithfully reflect the conscience of the British nation in their dealings with alien races, and condemn anything that was *not sympathetic straightforward, and just.*

Men of the most divergent views in other respects and of different schools of national politics are coming more and more to realise "*that Asiatics have rights and that Europeans have obligations; that a superior race is bound to observe the highest current morality of the time in all its dealings with the subject race.*" Repeated pledges have confirmed the Indians in their hopes and aspirations which England has done so much to foster by her innate love of freedom and fair-play. All honour to her sons who help her to carry out these pledges, while *firmly upholding order, quelling violence, and impartially administering justice.* Oh! it is excellent to have a giant's strength but it is tyrannous to use it as a giant, and practically disown at this stage

THE CHILD OF ITS OWN CREATION.

The greatest sympathy will be felt towards the handful of Europeans engaged in this stupendous task. They may now, for aught we know, be carrying their lives in their hands. Amidst much success that has attended their efforts they have yet to overcome mountains of social prejudice. But the English who have made conquests of

earth, air, fire and water, and their even more unconquerable selves, ought not to despair or be dismayed by the enormity of the task they have set upon themselves. They have yet to put their best foot forward in battling with prejudice and ignorance which are as deep-rooted as the everlasting hills, and *shake hands across the chasm that now divides them and Asatics, and meet the advance-guard of emancipated India half-way.* The East had given to the West the torch of light and learning which has made the West what it is and is now revolutionising the world, reconciling the East and West, till our "Kiplings" sing to a better strain than their favourite, "East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet." After all, the West *was* East and the East *is* West.*

The crisis has revealed at once the weakness and strength of the Empire, and the lessons which it has to teach will not be lightly thrown away by the people or by Government.

England has accomplished a great work so far, but the work is only partially done. The possibilities of the Empire are just beginning to dawn upon Englishmen and Indians. If they will only work shoulder to shoulder, they will soon see India occupying the position that we all hope it would occupy.

That scene in Overtoun Hall in Calcutta, where the Maharaja of Burdwan shielded and defended Sir Edward Fraser, the late Lieut.-Governor of Bengal, from the effects of the mad fanaticism of a fellow Indian.

* The fetish of an unchanging East exists only in the imagination of the *Pseudo Kiplings* whose wish is father to the thought. Happily for civilisation, this sect is fast becoming a vanishing factor in the counsels of nations.

was typical of the position of India at the time and should serve as a pledge to future generations of that inviolable friendship that should exist between the rulers and the ruled.

“The people of the earth are different in their dress and speech and manners but the same heart beats in every human breast.”—*Mathew Arnold.*

Oh! East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet
Till earth and sky stand presently at God's great judgment seat ;
But there is neither East nor West, Border nor Breed nor Birth,
When two strong men stand face to face ; tho' they come from the
ends of the earth !”

The Ballad of East & West.—Rudyard Kipling.

IV.

THE RULERS AND THE RULED: THEIR DUTY.

The wealth of Ormuz and of Ind has been proverbial, but let it not be forgotten by all who think of India that the Metropolis of the Empire, while it has been called

A CITY OF PALACES, IS ALSO A CITY OF HUTS.

This is true of India from one end to the other. The poverty of the country, the frequent epidemics and famines that cause such ravages, the destruction wrought by periodic floods, avalanches, cyclones, earthquakes and fanatic disturbances present a picture of India that would appeal to the best instincts of humanity, and the last thing that one would have the heart to suggest is to introduce the sword among these scourges. The suffering and destitution due to these and other causes have driven the people to the very verge of despair. This, I think, is half the trouble. The hoarded wealth of India could find no better outlet or be employed for better purpose than in stimulating and developing its native resources with a view to alleviate the condition of the needy, down-trodden millions of India. Its hidden and unexplored wealth and vast capabilities and energies yet wait for development and opportunity for action and enterprise. The most advanced and civilised nations of old have exploited her by turns and have been enriched by her learning and wisdom as well as by her commerce, and to this day she continues to supply the markets of the world, while she has always been and is a liberal and

generous customer to them, and expects all whom she has served so well to do their duty by her.

The task of governing a country and a people like India and the Indians is at once the hardest and the noblest that could be set before any nation and one which might baffle the mightiest power or nation on earth. A greater trust could not be conceived, and

STAGGER HUMANITY IT WELL MAY

if the Powers do not rise to their opportunities and a sense of their responsibilities, and rightly discharge that trust as *becomes a great race and a Christian nation.*

India has been called

THE BRIGHTEST GEM ON THE DIADEM OF
GREAT BRITAIN.

So it is, and so might it always be, and for far other and *weightier and nobler reasons* than the material and the money value it bears to the owners. The tried virtues of those true sons of India, the vast influence for good they exercise within their domains, the help rendered in various ways to relieve suffering and raise the condition of the poorer classes, the loyalty and attachment to the Sovereign and his representatives on all conspicuous occasions, their readiness to lay down their lives to maintain order at home and fight the enemies of England abroad, the noble examples of sacrifice and self-help they have presented to the world, the services rendered to the cause of science, Religion, philosophy, literature and art—these form its true value and give lustre to the gem.

Do not look upon India as existing merely for you, but

you are only a unit for India. Our common Master has set the example which has never yet been excelled. "If," says he, "I your master have washed your feet, you ought also to wash one another's feet."

Let the ruling body remember that they have a Master in Heaven to whom they have to give an account individually and collectively; that the alien races are certainly *their equals* as men; possibly, in the kingdom of their Redeemer, *Superiors*. Let them show that broad sympathy and personal interest that puts them in fellowship with the masses and makes their action popular. What is hard for flesh and blood becomes easy and second nature, when you give yourselves away to the impulses of your better selves. Let them only put their foot into it, and they will find that—so far from compromising their position in the land,—they will strengthen it. They will carry away true impressions of the people and will have the satisfaction when the time comes to say good-bye that the people among whom they have sojourned are the better and happier for it. The stronger race will be involuntarily served and copied by the other, and the good-breeding and superiority of the one will readily fraternise with those of the other.

In the meantime let us see for our part that our treatment of our guests is what we would expect if our circumstances were reversed. Let our hospitality be worthy of an oriental people and let us show them all the sympathy, consideration, and respect which their position calls from us.

We have been doing injustice to each other in many respects of which in our saner moments we cannot but

feel ashamed. Let our conduct in the future make amends for the past, for that alone will be the true test of the reality of our regrets and apologies.

Let me sincerely hope that Government and the people will treat them as their worst enemies who set up class against class, one section of the people against another, one caste, or tribe, or creed, against another. It is now come to be recognised among all civilised communities and Governments that to **DIVIDE AND RULE** is not only unchristian and inhuman but will defeat the very ends—always selfish—which it is proposed to serve. While enriching and bettering ourselves, as we well may, let us have some consideration for the claims of our neighbour, and thus help to bring about amity and harmonious relations among all classes. No half-hearted measures will avail; no palliation, no shuffling, no laying the blame on others will be of any use. We have had enough of this to make us all feel humiliated and abased. There need be no longer any friction, Indian, Ceylonese, and European fellow subjects, and there is nothing to impede that good understanding and closer friendship, among all classes of the communities which it must be the wish of every one to see.

I think a serious effort should be made to avoid that friction which has so often risen between the officers of Government and the people, and to bridge the gulf that now exists between the rulers and the ruled. It is not desirable and it is not necessary that there should always be unity of action or opinion. We cannot all think and act alike. It will be a sad day for India (with its heterogeneous mass of peoples and races and creeds hostile to each other, and living side by side

within that vast territory called India) to merge its individuality in the common mass to secure a mere outward union and show of strength. We do not always want to see eye to eye with Government. What is wanted is a little unselfishness on the part of all concerned, and some respect and consideration for each other's position. If we suspect and hate each other it is because there has not been that sympathy which ought to have existed. An imperfect and superficial knowledge of things seems to me to be at the bottom of all the mischief. It argues either a disinclination or inability to dive deep down and discover the true nature of things. If we analyse Indian character to the bottom, we will not be long before discovering that

FAITH IN THE INDIAN AND LOVE TO THE INDIAN

is the key to their hearts, and a personal interest in the man as equal subjects and fellow-men will meet with ample recompense. But our rulers have not the inclination, or the time to go down to such depths. They are content to look through the *eyes* and *ears* of others in most cases prejudiced and biassed.* At the best they can only get second-hand information, though on the spot, a one-sided picture and that generally the one which falls in with the known wishes of the superiors. How many of them have ever been at the pains to learn our mother-tongue, which is the life-blood of the nation, as it is the highest and truest expression of our national thought and aspirations? How

* If there is one thing more imperatively required than another at this stage of our progress, it is to ensure that the means of information at the disposal of Government should be unprejudiced and truly representative of the enlightened native public opinion, not only of the small section of the so-called *educated classes*, but of the intelligent masses both in towns and villages.

can we ever hope to understand each other when we live and move in two different spheres and our circles seldom, if ever, so much as cross each other? To understand us at our best let them occasionally move out of their spheres and club lives and come to our level, when they have the opportunity. Legislation and skilful combinations have effected much, but they will not help to get to the heart of the nation. "It is personal contact of man with man carrying with him wherever he goes the dignity and spirit of his race that has accomplished, and will accomplish, anything that is permanent and worth accomplishing."*

HOW THE RULERS CAN HELP TO A BETTER
UNDERSTANDING.

India never aspires to a republican form of Government. Monarchical principles have been ingrained in us. It is our pride and privilege, and no one can contradict that we feel and express sentiments of loyalty and love to the Sovereign and his representatives—a feeling so inseparable from the Oriental mind.

Let Britain and her rulers only prove true to their trust and they will find the Indian races they are called upon to govern

* A frank, genial, straightforward administrator, free of all official prejudice or predilection for outward ("caste") show, recognising merit whenever it is to be found, and good work for the benefit of the body-politic, no matter by whom promoted, has nowhere a more encouraging, or fruitful field to work in than Ceylon. * * * It may not be known to people in England interested in our tropical dependencies, how much evil cliques--official and otherwise--promoted to some extent by "Club" life, are working, and are likely still further to work, in India and Ceylon.—*Ferguson's Ceylon*, p. 36.

AS PLIANT AS CLAY IN THE HANDS OF THE POTTER.

The sceptre has passed, in God's providence, to our present Sovereign, King George the Fifth, the heir of the Crown and qualities of his gracious Father who has done more than any other to knit the Royal Families and Crowned Heads of Europe and the rest of the civilized world in one bond of peace and mutual understanding. May the representatives of this race, its satraps and envoys whom we receive in the name of the King, truly reflect the pure light that emanates from the Throne, and not intercept them in any way to the prejudice of themselves and the cause of Britain and the world-wide Empire which she embraces.

He that wrongs his friend
Wrongs himself more, and ever hears about
A silent Court of Justice in his breast,
Himself the judge and jury, and himself
The prisoner at the bar, ever condemned.

—Tennyson.

Speaking of our new King-Emperor George V. and the vast possibilities of a beneficent rule over the Indian Empire, I cannot do better than quote the following passage from the *Indian World* :—

“If His Majesty will faithfully abide by the spirit of the Imperial Proclamation of his august father, and of Victoria the Good, and if the well-being of India must ever remain the inspiration of his rule, there can be no doubt that his reign will outshine even the dreams of an Asoka or an Akbar.”

V.

THE AWAKENED EAST.

Let no one despise the awakening that has already begun in the East. It is perhaps well to have our eyes and ears open, and, while appropriating all that is best in others, rise to a manhood which other nations have reached before us, and work out our own regeneration from within.

It will perhaps be found best that we have had differences. It is better to differ where we cannot truly agree. More good will come from firm and steady adherence to one's real convictions than from easy conformity to circumstances and surroundings. Let us not seek or strive after a union which is not based on self-respect. A more than common sacrifice of individual will, time, and liberty, is what is needed to resist the tyranny of customs, prejudice, and racial feeling.

The mist is clearing up before the rising sun which will rise and set, but will rise one day to set no more. In spite of much that is wanting in us the heart of the people, when put to the test, has been found to be sound and true, and will yet prove that the nation can know their friends from their enemies, and are capable of recognizing their benefactors and brother-men.

It is not given to everyone to master the vernacular of a foreign nation. But there is a language intelligible to all which the highest and the lowest may master, viz. —

THE LANGUAGE OF LOVE.

The new-born nation must feel that their strength is in the weakest link. It is to their interest to cooperate with those who have so far led their destinies, to resist every attempt to undo the good that has been

done and to help forward the reforms that have already been inaugurated, and initiate others tending to lead to an early realisation of their just and legitimate wishes. At the threshold of such an important crisis the Government cannot be too careful to avoid the mistakes they may have made in the past, and ensure more permanent security in the future. Rome was not built in a day, and the empire which Britain has founded in the East must wait its day.

IN BLACK AND WHITE.

I have made a feeble effort to picture India and Ceylon at their best and at their worst. If in doing so I have unconsciously overdrawn the picture, or set down anything to their account not strictly justifiable in the peculiar circumstances of their situations, or said anything calculated to give offence, my sincere wish to see my countrymen and Indians *do justice to themselves and that justice is done to them* will be my ample apology.

A PURPOSE.—THE CONCLUSION.

If anything I have said should lead to an honest investigation of the real condition of things as they stand with us here and in India and tend to secure a happier and better understanding among all classes, and make them cooperate more heartily with each other and with Government in bringing about individual and communal well-being, and prepare in earnest for the inevitable future, the object of the author will be well attained.

With these aims and objects in my mind, and wishing a time of peace and contentment to all my fellowmen generally of India and Ceylon, let me conclude:—

We yearn for freedom, the birth-right of every human being, not that freedom which has as its motto "*non serviam*," but the freedom that children enjoy under

the loving authority of the head of the family ; and we want to be as free and prosperous under British Rule and under the British Sovereign as we have ever been under the best of our Kings of a past day. We are feeling our way to it, and will any true Briton, at this time of day, refuse or grudge to his Eastern fellow-subject the privilege of breathing that atmosphere of freedom which has helped him to emerge from a state of semi-barbarism to be the proudest and foremost nation in the rank of civilization ?

What if we, with the history of the British and other nations before us to serve as guide and warning, carve out our own fortunes and become a bulwark of the Empire and guard it as far as we may from its enemies at home and abroad and from any possibility of succumbing to the influences of materialism and self-centeredness and forgetfulness of God which has led to the downfall of nations and Empires ! Does not England stand to gain and acquire additional strength and stability by such propagation ?

God Grant it may be so, and that its statesmen and envoys ever remember their duty to the Colonies, as much as the colonies their duty to the

MOTHER.

We are happily living in an age when some of the greatest and broadest principles of religion are receiving prominent illustration and are acknowledged by our Rulers among the mightiest Powers now on the face of the earth. May it fall to the lot of England, as it has fallen to the lot of America, to carry out in practice the second great commandment which constitutes an integral portion of the dual duty of man :

LOVE YOUR NEIGHBOUR AS YOURSELF.

GOD SAVE THE KING !

INDIA IN 1897

BEHRAMJI M. MALABARI

A. J. COMBRIDGE & CO.

ESPLANADE ROAD, BOMBAY

31 NEWGATE STREET, LONDON

1898

Price One Shilling

INDIA IN 1897

BEHRAMJI M. MALABARI

A. J. COMBRIDGE & CO.

ESPLANADE ROAD, BOMBAY

31 NEWGATE STREET, LONDON

1898

INDIA IN 1897

THE New Year opens with a renewed lease of life for this writer. What worthier thanks-offering could he attempt than once more to draw nearer to each other the two countries that engage his affection so deeply? For India, 1897 has been a year of calamities. Famine, plague, earthquake, flood—offended Nature seems to have avenged herself, on the people and the rulers alike, with these and other afflictions. And, as if these strokes of Nature's vengeance were not heavy enough to chasten the decrepit penitent, India has had to face misfortunes brought on by man—by her rulers no less than by her own children. The large punitive expedition, at work for months outside the North-West frontier of the country, and the quasi-political troubles, with punitive and repressive measures following, that agitated her interior during the year, have added not a little to the misery of the situation. With all these disasters taken together, the country has been thrown back, in some respects, by fifty years. Such is the opinion of one who seldom yields to panic; who, though often cast down, may never despair. Will England be ashamed of receiving honest advice from such a friend, or India of listening to his filial appeal?

Let us deal with famine first, as the first and most widespread of the calamities, and the one we have, apparently for the moment, seen an end of. Starting with the Central Provinces and the North-Western Pro-

INDIA IN 1897

vinces (where it raged at its worst), this grim spectre stalked aside towards Central India, up across the outskirts of Bengal, down over several parts of Bombay, stretching its clammy fingers southward on the borders of the Madras Presidency. Over one only of these stricken provinces, the North-West, as many as three millions of the population were for a time declared officially to have been in the grip of Famine. Both here and in some of the adjoining Native States of Central India, as also in the British Central Provinces (once the granary of the Empire), this dismal situation took three years to develop itself. In other words, there had been more or less keen and widespread suffering from hunger over these parts during the previous three years. In 1897 the character of the disease could no longer be mistaken. The Viceroy, honest and upright, but lacking, it seems, in quickness of perception where the misery of millions is to be taken in at a glance, held out for weeks, maintaining that there was little cause for anxiety and less for a prompt appeal to the liberality of England. It has been a standing complaint against the English rulers of India, that they are ~~generally too slow to move, too unwilling to believe~~ what they do not wish to believe. Who can tell but that the very slowness (which rival nations call by a stronger name) may be a virtue, a talent for the gradual development of the East? If so, let no Englishman hide his talent under the official napkin. As to good Lord Elgin, with his singular notions of the 'Mandate' theory of government, he is too hard to be followed by a non-official vagabond owing no allegiance to a superior will at the distance of six thousand miles, or to expert guidance near at hand. But if the present writer cannot understand this side of Lord Elgin's administration, he is fully able to appreciate other phases of that much maligned career. For instance, as soon as the Viceroy was convinced that distress in the famine-stricken parts was beyond their own resources, or even the resources of the neighbouring

districts of the Empire, he gratefully accepted the offers of aid from England and other countries. The magnificent sum contributed by Great Britain throws into relief that identity of interests between the two nations, which has been established by Providence. It is to Lord Elgin, also, that Sir A. MacDonnell owes the support of his strenuous efforts to save life in the North-West Provinces. The ruler of these Provinces had determined to save life at any cost. And in the Viceroy he found a veritable tower of strength, in spite of the protests of a harassed and impecunious Finance Minister. The other provincial rulers had similar backing from the Viceroy, so far as his personal influence could go. No words could adequately describe the efforts made by the officials, European and native, to keep alive the perishing millions of India. Some of the worthiest members of the Civil Service died in the performance of this sacred duty, or have been permanently disabled; many more have undergone serious inconveniences of life. Admirable was their work throughout: a work which could be done only by Englishmen and under English inspiration. Next to the officials, we must not forget to mention here the missionaries, European and native, Christian and non-Christian, all working under a bond of brotherhood.

But here we are confronted with two suggestive side issues. Was it a *famine* that the British Government in India were engaged in combating last year? What is a *famine*? Ordinarily, the word means want of food stuff. If this is the correct meaning, it may be safely assumed that the British Government have made such a calamity almost impossible in India. What with railways and other means of communication by sea and land, the want of food in one district could be supplied by another without much trouble or loss of time. Burmah, for instance, could easily come to the aid of Bengal, Madras to that of Bombay, Punjab to the North-West Provinces, and so on. Each would pour its surplus of food stuff into the starving districts, and be

probably the richer for it. Even supposing the whole of the country suffered from failure of the year's crop (which scarcely ever happens), what is to prevent China, Japan, Europe and America from shipping for India their grain and other necessaries in time? Of course, India would have to pay for these imports. The question is, is she always able to do this? Were the population of the famine-stricken provinces last year, for example, sufficiently well off to purchase the grain ready to be exported by other provinces or countries? Let this question be settled once for all. Does India suffer periodically from famine, that is the *absence of food stuff*, or from the *want of means of buying the food*? That may well stand as our first question here. The second question, arising naturally out of the first, is—Have the British Government in India done the whole of their duty by attempting to 'save life'? May not this saving of life, under the conditions referred to, be almost tantamount to prolonging human misery? Far be it from a friend of the Administration to suggest that the famine-stricken masses should be left to die rather than be kept alive on one makeshift of a meal a day, or than earn their miserable famine rations, in order to keep body and soul together, by breaking stone under the fierce heat of May or in the biting cold of November—without regard to age, sex, and social position. But if this be the means and end alike of saving life, well may the victims of the policy cry out, 'Save us from our saviours.' The fact is, in India, with its shifting *personnel* of the Administration, there has been a tendency of late years to deal with the surface of economic evils, ignoring the centre and the root thereof. The question has been raised time after time—'Is the country growing poorer under the British rule?' That question has never been met in a fair, comprehensive spirit. Judging by appearances, one may almost say that India has grown both richer and poorer during the century. The condition of the masses in the interior, broadly speaking, seems to have deteriorated. There is less food for them

in many a remote corner of the country, and perhaps a more keen sense of this growing deficiency. A variety of taxes, cesses, assessments, and what not, more vexatious in their incidence than a foreigner could easily imagine, has led to sullen discontent over the land, especially in the rural areas. An eminent authority admitted, nearly twenty years ago, that forty millions of the people of India had to live, from year's end to year's end, on *one* scanty meal a day. Are the critics of Government wrong, to-day, in persisting with their cry of poverty on the increase, and placing the number of the half-starved population at eighty millions instead of forty? We here can afford to take a dispassionate view of the position, and say that while the masses have undergone certain deterioration on the whole, the classes have probably improved their material condition. At any rate, new classes have sprung up, to fill the professions of law, medicine, art, &c., to carry on extensive business with foreign countries, and thus ^{the} better to enjoy the comforts of modern life, under a Government affording the first essentials of civilization, security of person and property. Even as to the condition of the rural masses at large, it would be unjust to hold Government alone responsible for it. Climate, customs, habits, to say nothing of an occasional freak of Nature, have a good deal to answer for. When a pauper population, for example, marry in haste and propagate without forethought, expecting their grand-motherly Government to provide for them and their progeny, they must be prepared for disappointment. But when these and similar causes have been taken into account, the chief contention, as to the drain of India's resources to countries from which they may never return, remains unshaken. It is this exhausting drain—carrying off the life-blood of the nation in the shape of pay, pension, annuity, purchase money, profits of enormous business, and interest on still more gigantic loans—that has naturally riveted the attention of far-seeing critica-

And terrible as this drain is in its material results, it is even more terrible in its moral consequences. It cripples the nation in almost every sphere of activity. Here we must again avoid yielding to the call of declamation. We admit, as we have often done before, that this depletion of India's wealth seems to be more or less inevitable in the political condition of the country. But the very fact of the depletion being inevitable calls aloud for earnest and many-sided efforts to ameliorate the lot of the people, no more in their interests than in those of the rulers themselves. Is it not a grievous economic fallacy, that India, the poorest country in the civilized world, should be administered on a scale of remuneration, too high even for the richest country? This is a question for Parliament to decide, irrespectively of party bias. It concerns the nation, that is the British tax-payers, as intimately as it concerns their fellow-subjects in India. If, instead of making pyramidal promises from time to time—promises starting on a broad base, but narrowing almost to *nil* as they near performance—Parliament would but order a careful and thorough-going inquiry into the condition of the masses, it would render them a greater service than by combating ten so-called famines, or influencing the grant to them of twenty imperial subsidies. Let the British nation make up their mind to banish famine for ever from India: that would be truer charity, by far, than allowing the masses to live for two and three years next door to starvation, and then to perish by tens and hundreds of thousands before even partial relief could reach them. Let them ascertain roughly the amount of the annual withdrawals from India, from all sources; let them also ascertain the number of Europeans and natives employed to carry on the higher administration, and the amount of salaries and pensions paid to them respectively. Let them further find out the number of land assessments enhanced during the last fifty years, and the number of these assessments reduced in favour of the ryots. In short,

let them call for an authoritative report on the condition of the people of India, and in the light of the information thus obtained, ask the Government to devise the necessary means for improvement, such as a simpler and more attractive system of emigration, and of technical instruction; the development of industries, manufactures, &c. Wealthy Indians will find it to their own interest to join, if once they see that Government are in earnest.

We may now glance at the ravages of the plague in Bombay, which decimated its population in the outlying parts, dislocated trade and business, paralyzed public spirit for a time, and which has permanently retarded the progress of the most enterprising of the Indian communities. Here, too, the work done by Government, from Lord Sandhurst down, was beyond praise. At a time when many of the leaders of society appeared demoralized by sudden panic, when everyone for the time thought of his own safety in flight or concealment, when civic obligations were neglected and the ties of kinship sundered, the British authorities at Bombay set an example in courageous devotion to duty, the value of which could hardly be over-estimated. This example was followed by not a few of their countrymen, official and non-official, and by some of their noble countrywomen. And though slow to be followed by the native leaders, the example was certainly not lost upon them. Thanks to the education provided by Lord Ripon's scheme of self-government, they soon began to realize their civic obligation. Recovering from their panic, the citizens of Bombay rallied round their worthy Governor, offering their resources of time, skill, and influence. A great deal has been said of the unseemly stampede that followed the outbreak of the plague. But it is forgotten that the outbreak took the citizens by surprise, that they were not familiar with a disease so terrible in its rapidity, and that up till then they had been taught to expect the Government to protect them from such unexpected visitations. But for the training Bombay had

received in municipal self-government, the results would have been more disastrous to the city, more embarrassing for the authorities, and much more humiliating to the public spirit of its leaders. The efforts made to grapple with the growing epidemic could not, as we have said, be praised too highly. But the victims claimed by it were none the less numerous on that account. The towns of Bombay and Poona were, one after the other, practically deserted, and some of the suburbs almost devastated. If the famine was more widespread in its extent, the pestilence was decidedly more destructive. And if the famine had its lessons to teach, the plague also was not without them, for those willing to profit by such painful experience. Chief among these may be mentioned the lesson, that though Nature is usually patient and forbearing, when once roused she will avenge herself mercilessly. The neglect of sanitary laws, observable for years in the native quarters of Bombay and Poona, the accumulation of filth, the collection and percolation of unconserved water—these had been evils of almost daily observation. So, also, had been the remissness, the *cliquism*, the ignorance of some of the civic bodies, on the one hand, and, on the other, the over-zeal of the officials to transplant the sanitary appliances of the West bodily to the slow-moving East, regardless of the differences of climate, habits, usages, and ideals. If India moves slowly in this matter, it would be well to remember that in civilized Europe itself, sanitation, with personal hygiene, is a very modern science. Let the reader look up the accounts of life spent at the English Court a hundred years ago, or by French Royalty at Versailles.

Besides the lessons taught by the plague, which the authorities seem now, under pressure of a reaction, to be perhaps too eager to enforce, it also led to a discovery that has somehow been overlooked. And that is, that the plague, at its start anyway, was more or less a disease of the poor, due to chronic poverty, habitual underfeeding, insanitary surroundings, and want of physical stamina.

A number of victims were seen by this writer at the outset of the attack: he found that few of them could resist the violence of the disease long enough to allow of medical aid having effect, or even being administered. As in the famine districts, so in the quarters attacked by the plague, men and women were seen tottering, with outstretched arms and a gurgle in the throat. Such sights fairly justify the questions, whether the well-to-do classes in India are feeding upon the vitals of their wretched countrymen, and whether the State itself leaves a sufficient margin for their daily maintenance, after the rates, taxes, assessments, and other claims have been satisfied. It is a point worth noticing here, that under the worst of native rulers the wealth of the country remained generally *in* the country—if taken away from its owners by caprice, it was also usually restored to the people by the same caprice.

Though scarcely within the scope proper of this paper, it becomes necessary now to refer to the events of the last few months, that have so disturbed the peace of Poona and round about. It is not quite clear if these events deserve to have so much political importance attached to them. The highest tribunals in India and England, however, have tacitly given them this character. It is not for a layman, therefore, to quarrel with the legal aspect of the matter. The law has reached those who defied it, justice has been vindicated, official susceptibilities have been soothed. All this makes it the easier for us, then, to put in a word here for that *bête noire* of British opinion, and the implacable opponent of all-round progress, the Editor of the *Mahratta* and the *Kesari*. Many have been the efforts made to bring this eccentric meteor in a line with the steadier lights of our political constellation. But the public of Bombay have, at any rate, seen little in Mr. Tilak's acts and utterances to draw them to him as a leader, much less as a guide. His movement to revive the memory of Shivaji, though deserving of sympathy from every generous heart so far as it aims at the unity

of the Dekkan, is historically an anachronism. Shivaji could no more rise again in India than could Bruce or Wallace rise once more to upset the balance of the British Union. Even if the founder of the Mahratta dynasty were to come back for a time to the scenes of his past glory, it is not unreasonable to assume that he would be content with the *subhedarship* of the Dekkan, with perhaps a seat on the Governor of Bombay's Council or in the Supreme Legislature. Shivaji Maharajah was a much shrewder politician than some of his admiring co-religionists of the present time appear to think. Devoted, but deficient in historical perspective, these latter forget that man is a creature of circumstances; that in this particular instance there is hardly one circumstance to justify a political revival, even with a mighty name to conjure with. In its most attractive features, the Shivaji tradition has now become localized: enlarge it for political purposes, and it will at once assume a sinister aspect for more than three-fourths of the Indian community.

Mr. Tilak's other movement, the *Ganpati Meld*, (an annual demonstration in honour of the elephant-headed god), cuts away the very root of political unity, setting the lower orders of the Hindu population against the Mahomedan, between whom previously reigned an almost complete harmony of tastes and pursuits on public holidays. What folly, this, to be foisted on poor old Ganpati, the god of wisdom! The fact is, a vast amount of harm has been done in India by the misreading of history, and by the construing of false analogies. Macaulay and Mill, Bentham and Buckle, and many others have often been misread by Indians, and their teachings as often misapplied. Even when read aright, the reading is sometimes applied wholesale to a state of society radically different from that to which the writers originally referred. It is not difficult to imagine the result on the minds of teachers and students alike, of history and political economy. Poor Macaulay, for one, could hardly have foreseen, when carrying his

measures for the liberation of the Indian mind, the rise of a mongrel breed of law-mongers and make-bates, poisoning the moral and social life of the masses, teaching perjury and forgery to a race whose innocence was once the only handle for ridicule wielded against them by foreign visitors. The mind has been liberated to a certain extent; not so the heart. Hence the frequent conflict between the two, the contrast presenting itself between public and private life, which is so much to be deplored. How often is the voice of the native press in India dominated by this ugly contrast, leading to crookedness and confusion of ideas even among well-meaning men! Luckily, their number is not half so large as the noise they make may lead one to believe. Watch the tone of some of the smaller prints. Leaning always on someone behind them, quoting opinions third-hand, with hardly any comments of their own, they claim to be always 'independent.' They attack high-placed officials and revile honest citizens, secure in their sense of insignificance, and the inability of the servants of the Crown or the unwillingness of the leader of society to exercise his personal right of prosecuting or horsewhipping the anonymous slanderer. Such conduct passes muster for 'courage' and 'patriotism' on the part of not a few of the cheapjacks of native journalism. As to information, they generally crib from their respectable contemporaries, whose suspension would lead to their own demise during the first week of mourning. Such are some of our critics of public acts and events. Acts and events? No, no; their attention is solely confined to *men*.) The more exalted the objects of their attack, and therefore the less inclined to notice the attack, the more reckless grows the stinging of this mosquito press. Is it wise to take too much notice of the petty carpers? After all, they are no worse than their cousins of the same class in Europe or the United States, whom they usually try to imitate. The import of this foreign vice is perhaps as inevitable as the export of India's natural wealth. Be it noted that our mosquito scribes seldom venture upon

constructive criticism. As to their threats, why, they generally count for less than the promises made to India by some of her rulers of far greater consequence.

To be sure, these mosquitoes, bred in an atmosphere of intellectual insanitation, are often a nuisance. But are they worth being trampled under the elephant's foot? Is such trampling of the lawless little imp profitable, supposing it were possible? The British Government in India may be aptly likened here to an elephant—steady, slow, constitutionally indifferent to external impressions. Fancy this amiable pachyderm, stung to the quick by the tiny assailants, heaving and panting and flourishing his proboscis right and left in pursuit of the tormentors. The spectacle is not at all edifying for the friends of the elephant, however exhilarating it may be for the mosquito tribe. It is an unequal struggle, very much to the disadvantage of the ponderous pursuer. And further, it sets the native public musing in a way the excited animal has no idea of. To the quick-witted, light-hearted follower of Vishnu, this fight between the elephant and the mosquitoes is a source of infinite amusement; while it makes the stern Brahman and the equally rigid Mahomedan lift their eyebrows and shake their heads in silent surprise. The masses in the interior, when distorted versions of the struggle reach them, probably whisper to one another how differently things used to be managed in the days of the *Coompany Bahadur* (the East India Company), whom they recognize as the step-aunt of their Gracious Sovereign, so ill-served nowadays by agents who know not how to respect themselves. The struggle is thus wholly to the discredit of the seemingly strong, but, in many cases, the really weak party. Do not the State prosecutions in the Dekkan remind one of this ludicrous spectacle? Life-transportation for the editor of a small local print on account of a silly or spiteful article, and ten years' imprisonment for the decrepit old proprietor for a less than nominal share in the perpetration of that

article! But the judge is not without a sense of kindly humour. He drops a hint for the benefit of the accused, reminding them of the existence of the High Court and the Government. Go to them; they may anoint you with the spirit of the law after I have done lashing you with the letter thereof. This is what the Executive call 'setting an example.' After sleeping for years over insults and injuries, they rouse themselves suddenly by an effort, catch hold of half-a-dozen ill-conditioned culprits, discover wide-spread disaffection in their vapourings, issue a proclamation, order State trials, threaten the existence of the free press; and finally, having secured various terms of imprisonment for the offenders, subside into their normal condition of *insouciance*. Some of us might think that the best course would be to take prompt action against individual offenders, according to their own deserts, and thus be done with the nuisance in time. But the British Executive in India have their own way of doing things. They love to play the schoolmaster and the policeman by turn, and on an elephantine scale, however insignificant their opponents. But for this infatuation, they would have seen long before now the wisdom of encouraging honest journalism, the need of promptly putting down dishonest members of the craft, and more especially their clever instigators from behind, secretly upsetting the vehicle of government, whilst openly they profess loyalty and pocket favours and distinctions from their unsuspecting patrons.

Let us be thankful, however, there is to be no revival of the Press-gagging Act. The Government of India have undertaken, instead, to amend Section 124 A. of the Penal Code, bearing on seditious utterances. It may be admitted, for sake of argument, that this Section is capable of some slight improvement. But it is not clear, in the light of recent decisions of the Courts, wherein and how far it has fallen short of all reasonable requirements of the State. To increase the powers or extend the jurisdiction of

District Magistrates in this direction seems, at any rate, like adopting a remedy worse than the distemper of the press it seeks to cure.

Are not the Executive in India becoming more exclusive and intolerant? Fewer Indian papers are read to-day than ten or fifteen years ago. 'We have no time to read native papers;' 'I am sick of the dilute whine emitted by the vernacular press;' 'We are too poor to subscribe'—such are the excuses this writer has heard from friendly officials, men whom he knows to be true friends of the people. What a sophisticated view theirs is of personal and official responsibility! It was not the spirit in which Malcolm and Metcalfe, Canning and Ripon, desired to study the wants or aspirations of the people. How can the successors of these great names talk of a 'prostituted press,' when themselves often suffering from a disease which is the twin sister of the vice they are so eager to denounce? Is there much to choose between a sophisticated Service and a prostituted press? As men and brethren one might perhaps sympathize with their weakness. But here we have to deal with the rulers of an alien population. They are bound to study every shade of popular opinion, as reflected by its exponents. The worst of them have something, however foolish and far-fetched, that is likely to afford a cue to the inner workings of the popular mind. There is no excuse, indeed, for this growing conspiracy of contempt, inoffensive and unconscious as it often may be, which must ultimately recoil upon itself. If the educated natives of India have to learn that, foreign or not foreign, the Government of their country is *their own* Government, the European officials have equal need of learning that they are paid agents of the people of India, paid to carry out their legitimate wishes and to find scope for their legitimate aspirations.

To revert awhile to the troubles caused by the plague and by certain inflammatory utterances in Bombay.* We have said against the chief offender all that could be justly

urged against a public man. It would be ungenerous now to deny that there is a phase of Mr. Tilak's life, personal to himself, which appeals to the sympathy of those who, like the present writer, are unacquainted with him, and who often feel repelled by his methods of work. His sincerity of purpose, his simplicity and abstemiousness of habits, joined to a rugged independence, have an attraction for those who are getting sick of the meretricious refinement of perhaps too many of our English-educated men. To them it seems a pity that, with his natural shrewdness, he cannot rise above the narrow earth-bound horizon to which his little clique has condemned him. But whatever his faults, he possesses a virtue that redeems not a few of them, the virtue, namely, of character. That seems to be the secret of his popularity with the sturdy sons of Mahārāshtra, keen-scented, quick to take offence, always on the look-out for the appearance of a deliverer and redeemer of wrongs, past and present, sometimes real, often imaginary. Such being the case, need we wonder at Mr. Tilak's second return to the Legislative Council? Here we may state at once that inexpedient though it looked for Government to give effect to the popular vote in his favour, to have set the recommendation at naught would have been positively impolitic. In accepting the inevitable, therefore, probably against the wishes of his responsible advisers, Lord Sandhurst showed himself a consistent and conscientious upholder of the guiding principles of Liberalism. While sympathizing with the leader of the Poona reactionists, it is possible to forget that the Governor, to whom he owed his first as well as his second entrance to the Council Chamber, is deserving of more sympathy. Immediately on his arrival, Lord Sandhurst extended the electoral franchise to the Central Division, hitherto advisedly withheld from it. This was a bold departure; and Mr. Tilak ought to have been more considerate, if only to justify the belated boon. But we have no wish to press the point here. Suffice it to say that many a thoughtful native

observer saw at once the difficulties of Lord Sandhurst's position. His is not the first instance, however, of an Indian proconsul inaugurating his career in a liberal spirit, but, not being wisely supported by native leaders in the conflict of interests that is certain to ensue, relaxing his hold or giving up the struggle on behalf of the weaker majority in despair. How far the present Governor of Bombay has succumbed to this pressure, and how far he has risen superior to it, we cannot pause to examine in this place. But we feel inclined to ask if His Excellency may not, now that justice has been sufficiently vindicated, extend the prerogative of mercy to his whilom colleague in making laws for the Presidency? Mr. Tilak has erred, and erred egregiously. But is his whole future to be marred on that account? Few would reasonably wish to see this done, unless, in attempting to mar the future, they really intended making it.

As to the elect of the Dekkan proletariat, now in Yaroda Jail, let us see, for a moment, what has been his share in the recent agitation at Poona, notably that relating to the repression of the plague. This writer visited Poona more than once during the prevalence of the epidemic, making independent inquiries quietly into the matter since the repressive measures were taken up with characteristic British energy and devotion. Again and again, in the course of conversation, did the writer hear Mr. Tilak denounced as a deserter in the hour of need, as a betrayer of the city's trust. And he heard men in the streets, shopkeepers, cab-drivers and others, saying bitterly that he could have averted much of the *sulum* on the people had he been half as active as before. What more convincing proof could we require of the innocence in this matter of the arch-agitator, as it is the fashion in some quarters to call him?

And this brings us to the question, Were the search parties of European soldiers guilty of high-handedness and occasional wanton mischief? The Government of Bombay seem to deny the very possibility of such mis-

conduct. Well, their simple faith is to be admired. But men must be either more or less than human to cherish such faith; and so would be the soldiers if this hypothesis held good. We all know what a rough-and-ready hand at work Tommy Atkins is—willing and fearless, but mischievous like a monkey with the timid Hindus, often with a joke or an oath on his lips and a leer in his eye, and hopelessly at sea as to the domestic customs and habits of the people. But all Englishmen do not and cannot know what a company of red-coats is to the native house-wife, surprised in her own room, washing, dressing, cooking or worshipping. It would be perhaps unfair to hold a foreigner to blame for ignorance in such a case. But on his side the foreigner must not resent a reminder now and then of the ignorance he could hardly help. The Bombay authorities have asked for proof of a single instance of outrage alleged against the soldiers. Well, this writer is far from believing all that has been written on the subject by local chroniclers of small talk and savoury gossip. Poona is an arsenal of red-hot *canards* of all kinds. But this much is a matter of absolute certainty, namely, that no modest Hindu or Mahomedan woman will come forward to accuse the would-be assailant of her modesty. To ask her or her male relatives for proof is something like addition of insult to injury. Some years ago, this writer was called upon by a poor friend, a Mahomedan sepoy in the service of a Native State, to save the honour of his house, as he put it. He had been recently accepted by a girl, in preference to a superior in the same service. The rules of hospitality and the rank of his rival stood for some time in the way of an open rupture. But when the sepoy and his spouse could no longer bear the attentions of the *badmash*, they sent word to their only friend at Bombay, who had the offender transferred, with a gentle hint to avoid poaching upon private grounds. Later, having to pass that way, the Bombay friend halted at the sepoy's hut for a few hours. Sitting down to a supper of cocoa-nut sweets and *pānsupāri*, prepared by

the grateful little hostess behind the *pardah*, the guest asked his host why he had not openly accused his superior before the Durbar, that is, the Native Prince? The sepoy looked at his friend curiously, to see if he was joking, but finding him in earnest, explained, 'I was near enough to death; did you wish me to go to hell on the top of that?' Among these simple children of the forest death is not half so feared as dishonour; and the publishing of one's dishonour is downright descending to perdition.

Let us take another instance. In an upcountry town, far from the noise and publicity of Bombay, came a Hindu *Bávd* (ascetic) about twenty years ago. He was known as being learned in astrological and medical lore, and reputed, among other things, to be able to cure barrenness in women. The *Bávd* found the townfolk equally believing and hospitable. By degrees he wormed himself into the favour of a wealthy Hindu gentleman. Taking advantage of his trusting nature, he prevailed upon the friend one day to place his wife under his treatment. The wife, warned by her instinct of self-defence, hesitated. But to hear a husband in such a matter is to obey. Besides, the love of progeny is deep-rooted in the Hindu. So next morning she was taken to the *Bávd's* quarters, only to return half-dead with fright, grief-stricken and self-accusing. To the astonished husband her one request was to be allowed to proceed to a distant shrine and to immolate herself there. But the husband loved her too well for that. And, had he not himself been, in a way, accessory to the wrong inflicted or attempted on this noble creature? He threatened to destroy himself if she left him. So they managed to live apart under the same roof. The change that came over this once happy pair so suddenly puzzled many; and but for the equally sudden disappearance of that prowling wolf in human form, the *Bávd*, it would have for ever remained a mystery. Wife and husband lived on for years, an aimless, joyless life, as devoted to each other as ever, but unable to look each other in the face. And

this silent suffering was the result, in all likelihood, of a mere attempt on the wife's honour. Instances could be multiplied of wives committing suicide, husbands renouncing the world, for what Europeans would consider a passing insult, to be wiped off by a slap in the face by the wife herself or a whipping from the husband. Such are the ideals that overshadow life in many parts of India. They may be foolish; they may be injurious to the growth of true self-respect. But they are too sacred to be laughed out, too real to be brushed aside, even by such as cannot sympathize with them.

It may now, perhaps, be conceded that to ask for proof positive of this or that charge against the soldiers or the subordinates of the Plague Committee at work, would be to silence the voice of complaint; or to protest that no irregularity of any kind occurred in course of the delicate and painful investigations, would be to assume an infallibility beyond human comprehension. Let us admit at once that the employment of soldiers, under the peculiar circumstances of Poona, was, in a manner, forced upon the authorities, that it became a necessary evil for which the leaders of Poona Society were more to blame than the authorities; and that no serious outrage was attempted. But what excuse could be pleaded for Mr. Rand's employment here, at such a crisis, with a full knowledge of his unpopularity at another centre of Brahmanic orthodoxy? A prompt transfer, even later, when that officer's life began to be threatened, might have averted his murder along with that of poor Mr. Ayerst, and the serious complications that followed. But unbending is a virtue the British Executive in India are too slow to learn. If it came to that, they would rather lose the country than give up their pet theories of administration.

As regards the segregation of suspected plague cases, which was at the bottom of the popular outcry against the Committee, and a more potent cause of the panic than the plague itself, it must not be overlooked that segregation

presented the only chance of stamping out the disease in time. The Government of Bombay, as advised by the best available professional opinion, had no alternative to fall back upon. But on their part, Government might have taken more into account the habits and usages of the people, made greater allowance for the panic into which they had been thrown, and for the certain death with which, rightly or wrongly, segregation had been associated in the popular mind. Had adequate provision been made in all cases before patients were segregated, and special attention paid to the scruples of religion, Government would have been spared much of the unpopularity incurred by this particular measure of protection, and the people some very real hardship and loss. But these are mistakes incidental to all human management. They will likely be forgotten before a history of the plague comes to be written, whilst the solid good done by the Government of Bombay, for a time bewildered and badly informed, will long stand to their credit and for the guidance of others.

Whilst the Civil administrators of India were, as we have seen above, busy fighting a troop of mosquitoes within, their Military colleagues were on the alert for a hornet-hunt without. Now, it is a truism in the conduct of human affairs, that there can be no peace without war. And we, for one, shall excuse a war of self-defence, much as we may regret it at all times. But the punitive operations beyond the limits of the Empire, intended apparently to overawe some of the independent tribes, are really the outcome of our own blundering policy. Think of a number of paltry little outposts, in isolated positions, along a newly-opened route; all of them badly garrisoned, and the route itself left in charge of the tribes whose independence it threatened! How could Sir G. White reconcile this policy with his declaration—which Government have not yet seen fit publicly to repudiate—namely, that 'civilization and barbarism could not exist side by side'? What an excuse for entering

into a poor man's house, if these are the Commander-in-Chief's words! And when is this magnanimous policy to end? Not till Government have the courage to acknowledge their mistake. This policy is like putting your finger for experiment into a complicated steam machine at work, which will drag in your whole body before you have time to withdraw the finger. Whatever reasons the Government of India may have had for their previous change of front in regard to Chitral, they have never been able to justify it to the tax-payers. It is not a question of bad faith or breach of pledge that we have to discuss here. There was no deliberate intention to annex or to occupy the tribal possessions of barren rocks and bouldered ambuscades. But appearances were distinctly against our Government when, on the sudden collapse of the Liberal Ministry in 1895, they as suddenly reversed their policy in connexion with Chitral. We have to speak here, not of what *we* think of the matter, but of what the *tribes* concerned think of it. They could put but one construction on this change of policy; and no one, jealous of his own independence, could help overlooking even their excess of patriotic zeal in defending their homes. The tribes thought they had been badly used; they also feared the gradual loss of their independence, dearer to these rugged mountaineers than life itself. We are not prepared to deny that there may have been more causes than one to explain the rising of the tribes—their innate love of strife, the preaching of fanatical priests, the success of Turkish arms in Europe, the weakness of the British positions improvised along the new route, and so on. But each of these causes, or all combined, will be admitted as lacking the first incentive to arms, with an adequate excuse for it; that is, an apprehension of the loss of national independence.

Here it may be conveniently asked if the occupation of the Chitral road and the fixing of the military posts were undertaken with the Amir's knowledge, consent or connivance? If consulted, did His Highness warn the

Government of India against the course proposed, or did he encourage them in their course? Or, was the Ruler of Afghanistan kept in the dark as to the intentions of our Government? It would be idle to count upon the Amir's friendship in everything and at all times, simply because he owes his position on the throne, and the maintenance of it, to the Government of India. Amir Abdurrahman is a strong man; but the best of his strength lies evidently in the direction of self-interest. Are his English patrons, dispensing the patronage at India's expense, so foolish as to claim his gratitude for ever? He knows he had the gift of Afghanistan, most likely unasked, because that country would have been worse than a white elephant for us. He knows, too, that the annual subsidy he gets from unhappy India is mainly intended to keep his turbulent subjects in check. There is no special reason why the Afghan potentate should be grateful to us for ever. So long as it serves his interest to side with us, he will doubtless do so. But let his English allies see to it they do not strain his allegiance too far. Already, by his pamphlet on *Jehād* (Holy War) the Amir seems to have found it necessary or convenient to bid for popularity as a religious leader. If our Government continue their policy beyond the frontier, alienating the independent tribes from us, and indeed the sympathy of the Mahomedan world generally, neither the headmen of the tribes nor the Amir himself may be able to preserve even a neutral attitude. Does purse-proud Britain still believe that money can buy everybody and everything for all time? The staunchest of allies will shrink at last from breaking the ties of blood and creed.

It would be interesting, also, to know what Russia thinks of the plight into which we have drifted on the North-West frontier—Russia whom, if the astute Amir but winks, the tribes may yet welcome as their deliverer. The sentiment prevails all over these inhospitable regions that the first foreigner to come is an enemy, the second a friend. In

this way, advocates of the Forward Policy have done not a little to prepare the way for the Northern Power—if she ever finds time to come Indiawards. Railways, roads, military posts—what are these but so many facilities, given 'free and gratis,' to a rival willing to use them? 'The fool cooks the dinner, the wise man eats it': so runs an Indian proverb. But the Government of India are in no mood just now to profit by the teachings of proverbial philosophy. What they want is to know how to extricate themselves from their unenviable position. As things stand, they can neither turn back nor go forward. Their engagements with the Afridis have once more demonstrated the truth of our parable about the fight between the elephant and the mosquitoes—in this case the hornets. The Afghan tribes have their own methods of warfare, to which they have added a few of the European methods. We, on the other hand, can never adopt their methods, unless we have an army to meet these wild tribes with their own weapons. The best thing under the circumstances would, therefore, be to take counsel with His Highness the Amir. That worthy ally of ours may be able to suggest a way out of this *impasse*—a passage sufficiently wide for the weary old tusker to retire through, with dignity if not with grace.

What else are the Government of India going to do with the tribes? Do they intend to tame them out of existence? Do they propose to wage a war of extermination upon these gallant guerrillas fighting for their hearths and homes? There is no other effective course open to Government; and such a desperate move the British public will never permit, nor Government ever bring themselves to contemplate. What, then, is the use of carrying fire and sword into the enemy's country? The weekly reports of villages burnt, properties destroyed, Jirghas scattered, forts blown up, while sending a shudder through England and through India, will do little towards taming the militant marauders. These will disappear to-day, only to appear again to-

morrow ; their mud cottages, demolished this week, will rise once more as soon as they are needed. The rest they trust to the chances and changes of life. And what care they for life itself? In a few months they may be humbled, forced to accept the terms offered by the army of vengeance. Will that lead to a final settlement of the dispute? Far from it. Though six months may suffice for a patched-up peace, the bitterness of heart left behind will be transmitted from father to son, and to grandson. And this, not among the frontier tribes only, but to some extent among the Indian population likewise, many of them starving and despondent. Whence are the millions of money to come, to pay for this latest of our punitive expeditions? Even when Great Britain has borne her share, the balance will be found too heavy a burden for this already overburdened country. The outlook in this respect is perhaps the most serious. We may glorify the deeds of gallantry performed by British and Indian soldiers ; but, when the bill has to be paid and the death-roll to be read at leisure, friends of the Forward School themselves may have to scratch their heads, half-bewildered, wholly ashamed. If Englishmen will look at the subject in a rational way, they will see how India has suffered from the military ascendancy that has settled upon her like an incubus since the inauguration of the 'imperial' *régime*. Love of fighting, of rewards and decorations, steals unconsciously upon the senses of this powerful clique. Much as we may admire the pluck and devotion of our soldiers, we must not at the same time shut our eyes to the breach of discipline, the demoralizing crave for notoriety, now and then discernible in the desperate onrush of this or that party. This is one result, by no means the most deplorable, of the military ascendancy we have alluded to. Is there no hope of controlling it, in order to give the Indian Administration a fair chance of success? There seems to be only one way of doing this, that is, by putting the Commander-in-Chief on something like the same footing as the other

members of the Governor-General's Council, and to this extent modifying his powers of initiative. The head of the Army in India must be made amenable to a more wholesome constitutional check. How, and by whom, is a question for responsible statesmen to decide. We here can only suggest a course for the peaceful development of India, and partly in justice to the veteran officers themselves who from time to time hold the position of Commander of Her Majesty's Forces in that country. So cumbrous and involved appears to have become the military administration of India, that it is almost impossible for the head to control the action of politico-military officers, especially those posted outside the frontiers of the country proper. It is the more daring of these that are primarily to blame for our frontier troubles. Their personal ambition is at times stimulated by an appeal to prestige; and thousands of brave but idle soldiers are always at hand to maintain the prestige of the nation. It is the Service, the Army, in fact, that makes our wars for us. The Commander-in-Chief is more or less an instrument, though an active one; and the Government in India and in England are even less instructed agents. These have, however, a large share of the responsibility, which they must render to the British public, if any such final arbiter exists on behalf of helpless, voiceless India.

And what is the position of the Civil Service in the country? As everyone knows, it is in its way all-powerful. Viceroys and Governors come and go. This writer has known a number of them, some coming out resolved to see to all the larger affairs of State for themselves, prepared to consult outside opinion as much as they were bound to consult the opinion of their official advisers. And not a few of these ambitious rulers have gone back dazed and disappointed by the magnitude of the task they had set to themselves. How is it possible for the ablest of them to govern a country like India except under official guidance and tutelage? Happy they who know how to

accommodate themselves to the situation. The term for which they are sent out hardly suffices for most of them to learn their elementary lessons. And by the time they begin to act for themselves they have to think of making room for their successors. Would it be wrong, in such a state of affairs, to say that India is governed, not by the Viceroy and Governors, but by the Civil Service? Nor is there much to wonder at in this position. In the nature of things it ought really to be so. But the question then arises, why send out strangers, as expensive figure-heads, every five years? If they cannot act independently of the Services, even on occasions requiring independent action, their appointment is little more than a piece of Party patronage. And that this is so considered by the political patrons themselves, appears from the Party in power for the time being never making their choice from the ranks of the other Party, however urgent their obligations in this behalf. Not that the choice is, as a rule, made without careful thought of the interests of India. The motive is always pure; the men sent out are generally the best that could be spared; and each of these, speaking generally, puts forth his best efforts on behalf of the people under his care. But sooner or later he shows a tendency to hold the hand, be he Liberal or Conservative—so overpowering is the presence of the Services around him. This has gone on till the principle of selection itself begins to raise serious doubts as to its *bona fides*. Evil-minded critics go so far as to whisper that the selection is often made for the self-aggrandizement of the Party in power, or for its selfish political purposes. So far, then, the time seems to have come to consider if Governors and Viceroys might not be appointed from among the Services themselves; or, if that be too hazardous an experiment to be tried again, whether it would not be better to send out as Viceroy a large-minded and capable administrator of no more than 45, to remain in office for at least 10 years. This would give him time to learn, as also to unlearn; and, what is more

important, to utilize the knowledge acquired on the spot. There are disadvantages inherent to this proposal. But in the existing state of things the advantages seem so to outweigh the drawbacks, that a trial might well be mooted. Much of what we have said here comprises mere suggestions, or rather speculations. They are given for what they may be worth, and may be taken only as such by those who have the governing of a foreign country.

It is strange that at the time Lord Beaconsfield proclaimed an Imperial rôle for India, it did not occur to his fervid imagination that the appointment of a member of the Royal-Imperial Family might prove most acceptable to the subjects, steeped in the sentiment of personal loyalty. Even now a selection like this would tend to soothe the asperities and estrangement between the two races, unhappily on an increase, and might perhaps lead to something like the establishment of a permanent dynasty, worthier than the Moghul, and likely to revive some of the best traditions of the reign of Akbar. Such an arrangement, if practicable, might also neutralize to some extent the evils inseparable from the present system of employing a foreign and migratory agency—the breaking up of family ties, a growing distaste for life in India, and gradual diminution of interest in the welfare of a country in which English officers of a former generation felt proud of spending almost a lifetime.

There is one member of the Royal Family, fitted for the office of Viceroy by personal knowledge and sympathy, by intimate acquaintance with military questions, combined with no ordinary insight into the civil administration of India; above all, by the high character and courteous bearing that have already endeared him to the princes and peoples alike of the Empire. But we seem to have little hope of obtaining a loan of his services at present. India will, therefore, have to be content with the choice of her Conservative rulers, exercised in the usual manner, unless these try the heroic remedy of sending out the

Duke of Argyll, the Duke of Devonshire, or the Prime Minister himself, each of whom, in his day, made an excellent Secretary of State, and each of whom would delight, as Viceroy, to give effect to his kindly sentiments and just decisions of a former day. Should any one of these veterans make up his mind to expatriate himself even for the space of three years, we have little doubt that the Liberals would be among the first to wish him God-speed!

PARIS,
NEW YEAR'S DAY, 1898.

**SEPARATION
OF
EXECUTIVE AND JUDICIAL FUNCTIONS.**

SPEECH

MADE BY

MR. MANOMOHAN GHOSE,

AT THE

ELEVENTH INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,

HELD AT POONA,

ON

27th, 28th and 30th December 1895.

Bombay:

PRINTED AT THE "COMMERCIAL PRESS."

1896.

Mr. Manomohan Ghose, said :—

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN.—The Subjects Committee of this Congress having decided that I should move the fourth Resolution regarding the separation of Judicial from Executive functions in the administration of justice, I feel bound to carry out that direction. At the same time, I must confess that I cannot congratulate them on the wisdom of their choice in selecting me for this purpose. I have written and said so much on the subject of late years that I feel that, from one point of view, I am disqualified from discharging the duty satisfactorily, as I cannot say anything new. I am glad, however, that the principle which underlies the resolution is one regarding which there is not, and never has been, any serious difference of opinion. From the days of Lord Cornwallis down to the present time, English administrators have repeatedly acknowledged the soundness of the principle for which we are contending. It is now exactly 100 years since the government of Lord Cornwallis, in the preamble to a regulation of the Governor-General, publicly recorded that, in the opinion of the Government of India, it was exceedingly desirable that Revenue officers and others performing executive duties, should not be called upon to try cases in which they have themselves been mixed up. The reform, however, was not then carried out, but in 1861, a few years after the mutiny, when the Police Act was under discussion before the Legislative Council of the Governor-General of India, strenuous efforts were made by distinguished English officials to bring about this reform. It was on that occasion that no less eminent a member of the Civil Service than Sir Bartle Frere declared, that the reform was one which must be carried out sooner or later, and that the only difficulties in the way were "prejudices of long standing."

At that time Mr. Sconce another distinguished member of the Civil Service and a judge of the Sudder Court, insisted upon the reform being then carried out, but he was put off with the assurance that in a very few years the measure which he advocated would be carried out. At that time the National Congress was not even heard of, and I mention this fact in order to show that this is a reform which has all along been advocated by English officials and administrators themselves and not by so-called revolutionaries like ourselves. Nothing however was done and although since the establishment of this Congress we have repeatedly agitated for this small measure of reform, our cries have yet remained unheeded. As the President has told us, only the other day, both Lord Kimberley and Lord Cross stated from their places in Parliament that it was exceedingly desirable that this reform should be carried out without further loss of time; but the difficulty which then pressed Lord Kimberley was, as he put it, solely based upon financial considerations. I regret to say that it is impossible for me or any one who has studied the subject, to accept this as a satisfactory explanation of the delay which has taken place in carrying out this reform. I shall have occasion to dwell upon the real objection later on. You have probably read in the newspapers that on the 3rd of this month I had the honour of addressing the members of the East India Association in London, on this very subject, and it is satisfactory to me to think that on that occasion I was able to secure the support of so influential a body of Anglo-Indian officials headed by an eminent ex-civilian as Sir Lepel Griffin. On that occasion I am glad to say I also received the powerful support of our distinguished countryman, Mr. Bhownagree. I have advisedly said "powerful support" because I feel that by a strange accident Mr. Bhownagree has been placed in a position where if he chooses, he can do more good to his country than

our friend Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who has devoted his whole life to the cause of India. (Cheers.) I know nothing of the antecedents of Mr. Bhownagree, and though I do not sympathise with him in the somewhat sweeping and unjustifiable attacks in which he has recently indulged as regards the National Congress, I feel that we ought not to retaliate, especially when I have had his personal assurance that he will try to serve India to the best of his opportunities. (Cheers.) I think I may be permitted on your behalf to express a hope that in spite of the denunciations in which he has recently indulged, he will be thoroughly loyal and true to his own country, and if he is that, I am sure we shall all be prepared not only to forget his utterances but to accord to him our most hearty support. On that occasion Mr. Bhownagree very forcibly pointed out that even if financial difficulties existed the Government should be ready to remove those difficulties when the purity of the administration of justice was involved. He might have gone further and pointed out that, as regards the administration of justice, the Government is financially not a loser, but that there is a considerable surplus after paying all expenses to the credit of the Government under the head of Public Justice. It seems unreasonable that we should be put off on the ground of financial embarrassment, when there is a yearly surplus which ought undoubtedly to be devoted to improving the very administration which yields that surplus. (Applause). But after all, that is not the real objection. It is time that the responsible heads of the government and the public at large should know and realise what the real objection of our opponents is. Not long ago a distinguished Indian Civilian belonging to this Presidency, I think I ought to mention his name because he made no secret of it—Mr. James, Commissioner in Sind—wrote an article in an English magazine in which he described the present system which com-

bines judicial and executive functions in one officer as "the mainstay of British power in India." (Shame.) The real objection then is the apprehension on the part of the Executive officers that their prestige will suffer if the reform we advocate is carried out. I cannot help thinking that the vice of our present administration is that justice is too often sacrificed at the altar of that bugbear known as prestige. (Hear, hear.) I have always understood that the real "mainstay of British power in India" was not in a system which tended to pervert justice, but in the belief that English courts dispensed even-handed justice. I am sure I express the opinion of every one present here when I say that that is the true "mainstay of British power in India" and anything which tends to impair that confidence in the minds of the people strikes at the root of what is the true "mainstay of British power." (Cheers.) Not long ago I had occasion to point out to the present Secretary of State for India, who did me the honour of granting me an interview in London, that the general feeling among my countrymen was that justice was unattainable when the prestige of any public officer was involved. In saying so I believe I expressed the universal feeling of my countrymen on the subject. (Cheers.) I told him that the belief among the people of India was gaining ground that from the Police Constable drawing 7 Rupees a month upto Her Majesty's Secretary of State it was one continued ladder of prestige; that each officer was anxious to support the prestige of his own immediate subordinate even at the sacrifice of justice. Lord George Hamilton, who, I believe, is anxious to govern this country justly and with sympathy, no doubt realised the gravity of the observation but he remarked that to a certain extent in the case of a service animated by an *esprit de corps* this state of things was almost unavoidable. When speaking in London on the subject I was cautious enough to speak of the

feeling among my countrymen without expressing any opinion as to whether that feeling was well founded or not ; but by a strange fatality I now find that just about the time I was speaking to Her Majesty's Secretary of State, Sir Charles Elliott was making a speech in Calcutta admitting and justifying the truth of my observation. He said, on the occasion of a public dinner, that the Government in India was always anxious not "to wash their dirty linen in public" and that it was absolutely necessary to maintain the prestige of a public servant publicly even if he had miscondacted himself. (Shame.) This convinces me that I had accurately represented to the Secretary of State not only the true state of feeling among my countrymen but that in reality the feeling was well founded. Well, it is that bugbear of prestige which, as Sir Richard Garth has pointed out is in our way in this matter, and financial considerations are merely put forward because our opponents have not the courage to avow what the real objection is. Not long ago, a high Bengal official, whose name I am not permitted to divulge because his communication was confidential, wrote to the Government of India to say that in his opinion it was undesirable to divest the Magistrate of the District of his judicial powers, because he was "the connecting link" between the police and the judiciary of his district, or in other words because the magistrate of the district finds it convenient and necessary to pull the wires of the judiciary from behind in the administration of criminal justice. This officer has very candidly let the cat out of the bag and it is in this admission that we find the real secret of the opposition to this reform. It is time that our opponents should have the courage to declare publicly, as Mr. James declared what the real objection is and not take shelter behind supposed financial difficulties. Fortunately for us, the reform which we advocate is not one which originated with the Congress, nor is it one

which affects the interests of any particular class of our people. There is no race question involved, nor does the advocacy of this reform suggest any alarming issues or arguments based upon the stability of the Empire. The non-official European community are as much interested in this question as the people of the country, and even as regards the official classes I am glad to feel that the sympathies of nearly one half of the Indian Civil Servants themselves, namely, the members of the Judicial branch are entirely on our side. (Cheers.) That being so, I feel that if we persistently agitate for this reform we shall, as the President observed, be within measurable distance of attaining the object we have in view. With these remarks I beg to propose the following resolution. "That this Congress again appeals to the Government of India and the Secretary of State to take practical steps for the purpose of carrying out the separation of Judicial from Executive functions in the administration of justice."

POVERTY OF INDIA

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

POVERTY OF INDIA

BY

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

LONDON :

PRINTED BY VINCENT BROOKS, DAY AND SON, GATE STREET,
LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS.

1878.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
TOTAL PRODUCTION OF INDIA	I
Central Provinces	3
Punjab	4
North-West Provinces	6
Bengal	9
Madras	11
Bombay	13
Oudh	18
Necessary Consumption	20
DEFICIT OF IMPORTS COMPARED WITH EXPORTS OF INDIA	25
Bengal	30
Bombay	32
Madras	35
Punjab	35
North-West Provinces	36
Central Provinces	37
All India (Lord Laurence, Mr. Grant Duff, Lord Mayo)	37
England's Condition under Similar Circumstances	38
Economical Principles from Mill's Political Economy as Applicable to the Present Condition of India	39
PRESSURE OF TAXATION	41

PART II.

PRICES	44
Cotton	45
Coffee	46
Indigo	46
Rice	46
Silk	47
Surat	48
Linseed	48
Rapeseed	49
Wool	49
Tea	49
CAUSES OF TEMPORARY RISE IN PRICES	50
Madras	50
Punjab	50
North-West Provinces	51
Bombay	51
Bengal	51

	PAGE.
GENERAL FALL IN PRICES UNDER BRITISH RULE	39
Madras	39
Bengal	41
Bombay	51
Central Provinces	56
North-West Provinces	56
Punjab	57
BAD SEASON CAUSING RISE IN PRICES	58
Central Provinces	58
North-West Provinces	58
Madras	59
Punjab	59
WAGES	
Bengal	60
Bombay	61
Punjab	61
Central Provinces	62
BULLION	62
CONCLUSION—Words of Macaulay	66
REPLY TO CRITICISMS	66
The Remedy	79

POVERTY OF INDIA.

Extracts from Papers read before the Bombay Branch of the East India Association, in February, April, and July, 1876.

PART I.

WHILE pointing out in these notes one of the unfavorable results of the present system of British administration, I do not for a moment mean to ignore the very bright side of British rule, and the many blessings of law and order which it has conferred on India. On the latter subject I have already expressed my sentiments on several occasions.

My object at present is to shew in greater detail what I have already stated before, that, under the present system of administration, India is suffering seriously in several ways, and is sinking in poverty. In my humble opinion, this is the question, or rather the most serious question, of the day. Whether I am right or wrong will be for you to judge, after hearing what I have to say. If I am right, I shall have discharged a duty as a loyal subject to urge upon our rulers to remedy this most serious evil. If, on the other hand, I am shown to be wrong, none will rejoice more than myself; and I shall have equally done a duty, as a wrong feeling of a serious character will be removed.

These notes were written two or three years ago. I lay them before you as they are. If necessary, I shall consider hereafter any modification that the light of subsequent events may suggest, either in confirmation or refutation of the views expressed in them. There will be a few repetitions from my former papers, but they are necessary in order to make these notes complete. I have endeavoured to avail myself as much as possible of the weight of official or other great authorities, and facts from official records; hence I shall have more quotations than might be thought suitable in an address before an audience; and my notes may prove dull, but I only hope they may be found of some importance to atone for such dullness. I may propose here that any discussion upon the notes may be deferred till they are all read, and my whole argument placed before you, or otherwise there will be confusion in the discussions.

TOTAL PRODUCTION OF INDIA.

In July, 1870, I made a rough estimate, in my paper on "The Wants and Means of India," placed before the East India Association, as follows:—

* The whole produce of India is from its land. The gross land-tax is put down for 1870-71 a little above £21,000,000. Now, I suppose I shall be within the mark if I say that Government takes for this land-tax, on an average, one-eighth of the gross produce, if not more. This gives for the gross production of the country, say, about

£168,000,000; add to this—gross opium revenue about £7,000,000; gross salt revenue, £6,000,000; gross forest, £600,000. The total, thus, of the raw produce of the country amounts under £182,000,000—to be on the safe side, let us say £200,000,000, to include the produce of half a million tons of coal, of alienation lands, or anything else there may be. Now, the population of the whole of British India is nearly 150,000,000; giving, therefore, less than 27s. a head for the annual support of the whole people."

I then further raised the production from £200,000,000 to £300,000,000, to include the value of manufacturing industries, excise on spirits, and a large margin for any omissions, making 40s. a head for the gross production of India as a high estimate.

Since then I have endeavoured to work out the same problem *directly*, as far as the official data I could get enabled me to do so.

Parliament requires a yearly report of the moral and material progress of India; and a Statistical Committee is formed at Calcutta to supply the necessary information. This Committee has prescribed certain tables to be filled up by the different Governments in their administration reports.

The Central Provinces and Burmah reports are the only two complete in their agricultural tables as far as practicable. Four others (Madras, North-West Provinces, Punjab, and Oudh) give them imperfectly. Bengal and Bombay gave the least, or none, up to 1869-70. For what I could not get from the reports I applied to the India Office, which naturally replied they could not give what they did not get from India. It will be seen, therefore, that I have been obliged to work out the production under much difficulty. Not only is the quantity of information insufficient, but the quality even of such as is given is defective. For instance, in the tables of prices of produce in the different districts of the Central Provinces, in order to get an average the prices are added up together, and the total is divided by the number of the districts. This principle is generally adopted by the returns made by all the Governments with respect to average of produce or prices. The principle, however, is altogether fallacious. In taking the average of prices, the *quantities* of produce sold at the different prices are altogether lost sight of. In the same way, in taking the average produce per acre, the extent of land yielding *different quantities* is overlooked.

The result, therefore, is wrong, and all arguments and conclusions based upon such averages are worthless. Taking the instance of the Central Provinces in the administration report of 1867-8, the average price of rice is made out to be Rs. 2-12-7 per maund, when in reality the correct average will be only Rs. 1-8 per maund. Again, the table for the produce of rice per acre gives the average as 579 lbs., when in reality it is 759 lbs. Now, what can be the worth of conclusions drawn from these wrong averages? These averages are not only worthless, but mischievous. It is a pity that, with large Government establishments, more accurate and complete information should not be given. I sincerely trust that future reports will not only work averages upon correct principles, but also work out the total production of their respective provinces. Then only we shall know the actual condition of the mass of the people. All 'I thinks' and 'my opinions' are of no use on important subjects. The whole foundation of all administration, financial and general, and of the actual condition

of people, rests upon this one fact—the produce of the country, the ultimate result of all capital, labour and land. With imperfect materials at command, and not possessed of the means to employ a staff to work out all the details as they ought to be, I can only give approximate results.

On the question of taking proper averages and supplying complete information, I addressed a letter, in February, 1871, to the India Office, which I have reason to believe has been forwarded to the Governments in India. I hope that some attention will be paid to the matter. As a specimen of the correct principles of averages, I have got worked out table **A** of the averages of price and produce of some of the principal productions of the Central Provinces. From this will be seen that the correct average price for rice is Rs. 1-8, instead of Rs. 2-12-7, as stated above; also that the correct average of produce of 759, and not 579 lbs., of rice per acre. I have explained, in the following calculations for the different provinces, the mode I have adopted for each. Though working with insufficient and defective materials, and without the means and time to work out details, I have endeavoured to calculate *above* the mark, so that, whatever my error, it will be found on the safe side, of estimating a higher produce than the reality.

The principle of my calculations is briefly this. I have taken the largest one or two kinds of produce of a province to represent all its produce, as it would be too much labour for me to work out every produce, great and small. I have taken the whole cultivated area of each district, the produce per acre, and the price of the produce; and simple multiplication and addition will give you both the quantity and value of the total produce. From it, also, you can get the correct average of produce per acre and of prices for the whole province, as in this way you have all the necessary elements taken into account.

CENTRAL PROVINCES.

The total area of cultivated land (table 2, Fiscal of Report 1867-8 — an average *good season* year) is 12,378,215 acres. The price of produce per acre, as worked out in table **A** for the important articles rice, wheat, other food-grains, oil-seeds, and cotton, is Rs. 11-13-5 — say Rs. 12.* The total value of agricultural produce will be acres 12,378,215 × Rs. 12 = Rs. 14,853,8580. To this is to be added the produce of Sumbulpore; but the acreage of that district is not given. Making some allowance for it, I increased the produce to, say, Rs. 16,000,000, or £16,000,000, for a population of 9,000,000.

I have lately met with an unexpected confirmation of my views. The *Times of India* Summary of 6th June, 1873, takes from the *Englishman* some particulars from Mr. Peddar's reply to the Viceroy's circular on local funds. Mr. Peddar makes out, as the value of produce in the Nagpore district, about Rs. 8 per acre, and my estimate of the whole of the Central Provinces is Rs. 12 per acre. I do not know whether Mr. Peddar has avoided the wrong principle of averages — whether he calculates for an average *good season*, and whether any allowance is made for bad seasons.

* The table **A** is too large for insertion.

PUNJAB.

The administration report of 1867-8 gives all the necessary agricultural tables, except one, *viz.*, the produce per acre of the different kinds of crops. I take this year (1867-8) as a better season, and with a larger extent of cultivation, than that of 1868-9.

The chief crops are wheat and other inferior grains—the former nearly 20, and the latter 50 per cent. of the whole cultivation. The price of wheat is higher than that of other inferior grains; and as I take the prices of first-class wheat, I think the average price of the produce of one acre of wheat, applied to the whole cultivated acreage, will be very much above the actual value of the production, and my estimate will be much higher than it ought to be.

As the administration reports of both 1867-8 and 1868-9 do not give the produce of crops per acre, I ascertain it from other sources.

SUMMARY.

	Acre.	Rs.
Rice... ..	2,938,328	4,18,43,575
Wheat	3,313,677	3,51,77,956
Other Food Grains	4,197,516	4,70,63,760
Oil Seeds	697,100	1,04,42,854
Cotton	643,390	50,24,538
Total.....	11,790,011	13,95,56,683

Average, Rs. 11-13-5 per acre.

In the administration report of the Punjab for the year 1850-51 (published in 1854 by the Court of Directors), drawn up by Mr. (now Sir Richard) Temple, a detailed table, dated Jullundhur, 25th October, 1851, gives the produce per acre. The table gives 14 instances of first class lands, which, by the rough process of adding up and dividing by the number of instances, gives 144 maunds = 1,160 lbs.; (a maund equals 82 lbs.—Report 1855-6); for the *second* class from 8 instances, I find the average 13½ maunds, or 1,107 lbs.; and for the *third* class from 6 instances, I find 11 maunds, or 902 lbs. From this table I have taken all at 10 maunds or upwards as representing irrigated land, and the second class representing the bulk of it, as producing 1,100 lbs. per acre. For unirrigated land I have not sufficient data. I adopt 600 lbs. per acre, for reasons I have stated under heading 'North-West Provinces.'

After I had made my following calculations on the above basis, I was favored with a loan from the Record Department of the India Office of the administration report for 1869-70. The produce per acre is given in this report, but the average is taken on the objectionable principle of adding up the produce of all districts and dividing by the number of districts, without reference to the extent of cultivation in each district. According to this, the average of the produce of wheat per acre of all the districts is given in the report as only 624 lbs. The highest produce in three districts included in this average, is 1044, 1,066, and 1,000 lbs.: so that my assumption of 1,100 lbs. per acre for all irrigated land is much above the mark. Again, even making allowance for the drought of the years 1868-9 and 1869-70, my assumption, of 600 lbs. of wheat per acre of all unirrigated land only, is also above the mark.

I take the calculated area of 1867-8, which is also the largest of the three years 1867-8, 1868-9, and 1869-70; and I take prices for 1867-8, that having been an average good season. The prices of 1868-9 and 1869-70 are scarcity prices. The year 1867-8 is a fair test for the produce of the Punjab in an average favorable season.

The report for 1867-8 does not give prices of produce for all districts separately, but only of a few important towns, *viz.*, Delhi, Umballa, Lahore, Sealkote, Mooltan, and Peshawur (page clii.); and as I take these prices to represent not only those of the whole of the districts of these towns, but of all the districts of the Punjab, I evidently assume a much higher price than actually must have been the case. My results, therefore, will be affected in a double way (*viz.*, firstly, in taking *first-class* wheat to represent *all* produce; and secondly, in taking the prices in the principal towns to represent *all* Punjab); and will show then the total value of the production of all Punjab much higher than the reality. I, therefore, think I shall not be unfair in deducting 10 per cent. as some correction of this double error; and even then I shall be above the mark. The prices given in the report for 1867-8 are as follows (III. E. J. Statement, showing the prices of produce in the Punjab for the year 1867-8):—

	Prices in Seers for a Rupee.					
	1st June 1866	1st Jan. 1867	1st June 1867	1st Jan. 1868	Average	
Delhi	21½	20	19½	25	21½	} The Seer is 2 lbs.
Umballa	25	20	20½	20½	21½	
Lahore	23	20	22	17	20½	
Sealkote	24	20	22	16	20½	
Mooltan	16	17½	16	13½	15½	
Peshawur	24½	22	20½	15	20½	

I take the above averages of the towns to represent their whole districts, and then the average of the six districts to represent the whole of the Punjab in the following calculation (wheat first sort is taken to represent all produce):—

Districts.	Irrigated Land.	Produce per Acre.	Total Produce.	For Rs. 1.	Total Value.
	Acres.	lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	Rs.
Delhi	200,955	1,100	221,050,500	43	51,40,700
Umballa	96,328	"	105,060,800	43	24,64,204
Lahore	447,295	"	492,024,500	41	1,20,00,597
Sealkote	304,227	"	433,040,700	41	1,05,70,821
Mooltan	505,750	"	550,325,000	31½	1,76,61,111
Peshawur	240,144	"	274,058,400	41	60,84,351
Total.....	1,895,699	5,45,27,793

The average value of produce per acre of the irrigated land of the six districts will, therefore, be Rs. 28-7-9.

I now apply this to all irrigated land of the Punjab.

Total irrigated acres are 6,147,038, which, at Rs. 28-7-9 per acre, will give Rs. 17,69,73,224 as the total value of the produce of irrigated land of the Punjab for 1867-8.

I now calculate the value of the produce of unirrigated land (wheat first sort is taken to represent all produce) :—

Districts.	Unirrigated Land.	Produce per acre.	Total Produce.	For Re. 1.	Total Value
	Acres.	lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	Rs.
Delhi.....	307,690	600	184,614,000	43	42,03,348
Umballa	856,701	"	514,020,600	43	1,10,53,967
Lahore	557,882	"	334,729,200	41	81,64,126
Sealkote	425,440	"	255,264,000	41	62,25,951
Mooltan	118,684	"	71,210,400	31½	22,50,647
Peshawur	456,661	"	273,996,600	41	66,62,843
Total...	2,723,058	3,95,80,882

The average value of produce of one acre of unirrigated land of the six districts is Rs. 14-5-3. Applying this to the unirrigated land of the whole of the Punjab, the result will be as follows :—Total unirrigated acres 14,810,697, at Rs. 14-5-3 per acre, will give Rs. 21,51,99,427 as the value of the produce of all unirrigated land of the Punjab for 1867-8.

Adding up the value of the produce of irrigated and unirrigated land, the total will be Rs. 39,21,72,651. From this I deduct 10 per cent. for reasons stated above, which will leave Rs. 35,29,54,800 for a population of 17,593,946, or say £36,000,000 for a population of 17,500,000.

NORTH-WEST PROVINCES.

I take the figures of 1867-8, being an average good season. The subsequent ones, 1868-9 and 1869-70 have been bad.

The administration report does not give the distribution of chief crops, but I find in the Statistical Reporter of the *Indian Economist* (page 136) of 15th March, 1871, a table of the crops for 1868-9. From this it will be seen that, out of a total of 22,000,000 acres, rice, jowari, bajri, wheat, and barley make up—

Rice	2,479,874
Jowari and Bajri	4,302,800
Wheat and Barley	7,257,873

Acres 14,040,637 or nearly ½

As I cannot get the prices of all the above kinds of produce, except wheat and barley, if I take wheat to represent all, I shall be above the mark.

In the administration report of 1868-9 there is a table given of prices wheat and barley. I take the prices for the months of April, May,

and June as those of the good season of 1867-8. The subsequent prices are affected by drought. I should have preferred to take the prices for January to June 1868; but the table does not give the earlier months. These prices are of some of the chief markets only, so that, taking the prices to represent the whole of the respective districts, and then taking the average of these few districts to represent the whole of the North-West Provinces, the result will be much higher; so, as in the case of the Punjab, I deduct 10 per cent. as some correction for these errors of excess.

The prices given in the report of 1868-9, pages 29, 30, are as follow :—“The following table gives the prices at the close of each month for the year in the chief markets of the provinces. The figures denote seers and chittacks.

Districts.	WHEAT.							My Remarks.
	April.		May.		June.		Average.	
	s.	c.	s.	c.	s.	c.	lb. oz.	
Saharunpore.	22	6	25	14	25	14	24 11 49 6	The report does not say which seer this is.
Mecrut	26	0	27	0	27	8	26 13 53 10	
Moradabad	26	10	25	10	24	0	25 8 ³ / ₄ 51 1	(Parliamentary Return No. 29 of 1862, page 5.)
Bareilly	25	10	27	8	25	0	26 0 52 0	
Muttra	24	0	24	0	24 0 48 0	I take this seer = 2 lb.
Agra	23	0	23	0	24	0	23 5 46 10	16 chittacks = 1 seer
Cawnpore ...	23	0	23	0	22	0	22 11 45 6	
Allahabad ...	18	4	18	0	17	0	17 12 35 8	The report also does not say whether these quantities were got for one rupee, but it evidently appears to
Mirzapore ...	18	0	18	0	17	0	17 10 ³ / ₄ 35 6	„ be meant so.
Benares	17	5	18	5	18	0	17 15 ³ / ₄ 35 14	

The administration reports give no table of produce per acre of different crops. I adopt the same scale as given in the case of the Punjab, for the following additional reasons:—* Captain Harvey Tuket's estimate in the year 1840, from 2,000 experiments, of which 512 were for wheat, made by the Government of the North-West Provinces, gives the average produce of wheat per acre at 1,046 lbs. The late Mr. Thornton, formerly Secretary to that Government, has recorded that, judging from his own experience, he should say that 1,200 lbs. per acre was a high average for irrigated land, and 700 lbs.

* The "Agricultural Gazette of India" of the *Indian Economist*, 15th August, 1869, No. 1.

for that of which a considerable portion is dry.* Mr. Marconochi, in his recent settlements of Oonah (Oudh), gives for irrigated land—

1st class 21 bushels=1,218 lbs. (at 58 lbs. per bushel).

2nd " 16 " = 928 "

3rd " 9 " = 522 "

and for unirrigated land—

1st class 11 bushels= 638 "

2nd " 9 " = 522 "

3rd " 7 " = 406 "

Taking second class as representing the bulk, the average for irrigated land may be considered as 928 lbs., and for unirrigated 522 lbs. From all the above particulars it will be seen that the estimate I have adopted, of 1,100 lbs. per acre for irrigated and 600 lbs. for unirrigated land, is something above a fair average. A Settlement Officer of the North-West Provinces, in a letter to the *Indian Economist* of 15th February, 1871 ("Agricultural Gazette," page 171), sums up all that is known to him on the subject of the produce of wheat per acre in those Provinces. It will be too long an extract to insert here; but, making allowance for the "mischievous fallacy" of all official documents alluded to by this writer, about which I have already complained to the India Office, and which vitiates averages for a number of years or places, I think the average I have adopted above is something more than a reasonable one. When administration reports will give, as they ought, correct particulars for each district every year, accurate estimates of the actual produce of the Provinces could be easily made. I give the calculations below. The table of cultivated land, given at page 45 of the appendix to the administration report of 1867-8, does not give the irrigated and unirrigated extent of land separately for the Moradabad, Tarræ, Mynpoorie, Banda, and Ghazipore districts.

I find that the totals of irrigated and unirrigated land bear nearly the proportion of two-fifths and three-fifths respectively of the whole total cultivated land. I assign the same proportion to the above districts in the absence of actual particulars.

Wheat.

Districts.	Irrigated Land.	Produce per Acre.	Total Produce.	For 1 Re.	Total Value.
	Acres.	lbs.	lbs.	lbs. oz.	Rs.
Saharunpore	160,058	1,100	176,063,800	49 6	35,65,849
Meerut	577,346	"	635,080,600	53 10	1,17,26,444
Moradabad	806,930	"	787,623,000	51 1	1,73,83,069
Barcilly	344,662	"	379,128,200	52 1	72,82,174
Muttra	332,542	"	365,796,300	48 0	89,22,837
Agra	434,166	"	477,582,600	46 10	1,02,43,058
Cawnpore	397,390	"	437,135,600	45 6	96,33,842
Allahabad	345,624	"	380,180,400	35 8	1,07,09,476
Mirzapore	198,723	"	218,705,300	35 6	61,22,481
Benares	258,771	"	262,866,100	35 14	75,01,549
Total...	3,836,518	9,31,50,779

* See also Parliamentary Return No. 99 of 1872, page 471.

The average value of the produce of one acre will be Rs. 24-2-8.

Applying the average of the above districts to the whole of the irrigated area of the North-West Provinces, the result will be—acres 10,045,050 \times Rs. 24-2-8 = Rs. 24,38,93,814.

In a similar manner, the total value of the produce of unirrigated land, as represented by wheat, will be as follows:—

Districts.	Unirrigated Land.	Produce per Acre.	Total Produce.	For 1 Re.	Total Value.
	Acres.	lbs.	lbs.	lbs. oz.	Rs.
Saharunpore	621,382	600	372,829,200	47 6	75,50,960
Meerut	453,694	"	272,216,400	53 10	50,76,288
Moradabad	484,158	"	290,494,800	51 1	56,88,992
Bareilly	768,283	"	460,957,800	52 1	88,53,920
Muttra	406,153	"	243,691,800	48 0	50,70,912
Agra	374,970	"	224,985,600	46 10	48,25,424
Cawnpore	436,636	"	261,981,600	45 6	57,73,696
Allahabad	644,594	"	386,756,400	35 8	1,08,94,544
Mirzapore	614,658	"	368,794,800	35 6	1,04,25,280
Benares	202,818	"	121,690,800	35 14	33,92,064
Total... 5,007,372		6,75,58,080

The average value of wheat per acre of unirrigated land is, therefore, Rs. 13-4-9.

Applying this average to the whole unirrigated land of the North-West Provinces, we get—acres 14,132,111 \times Rs. 13-4-9 = Rs. 19,06,42,177. The grand total of the value of the produce of irrigated and unirrigated land will be—

Irrigated 10,045,050 acres = Rs. 24,38,93,814

Unirrigated... 14,132,111 " = " 19,06,42,177

Total... 24,177,161 " = " 43,45,35,991

Deducting 10 per cent. for reasons stated above, the remainder will be Rs. 39,10,82,392 for a population of 30,086,898, or say £40,000,000 for a population of 30,000,000.

BENGAL.

The administration reports till 1869-70 give no information required by the Statistical Committee, except the area of districts in square miles and acres (report 1869-70). For information for cultivated area, distribution, produce of crops, and prices, I have to look out elsewhere, or make a rough estimate.

First, with regard to the extent of cultivated land, I adopt the following plan as the best I can. The total area of the North-West Provinces is about 50,000,000 acres, of which about 25,000,000 are cultivated. The population of those Provinces is, by the late census

of 1865, about 30,000,000, so we have the total area 5 acres to 3 persons, and of cultivated area five-sixths of an acre per head. Now, assuming Bengal to be at least as thickly populated as the North-West Provinces, and the total area, as given in the administration report of 1869-70 (appendix, page xxi.), being about 105,000,000 acres, the population of Bengal will be about 63,000,000; and I am encouraged to adopt this figure instead of 36,000,000 of the report of 1869-70, as the *Englishman* of 25th June, 1872, states that the census of Bengal, as far as the figures are made up, lead to an estimate of about 65,000,000. Again, as in the North-West Provinces, I allow five-sixths of an acre of cultivated land per head, and take, therefore, 54,000,000 acres of cultivated land for a population of 65,000,000.

With regard to produce, coarse rice is the chief produce of Bengal, and, in taking it to represent the whole produce, I shall be near enough the mark. For the produce of rice per acre, I take a table given in the report of the Indigo Commission (Parliamentary Return No. 72, 1 of 1861, page 292), in which produce of paddy per beegah is given for a number of districts. The rough average, without reference to the quantity of land in each district, come to about 9 maunds per beegah.

The maund I take is the Indian maund of 82 lbs. The quantity of produce per beegah given in the table is evidently for rice and husk; for, though not so stated, this would be apparent by comparing the money values of these quantities given in the same table, with the prices for 1860 given in the table at page 291.

The beegah I find explained, at page lxi. of the same return, at about one-third of an acre. Thacker's Bengal Directory for 1872, page 2, gives the following table for "Bengal square or land measure":—

1 chittack	= 45 square feet	or 5 square yards.
16 "	= 1 cottah	= 720 sq. ft. or 80 sq. yds.
20 cottah	= 1 beegah	= 14,400. " or 1,600 "

This gives a little more than 3 beegahs to an acre.

Mr. Cowasjee Eduljee, the manager of the Port Canning rice mills and lands, thinks, that for an average of all lands, or say for standard land, 7 maunds of paddy per beegah will be a very fair calculation. I take 8 maunds. Mr. Cowasjee further says, as the out-turn of his mills, that paddy yields 55 per cent. of rice at the outside.

For the price of rice I take the season 1867-8. I take the rough average of the weekly prices given in the *Calcutta Gazette* for the months of January to March, 1868, as fairly representing the effect of the season of 1867-8. This average is taken by simply adding up the prices and dividing by the number of districts, and not on the correct principle of taking the quantities of the produce of each district into account (as in specimen table A I have given for the Central Provinces). The average, therefore, which I have adopted, must be much higher than the actual one, and will require some reasonable deduction. I shall deduct only 10 per cent. as some correction for this, and to make up for any error in the produce per acre. Besides, the prices given in the *Gazette* are retail prices, and are therefore higher than the prices all over the country; so my deduction of 10 per cent. will be but a very small correction for all the errors of my rough calculation. I cannot get the extent of cultivated land for each district. I give below the calculations. Since writing these notes, I have seen the late census report, which gives the population as 66,856,859, or say 67,000,000.

The approximate area of cultivated land will be, say, five-sixths of 67,000,000 or 56,000,000 acres. The produce per acre, taken as 24 maunds paddy per acre, will give about 13 maunds of clean rice, or 1,066 lbs.—say 1,100 lbs. The total produce of 56,000,000 acres will be 616,000,000 lbs., which, at 58 lbs. per rupee (as obtained by the rough average of the weekly prices of the three months of January, February, and March, 1868), will give Rs. 1,06,00,00,000, or £106,000,000. Deducting 10 per cent. will give £95,400,000, or say £96,000,000, for a population of 67,000,000. This will amply cover the higher price of some of the articles, such as silk, indigo, cost price of opium, tea, &c., or any double crops, &c. The percentage of these products is a small one; the total value for *all* these will be under 10 per cent. of the whole produce, while the average of price I have taken for rice as representing the whole produce of the presidency will be found much above the actuals. On the whole, I cannot help thinking that the total value of all productions of the Bengal Presidency will be found much under, than above, my estimate. It is very desirable, however, to get a correct result, and the Statistical Committee or Agricultural Department should give it.

MADRAS.

I take the administration report of 1868-9, as I have not been able to get an opportunity of studying that of 1867-8. Besides, as prices have not much altered, the latter report is the better. I am obliged to ascertain the produce per acre from other sources: the report does not give this information. I take paddy to represent the produce of wet and cumboo for dry land, as they form the bulk of the produce of the country.

Mr. H. Newill, the Director of Settlements for South Arcot, in his letter of 27th August, 1859 (Selections of the Madras Government, No. 14 of 1869, Appendix Y, from page 142), gives an elaborate table of produce per acre of the principal grains, as ascertained by a large number of experiments and general enquiry; and the result of his investigations gives, for the different classes of soils, the following produce, from which 5 per cent. is to be deducted for numerous ridges for regulating irrigation channels, exterior boundaries, &c. :—

Produce of Wet Land per acre for "Good Crop" first grade Land—

Description of Soils.	Value assigned for good Crops per acre. H.C. (Bazaar Huris Cullum.)
1.	45
2.	40
3.	35
4.	30
5.	28
6.	40
7.	35
8.	35
9.	28
10.	30

Description of Soils	Value assigned for good Crops per acre.
	H.C. (Bazar Harris Cultiva).
11.	35
12.	20
13.	18
14. }	15
15. }	
Average...30	

Deducting 5 per cent. for ridges, &c., $30 - 1\frac{1}{2} = 28\frac{1}{2}$ H. C.

For second grade land, deduct 15 per cent., which will give 24½ H. C. For third grade deduct 20 per cent., which will give 22.8 H.C. For bad seasons Mr. Newill deducts 10 per cent. more, which I do not; so that the produce calculated by me is for "good crop," or in "good season," as in all other cases. Taking second grade as the bulk of the land, I take 24½ H. C. as the average of all wet land.

For dry land for cumboo (page 150), Mr. Newill gives the produce per acre as follows:—

Descriptions of Soils. H.C.	Descriptions of Soils. H.C.	Descriptions of Soils. H.C.
1. 21	6. 17	11. 12
2. 18	7. 15	12. 10
3. 17	8. 13	13. 10
4. 16	9. 12	14. 9
5. 14	10. 14	15. 8
Average... 13½ say 14 H.C.		

The next thing necessary is to ascertain the correct average price. I take the average price as given in the administration report (calculated on the wrong principle referred to by me before), bearing in mind that the correct average, as worked out according to specimen table A, would be very likely found lower. Again, taking the rough average of first and second class paddy, the price comes to Rs. 180 per garce; and as second-class paddy must be the bulk of the produce, the correct average price in this respect also must be lower. In taking, therefore, Rs. 180 per garce, some reasonable allowance will have to be made. I shall make it only 10 per cent. for all kinds of excess. It is too much work for me to calculate as in table A.

Wet land under cultivation (except South Canara and Malabar, where areas under cultivation are not given) is, for 1868-9, 2,957.748 acres at 24½ H. C. produce per acre (and 133½ H. C. = 1 garce*) will give 511,490 garces, which, at Rs. 180 per garce, will give Rs. 9,68,53,500—the total value of the produce of wet land.

* 24 Madras measures = 1 Harris Cultiva.

133½ Harris Cultiva = 1 Madras Garce.

(Selection of the Madras Government, No. XIV. of 1869, page 26.)

Dry cultivated land (except South Canara and Malabar) is 13,560,329 acres, and, with produce at 14 H.C. per acre (and 133 H.C. = 1 garce), will give 1,427,403 garces. I take the rough average price as given in the table—Rs. 188 per garce—in the administration report of 1868-69. This will be an over-estimate, as quantities in each district are not taken into account. The total value will be—1,427,403 garces at Rs. 188 = Rs. 26,83,51,764. Total produce of wet and dry lands will be Rs. 36,52,05,264; adding 10 per cent. for South Canara and Malabar, the total for all the Madras Presidency will be a little above Rs. 40,00,00,000. From this is to be allowed 10 per cent. as a correction for errors of high averages, which will leave, say £36,000,000, for a population of 26,539,052 (Parliamentary Return No. ^(C. 184) 1870), or say 26,500,000.

BOMBAY.

The season 1867-8 was a favorable one (Bombay administration report, 1867-8, page 59); that for 1868-9 unfavorable (report for 1868-9, page 65). I take the former to ascertain the produce of a fair good season. I am sorry that the administration reports give no agricultural information. I therefore take the necessary particulars from other sources. The Revenue Commissioner's reports for 1867-8 give the total area under cultivation for the Northern Division at 5,129,754 acres and 1,263,139 beegahs, in which are included for grass and fallow-land 611,198 acres and 226,708 beegahs. The actual cultivated land will, after deducting this, be 4,518,556 acres and 1,036,431 beegahs=609,842 acres, or total acres 5,128,398. Out of this, bajri, jowari, rice, and cotton make up nearly two-thirds, or above 60 per cent. as follows:—

	Acres.	Beegahs.
Pajri ...	985,427	56,857
Jowari ...	676,377	224,210
Rice ...	616,802	94,306
Cotton ...	519,058	319,572
	2,797,664	694,945=408,791 acres,
		or total acres 3,206,455

Similarly for the Southern Division, out of the total acres, 13,085,892, jowari, bajri, rice, and cotton make up above 60 per cent., as follows:—

	Acres.
Jowari ...	4,906,073
Bajri ...	2,715,719
Rice ...	504,015
Cotton ...	704,629
	<u>8,830,436</u>

I take, therefore, these four articles to represent the produce of the *whole* presidency, though this will give a higher estimate. Neither the administration nor the Revenue Commissioner's reports give produce per acre or prices. I take these two items as follows. From Selections of the Bombay Government, Nos. 10 and 11 of 1853, I get the following estimate of produce:—

Produce per Acre in Pounds.

Selection.		Districts reported upon.	Bajri with Kuthule.	Jowari with Kuthule.	Sathi, or Coarse Rice.	Kupas or Uncleaned Cotton.	Remarks.
No.	Page.		lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	
X.	15	Prant of Husore— Morassa & Bayar Pergunnah in Ahmedabad Collectorate	680	700	1,020		Cleaned Cotton as per experiments made under order of Mr. Saunders, Resident of Hyderabad, in Bassein district of Berar—average of 8 acres, giving 31½ lbs. of clean Cotton and 83½ lbs. of Seed. (<i>Agricultural Gazette of India</i> , of 21st August, 1871, page 3.) This would give 82 lbs. for 305 lbs. of kupas.
	106	Duskroec pergunnah— Greatest ..		1,700	1,500	1,360	
XI.	15	Dholka— Least.....	270	210	410	200	
		Greatest ..	1,700	1,500	1,360	410	
		Least.....	270	210	410	200	
		Rough average.....	924	856	912	305	

The above averages belong to a fertile part of the Northern Division; so that if I put down 900 lbs. for bajri, jowari, and rice per acre, and 80 lbs. of cotton for the whole of that Division, I shall be making a high estimate.

The next thing to settle is the prices. I take them from the *Government Gazette* weekly prices for the months of January to May 1868, as fairly representing the effect of the average favorable season of 1867-8. These are retail prices of the chief markets of the respective districts, and it will be necessary to deduct 10 per cent. to make a fair average for the whole of the Division. For cotton I take the export prices from the Prices Current of the Bombay Chamber of Commerce for January to May, 1868. This gives an average of Rs. 181 per candy. The export prices I have taken represent more than the average value of the whole crop of the presidency, as the above average is for Fair Dholera and Bhowuggur, which necessarily give a higher figure than the average of all the different varieties. Again, the bulk of the cotton is not 'fair,' but 'mid-fair,' so, to make a fair allowance for all these circumstances, I take the price for 1867-8 as Rs. 170 per candy of 784 lbs.

The Southern Division.—As a whole, this Division is not as fertile as the Northern. I shall take, however, only 50 lbs. less for bajri, jowari, and rice; and for cotton I take 60 lbs. per acre—a high average for the whole of the Division; for Mr. J. B. Smith, M.P., in his paper of 1857 read before the Society of Arts, quotes Mr. Vary,

the then late Superintendent of Government Cotton Experiments in Sattara and Sholapore, to the effect that "40 lbs. per acre per clean cotton is considered a fair crop." For rice, I take Rutnagherry as exceptional in its produce. If I give 1,700 lbs. per acre for the whole district, it will be a high average.* I take the prices from the *Government Gazette* in the same way as for the Northern Division, and a similar reduction of 10 per cent. will have to be made. I give below a table worked out in the manner described above:—

Dajri.

Collectorates.	Cultivated Area. Acres.	Total produce (at 900 lbs. per Acre.) lbs.	Price per 1 Re. lbs.	Total Value. Rs.
Ahmedabad.....	129,365†	116,428,500	33·6	34,65,134
Kaira.....	150,841	135,756,900	30·0	45,25,230
Surat.....	27,217	24,495,300	25·5	9,60,600
Khandeish.....	711,447	640,302,300	27·6	2,31,99,359
Tanna.....
Total...	1,018,870	3,21,50,323
		(850 lbs. per Acre.)		
Poona.....	834,325	709,176,250	34·7	2,04,37,356
Ahmednuggur.....	1,152,316	979,468,600	34·3	2,85,55,936
Kulladghee.....	240,165	204,140,250	64·4‡	31,69,880
Rutnagherry.....
Belgaum.....	76,228	64,793,800	59·2	10,94,489
Dhacwar.....	14,108	11,991,800	69·0	1,73,795
Sattara.....	398,573	338,787,050	52·9	64,04,292
Total...	2,715,715	5,98,35,748

* The Statistical Reporter of the *Indian Economist* of 22nd January, 1872, gives a table, on official authority, of the total produce of the Bombay Presidency. The figures given for Rutnagherry are evidently wrong. For 113,206 acres, the produce of rice is given as 10,11,004 maunds of 82 lbs., which will be above 7,200 lbs. per acre. The best land may produce as much as 3,000, but 7,200 lbs. is simply out of the question. In the Pardy settlement (*Indian Economist* of 15th July, 1871, page 320), an acre of rice, "in embanked land receiving full supply of water for a crop of rice," is put down as producing 3,400 lbs. Even in Bengal and Burmah—rice-producing countries—there is no such production as 7,000 lbs. per acre. For the rest of the presidency (excepting Canara), the total produce is given as follows:—

Rice—

Acres.
822,218

Produce, maunds
of 82 lbs.
2,197,713, giving an average of
917 lbs.

Jowari and Berri—

Acres.
9,470,187

Produce, maunds
of 82 lbs.
44,557,000, giving an average
of 385 lbs.

Now, the year 1860-70 is reported to have been an average favorable season, in which case my adopting 900 lbs. for the Northern and 800 for the Southern Division for all grains, is very much higher than the real average. For cotton the figures are acres 1,037,375, maunds 1,264,406, giving an average of 1708 maunds, or 136 lbs. It is not stated whether this is cleaned or seed cotton. Any way, this cannot be correct. It is, however, remarked by the official who supplies those statistics:—"The figures in table iii., giving the weight of produce, are not, it is feared, very reliable, but now that attention is being given to the subject, they will become more so every year." I earnestly hope that it will be so; correct statistics of this kind are extremely important.

† Correct in Northern Division; the cultivated area is given partly in acres and partly in beegahs. The beegahs are converted into acres, as 17 beegahs = 1 acre.

‡ Bhabhake price is taken.

Jowari.

Collectorates.	Cultivated Area.	Total Produce (at 900 lbs. per Acre.)	Price per 1 Re.	Total Value.
	Acres.	lbs.	lbs.	Rs.
Ahmedabad	119,679	107,711,100	42'4	25,40,356
Kaira	44,536	40,082,400	42'4	9,45,339
Surat	178,839	160,955,100	27'1	59,39,302
Khandeish	465,198	418,678,200	40'4	1,03,63,322
Tanna	10	9,000	26'8	336
Total...	808,262	1,07,88,655
		(850 lbs. per Acre.)		
Poona	1,487,816	1,264,643,600	49'5	2,55,48,355
Ahmednuggur	852,232	724,397,200	45'6	1,58,85,003
Kulladghee	1,162,582	988,194,700	70'0	1,41,17,060
Rutnagherry
Belgaum	426,542	362,560,700	66'0	54,03,344
Dharwar	511,389	434,680,650	83'8	51,37,120
Sattara	465,509	395,682,650	52'6	75,22,487
Total...	4,906,070	7,37,54,269

Rice.

Collectorates.	Cultivated Area.	Total Produce (at 900 lbs. per Acre.)	and Sort. Price per 1 Re.	Total Value.
	Acres.	lbs.	lbs.	Rs.
Ahmedabad	31,902	28,711,800	14'0	20,50,843
Kaira	51,443	46,298,700	12'2	37,94,975
Surat	108,348	97,513,200	11'27	86,52,458
Khandeish	12,081	10,872,900	20'1	5,40,940*
Tanna	468,499	421,649,100	20'1†	2,09,77,567
Total...	672,273	605,045,700	3,60,16,783
		(850 lbs. per Acre.)		
Poona	108,643	92,346,550	22'2	41,59,754
Ahmednuggur	28,922	24,583,700	12'3	19,98,674
Kulladghee	5,496	4,671,600	20'9	2,23,521
Rutnagherry	130,403	221,685,100	27'0	82,10,559
		(1,700 lbs. per Acre.)		
Belgaum	70,889	60,255,650	29'0	20,77,781
Dharwar	91,840	78,064,000	27'1	28,81,590
Sattara	67,820	57,647,000	22'4	25,73,527
Total...	504,013	539,253,600	3,21,24,406

* Average of Tanna and Alhaug.

† Price at Dhooina being not given, I have taken the same with Tanna.

Cotton.

Collectorates.	Cultivated Area.	Produce per Acre.	Total Produce.	Price per Candy.	Total Value.
	Acres.	lbs.	lbs.	Rs.	Rs.
Ahmedabad	707,041	80	56,563,280	170	1,22,64,997
Kaira					
Surat					
Khandeish					
Tanna					
Poona	704,629	60	42,277,740	170	91,67,367
Ahmednuggur					
Kulladghee					
Rutnagherry					
Belgaum					
Dharwar					
Sattara					

SUMMARY.

Northern Division.

Acres.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Bajri ... 1,018,870	3,21,50,323		
Jowari ... 808,262	1,97,88,655		
Rice 672,273	3,60,16,783		
		8,79,55,761	- 10% = 7,91,60,185
Cotton ... 707,041		1,22,64,997
<u>Total, 3,206,446</u>			<u>Rs... 9,14,25,182</u>

Average per acre... Rs. 28'51.

Southern Division.

Acres.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Bajri ... 2,715,715	5,98,35,748		
Jowari... 4,906,070	7,37,54,269		
Rice 504,013	2,21,24,406		
		15,57,14,423	- 10% = 14,01,42,981
Cotton ... 704,629		91,67,367
<u>Total, 8,830,427</u>			<u>Rs... 14,93,10,348</u>

Average per acre... Rs. 17.

Total Cultivated Area.

	Acres.	Rs.
Northern Division ...	5,128,221 at Rs. 28'51	= 14,62,05,580
Southern ..	13,985,892 at .. 17	= 23,77,60,164
<u>Total Rs...</u>		<u>38,39,65,744</u>

This gives for the whole of the Bombay Presidency the total value as Rs. 38,39,65,744, or say £40,000,000, for a population of 11,000,000. About two or three months ago I came across an unexpected confirmation of my calculations. I was able to get from my friend Mr Nowrojee Furdoonjee, a few notes from Colonel Prescott's reports on the settlement of Akleshwar Taluka—I suppose an average Gujara taluka. Colonel Prescott has made the value of gross produce (excluding straw) about Rs. 24 per acre, while my estimate for the whole of the Northern Division is above Rs. 28 per acre.

ODDH.

The administration report does not give the agricultural tables, but they are given in the revenue report. Wheat forms the most important produce in Oudh, as in the North-West Provinces. I take it to represent the whole produce. In the revenue report ending 30th September, 1868, the average produce per acre is given as 892 lbs.—say 900 lbs. Now, in Oudh, irrigated land is nearly within 10 per cent. of unirrigated land. I shall give the above produce per acre for both, as the table also gives this as the average of all land. The year 1867-8 was somewhat below an average good season, and the prices, therefore, higher than they would be for an average good season year. I take them, however, as they are. The average for wheat, first quality, is given at Rs. 1-9-7 per maund of 80 lbs., and for second quality Rs. 1-8-4—the average will be about Rs. 1-9. As a small correction for the prices being of an inferior season, the average being on the usual wrong principle, and the second quality being the largest quantity, I shall deduct only 10 per cent. The total cultivated area is 12,486 square miles, or 7,991,040 acres. The total produce, at 900 lbs. of wheat per acre, will be 7,191,936,000 lbs. and the total value, at the rate of Rs. 1-9 per maund of 80 lbs., will be Rs. 14,04,67,000. This, less 10 per cent., will be Rs. 12,64,20,750 or say £13,000,000, for a population of 9,500,000.

SUMMARY.

Provinces.	Value of the Produce of Cultivated Land.	Population.	Produce per Head.
	£		Rs.
Central Provinces	16,000,000	9,000,000	18
Punjab	36,000,000	17,500,000	21
North-West Provinces ...	40,000,000	30,000,000	14
Bengal	96,000,000	67,000,000	15
Madras	36,000,000	26,500,000	14
Bombay	40,000,000	11,000,000	36
Oudh	13,000,000	9,500,000	14
Total	277,000,000	170,500,000	

Such is the produce of India for a good season year, in which any second crops will be fully included. I have not taken the produce of grazing-land, or straw or kurby, though the cattle required for cultiva-

tion and stock need not only all these grazing-lands, but also a portion of the produce of the cultivated land, such as some grains, fodder, and other produce. From the above total of £277,000,000 it is necessary to deduct for seed for next year, say, only 6 per cent., that is, allowing sixteen-fold for produce of land. The balance will be about £260,000,000 as the produce of cultivation, during a good season, for human use and consumption for a year. If the Government of India would calculate this production *correctly*, it would find the total a good deal under the above figures.

I have next to add for annual produce of stock for consumption, annual value of manufacturing industry, net opium revenue, cost of production of salt, coals, and mines, and profits of foreign commerce.

Salt, opium, coal, and profits of commerce will be about £17,000,000. For annual price of manufacturing industry or stock, I have not come across full particulars. The manufacturing industry in the Punjab—where there are some valuable industries, such as shawls, silks, &c., to the total estimated value of the “annual out-turns of all works”—is put down as about £3,774,000. From this we deduct the value of the raw produce; and if I allow this value to be doubled by all the manufactures, I shall be making a good allowance. Say, then, that the value of the industry is about £2,000,000, including the price of wool; the manufactures of other parts of India are not quite as valuable. Therefore, for the population of all British India, which is about ten times that of the Punjab, if I take £15,000,000 for the value of manufacturing industry, I shall not be far from the mark. The total for Central Provinces for 1870-71 for all manufactures is about £1,850,000. There are no very valuable industries, allowing, therefore, £850,000 for the value of the industry for a population of 9,000,000. In this proportion, the total value for India will be about, say, £17,000,000. For the annual produce of stock and fish for human consumption as milk or meat, I can hardly get sufficient data to work upon. I hope Government will give the particulars more fully, so that the annual production of stock for consumption, either as milk or meat, may be known. I set it down as £15,000,000 as a guess only.

All this will make up a total of about £307,000,000. I add for any contingencies another £30,000,000, making at the utmost £340,000,000 for a population of 170,000,000, or 40s. a head for an average *good season*. I have no doubt that, if the Statistical Department worked out the whole *correctly* and fully, they would find the total less. Again, when further allowance is made for bad seasons, I cannot help thinking that the result will be nearer 30s. than 40s. a head. One thing is evident—that I am not guilty of any under-estimate of produce.

Adding this additional £63,000,000 in proportion of population, that is to say, 7s. 5d. per head, the total production of each province will be as follows:—

	Per head.	
	s.	d.
Central Provinces	43	5
Punjab	49	5
North-West Provinces	35	5
Bengal	37	5
Madras	35	5
Bombay	79	5
Oudh	35	5
Average	40	0

NECESSARY CONSUMPTION.

I now consider what is necessary for the bare wants of a human being, to keep him in ordinary good health and decency.

I have calculated production chiefly for the year 1867-8. I shall take the same year for ascertaining the necessary consumption.

Surgeon S. B. Partridge, Government Medical Inspector of Emigrants, in a statement dated Calcutta, 26th March, 1870,* proposes the following as a scale of diet to supply the necessary ingredients of nourishment for the emigrant coolies during their voyage, living in a state of quietude.

Rice Diet for One Man.		For Flour Diet.	
	ozs.		ozs.
Rice	20 0	Flour	16 0
Dhal.....	6 0	Dhal.....	4 6
Preserved Mutton.....	2 5	Preserved Mutton.....	2 5
Vegetables	4 27	Vegetables	4 27
Ghee	1 0	Ghee	1 5
Mustard Oil	0 5	Mustard Oil	0 5
Salt.....	1 0	Salt	1 0
	Total...35 27		Total...29 77

The administration report of Bengal for 1870-71 gives, in appendix II D, the following "scale of provisions for ships carrying Indian emigrants to British and foreign colonies west of the Cape of Good Hope."

"Daily allowance to each statute Adult (Children above two and under ten years of age to receive half rations).

Class.	Articles.	Remarks.
	ozs. drs.	
Grain	Rice	(Four kinds of dhals make up this quantity.)
	Flour	
	Dhal { for rice-eaters.. 6 0	
	{ for flour-eaters.. 4 0	
Oil	Ghee { for rice-eaters.. 1 0	Half an ounce extra allowance of ghee to each adult for every day that dried fish is supplied.
	{ for flour-eaters.. 1 8	
	Mustard Oil.... 0 8	

* The Indian Economist of 15th October, 1870, Statistical Appendix, p. 20.

Class.	Articles.	Remarks.
	ozs. drs.	
Meats, &c...	Preserved Mutton 2 8	In lieu of preserved mutton to be supplied at scale rate, dried fish for two to three weeks. Fresh mutton (sheep) one week.
Vegetables	{ 1 oz. pump-kins or yams } 2 oz. potatoes } 5 0	In lieu of fresh potatoes, a sufficient quantity of preserved potatoes to allow 2 ozs. twice a week to each adult, or about five weeks' supply at scale rate.
	2 oz. onions...	
Curry Stuff, &c.	Garlic 0 0 ½	
	Mustard Seed... 0 0 ½	
	Chillies 0 0 ½	
	Black Pepper... 0 1 ½	
	Coriander Seed 0 2	
	Turmeric..... 0 4	
Narcotic	Tamarind 0 8	Or in lieu of firewood, its equivalent in coal for half the quantity.
	Salt 0 8	
	Prepared tobacco 0 7	
	Leaf..... 0 3	
	Firewood..... 2 0	

Besides the above, there is an allowance for dry provision to be used at the discretion of the surgeon, for medical comforts, medicine, instruments and appliances for hospital and dispensary. Again, for confirmed opium-eaters or *ganja*-smokers, the surgeon superintendent is to see a proper quantity supplied. Surgeon Partridge's scale is *absolutely* necessary to supply the necessary ingredients of nitrogen and carbon; not the slightest luxury—no sugar or tea, or any little enjoyment of life, but simple animal subsistence of coolies living in a state of quietude. I have worked out below the cost of living according to Surgeon Partridge's scale for the year 1867-8 at Ahmedabad prices. The scale in the Bengal administration report provides curry-stuff and narcotics in addition, which I have not calculated in this table, though it can hardly be said that they are not necessities to those poor people.

Cost of necessary living at Ahmedabad prices, on 30th January, 1868, as given in the "Bombay Government Gazette."

Rice, second sort, 20 oz. per day, or 37½ lbs. per month, at 15 lbs. per rupee	Rs. 2 8 0
Dhal 6 oz. per day, or 11¼ lbs. per month, at 20 lbs.* per rupee	" 0 9 0
Preserved mutton 2½ oz. per day, or 4 lbs. 11 oz. per month, at 6½ lbs.† per rupee	" 0 11 7
Vegetable 4·27 oz. per day, or 8 lbs. per month, at 20 lbs.‡ per rupee	" 0 6 5
Ghee 1 oz. per day, or 1 lb. 14 oz. per month, at 2 lbs. 1 oz. per rupee	" 0 11 0

* There are three kinds of dhal—Dorud, Masag, and Toor. I take an average.

† I don't find price of preserved mutton. I have taken of mutton.

‡ No price is given for vegetables. I take it the same as dhal.

Mustard oil 0.5 oz. per day, or 1 lb. 8 oz. per month, at 6 lbs.* per rupee	Rs. 0 4 0
Salt 1 oz. per day, or 1 lb. 14 oz. per month, at 38 lbs.† per rupee	„ 0 0 10
	<hr/>
Per Month.....	Rs. 5 2 10

The annual cost of living, or subsistence only, at Ahmedabad prices, is thus : Rs. 62-2.

The following is an estimate of the lowest absolute scale of necessities of a common agricultural labourer in the Bombay Presidency annually, by Mr. Kazeo Shahaludin, formerly a deputy collector :—

Food—

1½ lbs. rice per day, at Rs. 2 to Rs. 2.8 per maund of 40 lbs., say... ..	Rs. 28 8
Salt, including waste, about 1 oz. a day	„ 1 0
½ lb. Dhal	„ 9 0
Vegetables	„ 0 0
Food-oil	„ 5 0
Condiments, chillies, &c	„ 0 10
Tobacco	„ 5 0
	<hr/>
	*Rs.... 48 8

Clothing—

3 Dhotees a year	Rs. 3 0
1 pair champal (shoes)... ..	„ 0 12
½ a turban	„ 1 8
1 Bunde (jacket)	„ 1 0
2 Kamlees (blankets)	„ 1 8
1 Rumal (handkerchief)	„ 0 2
1 Rain-protector	„ 0 4
	<hr/>
	Rs.... 8 2

The dress of the female of the house—

1½ Saree (dress)	Rs. 3 12
1 Cholee (short jacket)	„ 0 12
Oil for head	„ 1 8
Bangrees (glass bangles)	„ 0 6
½ Champal (shoes)	„ 0 4
Extras	„ 1 0
	<hr/>
	Rs.... 7 10

The old members of the family will require as much.

* No price of mustard-oil is given. I have taken for oil, which is the cheapest among the four kinds of oil given in the table.

† This is the price of common sea salt, which would require to be taken more than a ½ oz. to make up for the ½ oz. of good salt required. Also, there is some wastage or loss.

Lodging—

Hut (labour taken as his own)	Rs. 25	0
Hut repairs (bamboos, &c.), per annum	"	4 0
Oil for lamp, per day	"	0 0½
Barber, per month	"	0 1
Domestic utensils, per annum... ..	"	0 12

Say altogether Rs. 12 to Rs. 15 for the family.

Taking one-quarter less, for reasons stated further on, to calculate the cost per head of family, the result will be—

Food.....Rs. 36	} Without any provision for social and religious wants, letting alone luxuries, and anything to spare for bad seasons.
Clothing ... " 6	
Lodging ... " 3	
<u>Rs.... 45</u>	

The report of the Bombay Price Commission gives the following particulars of the wants of the lowest servants of Government (pages 85, 86), supplied from the Poona district :

	Quantities per month.	Cost per month in 1863.		Remarks.
	Seers.	Rs.	a.	
Rice	12	1	8	It will be observed that simple living and clothing are here exhibited, and nothing is taken into account for support of dependent members of family, servants, religious and other domestic expenses.
Bajri	12	1	4	
Toor Dhal, &c... ..	4	0	12	
Ghee	0½	0	10	
Vegetables	0	6	
Oil.....	1½	0	6	
Firewood	0	8	
Salt	1	0	1	
Mussala	0	2	
Chillies.....	0½	0	2	
Milk	4	0	8	
Betelnut-leaves..	...	0	8	
	Rs...	6	11	

Clothing—

	Cost, per month.			
Turbans... ..	Rs.	0	8	
Dhotee	"	0	10	
Puncha	"	0	2	
Rumal	"	0	0½	
Coats	"	0	3	
Waistcoat	"	0	2	
Shoes	"	0	1½	

Total...Rs. 1 11

Grand total...Rs. 8 6 per month

For Poona, the above scale is calculated to cost Rs. 6-11 per month, or Rs. 80-4 per annum, at the high prices of 1863, while my estimate, according to Surgeon Partridge's scale for 1867-8, is Rs. 5-2-10 per month, or Rs. 62-2 per annum—nearly 24 per cent. less, as prices have gone lower. For clothing, the estimate for 1863 is Rs. 1-11 per month, or Rs. 20-8 per annum, while Mr. Shahabudin's estimate is only Rs. 8-2 in 1868. Even allowing for fall in prices, Mr. Shahabudin's estimate is lower, and calculated on a very low scale for an agricultural labourer in the poorest districts; while that of 1863 is for the lowest class of Government servants. Upon the whole, therefore, the estimate given for 1867-8, as for the bare necessities of a common agricultural labourer, is evidently under the mark.

Lately I found the following in the "Statement of the Moral and Material Progress of India" for 1871-2:—"The best account of the Bombay peasantry is still probably that by Mr. Coats, written fifty years ago. The clothes of a man then cost about 12s., and the furniture of his house about £2."—(Parliamentary Return No. 172 of 28th April, 1873.)

I have not been able to work out the details of cost of living in other parts of India. For the present I give the following approximate comparison for 1867-8:—

Jails.

Provinces.	Cost of Living.			Cost of Clothing.			Total.		
	Rs.	A.	P.	Rs.	A.	P.	Rs.	A.	P.
Central Provinces	25	8	0	5	8	0	31	0	0
Punjab	23	6	0	3	13	0	27	3	0
North-West Provinces ...	18	8	0	3	5	0	21	13	0
Bengal*	28	3	0	3	8	0	31	11	0
Madras	†49	2	7	3	15	9	53	2	4
Bombay	41	13	0	5	10	0	47	7	0
Oudh									

Now, the Bengal Census Report of 1872, page 109 of the appendix, gives the percentage of population according to age as follows:—

Males.		Females.		
Not exceeding 12 years.	Above 12 years.	Not exceeding 12 years.	Above 12 years.	
18.8	31.3	15.7	34.2	The Census of the N.W. Provinces gives nearly the same result. Above 12 years' adults, 64.4 per cent.; under 12, 35.6 per cent. (see Administration Report for 1871—72, page 55; Census Report, vol. 1, page 31).

* Administration Report of Jail for 1871, page 3, of appendix.

† This appears to be a very large expenditure. Besides, the average is taken on the wrong principle, without taking the number of the prisoners in each contract into account. The correct average will be above Rs. 50.

The total adults, that is, above 12 years, are 65·5 per cent. and infants or children under 12 years 34·5 per cent., which gives the proportion of 2 adults to each child, or 1 child to every 3 persons.

From taking the cost of adults per head to be a , and cost of the mass per head to be x , and supposing that, out of 34 per cent. of children under 12, only 17 per cent. cost anything, say one-half of the adult (though the Bengal provision is half for children from two to ten years), while the other 17 cost nothing at all, the problem will be—

$$66a + 17 \frac{a}{2} + 17 \times 0 = 100x$$

$$x = \frac{74\frac{1}{2}a}{100}, \text{ or say } \frac{75a}{100} \text{ or } \frac{3}{4}a,$$

i.e., the cost outside jail, or for the whole mass per head, will be about three-fourths of inside the jail, allowing the jail for adults only. Thus, taking the cost of 3 persons in the jail, or of 3 adults, to 4 persons outside, or of the mass, it comes to this :—

Production per Head.	Three-fourths of Jail Cost of Living or Cost per head outside Jail.
Central Provinces Rs. 21 $\frac{1}{2}$ or say Rs. 22	Rs. 23
Punjab " 24 $\frac{1}{2}$ " " 25	" 20
North-West Provinces ... " 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ " " 18	" 16
Madras " 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ " " 18	" 41
Bengal " 18 $\frac{1}{2}$ " " 19	" 23-12
Bombay " 39 $\frac{1}{2}$ " " 40	" 35
Oudh " 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ " " 18	"

It will be seen, from a comparison of the above figures, that, even for such food and clothing as a criminal obtains, there is hardly enough of production even in a good season, leaving alone all little luxuries, all social and religious wants, all expenses of occasions of joy and sorrow, and any provision for bad season. It must, moreover, be borne in mind that every poor labourer does not get the full share of the average production. The high and middle classes get a much larger share, the poor classes much less, while the lowest cost of living is generally above the average share.

Such appears to be the condition of the masses of India. They do not get enough to provide the bare necessities of life.

On the subject of necessary consumption, I shall be very glad if some members of this Association, or others who possess or can ascertain the necessary information, will supply it, as I have not been able to make such minute and extended enquiries myself as I could wish.

DEFICIT OF IMPORTS COMPARED WITH THE EXPORTS OF INDIA.

The total imports and exports of the United Kingdom for the years 1878 to 1890 are—

Imports	£3,608,216,242 (including Bullion)
Exports	£2,875,027,301 (" ")

This shows an *excess of imports* over exports of £733,158,941, *i.e.*, the imports are above 25 per cent. greater than the exports.

This excess is to be increased to the extent of about £125,000,000, the balance of loans to India included in the exports, less interest on these loans included in imports of about £60,000,000, and by such further amounts as may be made up by balances of loans and interests with foreign parts. As England is the greatest lending country in the world, the ultimate result of excess of commercial imports over commercial exports will most probably be above, rather than under, £733,000,000, or 25 per cent. of exports. At all events, it will not be less than 15 per cent.

For British North America, the total imports and exports, including bullion, for the years 1854 to 1868, are—

Imports	£200,257,620
Exports	£154,900,367

This shows an excess of imports over exports of £45,357,253, *i.e.*, the imports are about 29 per cent. more than the exports, subject to a modification of the extent to which it has received from, or given loan to, foreign parts. As far as I can see, it is a borrower, and the excess to that extent will be lesser.

For Australia, the total imports and exports, including bullion, for the years 1854 to 1868, are—

Imports	£443,407,019
Exports	£384,503,081

The excess of imports over exports is therefore £58,903,938, *i.e.*, the imports are 15 per cent. more than the exports, subject to modification, as in the case of British North America, for its foreign debt. These figures show that the normal condition of the foreign commerce of any country is generally such that for its exports there is always a return in imports equal to the exports, *plus* profits. On an average, commercial profits may be taken at 20 per cent. Indian merchants generally insure by sailing vessels 25 per cent. more, and by steamers 15 per cent., for profits, as by steamers the same capital may be turned over oftener. If I take general commercial profits as 15 per cent., I shall be quite under the mark.

Now we must see what the case is with India. The exports of India for the years 1835 to 1872 being about £1,120,000,000, the imports, with an addition of 15 per cent. to exports for profits (of about £168,000,000), should be about £1,288,000,000. Besides this, India has incurred to foreign parts a debt of about £50,000,000 for the public debt, and about £100,000,000 for railways, during the same period.

Now, on the other hand, in return for the exports, *plus* profits, of £1,288,000,000, and £150,000,000 of the loans, India has actually imported, during the last 38 years, from 1835 to 1872 (not, as would be the case in a normal condition, £1,430,000,000, but only about £943,000,000, leaving a balance of about £300,000,000, which England has kept back as its benefit, chiefly arising from the political position it holds over India. This is without including any interest at all. Towards this drain, the net opium revenue contributed by China amounts to about £141,000,000. The balance, of about £300,000,000, is derived from India's own produce and profits of commerce. The profits of commerce are, say, about £168,000,000. Allowing, then, the whole

opium revenue and the whole profit of commerce as having gone towards the drain, there is still a deficiency of nearly £200,000,000 which must have gone out of the produce of the country. Deducting from this £200,000,000 the interest on railway loans remitted to England, the balance still sent from the very produce of the country is about £144,000,000. Strictly speaking, the whole £200,000,000 should be considered as a drain from the very produce of the country, because it is the exhaustion caused by the drain that disables us from building our railroads, &c., from our own means. If we did not suffer the exhaustion we do, and even then if we found it to our benefit to borrow from England, the case would be one of a healthy natural business, and the interest then remitted would have nothing to be deplored in it, as in the case of other countries, which, being young, or with undeveloped resources, and without much means of their own, borrow from others, and increase their own wealth thereby, as Australia, Canada, the United States, or any other native-ruled country that so borrows. However, as matters stand at present, we are thankful for the railway loan, for in reality that, though as a loan (with the profits during the American War), has revived us a little. But we are sinking fast again. Allowing for the railway interest as a mere matter of business, and analysing the deficit of imports, or drain to England, as only about £453,000,000, the following is the yearly average for every five years :—

Years.						Yearly Average.
						£
1835 to 1839	5,347,000
1840 „ 1844	5,930,000
1845 „ 1849	7,760,000
1850 „ 1854	7,458,000
1855 „ 1859	7,730,000
1860 „ 1864	17,300,000
1865 „ 1869	24,600,000
1870 „ 1872	27,400,000

Now, can it be shown by anybody that the production during these 38 years has been such as to leave the same amount per head every year, and surplus besides to make up the above £200,000,000 taken away from the produce of the country, in addition to opium revenue and profits of commerce? In that case it will be that India is no better off now, but is only in the same condition as in 1834. If it can be shown that the production of the country has been such as to be the same per head during all these years, and a surplus greater than £200,000,000 besides, then will it be that any material benefit has been derived by India to the extent of such excess of surplus over £200,000,000. It must, however, be remembered that, in the years about 1834, the condition of the people had already gone down very low by the effects of the previous deficits, as will be seen further on from the official opinions I have given there.

The benefit to England by its connection with India must not be measured by the £500,000,000 only (not including interest) during the last 38 years. Besides this the industries of England receive large additional support for supplying all European stores which Government need, and all those articles which Europeans want in India from their habits and customs, not from mere choice, as may be the case with natives. All the produce of the country, thus exported from

sheer necessity, would otherwise have brought returns suitable to native wants, or would have remained in the country, in either case, to the benefit of the produce or industry of India. Be it clearly borne in mind that all this additional benefit to English industries is entirely independant of, and in addition to, the *actual deficit* between the export, *plus* profits and imports. Everything I allude to is already included in the imports. It is so much additional capital drawn away, whether India will or no, from the industry of India to the benefit of English industry. There is, again, the further legitimate benefit to England of the profits of English firms there carrying on commerce with India, the profits of the shipping trade, and insurance. The only pity—and a very great one too—is that the commerce between England and India is not so large as it should and can be, the present *total exports* of India to all the outside world being only about 5s. a head, while the exports of the United Kingdom are about £6 *tos.* a head, of British North America about £3 a head, and of Australia about £19 a head, including gold (and exclusive of gold, about £11 a head). Again, what are imports into India from the United Kingdom, *including* treasure, Government stores of every kind, railway and other stores, articles for European consumption, and everything for native consumption and use? Only less than 3s. a head, as below:—

*Total Imports, including Treasure, into India from the
United Kingdom.*

1868...£31,629,315	}	Say 32,000,000, on an average, for a population of about 225,000,000, or less than 3s. a head.
1869...£35,309,973		
1870...£30,357,055		
1871...£28,826,264		

(Parliamentary Return [C. 587] of 1872, page 16—Trade and Navigation Returns of the United Kingdom).

What a vast field there is for English commerce in India! Only £1 a head will be equal to nearly the whole present exports of the United Kingdom to *all* parts of the world. There is one further circumstance against British-Indian subjects, which will show the actual drain from the produce of the country of more than £200,000,000 as borne by *British India*. The exports from India do not all belong to British India; a portion belongs to the Native States. These States naturally get back their imports equal to their exports, *plus* profits—less only the tribute they pay to British India, of only about £720,000 altogether per annum, of which even a portion is spent in their own States. No account can I take here of the further loss to India (by famines) of life and property, which is aggravated by the political exhaustion. It is complained that England is at the mercy of India for its loan of some £200,000,000, but let it be borne in mind that, within the next few years, that sum will have been drawn by England, while India will continue to have its debt over its head.

The figures of the deficit previous to 1834 I cannot get. I hope the India Office would prepare a table similar to this for this previous period, in order that it may be ascertained how India had fared materially under British rule altogether.

The effect of the deficit is not equally felt by the different presidencies. Bengal suffers less than the others on account of its permanent settlement. I do not mean that as any objection to such settlement, but I state it merely as a fact.

The Court of Directors, in the year 1858, deliberately put forth before the Parliament and public of England the statement (Parliamentary Return No. 75 of 1858) that "the great excess of exports above imports is being regularly liquidated in silver." Now, is it not India's misfortune that not one man in the India House pointed out how utterly incorrect, misleading, and mischievous this statement was?

Now, Mr. Laing makes the following statement before the present Finance Committee:—"Question 7660 of 2nd Report—Would it not be correct to state that the difference between the value of the exports from India, and the imports into India, which now amount, I think, to the sum of about £20,000,000, represents the tribute which India annually pays to England? Answer.—No, I think not; I should not call it a tribute when there is a balance of trade of that sort between the two countries. There are many other countries which are in the same condition of exporting considerably more than they import from one particular country, and the balance of trade is adjusted either by other payments which have to be made, or by transactions through third countries, or finally by remittance of bullion."

First of all, the question was not about India's commerce with any particular country, but about *all* its exports and imports. And next, taking his answer as it is, it is altogether incorrect and inapplicable to India, as must be evident from the facts I have already laid before you.

Next comes Mr. Maclean. He is reported to have said before this Committee something to the effect that, if we compare India, for instance, with the United States, which can hardly be called a country that is being drained of its natural wealth, we will find that the excess of exports over imports in the United States is very much greater than the corresponding excess in India. Now, let us see what the facts are. I have prepared a table, and have taken the figures from the year 1795—the earliest I could get. From the totals I have excluded the years 1802-6, 1808-14, 1818-20, because the imports for them are not given, and the years 1863-6 for reasons well known (the American War). The result till 1869 (I cannot get later authentic figures) is not, as Mr. Maclean says, that "the excess of exports over imports in the United States is very much greater than the corresponding excess in India," but that the excess of *imports* over exports is about \$413,000,000 till 1847, and £43,000,000 from 1848-69, excepting the years I have mentioned above; and if all the necessary modifications from various other circumstances be made, the excess of the imports will be found necessarily much greater. In fact, the United States are no exception to the ordinary laws of political economy, in a country where the rule is a native, and not a foreign, one. I have made up my tables from Parliamentary Returns.

The deficits of £500,000,000 in imports, do not, as I have already explained, show the whole drain; for the English stores, whether Government or private, are all already *included in the imports*, nor is any interest calculated. With interest, the drain from India would amount to a very high figure.

This drain consists of two elements—first, that arising from the remittances by European officials of their savings, and for their expenditure in England for their various wants both there and in India; from pensions and salaries paid in England; and from Government expenditure in England and India; and the second, that arising from similar remittances by non-official Europeans.

We may draw our own inferences about the effects of the drain, but I give you below official opinions on the subject, from early times to the present day, for each presidency.

BENGAL.

Sir John Shore, in 1787, says, in his famous minute (appendix to 5th report Parliamentary Return No. 377 of 1812) :—

" 129. Secondly, it is a certain fact that the zemindars are almost universally poor. . . . Justice and humanity calls for this declaration.

" 130. . . . I do not, however, attribute this fact to the extortions of our Government, but to the causes which I shall hereafter point out, and which will be found sufficient to account for the effect. I am by no means convinced that the reverse would have taken place if the measure of our exactions had been more moderate.

" 131. Thirdly, the Company are merchants, as well as sovereigns of the country. In the former capacity they engross its trade, whilst in the latter they appropriate the revenues. The remittances to Europe of revenues are made in the commodities of the country which are purchased by them.

" 132. Whatever allowance we may make for the increased industry of the subjects of the State, owing to the enhanced demand for the produce of it (supposing the demand to be enhanced), there is reason to conclude that the benefits are more than counterbalanced by evils inseparable from the system of a remote foreign dominion.

" 135. Every information, from the time of Bernier to the acquisition of the Dewani, shows the internal trade of the country, as carried on between Bengal and the upper parts of Hindustan, the Gulf of Moro, the Persian Gulf, and the Malabar Coast, to have been very considerable. Returns of specie and goods were made through these channels by that of the foreign European companies, and in gold direct for opium from the eastward.

" 136. But from the year 1765 the reverse has taken place. The Company's trade produces no equivalent returns, specie is rarely imported by the foreign companies, nor brought into Bengal from other parts of Hindustan in any considerable quantities.

" 141. If we were to suppose the internal trade of Hindustan again revived, the export of the production of the country by the Company must still prevent those returns which trade formerly poured in. This is an evil inseparable from an European government."

Page 194.—"A large proportion of the rents of the country are paid into the Company's treasury, and the manufactures are applied to remit to England the surplus which remains after discharging the claims on this Government, and to augment the commerce and revenue of Great Britain."

Lord Cornwallis' minute on land settlements, dated 10th February, 1790, says :—The consequence of the heavy drain of wealth from the above causes (*viz.*, large annual investment to Europe, assistance to the treasury of Calcutta, and to supply wants of other presidencies), with the addition of that which has been occasioned by the remittances of private fortunes, have been for many years past, and are now, severely

felt, by the great diminution of the current specie, and by the languor which has thereby been thrown upon the cultivation and the general commerce of the country."

The East India Company, on finding the provinces of Bengal and Behar continuously deteriorating, caused a long and minute survey of the condition of the people. This survey extended over nine years, from 1807 to 1816. The reports, however, lay buried in the archives of the India House, till Mr. Montgomery Martin brought them to light. He sums up the result of these official minute researches in the following remarkable words (vol. I., page 11) :—"It is impossible to avoid remarking two facts as peculiarly striking—first, the richness of the country surveyed; and, second, the poverty of its inhabitants."

Before proceeding further, I must first say that the drain to which these great men have referred was much less than at present. I give the figures in Mr. Martin's words (page 12) :—"The annual drain of £3,000,000 on British India has amounted in 30 years, at 12 per cent. (the usual Indian rate) compound interest, to the enormous sum of £723,900,000 sterling. . . . So constant and accumulating a drain, even in England, would soon impoverish her. How severe, then, must be its effects on India, where the wage of a labourer is from two-pence to three-pence a day."

In volume III., page 4., &c., alluding to the nine years' survey Mr. Martin says that the obscurity to which such a survey was consigned was to be deplored, "and can only be accounted for by supposing that it was deemed impolitic to publish to the world so painful a picture of human poverty, debasement, and wretchedness;" and Mr. Martin draws many other painful conclusions.

Coming down to later times, Mr. Frederick John Shore, of the Bengal Civil Service, has left us the following account of the condition of the people in 1837 (vol. II., page 28) :—"But the halcyon days of India are over; she has been drained of a large proportion of the wealth she once possessed, and her energies have been cramped by a sordid system of misrule to which the interests of millions have been sacrificed for the benefit of the few." "The gradual impoverishment of the people and country, under the mode of rule established by the British Government, has," &c., &c.

"The English Government has effected the impoverishment of the country and people to an extent almost unparalleled."

For the manner in which the cotton industry of India was destroyed, see note at page 37 of the same volume. In his concluding remarks (vol. II., page 516), Mr. Shore says :—"More than seventeen years have elapsed since I first landed in this country; but on my arrival, and during my residence of about a year in Calcutta, I well recollect the quiet, comfortable, and settled conviction, which in those days existed in the minds of the English population, of the blessings conferred on the natives of India by the establishment of the English rule. Our superiority to the native Governments which we have supplanted; the excellent system for the administration of justice which we had introduced; our moderation; our anxiety to benefit the people—in short, our virtues of every description—were descanted on as so many established truths, which it was heresy to controvert. Occasionally I remember to have heard some hints and assertions of a contrary nature from some one who had spent many years in the interior of the country; but the storm which was immediately raised and thundered on did not

of the unfortunate individual who should presume to question the established creed, was almost sufficient to appal the boldest.

"Like most other young men who had no opportunities of judging for themselves, it was but natural that I should imbibe the same notions; to which may be added, the idea of universal depravity of the people, which was derived from the same source."

After stating how his transfer to a remote district brought him into intimate contact with natives, how he found them disaffected towards British rule, and how this conviction in spite of himself was irresistible, he says:—"This being the case, an attempt to discover the reasons for such sentiments on the part of the native population, was the natural result. Well-founded complaints of oppression and extortion, on the part of both Government and individuals, were innumerable. The question then was, why, with all our high professions, were not such evils redressed? This, however, I was assured, was impossible under the existing system; and I was thus gradually led to an enquiry into the principles and practice of the British-Indian administration. Proceeding in this, I soon found myself at no loss to understand the feelings of the people both towards our Government and to ourselves. It would have been astonishing indeed had it been otherwise. The fundamental principle of the English had been to make the whole Indian nation subservient, in every possible way, to the interests and benefits of themselves. They have been taxed to the utmost limit; every successive province, as it has fallen into our possession, has been made a field for higher exaction; and it has always been our boast how greatly we have raised the revenue above that which the native rulers were able to extort. The Indians have been excluded from every honor, dignity, or office which the lowest Englishman could be prevailed upon to accept.

"Had the welfare of the people been our object, a very different course would have been adopted, and very different results would have followed; for, again and again I repeat it, there is nothing in the circumstance itself, of our being foreigners of different colour and faith, that should occasion the people to hate us. We may thank ourselves for having made their feelings towards us what they are."

In vol. I., page 162, Mr. Shore says:—"The ruin of the upper classes (like the exclusion of the people from a share in the Government) was a necessary consequence of the establishment of the British power; but had we acted on a more liberal plan, we should have fixed our authority on a much more solid foundation."

Colonel Marriot, at the East India Association meeting in July last, referring to Bengal, said:—"But he had no doubt that he accurately quoted the words of the present Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal in saying that the mass of the population is probably poorer, and in a lower social position, than any in India."

The "Material and Moral Progress" for 1871-2 (page 100) says that "the Calcutta missionary conference had dwelt on the miserable and abject condition of the Bengal ryots, and there is evidence that they suffer many things, and are often in want of absolute necessaries."

BOMBAY.

Mr. Saville Marriot, "one of the Commissioners of Revenue in the Deccan," and afterwards a Member of Council, says in 1836, in his

letter to Sir R. Grant :—"You will readily conceive that my opinions are the result rather of practical experience than deduction drawn from scientific views.

"For many years past, I have, in common with many others, painfully witnessed their decline [the people's]; and more especially that part of the community which has emphatically been styled the "sinews of the State"—the peasantry of India. It is not a single, but a combination of causes, which has produced this result. Some of these are, and have been from the beginning, obvious to those who have watched with attention the development of the principles of our rule in relation to such as have been superseded, become blended with our system, or are opposed to it in practical effect. Others are less apparent, and some complex; whilst another class of the decline may possibly be involved in obscurity."

"It is a startling but too notorious a fact, that, though loaded with a vastly greater absolute amount of taxation, and harassed by various severe acts of tyranny and oppression, yet the country was in a state of prosperity under the native rule, when compared with that into which it has fallen under the avowedly mild sway of British administration. Though, in stating the subject, I have used the expression "a vastly greater absolute amount of taxation," yet I would beg to be understood as being fully aware those terms must be treated in a qualified sense, since it is manifest that, relatively viewed, a smaller numerical amount of taxation may, with reference to the means of payment, be, in point of fact, more burdensome than a much larger one where the resources are more adequate to the object. But, in the particular case in point, it is, I believe, ability which has diminished; and that, too, to many grades below the proportionate fall in the pecuniary amount of fiscal demand. To the pecuniary injurious result are also to be added the many unfavourable circumstances inseparable for a time from a foreign rule. In elucidation of the position *that this country is verging to the lowest ebb of pauperism*, I would adduce a fact pregnant with considerations of the most serious importance, namely, that of late years a large portion of the public revenue has been paid by encroachment upon the capital of the country, small though that capital is in itself. I allude to the property of the peasantry, which consists of personal ornaments of the precious metals and jewels, convertible, as occasions require, to profitable purposes, and accommodations in agricultural pursuit, most frequently in the shape of pawn, till the object has been attained. I feel certain that an examination would establish that a considerable share of *this and other property, even to cattle and household utensils*, has been for ever alienated from its proprietors to make good the public revenue. In addition to *this lamentable evidence of poverty*, is another of equal force, to be seen in all parts of the country, in the numerous individuals of the above class of the community wandering about for the employment of hirelings, which they are glad to obtain even for the most scanty pittance. In short, *almost everything forces the conviction that we have before us a narrowing progress to utter pauperism.*"

Mr. Marriot in another place (page 11) says :—"Most of the evils of our rule in India arise directly from, or may be traced to, the heavy tribute which that country pays to England."

* Mr. Marriot's pamphlet re-published in 1857, page 11. The italics are mine.

And with regard to this tribute, he quotes the Chairman of a Court of Proprietors held on the 28th February, 1845, as follows:—"India paid to the mother country, in the shape of home charges, what must be considered the annual tribute of £3,000,000 sterling; and daily poured into the lap of the mother country a continual stream of wealth in the shape of private fortunes." To this should be added all earnings of Europeans, except what they spent in India for Indian supplies; which would show that there is something far beyond even private fortunes which is continuously poured into the lap of England.

Mr. Marriot goes on to say:—"It will be difficult to satisfy the mind that any country could bear such a drain upon its resources without sustaining very serious injury. And the writer entertains the fullest conviction that investigation would effectually establish the truth of the proposition as applicable to India. He has himself most painfully witnessed it in those parts of the country with which he was connected, and he has every reason to believe that the same evil exists, with but slight modification, throughout our Eastern empire."

Again says Mr. Marriot (page 17):—"A different state of things exists in the present day on that point; and, though the people still, and gratefully so, acknowledge the benefits they have derived from the suppression of open violence, yet they emphatically and unanswerably refer their increasing penury as evidencing the existence of a canker-worm that is working their destruction. The sketch which I have given shows a distressing state of things; but lamentable as it may appear, I would pledge myself to establish the facts advanced, and that the representation is not overdrawn."

Mr. Robert Knight says:—"Mr. Giberne, after an absence of fourteen years from Guzerat, returned to it, as judge, in 1840. "Everywhere"—he told the Commons Committee on Cotton Cultivation in 1848—"he remarked deterioration," and "I did not see so many of the more wealthy classes of the natives. The aristocracy, when we first had the country, used to have their gay carts, horses, and attendants, and a great deal of finery about them, and there seems to be an absence of all that. The ryots all complain that *they had had money once, but they had none now.*"

In a private letter, dated 1849, "written by a gentleman high in the Company's service," and quoted in a pamphlet in 1851, the decay of Guzerat is thus described:—"Many of the best families in the province, who were rich and well to do when we came into Guzerat in 1807, have now scarcely clothes to their backs.

Our demands in money on the talookdars are more than three times what they originally paid, without one single advantage gained on their parts. Parties, from whom they have been compelled to borrow at ruinous rates of interest, enforced their demands by attachment of their lands and villages; thus they sink deeper and deeper in debt, without the chance of extricating themselves. What, then, must become of their rising family?"*

Lieutenant A. Nash, after giving a table of the prices of grain from

* Mr. Robert Knight's paper read before the East India Association, 3rd March, 1868.

1809 to 1838 in Indapore (Bombay Government Selections, No. 107, New Series, page 118), says :—"The table is chiefly interesting in showing the gradual diminution in the price of corn from the days of the Peishwas to our own. By comparing the prices at the commencement with those at the end of the table, and then reading the list over, this circumstance will become apparent." I give this table in my notes on prices.

MADRAS.

Mr. John Bruce Norton, in his letter to Mr. Robert Lowe in 1854, quotes the words of Mr. Bourdillon—"one of the ablest revenue officers in the Madras Civil Service, and a Member of the Commission on Public Works"—about the majority of the ryots :—"Page 21.—"Now, it may certainly be said of almost the whole of the ryots, paying even the highest of these sums, and even of many holding to a much larger amount, that they are always in poverty and generally in debt." Page 22.—"A ryot of this class, of course, lives from hand to mouth. He rarely sees money. . . His dwelling is a hut of mud walls and thatched roof—far ruder, smaller, and more dilapidated than those of the better classes of ryots above spoken of, and still more destitute, if possible, of anything that can be called furniture. His food, and that of his family, is partly thin porridge made of meal of grain boiled in water, and partly boiled rice, with a little condiment; and generally the only vessels for cooking and eating from, are of the coarsest earthenware, much inferior in grain to a good tile or brick in England, and unglazed. Brass vessels, though not wholly unknown among this class, are rare."

About the labourer he says :—"As respects food, houses, and clothing, they are in a worse condition than the class of poor ryots above spoken of. It appears from the foregoing details that the condition of the agricultural labourer in this country is very poor. . . . In fact, almost the whole of his earnings must necessarily be consumed in a spare allowance of coarse and unvaried food, and a bare sufficiency of clothing. The wretched hut he lives in, can hardly be valued at all. As to anything in the way of education or mental culture, he is utterly destitute of it."

Such is the testimony in the year 1854. Now let us come down to so late a time as 1869. Mr. (now Sir George) Campbell, in his paper on tenure of land in India, published by the Cobden Club, quotes from an official authority a report made so late as 1869 about the Madras Presidency, as follows :—"The bulk of the people are paupers. They can just pay their cesses in a good year, and fail altogether when the season is bad. Remissions have to be made, perhaps every third year, in most districts. There is a bad year in some one district, or group of districts, every year."

Again, the Parliamentary Report of the Moral and Material Progress of India for 1868-9, page 71, says—"Prices in Madras have been falling continuously."

PUNJAB.

The administration report for 1855-6 (Government of India Selections, No. 18, 1856), gives the following table :—

Average Prices.

For Ten Years up to 1850-51.	Wheat, Rs. 1 per maund of 80 lbs.	Indian Corn, Rs. 1½ per maund.
1851-2	Rs. 1 per maund.	Rs. 0½ per maund.
1852-3	„ 1½ „	„ 1½ „
1853-4	„ 1½ „	„ 1½ „
1854-5	„ 1 „	„ 0½ „
1855-6	„ 1½ „	„ 0½ „

With the usual effects of the introduction of a foreign rule, and the seasons happening to be good, the result was a fall in prices to nearly half during the five years after the annexation. The political portion of the causes of this depression is well described in a subsequent report, and how a change in that political portion produced a favourable reaction in the province.

The administration report of 1856-8 (Parliamentary Return, No. 212 of 1859, page 16), "prepared under the direction of Sir J. Lawrence, K.C.B., Chief Commissioner of Punjab, by R. Temple, Secretary to Chief Commissioner, Punjab," says:—"In former reports it was explained how the circumstance of so much money going out of the Punjab contributed to depress the agriculturist. The native regular army was Hindustani; to them was a large share of the Punjab revenues disbursed, of which a part only they spent on the spot, and a part was remitted to their homes. Thus it was that, year after year, lakhs and lakhs were drained from the Punjab, and enriched Outh. But within the last year, the native army being Punjabi, all such sums have been paid to them, and have been spent at home. Again, many thousands of Punjabi soldiers are serving abroad. These men not only remit their savings, but also have sent quantities of prize property and plunder, the spoils of Hindustan, to their native villages. The effect of all this is already perceptible in an increase of agricultural capital, a freer circulation of money, and a fresh impetus to cultivation."

This is just the cause which, in a far more aggravated form and on a far larger scale, operates on the whole of British India in its relations with England. Millions are drained to England; and till the reversing cause of the retaining and return of wealth in some way does not come into operation, the evils of the drain cannot be remedied. And what is the condition of a labourer now? Here is the Punjab Government's own answer in the administration report for 1867-8 (page 28). After stating the rates of unskilled labour as ranging from two annas (three-pence) to five annas (seven and a half pence) per diem, and alluding to a considerable rise in rates in places affected by the railway and other public works, where labour in any shape commands higher remuneration than formerly, the report says:—"It may be doubted whether the position of the unskilled labouring classes has materially improved."

NORTH-WEST PROVINCES.

Colonel Baird Smith's report on the famines of the North-West Provinces (Parliamentary Return No. 29 of 1862), referring to the

famine of 1837, says:—*Page 57.*—"From the time of our earliest acquisition of any part of these up to 1833, our fiscal system, notwithstanding some improvements on the native method which were gradually introduced, had been thoroughly bad." *Page 59.*—"Speaking in general terms, therefore, native society in the N. W. Provinces had to face the calamity in 1837, debilitated by a fiscal system that was oppressive and depressing in its influence. . . . In India we all know very well that when the agricultural class is weak, the weakness of all other sections of the community is the inevitable consequence."

I have not come across Mr. Halsey's report on the assessment of Cawnpore, but I take an extract from one given in the *Bombay Gazette Summary of 21st June, 1872, page 12*:—"I assert that the abject poverty of the average cultivator of this district is beyond the belief of any one who has not seen it. He is simply a slave to the soil, to the zemindar, to the usurer, and to Government. . . . I regret to say that, with these few exceptions, the normal state of between three-fourths and four-fifths of the cultivators of this district is as I have above shown. It may appear to many to be exaggerated, and, from the nature of the case, it is of course impossible to produce figures in support of it; nevertheless, it is the result of my personal observations, and I feel confident the result of the whole discussion will be to prove I have not overstated the truth."

The figures I have given of the total produce of the North-West Provinces proves by fact what Mr. Halsey gives as his observations. Hardly 27s. per head—say even 30s.—cannot but produce the result he sees.

CENTRAL PROVINCES.

Here is the latest testimony about the people. Mr. W. G. Pedder says*—"Who [the people], if an almost universal consensus of opinion may be relied on, are rapidly going from bad to worse under our rule, is a most serious question, and one well deserving the attention of Government."

INDIA.

Lastly, to sum up the whole, here is Sir John Lawrence (Lord Lawrence), testifying so late as 1864 about *all India*:—"India is, on the whole, a very poor country; the mass of the population enjoy only a scanty subsistence." And Lord Mayo, on the 3rd March, 1871, says, in his speech in the Legislative Council—"I admit the comparative poverty of this country, as compared with many other countries of the same magnitude and importance, and I am convinced of the impolicy and injustice of imposing burdens upon this people which may be called either crushing or oppressive."

"Mr. Grant Duff, in an able speech which he delivered the other day in the House of Commons, the report of which arrived by last mail, stated with truth, that the position of our finance was wholly different from that of England. 'In England,' he stated, 'you have a comparatively wealthy population. The income of the United Kingdom has, I believe, been guessed at £800,000,000 per annum; the income of British India has been guessed at £300,000,000 per annum. That gives well on to £30 per annum as the income of every person in the United Kingdom, and only £2 per annum as the income of every person in British India.'"

"I believe that Mr. Grant Duff had good grounds for the statement he made, and I wish to say, with reference to it, that we are perfectly cognizant of the relative poverty of this country as compared with European States."

So here is a clear admission by high authorities of what I had urged in my paper on the "Wants and Means of India," and what I now urge, that India's production was only about 40s. a head.

And now in the year 1873, before the Finance Committee, Lord Lawrence repeats his conviction that the mass of the people of India are so miserably poor that they have barely the means of subsistence. It is as much as a man can do to feed his family or half feed them, let alone spending money on what may be called luxuries or conveniences. Mr. Grant Duff asked Mr. Lawson so late as in May, 1870, in the House of Commons, whether he meant to "grind an already poor population to the very dust."

ENGLAND'S CONDITION UNDER SIMILAR CIRCUMSTANCES.

The following picture about England itself under similar circumstances, may, I hope, enable the British people to realize our condition. The parallel is remarkable, and the picture in certain portions life-like of the present state of India. Draper's "Intellectual Development of Europe," 5th edition:—*Page 365.*—"In fact, through the operation of the Crusades, all Europe was tributary to the Pope (Innocent III.). . . A steady drain of money from every realm. Fifty years after the time of which we are speaking, Robert Grostale, the Bishop of Lincoln and friend of Roger Bacon, caused to be ascertained the amount received by foreign ecclesiastics in England. He found it to be thrice the income of the king himself. This was on the occasion of Innocent IV. demanding provision to be made for three hundred additional Italian clergy by the Church of England; and that one of his nephews—a mere boy—should have a stall in Lincoln Cathedral." *Page 397.*—"In England—for ages a mine of wealth to Rome—the tendency of things was shown by such facts as the remonstrances of the Commons with the Crown on the appointment of ecclesiastics to all the great offices, and the allegations made by the 'Good Parliament' as to the amount of money drawn by Rome from the kingdom. They asserted that it was five times as much as the taxes levied by the king, and that the Pope's revenue from England was greater than the revenue of any prince in Christendom." *Page 434.*—"It is manifest by legal enactments early in the fourteenth century. . . By the Parliamentary bill of 1376, setting forth that the tax paid in England to the Pope for ecclesiastical dignities is fourfold as much as that coming to the king from the whole realm; that alien clergy, who have never seen, nor cared to see, their flocks, convey away the treasure of the country." *Page 477.*—"The inferior, unreflecting orders were in all directions exasperated by its importunate unceasing exactions of money. In England for instance, though less advanced intellectually than the southern nations, the commencement of the Reformation is perhaps justly referred as far back as the reign of Edward III., who, under the suggestion of Wickliffe, refused to do homage to the Pope; but a series of weaker princes succeeding, it was not until Henry VII. that the movement could be continued. In that country, the immediately existing causes were, no doubt, of a material kind, such as the alleged avarice and impurity of the clergy, the immense amount of

money taken from the realm, the intrusion of foreign ecclesiastics." *Page 478.*—"As all the world had been drained of money by the Senate and Cæsars for the support of republican or imperial power, so there was a need of like supply for the use of the pontiffs. The collection of funds had often given rise to contentions between the ecclesiastical and temporal authorities, and in some of the more sturdy countries had been resolutely resisted."

The result of this drain from England to Italy was the condition of the people, as pictured at pages 494-5, than which nothing could be more painful. Mr. Draper says:—"For many of the facts I have now to mention, the reader will find authorities in the works of Lord Macaulay, and Mr. Froude on English History. My own reading in other directions satisfies me that the picture here offered represents the actual condition of things.

"There were forests extending over great districts; fens forty or fifty miles in length, reeking with miasma and fever, though round the walls of the abbeys there might be beautiful gardens, green lawns, shady walks, and many murmuring streams.

The peasant's cabin was made of reeds or sticks, plastered over with mud. His fire was chimneyless—often it was made of peat. In the objects and manner of his existence, he was but a step above the industrious beaver who was building his dam in the adjacent stream.

Vermin in abundance in the clothing and beds. The common food was peas, vetches, fern-roots, and even the bark of trees.

The population, sparse as it was, was perpetually thinned by pestilence and want. Nor was the state of the townsman better than that of the rustic; his bed was a bag of straw, with a fair round log for his pillow.

It was a melancholy social condition when nothing intervened between reed cabins in the fen, the miserable wigwams of villages, and the conspicuous walls of the castle and the monastery. Rural life had but little improved since the time of Cæsar; in its physical aspect it was altogether neglected.

"England, at the close of the age of faith, had for long been a chief pecuniary tributary to Italy, the source from large revenues have been drawn, the fruitful field in which herds of Italian ecclesiastics had been pastured. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the island was far more backward, intellectually and politically, than is commonly supposed."

We see, then, to what condition the people of England were reduced under the Italian drain. India cannot but share the same fate under similar causes, unless England, as she sincerely means to do, adopts the necessary precautions and remedies to prevent such results.

ECONOMICAL PRINCIPLES FROM MILL'S POLITICAL ECONOMY AS APPLICABLE TO THE PRESENT CONDITION OF INDIA.

Before I close the subject of the drain and its consequences, I direct your attention to a few facts connected with the subject of railways, and such other useful public works. You are well aware that I strongly desire these works, but I cannot shut my eyes to the following facts:—

America, for instance, requires money to build a railway, takes a loan and builds it—and everybody knows it is immensely benefited. I need not read to you a chapter on political economy why it is so. I

need only say every man employed in the construction of that railway is an American; every farthing, therefore, that is spent out of the loan remains in the country. In the working of the railway, every man is an American; every farthing taken out of the produce of the country for its conveyance remains in the country; so, whatever impetus is given to the production of the country, and increase made in it, is fully enjoyed by the country paying, out of such increase in its capital and production, the interest of the loan, and in time the loan itself. Under such ordinary economical circumstances, a country derives great benefit from the help of loans from other countries. In India, in the construction of the railroad, a large amount of the loan goes towards the payment of Europeans, a portion of which, as I have explained before, goes out of the country. Then again, in the working of the railway, the same drawback, leaving therefore hardly any benefit at all to India itself, and the whole interest of the loan must also go out of the country. So our condition is a very anomalous one—like that of a child to which a fond parent gives a sweet, but to which, in its exhausted condition, the very sweet acts like a poison, and, as a *foreign substance*, by irritating the weak stomach makes it throw out more, and causes greater exhaustion. In India's present condition, the very sweets of every other nation appear to act on it as poison. With this continuous and ever-increasing drain by innumerable channels, as our normal condition at present, the most well-intentioned acts of Government become disadvantageous. Sir Richard Temple clearly understands this phenomenon, as I have already shown. But somehow or other, he seems to have now forgotten what he so clearly pointed out a score of years ago. Many a time in discussing with English friends the question of the material drain generally, and the above remarks on railways, irrigation-works, &c., I found it a very difficult task to convince. Fortunately, a great authority enunciates the fundamental principles very clearly and convincingly, and I give them below, hoping that an authority like that of the late Mr. Mill, will, on economical principles especially, command attention.

I give a few short extracts from Mill's 'Political Economy,' chapter V.:

"Industry is limited by capital."

"To employ industry on the land is to apply capital to the land."

"Industry cannot be employed to any greater extent than there is capital to invest."

"There can be no more industry than is supplied by materials to work up, and food to eat. Yet, in regard to a fact so evident, it was long continued to be believed that laws and governments, without creating capital, could create industry."

"While, on the one hand, industry is limited by capital, so on the other every increase of capital gives, or is capable of giving, additional employment to industry, and this without assignable limit."

"A second fundamental theorem respecting capital relates to the source from which it is derived. It is the result of saving. All capital, and especially all addition to capital, are the result of saving."

"What supports and employs productive labour is the capital expended in setting it to work, and not the demand of purchasers for the produce of the labour when completed. Demand for commodities is not demand for labour."

"The demand for commodities determines in what particular branch

of production the labour and capital shall be employed. It determines the *direction* of labour, but not the more or less of the labour itself, or of the maintenance or payment of the labour. These depend on the amount of the capital, or other funds directly devoted to the sustenance and remuneration of labour."

"This theorem—that to purchase produce is not to employ labour; that the demand for labour is constituted by the wages which precede the production, and not by the demand which may exist for the commodities resulting from the production—is a proposition which greatly needs all the illustration it can receive. It is to common apprehension a paradox."

These principles applied to the particular case of India, amount to this:—Poor India has not even to support its absolute want, even were the whole production employed in supporting labour. But as this is not the case,—as there must be some portion of the produce consumed unproductively in luxuries,—the share for the support of labour for reproduction becomes still more scanty; saving, and therefore addition to capital, being altogether out of the question. Moreover, not only is there no saving at the present rate of production, but there is actual continuous yearly abstraction from this scanty production. The result is an additional evil consequence, in the capability of labour deteriorating continuously, for "industry is limited by capital"—so the candle burns at both ends,—capital going on diminishing on the one hand, and labour thereby becoming less capable, on the other, to reproduce as much as before. The last theorem of Mill is a clear answer to those who say that, because the railways open up a market for the commodities, the produce of the country *must* increase. I need only repeat the "demand for commodities is not demand for labour," and that "industry cannot be employed to any greater extent than there is capital to invest."

If these principles are fairly borne in mind, and the element of the drain from India fairly considered, the gradual impoverishment of India, under the existing system of administration, will cease to appear a paradox.

PRESSURE OF TAXATION.

In Lord Mayo's speech of the 3rd March, 1871 (*Times of India* Summary of 8th April, 1871), he endeavours to refute the assertion that Indian taxation is "crushing." His Lordship on this point has made several assumptions which require examination. I shall, therefore, first consider whether the conclusion drawn is legitimate, and whether all necessary elements of comparison have been taken into account.

I have already shown that the production of India is hardly 40s. a head, and that Lord Mayo has adopted that estimate as being based on good reasons by Mr. Grant Duff. After admitting this fact, Lord Mayo compares the taxation of India with that of some other countries. In doing this, he deducts as land-revenue (whether rightly or wrongly will be seen hereafter) the opium, tributes, and other small receipts from Indian taxation, and then compares the balance with the taxation of other countries. I do not know whether he has made similar deductions from the taxation of the latter. The result of his com-

parison would appear to be that, while India pays only 1s. 10d. per head of taxation per annum, Turkey pays 7s. 9d., Russia 12s. 2d., Spain 18s. 5d., Austria 19s. 7d., and Italy 17s. per head per annum. The conclusion drawn is that the taxation of India is not "crushing." What idea His Lordship attaches to the word "crushing" I cannot say, but he seems to forget the very first premise that the total production of the country is admitted to be 40s. per head. Now, this amount is hardly enough for the bare necessities of life, much less can it supply any comforts, or provide any reserve for bad times; so that living from hand to mouth, and that on "scanty subsistence" (in the words of Lord Lawrence), the very touch of famine carries away hundreds of thousands. Is not this in itself as "crushing" to any people as it can possibly be? And yet out of this wretched income they have to pay taxation!

His Lordship has, moreover, left out a very important element from account. He is well aware that whatever revenue is raised by other countries—for instance, the £70,000,000 by England—the whole of it returns back to the people, and remains in the country; and, therefore, the *national capital, upon which* the production of a country depends, does not suffer diminution; while, with India, as I have already shown, the case is quite different. Out of its poor production of 40s. a head, some £25,000,000 go clean out of the country, thereby diminishing its capital and labour for reproduction every year, and rendering the taxation more and more crushing.

I shall now consider what would have been the fairest way of making the comparison of taxation. Every nation has a certain amount of income from various sources, such as production of cultivation, minerals, farming, manufactures, profits of trade, &c. From such total income all its wants are to be supplied. A fair comparison as to the incidence of taxation, will be to see the proportion of the amount which the Government of the country takes for its administration, public debts, &c., to the total income. You may call this amount taxation, revenue, or anything you like; and Government may take it in any shape or way whatsoever. It is so much taken from the income of the country for the purposes of Government. In the case of India, whether Government takes this amount as land-tax or opium revenue, or in whatever other form, does not matter, the fact remains that out of the total income of the country, Government raises so much revenue for its purposes which otherwise would have remained with the people.

Taking, therefore, this fair test of the incidence of taxation, the result will be that England raises £70,000,000 out of the national income of some £800,000,000, that is, about 8 per cent., or about £2 10s. per head from an income of about £30 per head; whereas the Indian Government raises £50,000,000 out of the national income of £340,000,000, that is, about 15 per cent., or 6s. per head out of an income of 40s. per head.

Had His Lordship stated the national income and population of the countries with which he has made the comparison, we would have then seen what the percentage of their revenue to their income was, and from how much income per head the people have to pay their 7s. to 19s. 7d. per head of taxation, as quoted by His Lordship.

Further, if, in consequence of a constant drain from India from its poor production, the income of the country continues to diminish, the

percentage of taxation to income will be still greater, even though the amount of taxation may not increase. But, as we know the tendency of taxation in India has, during several years, been to go on increasing every year, the pressure will generally become more and more oppressive and crushing, unless our rulers, by proper means, restore India to at least a healthy, if not a wealthy, condition. It must, moreover, be particularly borne in mind that, while a ton may not be any burden to an elephant, a few pounds will crush a child; that the English nation may, from its average income of £30 per head, be able to pay £2 10s. per head, while to the Indian nation, 6s. out of 40s. may be quite unbearable and crushing. The capacity to bear a burden with ease, or to be crushed by it, is not to be measured by the percentage of taxation, but by the abundance, or otherwise, of the means or income to pay it from. From abundance you may give a large percentage with ease; from sufficiency, the same burden may just be bearable, or some diminution may make it so; but from insufficiency, any burden is so much privation.

But as matters stand, poor India has to pay not the same percentage of taxation to its income as in England, but nearly double; *i.e.*, while England pays only about 8½ per cent. of its national income for the wants of its Government, India has to pay some 15 per cent. of its income for the same purpose; though here that income per head of population is some thirteenth part of that of England, and insufficient in itself for even its ordinary wants, leaving alone the extraordinary political necessity to pay a foreign country for its rule.

Every single ounce of rice, therefore, taken from the "scanty subsistence" of the masses of India, is to them so much starvation, so much more crushing.

Lord Mayo calls the light taxation of the country, which he calculates at 1s. 10d. a head, as a happy state of affairs. But that, in so lightly-taxed a country, to get a 6d. more per head without oppression should tax the highest statesmanship and intelligence without success, is in itself a clear demonstration that there must be something very rotten in the state of India, and that the pressure of taxation must have already arrived short of the proverbial last straw that breaks the camel's back.

The United Kingdom pay a total revenue of about £2 10s. per head. India's whole production is hardly £2 a head; it pays a total revenue (less net opium) of hardly 5s. a head, and is unable to pay a shilling more. Why so? Short of only representation, India is governed on the same principles and system as the United Kingdom, and why such extraordinarily different results? Why should one prosper and the other perish, though similarly governed? &c.

PART II.

As the first part of my paper is already in your hands, I need not trouble you with a recapitulation to-day. I place further notes before you.

PRICES.

We hear much about the general enormous rise of prices, and conclusions drawn therefrom that India is prosperous. My figures about the total production of the country are alone enough to show that there is no such thing as that India is a prosperous country. It does not produce enough for mere existence even, and the equilibrium is kept up by scanty subsistence, by gradual deterioration of physique, and destruction. No examination, therefore, of the import of bullion, or of rise of prices and wages, is necessary to prove the insufficiency of production for the maintenance of the whole population. When we have such direct positive proof of the poverty of the country, it should be useless to resort to, or depend upon, any indirect evidence or conclusions. But as there appears to me much misapprehension and hasty conclusion from a superficial examination of the phenomena of prices, wages, and bullion, I deem it necessary to say something upon these subjects. I shall consider each subject separately. High prices may occur from one of the three following causes:—

1st.—From a natural healthy development of foreign commerce, which brings to the country fair profits upon the exports of the country; or, in other words, the imports exceed the exports by a fair percentage of profits, and thus add to the wealth and capital of the country.

From a quantity of money thrown into the country, not as the natural profits of foreign commerce, but for some special purpose independent of commercial profits, such as the railway and other loans of India expended in certain parts where the works are carried on, and where, therefore, a large collection of labour takes place requiring food that is not produced there; and on account of bad or imperfect communications occasioning a local and temporary rise in prices.

From scarcity of food or other necessaries, either on account of bad seasons or bad communications, or both; in other words, either there is not enough of food produced, or the plenty of one district cannot supply the deficiency of another, or both.

We may now see how each of these causes has operated. As to the first cause, it is clear that so far from India adding any profits to its wealth from foreign commerce, not only does an amount, equal to the whole profits of foreign commerce including the whole of the opium revenue, go elsewhere, but even from the very produce of the country some £7,000,000 more annually. This shows, then, that there is no increase of capital or wealth in the country, and consequently no such general

rise in prices as to indicate any increase of prosperity. From want of proper communications, produce in provinces near the seaports is exported to foreign countries, not because the foreign countries give better prices than can be obtained in this country, but because, if not exported, the produce would simply perish. For instance, Bengal and Madras export rice at any reasonable prospect of profits, even though in some of the interior parts there may be scarcity, or even famine, as in the case of the North-West Provinces, Orissa, and Rajpootana.

The first cause, therefore, is not at all operative in India in raising prices; on the contrary, the constant drain diminishes capital, and thereby gradually and continuously diminishes the capability of the country even to keep up its absolutely necessary production. Besides the necessity of seeking foreign commerce on account of bad communications, there is a portion of the exports which is simply compulsory—I mean that portion which goes to England to pay for the political drain. So far, therefore, the alleged increase of prices in India does not arise from any natural addition to its wealth by means of a healthy and profitable foreign commerce. Then, the next thing to be examined is whether the different kinds of produce exported from British India are so exported because foreign countries offer more profitable markets for them, that is to say, offer greater prices than can be obtained in the country itself; thus indicating that, though prices have risen in the country itself, still higher prices are got from foreign countries. Suppose we find that Indian produce has been selling in foreign countries at about the same prices for the last fifteen years, what will be the inevitable conclusion? Either that, in the country itself, there is no great rise of prices, or that the people of India are such fools that, though there is an “enormous” rise in prices in their own country, they send their produce thousands of miles away—to get what? Not *higher* prices than can be got in the country itself, but sometimes much less! We may take the principal articles of export from India.

Cotton.—The exceptional and temporary rise in the price of cotton, and its temporary effect on some other produce, was owing to the American War; but that is gradually coming down to its former level, and when America once makes up its four or five million bales, India will have a hard struggle. The opening of the Suez Canal has been a great good fortune, or Indian cotton would in all likelihood have been driven out of the English market particularly, and perhaps from European markets also.

The following table will show how near the prices are returning to their old level before the American War (Parliamentary Return [c. 145] of 1870):—

Average price per cwt...			1857	1858	1859	1860*
1861	1862	1863	£2-8-8	2-10-7	2-5-10	1-17-0
£2-17-5	6-5-9	8-13-11	1864	1865	1866	1867
1868	1869	1870	8-9-9	6-5-7	4-12-0	3-2-10
£3-12-8	4-5-8	3-5-6				

So far the rise in cotton is going; but great as this rise has been, it has hardly reached the prices of former years, as will be seen hereafter. Leaving the exceptional prices of cotton during the cotton famine out of consideration, let us examine the most important articles of export;

* This year there was a large American crop.

and if we find that these articles have fetched about the same price for nearly fifteen years past, there could not have been any normal general rise in the country itself of which the exporters could take advantage, and thereby prefer earning more profits by selling in the country itself, than getting less by exporting to foreign parts.

Take Coffee.—The average prices in the United Kingdom (Parliamentary Return [c. 145] of 1870) are per cwt. :—

Years.	£	s.	d.	Average.
1855	3	3	0	£ s. d.
1856	3	11	8	
1857	3	15	3	
1858	3	11	7	
1859	3	13	6	
							3 11 0
1860	3	18	2	
1861	3	16	2	
1862	3	18	8	
1863	4	0	6	
1864	3	9	8	
							3 16 7
1865	3	16	2	
1866	3	16	4	
1867	3	19	1	
1868	3	6	1	
1869	3	7	11	
1870	3	6	6	
							3 12 0

This does not show any rise.

Take Indigo.—

Years.	Average Price per cwt.			Years.	Average Price per cwt.				
	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.		
1855	...	27	8	0	1863	...	28	4	7
1856	...	30	11	4	1864	...	30	10	0
1857	...	33	1	0	1865	...	31	7	2
1858	...	35	18	0	1866	...	31	5	1
1859	...	31	8	9	1867	...	35	17	6
1860	...	33	13	11	1868	...	40	4	2
1861	...	37	8	7	1869	...	38	2	6
1862	...	36	11	3	1870	...	35	4	8

The average of first five years, 1855-59, is £31 13s. 5d., of 1860-64 £33 5s. 8d., of 1865-70 £35 6s. 10d.—making a rise of 12 per cent. over the first five years. Now, this is an article in which India may be said to have a sort of monopoly, and yet there is virtually no rise from any increased demand. The average of the last six years is raised by the year 1868, but the quantity imported into the United Kingdom was in that year 2,000 cwts. less than in the previous year, and the scarcity gave a temporary high price.

Now take *Rice*.—This is the most important article; rise or fall in its price requires careful consideration. It is the alleged rise of price in this article which is held up as proving the prosperity of the country.

The average price of rice in the United Kingdom, after paying all charges and profits from India to arrival in England, is per cwt. :—

Years.	s.	d.	Years.	s.	d.
1855 ...	14	6	1863 ...	11	11
1856 ...	10	6	1864 ...	11	2
1857 ...	11	3	1865 ...	12	4
1858 ...	8	10	1866 ...	13	1
1859 ...	10	9	1867 ...	14	3
1860 ...	13	0	1868 ...	12	2
1861 ...	12	8	1869 ...	10	8
1862 ...	11	10	1870 ...	10	11

Averages of five years, 1855-59, 11s. 2d. ; 1860-64, 12s. 1½d. ; 1865-70, 12s. 3d.

This does not show that there is any material rise any more than the varying wants of the country and the average fluctuations of all ordinary articles of commerce, taking also into consideration the effect of the American War during some of these years. Such are the prices paid in England for Indian rice during the past fifteen years, and yet India had three or four famines, and in the famine districts food could not be got to save life at any price. If the United Kingdom got Indian rice at the above steady prices, how could there have been any real natural "enormous" rise of prices in India proving its prosperity? This simple fact is enough to show conclusively that, if the United Kingdom could get its thousands of tons of Indian rice at such steady prices during the past fifteen years, there is no such thing as an enormous general healthy rise of prices throughout the country. Whatever partial local and temporary rise there has been in certain localities, has arisen, as will be seen hereafter, from partial local and temporary causes, and not from any increase of prosperity.

Take *Silk*.—The prices of silk are as follows :—

Years.	Price per lb.		Average.
	s.	d.	
1855 ...	12	9	17 7
1856 ...	18	10	
1857 ...	19	8	
1858 ...	17	8	
1859 ...	19	1	
1860 ...	20	2	18 7
1861 ...	16	10	
1862 ...	18	8	
1863 ...	18	8	
1864 ...	18	5	
1865 ...	23	6	22 7½
1866 ...	22	0	
1867 ...	21	2	
1868 ...	23	8	
1869 ...	23	0	
1870 ...	22	4	

This shows an apparent rise of 28 per cent. over the first five years, but the quantities imported in the years 1867, 1868, and 1869 were

very small, being in 1867 2,469 lbs., in 1868 32,103 lbs., in 1869 17,845 lbs. Whereas in 1865 it is 183,224 lbs., in 1866 123,561 lbs., and in 1870 123,600 lbs. There is then a rise in the price of this article, only a scarcity rise. Besides, its fate hangs upon the China market, and its produce in India yet is too small to have any important effect on general prices in ordinary economic conditions, much less when all such little or large profit is not retained by the country at all. The total quantity of waste as well as raw silk exported from India to all foreign parts is about £1,500,000 worth.

Sugar.—There are three or four qualities of sugar imported into the United Kingdom from India. I give below the price of middling as a fair representative of the bulk:—

Years.	Price per cwt.			Years.	Price per cwt.		
	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
1855...	1	9	8	1863...	1	6	5
1856...	1	12	6	1864...	1	5	11
1857...	1	17	6	1865...	1	3	6
1858...	1	10	3	1866...	1	3	4
1859...	1	7	9	1867...	1	3	3
1860...	1	7	1	1868...	1	3	6
1861...	1	8	5	1869...	1	7	2
1862...	1	6	9	1870...	1	5	7

The averages are from 1855-59 £1 11s. 6d., 1860-64 £1 6s. 11d., and 1865-70 £1 4s. 5d. There is, then, an actual decline, and it cannot, therefore, be expected that there was a rise in India notwithstanding.

Linseed.—Average prices as follows per quarter:—

Years.	£	s.	d.	Average.
1855 ...	3	11	6	
1856 ...	2	18	0	
1857 ...	3	2	0	
1858 ...	2	15	1	
1859 ..	2	9	9	
	<hr/>			2 19 3
1860 ...	2	12	9	
1861 ...	2	15	10	
1862 ...	3	4	7	
1863 ...	3	4	7	
1864 ...	2	19	7	
	<hr/>			2 19 6
1865 ...	3	0	5	
1866 ...	3	8	11	
1867 ...	3	6	9	
1868 ...	3	1	8	
1869 ...	2	18	9	
1870 ...	2	19	7	
	<hr/>			

This shows a rise of about 5 per cent., which is nothing when allowance is made for the temporary effect of the American War from 1861, and the prices have latterly gone down again to the level of the average, 1855-59.

Rapeseed per quarter:—

Years.	£	s.	d.	Years.	£	s.	d.
1855...	...	3	9	8	1863...	...	2 19 6
1856...	...	2	18	6	1864...	...	2 16 11
1857...	...	3	1	0	1865...	...	3 5 7
1858...	...	2	13	4	1866...	...	2 17 11
1859...	...	2	4	8	1867...	...	3 12 6
1860...	...	2	16	11	1868...	...	2 11 4
1861...	...	2	19	6	1869...	...	2 18 11
1862...	...	3	7	4	1870...	...	3 4 11

This also shows the temporary effect of the American War, and hardly any rise, the averages being—1855-59, £2 17s. 5 $\frac{1}{2}$.; 1860-64, £3; and 1865-70, £2 18s. 6d.

Wool.—Average price per lb. :—

Years.	s.	d.	Years.	s.	d.
1855	...	8 $\frac{1}{2}$	1863	...	11 $\frac{5}{8}$
1856	...	9	1864	...	11 $\frac{1}{2}$
1857	...	8 $\frac{3}{4}$	1865	...	11 $\frac{1}{2}$
1858	...	6 $\frac{3}{4}$	1866	...	9 $\frac{1}{2}$
1859	...	7 $\frac{1}{2}$	1867	...	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
1860	...	8 $\frac{1}{2}$	1868	...	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
1861	...	7 $\frac{3}{4}$	1869	...	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
1862	...	10	1870	...	7 $\frac{3}{4}$

The temporary effect of the American War is clearly to be seen in the above prices, and latterly they are getting down again to their old level.

Indian Tea.—Average price per lb. :—

Years.	s.	d.	Years.	s.	d.
1856	...	2 4 $\frac{3}{4}$	1864	...	2 3
1857	...	2 1 $\frac{1}{4}$	1865	...	2 3 $\frac{1}{2}$
1858	...	2 0	1866	...	1 11 $\frac{3}{8}$
1859	...	2 0	1867	...	1 9 $\frac{1}{2}$
1860	...	1 9	1868	...	1 9 $\frac{1}{2}$
1861	...	1 9 $\frac{1}{2}$	1869	...	1 8 $\frac{1}{2}$
1862	...	1 9	1870	...	1 9
1863	...	1 11 $\frac{3}{8}$			

Here again is a decline.

I have given above the most important articles of export, and it cannot be concluded from the above figures that prices have increased in India to any material extent, much less "enormously." The necessary causes for a healthy rise do not exist; the effect, therefore, is only a dream. On the contrary, the causes to diminish capital and labour are unceasingly at work, and the consequence can only be increased poverty instead of prosperity.

Cause No. 2 stated by me at the commencement of this paper, will partly account for such rise as has actually taken place in some parts of India, and has misled many persons to the conclusion of a general rise and increased prosperity.

During the last twenty years, something like £82,000,000 (Railway Report, 1869), have been sent to India for railway works, out of which some £26,000,000 are spent in England for stores, &c., and about £55,000,000 remitted to India to be spent here. This amount has been spent in certain parts, with the effect of raising prices there in

two ways. Large numbers of labourers are collected in such places, and to a great extent agricultural labour is diminished in their neighbourhood, the want of good communication preventing other parts from supplying the demand.

The result is, that less food is produced and more mouths to feed, and, with the labourers well paid, a temporary and local rise of prices is the inevitable consequence. On looking over the maps, and examining the prices given in the tables of administration reports, it will be easily seen that, in every presidency in good seasons, the localities of high prices have been those only where there have been large public works going on. For instance, in the Central Provinces in the year 1867-68, when there was an average good season, the districts in which the price of rice was highest were—Hoshungabad Rs. 5 per maund, Baitool Rs. 4 per maund, Nursingpore Rs. 3-12 per maund, Jubbulpore Rs. 3-12 per maund, Nagpore Rs. 3-8 per maund, and Saugur Rs. 3-9 per maund. While the lowest prices were—Raipore and Belaspore Re. 1 per maund, Sumbulpore Rs. 1-2, Balaghaut Rs. 2, Bhandara Rs. 2, Chindwara Rs. 1-8. Now, the places having the highest prices are almost all those along, or in the neighbourhood of, railway lines, or carrying on some public works; and those with lowest prices are away from the lines, &c. In 1868-69, the range of prices is about the same, though higher on account of bad season, Hoshungabad being Rs. 8 and Raipore Rs. 2; and through the season being unequal in different parts, there is some corresponding divergence from the preceding year.

Take the *Madras Presidency*. The districts with highest prices in 1867-68 are :—

Cuddapah	Rs. 492 per garce.*
Madura	" 477 "
Coimbatore	" 474 "
Bellary	" 469 "

The districts with the lowest prices are :—

Vizagapatam	Rs. 203 per garce.
Godavery	" 222 "
Ganjam	" 232 "
South Canara	" 308 "

Almost all the high-price districts ate on the railway line, or have some public works. The districts of the lowest prices are away from the line. In the Godavery district I do not know how far irrigation has helped to produce abundance.

Take the *Punjab* for June 1868-69. The report gives prices for the following districts only :—

Delhi	Wheat 26 seers or 52 lbs. per Re. 1.
Umballa	" 48 " "
Sealkote	" 38 " "
Lahore	" 34 " "
Multan	" 34 " "
Peshawur	" 30 " "

Now, the first three are those where railways are finished, the last three are those where new lines are being constructed.

* Garus=9,256 lbs. (Parliamentary Return 7/2 of 1853).

In the *North-West Provinces*.—For the month of June, 1868 (I have taken this month in which there was no scarcity; the month after, prices gradually rose to famine prices)—

Meerut	27 seers	8 chittacks	or 55 lbs.	per Re. 1.
Saharunpore .	25 "	14 "	50 "	nearly "
Bareilly.....	25 "		50 "	" "
Moradabad	} 24 "		48 "	" "
Muttra ...				
Agra				
Cawnpore ...	22 "		44 "	" "
Benares	18 "	4 "	36½ "	" "
Allahabad ...	17 "		34 "	" "
Mirzapore ...	17 "		34 "	" "
Ajmere.....	16 "		32 "	" "

The East Indian Railway being finished, the irrigation-works now going on are beginning to tell; the Agra Canal raising prices at Agra and Muttra.

Cawnpore and the places mentioned after it have had railway works in progress about them. In these Provinces, besides railways, there is public works expenditure from imperial funds close upon a crore of rupees during 1868-69, greater part of which is spent in places where prices are high.

In the *Bombay Presidency*.—What with cotton money lately poured in, and perhaps not quite re-drained yet, and large railway works going on for some time past, prices are comparatively higher than in all the other parts of India, but most so only where railway works and cotton combined, such as all such places on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India line as Surat, Broach, Kaira, Ahmedabad, &c., or on the G. I. P. line, either northward or southward. Belgaum and Dharwar, not being on a line, have not high prices.

All the very high prices in the Bombay Presidency in the year 1863 (the year of the inquiry of the Price Commission) are things of the past. For instance, in the report of the Commission, the prices given for the town of Belgaum for November 1863 are (page 32)—

Seers of (80 tolas or 2 lbs.) per Rupee.

	14th Nov. Seers.	21st Nov. Seers.
Coarse Rice	8	6
Bajri	10	7
Jowari	9½	7

Contrast these with the prices in 1867-68 :—

	Nov. 1867. seers.	Nov. 1868. seers.
2nd Sort Rice	14.40	13.9
Bairi	24	26
Jowari	28	35

In *Bengal*.—All places which are cheapest in 1868 are distant from the railway lines.—Tipperah, Purneah, Cuttack, Puri, Dacca, Maunbhun. Even in some places where the railway line has passed, the prices are not so high—as they are, I think, rice-producing districts—such as Rajmahal and Bankurah. As in other parts of India, it will be found that in Bengal also prices rose for a time where rail-

way and other public works were building. These facts show that railway capital, and money for other public works, raised prices temporarily in certain localities.

I must not be misunderstood, however. I do not mean to complain of any such temporary effect produced during the prosecution of such public works as railways, roads, canals, or irrigation-works, or any work of reproduction or saving. My object is only to show that the statement often made, that India is prosperous and happy because prices have risen, is a conclusion not warranted by actual facts; and that any partial, local, or temporary rise in prices is attributable to the temporary and local expenditure of railway and other loans, or of imperial and local funds on public works.

So far I have shown that any rise that has taken place has been only local and temporary, as long as railways or public works were building there. I shall now show more directly how, in every province as it came under the British rule, prices went down, as the natural consequence of the drain setting in under the new system, and that there has not been a general rise of prices.

Take *Madras*.—Return 362 of 1853 gives “the average price per cwt. of Munghi 2nd sort in the month of January, 1813” as 7s. 6½d. to 9s. 8d., and Bengal table-rice 14s. 0½d. After this, Madras kept sinking, till, in 1852, there is 3s. to 3s. 6½d. per cwt., and the Board of Revenue felt it necessary to inquire into “the general decline of prices, and to find out any general measures of relief” to meet falling prices.—(Madras Selections No. XXXI. of 1856, page 1). This selection gives prices from almost all districts of Madras, and the general result is that there is a continuous fall in prices (excepting scarcity years) from the commencement of the century to 1852, the year of the reports. Then further on, what are the prices now in the first half of March, 1873?

	<i>Rice 1st sort.</i>		
Present fortnight.....seers 12'4 or lbs. 27'28		}	So that best sort is
Past " " " " " 12'4			about 8s. 2½d. per cwt. ;
	<i>Rice Common.</i>		common sort 6s. 6½d. to
Present fortnight.....seers 15'6 or lbs. 34'32			7s. 4d. per cwt. (<i>Indian Gazette</i> , 5th April, 1873).
Past " " " " " 13'9 " 30'8		1 seer = 2'2 lbs.	

This is the only number of the *Indian Gazette* I have come across. Again, the average price of Madras rice for the year 1868 in the United Kingdom, after paying for freight, insurance, commission, profits, and all other charges from Madras to arrival to that country, was 9s. 8d. per cwt. (trade returns, 1868), while the price for January, 1813, given above is 8s. 2½d. in Madras itself. Or, let us take the export price in the ports of the Madras Presidency. The export price of cargo rice in the ports of the Madras Presidency according to the price-currents of the Madras Chamber of Commerce, in the year 1867, is put down uniformly in the price tables at Rs. 6 per bag of 164 lbs. or 2 Indian maunds; but in the remarks in which precise quotations are given, the price ranges from Rs. 3-15 to Rs. 6-2. Rs. 6, though a higher price than the average for a bag of 164 lbs., is equal to 8s. 2d. per cwt.; and even this price, though not higher than that of 1813, was owing to bad seasons and short crop; and certainly prices consequent upon bad seasons are not an indication of prosperity. In the year 1868, the season being average good, the price quoted for cargo

rice is Rs. 3-15 per bag. Now and then, in the remarks, higher prices are quoted, but Rs. 4 will be quite an approximate average. Rs. 4 per bag is nearly 5s. 6d. per cwt. During 1869, the same Rs. 3-15 is the general quotation; but the season of 1869 not being good, prices went up in 1870 to Rs. 5-8, with an average of about Rs. 5, or about 6s. 10d. per cwt. Thus, then, there is no material rise in price in the Madras Presidency compared with the commencement of this century. The subsequent fall made the poor people wretched. Government inquired and reduced the assessment, which, with expenditure on railways, &c., gave some little relief. But the depression is not yet got over. On the contrary, the Material and Moral Progress (Report for 1869, Parliamentary Return [c 213 of 1870], page 71) tells us that "prices in Madras have been falling continuously," and my impression is that they so still continue.

Bengal.—The Parliamentary Return 362 of 1853 gives the prices at Calcutta from 1792 only (and that is stated to be a year of famine), when there was already about that period much depression by the action of the Company's rule. I cannot get in this return earlier prices of the time of the native rule to make a fair comparison. For 1813 the prices given in the then depressed condition are from 2s. 8½d. to 3s. 7d. A comparison with this depression of the present prices is, of course, not fair. In 1832, Patna rice is quoted at 7s. 5½d. per cwt., and Patchery at 7s. 1½d. Now, the best sort of rice of Patna in the first half of March, 1873, is quoted 21'50 seers, or 43 lbs., per rupee, or about 5s. 1½d. per cwt. In 1852, the above return quotes Patna at 5s. 4½d. per cwt. Colonel Baird Smith, in his famine report (Parliamentary Return 29 of 1862, page 55) quotes as follows the ordinary prices of grain, &c., "from an official statement prepared from authentic documents by the Fiscal of Chinsura" at that station between the years 1770 and 1813 (as given in "Gleanings in Science," vol. 1, page 369, 1829)—rice best sort 28 seers per rupee, coarse sort 40 seers per rupee. The same statement gives prices for the year 1803 also for ordinary rice at 40 seers per rupee (page 56). And in the *Bengal Government Gazette* for the year 1867-68, it will be found that, in some places in Bengal, the ordinary price of cheapest sort of rice is even then between 40 and 50 seers per rupee (this seer being 2 lbs.) So we have the same story as Madras. Bengal first sank, and helped by a permanent settlement, by the railway loan, cotton, &c., again got over the depression to a certain extent.

Bombay.—The same return, 362 of 1853, gives the average price of rice between the highest and lowest prices of the year 1812-13, as 15s. 4½d. per cwt. This price goes on declining to about 3s. 5d. to 7s. 6½d. in 1852, and what is it now in the first half of March, 1873 (*Indian Gazette*, 5th April, 1873, page 448), after all favourable circumstances of railways and other public works, some of them still going on, cotton-wealth, &c.?

Rice best sort—

	Seers.	
Present fortnight.	74 = 16'28 lbs.	less than 14s. per cwt.
Previous "	68 = 15 "	" " 15s. "
Rice Common	10 = 22 "	" " 10s. "

The average between the highest and lowest prices will be about 12s. 6d. per cwt., when in 1812-13 this is 15s. 4½d.

In the report of the Indapore re-settlement (Bombay Selections, cvii., new series, pages 118 and 71), the price of jowari is given from 1809 to 1865-66 :—

Years.	Pucca seers per Rupee.	Years.	Pucca seers per Rupee.
February 1809.....	24	April 1824.....	36½
" 1810.....	24	" 1825.....	12½
" 1811.....	22	February 1826.....	44
" 1812.....	25½	" 1827.....	64
" 1813.....	27	" 1828.....	32
March 1814.....	28	" 1829.....	80
February 1815.....	33½	" 1830.....	46
" 1816.....	26	May 1831.....	40
April 1817.....	48½	February 1832.....	60
February 1818.....	24	" 1833.....	23
" 1819.....	17	" 1834.....	46
" 1820.....	19½	" 1835.....	48
March 1821.....	32	" 1836.....	38
" 1822.....	32	" 1837.....	66
" 1823.....	32		

After giving these prices, Lieutenant A. Nash remarks—" This table is chiefly interesting as showing the gradual diminution in the price of corn from the days of the Peishwas to our own. By comparing the prices at the commencement with those at the end of the table, and then reading the list over, this circumstance will become very apparent."

About the year 1836-37 when prices had gone down very low, the Survey Settlement commenced, and the prices subsequently are given for Indapore as follows :—

Years	Seers per Rupee.	Years	Seers per Rupee.
1836-37... ..	43	1851-52... ..	40
1837-38... ..	36	1852-53... ..	56
1838-39... ..	67	1853-54... ..	56
1839-40... ..	44	1854-55... ..	29
1840-41... ..	64	1855-56... ..	32
1841-42... ..	56	1856-57... ..	32
1842-43... ..	68	1857-58... ..	39
1843-44... ..	72	1858-59... ..	32
1844-45... ..	60	1859-60... ..	39
1845-46... ..	36	1860-61... ..	33
1846-47... ..	15	1861-62... ..	27
1847-48... ..	48	1862-63... ..	16
1848-49... ..	72	1863-64... ..	13
1849-50... ..	72	1864-65... ..	16
1850-51... ..	38	1865-66... ..	18

Now, from the year of the Mutiny, followed by the cotton famine, the times were exceptional, so that the prices in 1856, or about that period, can only be considered normal, and that is about 32 seers, while in 1809-13 about 25 seers. Now, in 1867-68 the average from November, 1867, to September, 1868, for Ahmednuggur (*Bombay Government Gazette* price list) is about 24½ seers.

Thus, then, it is the old story. From the time of the Peishwa, prices kept going down under the British rule till, with the aid of railway loans, cotton windfall, &c., they have laboured up again, with a tendency to relapse.

I take the following figures from the Price Commission report of Bombay (Finance Committee's Report of 1871, page 617). I take jowari as the chief grain of the presidency :—

Tolas per Rupee.

Years.	Poona.	Belgaum.	Ahmedabad.
1824	1,892	2,480	2,560
1825	1,548	2,600	1,840
1826	3,040	2,200	3,240
1827	3,268	2,800	3,600
1828	2,752	2,640	4,000
1829	3,440	4,200	4,800

Instead of quoting here the whole table, which is already published in the first report of the Finance Committee, page 617, I take six years, from 1850 to 1855 :—

Tolas per Rupee.

Years.	Poona.	Belgaum.	Ahmedabad.
1850	3,056	4,240	3,520
1851	3,440	4,560	4,320
1852	3,440	3,280	2,800
1853	4,128	3,200	2,800
1854	2,504	3,040	3,400
1855	2,432	2,540	4,520

Even taking the rough average without consideration of quantities in each year, the latter six years are lower than the former. It is only about and after 1857 that prices rose under exceptional and temporary circumstances—the Mutiny and the American War, aided by the expenditure on railways, &c. After the American War, prices have commenced falling. Contrast the prices in 1863 with those of 1867-68 for the same places—Poona, Belgaum, and Ahmedabad (I take the rough averages from the monthly prices given in the *Bombay Government Gazette* for 1867-68) :—

Tolas per Rupee.

Years.	Poona.	Belgaum.	Ahmedabad.
1863	1,120	720	880
1867-68	1,786	2,633	1,180

For 1868 and 1869. This year, except in the southern part of the Southern Division, was a bad season, and the Bombay Administration Report says that the distress in two districts, Poona and Ahmednuggur, became "so great that it became necessary to afford relief to the labouring poor by undertaking works of public utility." In the Northern Division, in Ahmedabad, Kaira, and the Punch Mahals, "the scanty rains of June and July were followed by severe floods in August, which were succeeded by drought. In Khandeish there was an entire failure of the later rains in some talookas." In some talookas, with no rain, "there were no crops to watch, and no harvest to reap." In Khandeish, also, relief works had become necessary, as the effects of scarcity were heightened

by immigration from Rajpootana. Such was the generally unfavourable character of the season, and yet the rough average of retail prices from the *Bombay Government Gazette* is as follows for the same three places :—

Tolas of Jowari per Rupree.

Nov. to Oct. 1868-69	...	Poona.	Belgaum.	Ahmedabad.
		1,227	2,100	930

(lower than those of 1863).

I may just say a word here about the Price Commission Report of Bombay of 1864 to which I have referred above, and from which Sir Bartle Frere has made up his statement, embodied in the first report of the Finance Committee, that all the tables given in it, as averages either of a number of years or of a number of places, are worthless for any correct and practical conclusions with regard to the actual change in prices, or the actual condition of the people. Because, in these averages, as is generally done, no regard, I think, is had for the different quantities of produce in different years or different places. This remark applies, as I have already said before, to all averages taken on the wrong principle of adding up prices and dividing by the number of the prices.

Take Cotton. I cannot get a list of prices in India, but the prices in Liverpool may be taken as a sufficient index of the changes in India. (Dr. J. Forbes Royle, in his "Culture and Commerce of Cotton in India" (1851), gives before the title page a diagram of the prices and quantity of American and Indian cotton imported into the United Kingdom from the year 1806 to 1848. The prices of Indian cotton in Liverpool in 1806 is 16½*d.*, in 1807 15½*d.* In 1808 it went up to 20*d.*, and then declined, till in 1811 it touched 12*d.* It rose again, till in 1814 it went up to 21*d.* It had subsequently various fluctuations, till in 1832 it just touched 4½*d.*, but again continued to be above till 1840 with an average above 6*d.* It subsequently continued at a low average of about 4*d.*, and would have remained so to this day, or perhaps gone out of the English market altogether, as was very nearly the case in 1860, but for the American War which sent it up. Now, looking at the figures given above, it will be seen that, now that the temporary impulse of the American War is over, cotton is fast sinking again, and we can no longer expect to see again that high curve of the first quarter of the present century ranging from 7*d.* to 21*d.* The Suez Canal opening direct communication with European Ports, has only saved the Indian cotton trade from perishing altogether. The Administration Report of 1871-72 gives a distressing picture of the season over nearly the whole of the presidency, and of the inability of the people to stand it; and are the prices of such years to be glad about, and to be taken in averages of rise?

The Central Provinces.—In the Central Provinces the average price of rice, as I have pointed out before, for the year 1867-68—a year of average good season—is Rs. 1-8 per maund of 80 lbs., not a high price certainly; and if these be an "enormous" rise in former prices, what wretched prices must they have been before? I have not materials for comparison with prices before the British rule.

Of the *North-West Provinces* I have not come across sufficient

materials to make a fair comparison, but, from what data I have, I feel that the conclusion about these Provinces will be similar to those of other parts of India.

As an imperfect indication, I may refer to the table given in Colonel Baird Smith's report of prices in 1860, and those of 1868-69 given in the administration report. Both years have nearly the same common features,—in 1860, in July and August, scarcity prices; in 1868-69, latter part of the year, of scarcity. On a comparison, the prices of 1868-69 are, if anything, something lower on the whole, except at Allahabad and Cawnpore, where railway works are in progress. I give this comparison below.

Prices of fine Wheat at the undermentioned places.

SEERS PER RUPEE.

		Saharunpore.	Meerut.	Allyghur.	Cawnpore.	Allahabad.	Muttra.	Agra.
At the end of								
May	1860.	26-13	22-8	19	25	24-1	21-12	17-8
	1868.	25-14	27		23	18		23
June	1860.	25-12	20	18	23	22-8	19	18
	1868.	25-14	27-8		22	17	24	24
July	1860.							
(missing)								
	1868.	23-11	26-8		21	17-8	24	23
August	1860.	11-12	11-8	12-4	18	21-4	9-12	10
	1868.	18-4	22		17	15	18	19-8
September	1860.	13-2	11-8	10-8	17	20	9	9-13
	1868.	11-13	11-4		16	15	16-3	14
October	1860.	9-9	9-8	11-4	17	18-12	10-12	11
	1868.	12-15	17-12					

This really does not show any enormous rise during the nine years which of all others are supposed to have raised prices most.

Take the *Punjab*.—The prices of wheat in Lahore are (Report of Punjab, 1850-51, page 74) as follows :—

Years.	lbs. per Rupee.	Years.	lbs. per Rupee.
1844	45	1848	54
1845	46	1849	38
1846	39½	1850	43½
1847	40		

Mr. John (now Lord) Lawrence repeats, in his report of 1855-56 (page 28), that, for ten years up to 1850-51, wheat was Rs. 2 per maund of 82 lbs., i.e., during the native rule, ten years previous to annexation, the price was 41 lbs. per rupee. Now, the Administration Report for 1855-56 (Government of India Selection No. XVIII. of 1850) gives the following table :—

AVERAGE PRICES.

For 10 years up to 1850-51.	Wheat Rs. a per maund of 82 lbs.
1851-52	/ Rs. 1 per maund.
1852-53	" 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ "
1853-54	" 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ "
1854-55	" 1 "
1855-56	" 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ "

This table shows how prices fell after the annexation. Assessments were revised and lowered, railway and other public works created demand for labour, and another additional very important element operated, which, in the words of Sir R. Temple, is this:—"But within the last year, the native army being Punjabi, all such sums have been paid to them and have been spent at home. Again, many thousands of Punjabi soldiers are serving abroad. These men not only remit their savings, but also have sent quantities of prize property and plunder, the spoils of Hindustan, to their native villages. The effect of all these is already perceptible in an increase of agricultural capital, a freer circulation of money, and a fresh impetus to cultivation."

Now, the prices after all such favourable circumstances, even as late as 1867-68, are about the same as they were in 1844-47—about 34 to 46 lbs. per rupee. In 1868-69 the prices are higher on account of bad season.

I trust I have made it clear that the so-called rise in prices is only a pulling up from the depth they had sunk into under the natural economic effect of the British rule, by the temporary help of the railway and other loans, and by the windfall of the high cotton prices for a short period—so that India got back a little of its lost blood, though the greater portion of it is borrowed.

But, among the causes of the occasional rise in prices, and whose effects are indiscriminately mixed up in the averages, there is one which no person who gives the slightest consideration to it will regard as a matter for congratulation. Besides the public works expenditure causing high prices locally, the additional cause to which I allude is scarcity and bad season. Such rise will not certainly be regarded by anybody as a sign of prosperity, but calculation of averages often include these scarcity prices, and their results and conclusions are mischievous, in leading to wrong practical action. For instance, take the Central Provinces. The average price of rice for all the districts is Rs. 1-8 per maund for 1867-68, while in 1868-69 it is Rs. 4-4-9 per maund, and this is entirely owing to a bad season. But there are writers who do not, or would not, see the bad season. They see only the high prices, and clamour prosperity and for increased assessments.

In the North-West Provinces the price of wheat is given, say, in Saharanpore above 50 lbs. per rupee in June, 1868, and in December, 1868, it rises to as much as 20 lbs. per rupee. I give a few more figures from the report of 1868-69:—

	April, 1868.		Sept., 1868.	
	seers.	chittacks.	seers.	chittacks.
Meerut	26	0	11	4
Moradabad	26	10	13	7
Barilly	25	10	15	5
Muttra	24	0	16	2
Agra	23	0	14	0

So are these places more prosperous in September than in April when they are, in fact, suffering from near famine prices?

Again, for 1871-72 (Administration Report for 1871-72, pages 1 and 2), both the *kharrif* (autumn crop) and *rabi* (spring crop) had been short, and the consequence was rise in prices. Is such rise a healthy sign of prosperity?

In Madras the price of cargo rice is, all throughout in 1868-69, about Rs. 3-15 per bag, and by the end of July, 1870, it goes up to Rs. 5-10, owing to bad season.

The comparative high prices of 1865 to 1867 were owing to bad season; 1867-68, a good season, brought them down. Bad season again, and a rise and continuous fall since 1870. Return No. 335 of 1867 on the Orissa famine gives a list of prices rising many times, in the time of various famines; and are these prices of prosperity? Leaving extreme cases of past famine alone, let us take present times.

Punjab.—The Administration Report for 1868-69 says (page 101)—“Appendix III. F1 shows that food was cheaper in June, 1868, than during the preceding year, but in January, 1869, prices had risen to famine rates, in consequence of the drought that prevailed during the intervening months. In January, 1869, wheat was selling at Delhi at 11½ seers (22½ lbs.) per rupee, and in the other districts specified in the return as follows:—

Umballa	9½ seers.
Lahore	9½ ”
Sealkote	10½ ”
Multan	11½ ”
Peshawur	14½ ”

Now, the prices in the above places in January and June, 1868, were—

	January.	June.
Delhi	25 seers	26 seers
Umballa	20½ ”	24 ”
Lahore	17 ”	18 ”
Sealkote	16 ”	19 ”
Multan	13½ ”	17 ”
Peshawur	15 ”	20½ ”

So the prices are more than doubled in January, 1869. And this unfortunate state continues, after a little relief.

Here is the summary of the table in the Report for 1869-70 (page 95):—

	1st June 1868. seers.	1st Jan. 1869. seers.	1st June 1869. seers.	1st Jan. 1870. seers.	Prices in seers of 2 lbs. per rupee.
Delhi	20	11½	15	9	
Umballa	24	9½	13½	9	
Lahore	18	9½	13½	9½	
Sealkote	19	10½	13½	10½	
Multan	17	11½	12½	9½	
Peshawur	20½	14½	17½	17½	

To sum up.—the course of prices during the last two years has been, if anything, downward, except in places of drought or famine, or new public works; and all my remarks based upon 1867-68-69 will, I think, derive greater force from the statistics of the past two years.

I trust I have proved that there has been no general healthy rise of prices in any part of India from the time of its acquisition by the British. On the contrary, there has been continuous depression, till the railway loans, &c., and cotton money revived it a little, and that even temporarily and locally, from its extreme previous illness. And that very often the so-called high prices are the result of misfortune, of scarcity, rather than of increased prosperity.

It will tax the ability of Indian statesmen much, and will require a great change in the policy of the British rule, before India will see prosperity, or even rise above its absolute wants.

WAGES.

It is alleged that there is great rise in wages, and that therefore India is increasing in prosperity. Almost all remarks applied to prices will do for this. The rise is only when railway and other works have gone on, and is only local and temporary. In other parts there is no material alteration.

With regard to *Bengal*, there is the same difficulty as in the case of prices—that I cannot get earlier wages than 1790-91, which were depressed times. I find for the year 1830-31 the daily wages of a cooly was on zemindari estate two annas in the Collectorates of Dinapore, Bakergunge, Dacca, 24-Purgunnahs, Murshedabad, in the Purgunnahs of Calcutta, Barughati (Return No. 362 of 1853).

Now, in the year 1866-67, the daily wage of unskilled labour in several districts of Bengal, where even public works were going on, were as follows:—

1st Division Grand Trunk-road Division	...	2	6
2nd " " " " " "	...	2	0
Patna Branch Road Division	...	2	0
Barrakar Division	...	2	2
Tirhoot	...	1	6
Behar Road	...	2	0
Barrackpore	...	2	8
Purneah	...	2	6
Bhagulpore	...	2	6
Behrampore	...	2	6
Dinapore	...	1	6
Ramghur	...	2 to	1 6
24-Purgunnahs	...	2	6
Chittagong	...	2	6
Burdwan	...	2	6
	...	1	6

In some divisions it is as high as 4 annas, but the general rate is as above, and it is the rates paid by the Public Works Department. So the general average rate of a cooly on zemindari estates, I think, cannot

be much above two annas a day—just what it was forty years ago. I have obtained the above figures from the Public Works Department through a friend in Calcutta.

Bombay.—Sir Bartle Frere has given a table from the Price Commission Report of 1864 of Bombay, of the monthly wages of a cooly or common labourer (Finance Committee, first report, page 616). On examining this table (which I do not repeat here), it will be seen that there is hardly a rise in wages worth mentioning between the average of 1824-29 and 1850-59, the intervening period having some depression. It is after 1859, as in the case of prices and from same causes (mutiny, railways, and cotton), wages rose suddenly. But that they are falling again will be evident from what is passing in Bombay itself, as the centre of the greatest activity, and as where large public works are still going on, one would hardly expect a fall. I obtained the following figures from one of the Executive Engineers' office for wages paid by the Public Works Department. The following rates were current during the last six years in Bombay (the letter is dated 11th June, 1872):—

Years.	Wages of Baggari per diem.		Wages of Women.		Wages of Boys.	
	a.	p.	a.	p.	a.	p.
1867-68.....	6	0	4	0	3	0
1868-69.....	6	0	4	0	3	0
1869-70.....	5	0	3	6	2	4
1870-71.....	5	0	3	0	2	4
1871-72.....	5	0	3	0	2	4

This is a fall from 1863, when in Bombay the maximum was Rs. 13-8 per month, and minimum Rs. 7-12 per month, or 7 annas and 2½ pies per diem, and 4 annas and 1½ pies per diem respectively. Now, had large public buildings not been building in Bombay, these wages would have gone much lower than given in the tables above. I am not aware how the wages are during 1872 and 1873, but my impression is that they are lower, and will be again down, after the present buildings are finished, to the old levels shown in the table to which I have already referred (page 616 of Finance Committee's first report).

In Punjab the highest rate in 1867-68 is 5 annas and 4 annas per day, chiefly in those parts where public works are going on, such as Sealkote, Multan, Lahore, &c. But even in these, the lowest, and in most of the other districts the rate generally is 3 annas. The average given of wages of unskilled labour in the Report for 1868-69 is—

Highest, 3 annas 3 pies, or 4½d.
Lowest, 2 annas 5 pies, or 3½d.

This average is taken without any reference to the number of persons earning the different wages. Were this element considered, the average will come down to the old famous 3d. a day. There is the further element to consider how many days of the year are the different wages earned! However, even with regard to any high rate, that is, in some districts, the Punjab Government says what is applicable to other parts of India under similar circumstances. The Administration Report for 1867-68 (page 83) says—"The rates of unskilled labour range from 3 annas (3d.) to 5 annas (7½d.) per diem. There has been a considerable rise in rates in places affected by the railway and other public works, and labour in any shape commands higher remuneration than formerly; but as prices of the necessaries of life have risen in

even a higher ratio, owing chiefly to the increase of facility of export, it may be doubted whether the position of the unskilled labouring classes has materially improved." Leaving the cause to be what it may, this is apparent, that higher wages in some places have not done much good to the poor labourer. The general rate of wages is, however, about 2 annas. In the Central Provinces (excepting those parts where railway works have been going on), in Raipore, Belaspore, Sumbulpore, Balaghat, Bhundara, and Chindwara, the rate of wages for unskilled labour is generally 2 annas only, both for the years 1867-68 and 1868-69. On the other hand, where railway works are going on and the price of food is high, wages are also high—as in Hoshungabad, 3 annas; Baitool, 4 annas; Nursingpore, 3 annas; Jubbulpore, 5 annas; Nagpore, 3 annas, &c. Thus, only locally and temporarily are there high wages in some parts. The general rate of wages is not improved. Even with all such high wages for a few, the average all over the Provinces in 1868-69, as well as in 1870-71, is put down as 3 annas, or 4½d.; but if the number of those earning the different wages, and the number of days when such wages are earned, were considered, as well as the temporary effect of the buildings of public works, we shall again come to our old friend 3d. per day, or perhaps less. Except, therefore, all over India where railway or public works have congested labour temporarily, without good facility of communication of bringing food, the general rate of wages is scarcely above 2 annas a day. The notion of a general rise of wages, and of the vastly improved condition of the labourer, is a delusion. Here is the latest summary of wages on the highest authority (*Material and Moral Progress of India for 1871-72*, pages 100-101). In Punjab, wages are 6d. to 2d. a day for unskilled labour. In Oudh, 1½d. for unskilled labour a day. In Central Provinces, unskilled labour is 3d. to 1½d. per day. In the Bombay Presidency, unskilled labour is 6d. to 3d. a day. The rates of other provinces are not given. It must be remembered that the lower figure is the rate earned by the majority; and are these present rates of 1½d. to 3d. an enormous rise on the former ones?

BULLION.

It is often alleged that India has imported large quantities of bullion, and is very much enriched thereby. Let us see what the facts are!

First of all, India has not got its imports of silver as so much profits on its exports, or making up so much deficit of imports against exports and profits. As far as exports go, I have already shown that the imports (including all bullion) are short of exports *plus* profits, to the extent of not only the whole profits, but the whole opium revenue, and a good deal from the produce itself besides. The import of bullion has been chiefly from commercial and financial necessities, as will be seen further on, except during the few years of the American War, when some portion was sent in because the people could not suddenly create a large demand for English goods in payment of profits. The total balance of the imports and exports of bullion from the year 1801 to 1863, according to Parliamentary Return 133 of 1864, is £234,353,636; and from 1864 to 1867, according to Return c. 184 of 1870, is £101,123,448 (which includes, mark! the years of the great

cotton windfall, and large remittances for railway loans), making altogether £335,477,134 from 1801 to 1869. The British rulers introduced universally the system of collecting all revenue in money instead of in kind. This circumstance produced a demand for coin. The foreign trade of the country having increased (though without any benefit to India), increased the demand for coin. The coinage of India from 1801 to 1869, according to the same returns, amount to £265,652,749, exclusive of coinage in Madras for the years 1801 to 1807, and for Bombay for the years 1821-22, 1824 to 1831, and 1833 (particulars of which are not given), leaving a balance of about £70,000,000 of bullion for all other wants of the country. It may be said that some of the coinage must have been re-melted. This cannot be to a large extent, as specie is 2 per cent. cheaper than coin, as the mint charge is 2 per cent. for coining. Mr. Harrison, in reply to question 3993 of the Finance Committee, confirms this—that the coinage “is burdened with a charge of 2 per cent., which is a clear loss to all persons wishing to use it for any other purpose than that of coin.”

Then there is the wear and tear to consider. The wear and tear of shillings and sixpences given by the return (24 of 1817) is 28 per cent. on shillings and 47 per cent. on sixpences. The period of the wear is not given in the return. In India, this wear, from the necessity of moving large quantity of coin for Government purposes, and a much rougher and more widespread use of the coin by the people generally, the percentage per annum must be a large one indeed.

Mr. Harrison again says on the subject—“*Question 3992.*—But do you, then, think that a million fresh coinage a year is sufficient to supply the wants of India? *Mr. Harrison.*—More than sufficient, I suppose, to supply the waste of coin or metal.” This, I cannot help thinking, is under the mark, but it shows that nearly a million a year must be imported for simply making up waste of coin or metal.

The coinage of India as per return is, from 1801 to 1869, about £260,000,000 (not including the coinage in Native States). Deducting only £66,000,000 for wastage for the sixty-nine years, there should be in circulation £200,000,000. Taking the wide extent of the country (equal to all Europe, except Russia, it is said), this amount for revenue, commercial, and social purposes is not an extravagant one. Strike off even £50,000,000 for re-melting, though at the loss of 2 per cent. value; I take the coin as only £150,000,000. Deducting this amount and wastage of £66,000,000—or say even £50,000,000 only (to be under the mark)—making a total of £200,000,000, there will remain for all other social and industrial wants, besides coinage, about £135,000,000. This, distributed over a population of above 200,000,000, hardly gives 13s. 6d. per head, that is to say, during altogether sixty-nine years, India imported only 13s. 6d. per head of bullion for all its various purposes, except coin. What an insignificant sum!! Take even the whole import altogether of £335,000,000 during the long period of sixty-nine years, and what is it? Simply about 33s. 6d. per head for all possible purposes, and without making any allowance for wear and tear. Just see what the United Kingdom has retained for its purposes. I cannot get any returns of import of silver and gold before 1838. I take only, then, 1838 to 1869 (both inclusive). The total imports are £322,628,000, and the total exports £268,310,000, leaving a balance of about £54,300,000. Deducting about £10,000,000

for the excess of the quantity in the Bank of England at the end of 1869 over 1857, there remain about £44,000,000 for the social and trade use of the country, allowing equal amounts for coin in 1858 and 1869. This, therefore, is about 30s. a head retained by the United Kingdom within a period of twelve years, independent of its circulating coin, while India retained only 33s. 6d. a head during a period of sixty-nine years for *all* its purposes. Much is said about the hoarding by the natives, but how little is the share for each to hoard, and what amounts are in a shape hoardings, in all plate, jewellery, watches, &c., the people use in England! I do not suppose that any Englishman would say that the natives of India ought to have no taste and no ornaments or articles of use, and must only live like animals; but, after all, how little there is for each, if every one had its share to hoard or to use. The fact is, that, far from hoarding, millions who are living on "scanty subsistence" do not know what it is to have a silver piece in their possession. It cannot be otherwise. To talk of oriental wealth now, as far as British India is concerned, is only a figure of speech, a dream! When we talk of all the silver having a purchasing power, we forget how minutely and widely a large portion of it must be distributed in India to be of no use for national purposes. The notion that the import of silver has made India rich, is another strange delusion! There is one important circumstance which is not borne in mind. The silver imported is *not* for making up the balance of exports and profits over imports, or for what is called balance of trade. Far from it; as I have already explained. It is imported as a simple necessity, but it therefore no more makes India richer, because so much *silver* is imported. If I give out £20 worth of goods to anybody, and in return get £5 in other goods and £5 in silver, and yet if by so doing, though I have received only £10 worth in all for the £20 I have parted with, I am richer by £5, because I have received £5 in silver, then my richness will be very *unenviable* indeed. The phenomenon in fact has a delusive effect. Besides not giving due consideration to the above circumstances, the bewilderment of many people at what are called enormous imports of silver in India is like that of a child which, because it can itself be satisfied with a small piece of bread, wonders at a big man eating up a whole loaf, though that loaf may be but a very "scanty subsistence" for the poor big man.

The little England can have, £1 a head out of £30,000,000, the big India must have £200,000,000 to give this share per head to its population. Yet the 33s. 6d. per head in sixty-nine years appears to the bewildered Englishmen something enormously larger than 30s. a head in twelve years they themselves have got, and that as a portion of the profits of trade—while India has it for sheer necessity, and at the highest price, as silver is its last destination, and paying that price by the actual produce of the country, not from any profits of trade, thereby diminishing to that extent its own means of subsistence.

There is one more point to be borne in mind. How much did the East India Company first drain away from India, before it, as a matter of necessity, began to re-import bullion for its wants? What are the statistics of the imports and exports of bullion before 1801?

Where can we find an account of the fortunes which the Company's servants made, by foul means or fair, in spite of their masters' orders, and which they may have taken over to their country in various ways independently of the custom house, with themselves in their own boxes?

Sir John Shore (Afterwards Lord Teynmouth) says in his minute of 1787 (Report of Select Committee of 1812, appendix, page 183) in reference to Bengal—

“137. The exports of specie from the country for the last twenty-five years have been great, and particularly during the last ten of that period. It is well understood, although the remittances to China are by the Government, provided by bills, that specie to a large amount has been exported to answer them. . . . Silver bullion is also remitted by individuals to Europe; the amount cannot be calculated, but must, since the Company's accession to the Dewany, have been very considerable.

“140. Upon the whole, I have no hesitation in concluding that, since the Company's acquisition of the Dewany, the current specie of the country has been *greatly diminished* in quantity; that the old channels of importation by which the drains were formerly replenished are now in a great measure closed; and that the necessity of supplying China, Madras, and Bombay with money, as well as the exportation of it by the Europeans to England, will continue still further to exhaust the country of its silver.

“142. It is obvious to any observation that the specie of the country is much diminished; and I consider this as a radical evil.”

In a quotation I have given before, Lord Cornwallis mentions “the great diminution of the current specie,” in pointing out the result of the drain.

Such was the exhaustion of British territory in India of its specie before it began to re-import. The East India Company and their servants carried away *via* China or direct to England, the former the surplus of revenue, the latter their savings and their bribes, in specie. The country was exhausted, and was compelled to re-import specie for its absolute wants, and it is from the time of such re-importations after exhaustion that we have the return of bullion from the year 1801, and which, after all, is only 34s. a head for all possible wants, commercial, social, religious, revenue, industrial, trade, railway and other public works, or any other, in a period of sixty-nine years. And having no specie left to pay for the heavy English drain, it began to pay in its produce and manufactures, diminishing thereby the share of its children year by year, and their capacity for production. Be it remembered also that this import of specie includes all imported for building railways, and which is a debt on the country to be repaid. This debt to the end of 1869 was some £82,000,000.

As far as I could, I have now placed before you a series of facts and figures directly bearing upon the question of the Poverty of India. As I told you before, these notes were written more than two or three years ago. It remains to be seen what modification should be made in these views by the light of the events of the subsequent years. For the present the inevitable conclusion is that there is a heavy and exhausting annual drain, both material and moral, from India, caused by the excessive employment of Europeans; and to remedy this unnatural and serious evil, such employment needs to be limited to some reasonable extent, so that India may be able to retain to itself some portion of the profits of its trade, and, by thus increasing its capital and prosperity, may be strengthened and confirmed in its loyalty and gratitude to the British nation. I hoped to be able to speak more definitely on this point, but though it is now (1870) nearly three years

since Sir D. Wedderburn moved for a return of the number, salaries, allowances, &c., of all Europeans and natives, employed in all the departments of the State, drawing a salary of above Rs. 100, it is not forthcoming yet. Had this been given as promised, we should have now been able to know the real extent of the material evils from which India is suffering.

The drain of India's wealth on the one hand, and the exigencies of the State expenditure increasing daily on the other, set all the ordinary laws of political economy and justice at naught, and lead the rulers to all sorts of ingenious and oppressive devices to make the two ends meet, and to descend more and more every day to the principles of Asiatic despotism, so contrary to English grain and genius. Owing to this one unnatural policy of the British rule of ignoring India's interests, and making it the drudge for the benefit of England, the whole rule moves in a wrong, unnatural, and suicidal groove.

I conclude this part with some of Macaulay's noble and wise words, uttered, in Parliament, nearly half a century ago. (1833):—

"The mere extent of empire is not necessarily an advantage. To many Governments it has been cumbersome, to some it has been fatal. It will be allowed by every statesman of our time *that the prosperity of a community is made up of the prosperity of those who compose the community*, and that is the most childish ambition to covet dominion which adds to no man's comfort or security. To the great trading nation, to the great manufacturing nation, no progress which any portion of the human race can make in knowledge, in taste for the conveniencies of life, or in the wealth by which those conveniencies are produced, can be matter of indifference. It is scarcely possible to calculate the benefits which we might derive from the diffusion of European civilization among the vast population of the East. It would be on the *most selfish view* of the case; far better for us that the people of India were well-governed and independent of us, than ill-governed and subject to us—that they were ruled by their own kings, but wearing our broadcloth and working with our cutlery, than that they were performing their *salams* to English collectors and English magistrates, but were too ignorant to value, or too poor to buy, English manufactures. *To trade with civilized men is infinitely more profitable than to govern savages.* That would, indeed, be a daring wisdom which, in order that India might remain a dependency, would make it an useless and costly dependency—*which would keep a hundred millions of men from being our customers in order that they might continue to be our slaves.* It was, as Bernier tells us, the practice of the miserable tyrants whom he found in India, when they dreaded the capacity and spirit of some distinguished subject, and yet could not venture to murder him, to administer to him a daily dose of the *pousta*—a preparation of opium, the effect of which was in a few months to destroy all the bodily and mental powers of the wretch who was drugged with it, and to turn him into an helpless idiot. That detestable artifice, more horrible than assassination itself, was worthy of those who employed it. It is no model for the English nation. *We shall never consent to administer the pousta to a whole community, to stupefy and paralyse a great people whom God has committed to our charge, for the wretched purpose of rendering them more amenable to our control.* What is that power worth which is founded on vice, on ignorance, and on misery—which we can hold

only by violating the most sacred duties which, as governors, we owe to the governed.*

But nature's laws cannot be trifled with, and so long as they are immutable, every violation of them carries with it its own Nemesis as sure as night follows day.

* The italics are mine.

REPLY TO CRITICISMS.

I begin with Mr. Maclean.

He has very much misunderstood my papers. As a first instance—when he asks me to deduct the exports of India (less the exports from Native States) from my estimate of the production of India, he does not see that my estimate is for the *total production* in India and that what is exported is not to be deducted therefrom. Besides my estimate is for British India and is not affected in any way by the exports from the Native States.

As a second instance—he asks me to add £15,000,000 for Cotton manufactures. My estimate of production *includes* all *raw* Cotton of British India. The only thing to be added (which is already included in my estimate) is the additional value the raw Cotton acquires by the application of industry in its conversion into cloth. Coal and foreign stores that are used in the Mills are paid for from and therefore *included* in the production I have estimated. The only additional value is that of the labour employed. But even if we allowed the *whole* additional value acquired by raw cotton in its conversion into cloth, what will it be? Mr. Maclean's Guide to Bombay (1875) gives the number of the then working spindles (which is much later than the time of my notes) as about 6 lacs in the whole of the Bombay Presidency. Taking 5 ozs. per day per spindle and 340 working days in the year, the total quantity of raw cotton consumed will be about 81,300 candies, which, at Rs. 150 per candy amounts to about £1,270,000. The price of cloth is generally about double the price of raw cotton, as I have ascertained from the details of two or three mills of Bombay, so that the whole addition caused by the mills to the value of raw cotton is only nearly £1½ millions, say 1½ millions sterling to leave a wide margin. Then again there are about the time of my notes, yarn imports into India worth about £2,500,000 per annum. This, of course, is paid for from the production of the country. The value added to it in its conversion into cloth. Now the cost of weaving is about 25 per cent. of the value of yarn, so that the value thus added is about £600,000; say a million to include any contingency, making the total value to be added to the raw production of about £2,500,000. If deduction is made for coal and foreign stores, this amount will be much lessened. Again we know that hand-spinning is much broken down, and there can be but a little quantity of cloth woven out of hand-spun yarn in India. Giving even £500,000 more for that industry, the outside total of addition to the raw produce would come to, as a high estimate, £3,000,000 instead of the £15,000,000 which Mr. Maclean asks me to add without giving a single figure for his data. Let him give any reasonable data, and I shall gladly modify my figures so far. As a third instance of his misunderstanding my paper—when he asks me to take £5,000,000 for gold and silver ornaments made in this country, he forgets that gold and silver are not produced in this country. All bullion is *imported*, and is paid for from the produce of India. It, therefore, can add nothing to my estimate of production. The only addition is the industry employed on it to convert it into ornaments. This industry for the ordinary native ornaments will be amply

covered by taking on an average an eighth of the value of the metal, which will give about £625,000, or say three quarters of a million sterling, or even a million, while Mr. Maclean wants me to take £5,000,000.

As a fourth instance:—while Mr. Maclean tells me erroneously to add £15,000,000 and £5,000,000 when there should be hardly one-fifth of these amounts, he does not see that I have actually allowed in my paper for all manufacturing industrial value, to be added to that of raw produce as £17,000,000. And further for any omissions £30,000,000 more (*E. I. Association Journal*, Vol. IX., No. 4, page 257).

These four instances, I think, would be enough to show the character of Mr. Maclean's criticism, and I pass over several other similar and other mistakes and misstatements. I come to what is considered as his most pointed and most powerful argument, but which, in reality, is all moonshine. After contradicting flatly in my paper, his assertion that the exports of the United States were in excess of imports, I had said that I had no reliable figures for the years after 1869. To this he replies:—"Here they are," and he gives them as follows. I quote his own words.

"Mr. Dadabhai says he cannot get 'authentic figures' of American trade for a later year than 1869. Here they are for him:—

Imports.	Merchandise and bullion.	Exports.	Merchandise and bullion.
1869 ...	£ 87,627,917	1869 ...	£ 99,330,735
1870 ...	97,779,351	1870 ...	117,534,993
1871 ...	112,552,770	1871 ...	138,084,008
1872 ...	117,250,899	1872 ...	128,337,183
1873 ...	132,709,295	1873 ...	142,240,730
1874 ...	119,172,249	1874 ...	130,582,689
	£667,085,481		£756,111,238

The excess of exports over imports for the six years is, therefore, 89 millions sterling, giving a yearly average of nearly 15 millions against only 11½ for India. The explanation of the deficit in imports in the case of the United States is, of course, similar to that which accounts for so much of the Indian deficit. The United States form a favourite field for investment of English capital, the interest of which is paid by America in the form of exports of produce. Yet we never heard an American citizen complain that his country was being drained of its wealth for the benefit of foreigners. He is only anxious to borrow as much English capital as he can, knowing that invested in reproductive works, it will repay him a hundred-fold the paltry rate of interest he has to send abroad."

To these remarks of Mr. Maclean I reply that he is as utterly wrong now as he was *before*. When he first made the mistake which I have pointed out in my paper, there was some excuse for him,—that he was misled by what was supposed to be a book made up from authoritative statements,—but after I flatly contradicted him once, it was his duty to ascertain whether my contradiction was correct, and if so, not to follow the same blind guide again. He did nothing of the kind, and his conduct now was quite inexcusable in dealing with such important matters. He has taken his figures from the *Statesman's Year Book*. This book has made curious mistakes. It has *included* bullion in the

figures for exports of "Merchandise," and again given bullion separately; and it has *not* converted the "currency" value of exports of "domestic produce" from the Atlantic ports into gold. These two and some such other mistakes render this book's figures for the years taken by Mr. Maclean utterly wrong. I give the following illustration of these mistakes in the figures for the year ending 30th June, 1871. The correct official* figures are:—

Merchandise.		RE-EXPORTS.		Total.
\$14,421,270		(Gold Value.) (Gold and silver.) \$14,038,629	\$28,459,899	
Merchandise		SPECIE AND BULLION Gold Value.		Total.
From Atlantic Ports. Currency Value.	From Pacific Ports. Gold Value.	From Atlantic Ports.	From Pacific Ports.	Mixed Value.
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
464,300,771	13,712,624	76,187,027	8,318,229	562,518,651
Equal to Gold Value.		Total.		Equal to Gold Value.
\$		\$84,505,256		\$
414,826,393	13,712,624			513,044,273
Domestic Exports. (Gold Value.)		Re-Exports. (Gold Value.)		Total Gold Value.
\$		\$		\$
513,044,273		28,459,899		541,504,172

* Now, instead of the above correct official figure of \$541,504,172 as the total exports from the United States (including bullion), the Statesman's Book makes "Merchandise" \$590,978,550 and bullion \$98,441,989, which I find to be made up as follows:—It takes from the official returns total mixed value of domestic exports, \$562,518,651, and then adds to it the total re-exports \$28,459,899 and makes the addition of these two figures as the total for "Merchandise," *viz.* \$590,978,550. It will be now seen by a comparison of these figures with the official ones, that the "currency" value of the domestic exports from the Atlantic ports is *not* converted into gold, and that though in the two official totals of \$562,518,651 and \$28,459,899, bullion is *already included*, the total of these in the Statesman's Book is given for "Merchandise" alone, and a further statement is given for bullion as \$98,441,989 made up nearly of \$84,505,256 of domestic exports and \$14,038,629 of re-exports.

Mr. Maclean takes the total \$590,978,550 of "Merchandise" (which *already includes* bullion) and bullion *over again* \$98,441,989, and makes the exports \$689,420,539, or £138,084,908. It will thus be seen that Mr. Maclean's figure for 1871 contains bullion to the extent of \$98,441,989, or £19,889,198 taken *twice*, and the "currency" value of domestic produce exported from the Atlantic ports, is *not* converted into gold value, making a further error of \$49,474,378: or the total error in Mr. Maclean's figure for exports for 1871 alone is \$73,543,885

* Monthly Reports on the Commerce and Navigation of the United States, by the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics for the year ending 30th June, 1871, page 396.

+49,474,378 = \$148,018,263, or nearly £31,000,000 sterling @ 50d. per \$.

I take 50d. per \$, as the Parliamentary Returns for foreign States No. XII. has taken this rate of Exchange.

Mr. Maclean has given the figures for six years. I am not able to verify the figure for 1874, so I give a comparison of the *official correct* figures, and Mr. Maclean's figures for the years ending June, 1869, to 1873.

The Statesman's Book's wrong figures.

Years ending June.	Imports.		Exports.	
	Mer. \$	Bullion. \$	Merchandise. \$	Bullion. \$
1869...	417,506,379	19,807,876	439,134,529	57,138,380
1870...	462,377,587	26,419,179	529,519,302	58,155,666
1871...	541,493,774	21,270,024	590,978,550	98,441,989
1872...	572,510,304	13,743,689	561,808,381	79,877,534
1873...	442,030,539	21,480,937	626,595,077	84,608,574
	2,635,918,583	102,721,705	2,748,035,839	378,222,143
Add...	102,721,705		378,222,143	
Total.	2,738,640,288	Imports.	3,126,257,982	Total Exports.
			2,738,640,288	deduct Imports.
				387,617,694 Excess of Exports.

Official correct figures.*

Years ending June.	Imports Including bullion. gold value. \$	Exports Including bullion. gold value.		Total. \$
		Domestic. \$	Foreign. \$	
1869.....	437,314,255	318,082,663	25,173,414	
1870.....	462,377,587	420,500,275	30,427,150	
1871.....	541,493,708	512,802,267	28,459,899	
1872.....	640,338,706	501,285,371	22,769,740	
1873.....	603,617,147	578,938,985	28,149,511	
Total Imports ..	2,745,141,403	2,331,609,561	134,979,732	2,466,589,293
Deduct Exports	2,400,589,293			
Excess of Imports	278,552,110			

Mr. Maclean's total error for the five years 1869 to 73 is, therefore, \$278,552,110 + 387,617,694 = \$666,169,804 = £138,785,000 @ 50d. per \$; or \$133,233,001 = £27,570,000 per annum.

In making, however, a comparison between the trade returns of India and the United States, there is one important matter to be considered, and which when taken into account, as it ought to be, the

* Monthly Reports on Commerce and Navigation of the United States by Edward Young, Ph. D., Chief of the Bureau of Statistics for the year ending 30th June, 1874, page 177.

Imports of the United States will be some 16% more than they are above shown to be. In India the exports are declared at the value at the ports of exports. It is the same with the United States. The Imports in India are declared at the "wholesale cash price less trade discount" at the *Port of Import*, which means the value at the foreign port of export, plus freight, insurance and other charges to the Indian port of import, and also plus 10% for profits. This is the principle on which the imports are declared in the Custom Houses in India, when the tariff value is not already fixed, or the market price not agreed upon by the importer and the Custom House. But in the case of the United States the declared value of Imports is only the value declared at the *foreign port* from which the merchandise was exported, which means *without* adding the cost of freight, insurance and other charges, and 10% profits. Now, Mr. Edward Young, the "Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department" of the United States, calculates 6% as representing the freight from foreign ports to America.

This 6% for freight (without taking the further additional charges for insurance, commission, &c., into account), together with the 10% as calculated in India for declaration for Imports, makes it necessary to add 16% to the Imports of the United States, before the actual excess of Imports of the United States on the principle adopted in India, can be ascertained and compared with that of India. In that case the actual excess of imports over exports in the United States will be \$717,774,734 = £149,536,403 for the five years, 1869 to 1873, or \$143,554,947 = £29,907,280 per. annum. Thus the correct result about the United States (on the principle of the Indian Custom House), is that instead of there being an excess of exports of 15 millions sterling per annum, there is actually an excess of imports of double that amount, or nearly 30 millions sterling, thus making a difference between Mr. Maclean's and the correct figures, of nearly 45 millions sterling per annum.

Now, after all Mr. Maclean's recklessness, what does he come to? He clearly admits my most important statements; he says:—

"It has been estimated that the amount of the annual earnings of Englishmen connected with India, which are thus transmitted home, cannot be less than £20,000,000, and we should be inclined to place it at a *very much higher figure.*"

* Customs Act (6) of 1863. Section 180, also inquiry at the Custom-house gave 10% to be added on the Importer's Invoice, or 20% on the Manufacturer's Invoice.

† Annual Report of Commerce and Navigation, 1873, 1879, page 7 "import charges: seven specie values at foreign places of export."

‡ Monthly reports for the year ending 30th June, 1874, pages 353. "The value of the imports of merchandise, as presented in the first table being those at the ports of shipment, it will be proper to add thereto the amount of freights to the several ports of the United States."

§ It is believed that 6% on the total value of imports is an estimate of approximate accuracy.

§ Total imports....	\$2,747,144,403
add 16%	4,395,431,024
	<hr/>
Deduct exports	2,164,304,027
	2,477,377,223
	<hr/>
Excess of imports	\$717,774,734 <i>or</i> <i>and</i> for five years = £149,536,403
Average per annum,	\$143,554,947 <i>or</i> <i>and</i> = £29,907,280.

§ Italics are mine.

Again :—" To decrease these (home remittances) by clipping establishments, or rather reframing on an economical basis, *by never employing other than natives of this Country,** except when good policy and public convenience demand it, and, if possible, by establishing some check on the extravagant follies of the Secretary of State, should be the task of the Indian Government."

" This is just what I say, that there is an enormous transfer of the wealth of this country to England, and the remedy is the employment of natives only, beyond the exigencies of the British rule. But for this single circumstance, his remarks about the United States would apply to India perfectly well, *viz.* :—" He (the American) is only anxious to borrow as much English capital as he can, knowing that, invested in reproductive works, it will repay him a hundredfold the paltry rate of interest he has to send abroad."

The Indian will do *just the same*, but Mr. Maclean, blinded by his blind patriotism does not see, that that is just the difficulty ; that while the American derives *the full benefit* of what he borrows, the Indian borrowing with one hand, has to give the money away to England with the other hand in these " home remittances " of Englishmen and " home charges," getting for himself the *burden* only of the debt. The very idea of comparing the circumstances and condition of the United States and India as being similar, is simply absurd, for which another reason will be given further on. When Mr. Maclean has digested the figures I have given above, there will be time enough to discuss whether, even if the United States exported more than imported for any particular period or periods, there will be anything at all similar to India's case. The fact is there is no such similarity except the interest paid on loans for reproductive works.

Next Mr. Shapoorjee says I have discarded official figures and substituted my own. I have done nothing of the kind. I have requested him to point out, but he has not done so. Mr. Shapoorjee says India is in the same boat with the United States. From the remarks I have already made, it may be seen that no weight can be given to this statement. In support of his assertion he says the United States have foreign debts of about £1625 millions. I requested him to show me any official or sufficiently reliable authority for these figures, and he shows me none.

From what I have already shown about the imperfections of even such a book as the Statesman's Year Book, and the reckless reliance of Mr. Maclean upon it, I cannot but be careful in accepting such off-hand assertions of Mr. Shapoorjee. He is kind enough to advise me to adhere to official figures, and I need simply request him to do the same himself. Like Mr. Maclean, Mr. Shapoorjee also does not read my paper carefully ; or he would not have said a word about America's public debt. He would have seen that I have excluded from my total of imports and exports those very years, in which the United States contracted nearly the whole of its public debt (1863 to 1866). Again, Mr. Shapoorjee tells us that the railways of the United States " could not have cost less than £20,000 a mile," while the Railway Manual for 1873-74, which Mr. Shapoorjee has kindly lent me, gives the average cost at \$55,116, and Mr. Maclean's guide, the Statesman's Book, give \$50,000 a mile. This is about £10 to 11,000, or nearly half of Mr. Shapoorjee's figure ; and thus nearly half of his " £850 millions, if not more," of foreign capital for railways disappears. Now I give

one more reason why Mr. Shapoorjee's figure of 1625 millions sterling, as the present foreign debts of the United States, cannot be accepted. Mr. Edward Young, whom I have already mentioned, the highest official and authority on the treasury statistics of the United States, calculates and gives (in his official "monthly reports on the Commerce and Navigation of the United States for the year ending June 30th, 1874, page 352) his own personal and unofficial estimate of the 'aggregate foreign debts' of the United States." He says: "Although there were no national securities held abroad at the commencement of our late war, yet some of the bonds of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and probably of Massachusetts and other States, as well as railroad shares and securities, were owned in Europe. In the absence of accurate data on the subject, it is believed that fifty millions is an ample estimate for these *ante bellum* securities. With this addition, our aggregate foreign debt amounts to nearly twelve hundred million dollars. Such is Mr. Young's estimate of the aggregate debts, "national, state, municipal, and corporation—held in foreign countries"—*i.e.*, \$1,200,000,000, when Mr. Shapoorjee asks us to take the figure nearly seven times larger,—£1,625,000,000, equal to \$7,800,000,000. Mr. Shapoorjee will, I trust, therefore excuse me for not accepting his figures and his conclusions based thereon. Again, Mr. Shapoorjee has been good enough to give me an extract from the Westminster Review of January, 1876. This extract gives (in 1875) the national production of the United Kingdom as £28 per head of population; of the United States as £25 per head; and of Russia as £7 10s. per head; France £22; Austria £18; and Italy £15; while India hardly produces £2 per head. The simple fact then, that the United States is the second richest country in the world, and its people have *all* their revenues and resources at *their own* command, and for *their own* benefit only, is enough to show that it is simply absurd and idle, to compare it, in its circumstances and condition, as being in the same boat with the half starving and ever-draining India. Mr. Shapoorjee and Mr. Maclean's wonder that the Americans are not lachrymal is a great wonder in itself. When the Americans are subjected to a "home remittance" to a foreign country of some "very much higher figure" than twenty millions sterling a year, and "home charges," and when a large number of foreigners engross all official and important positions to their own exclusion, causing thereby such heavy drain, *then* will be the proper time to make a comparison between America and India.

Mr. Shapoorjee's comparison with Russia and other European States is equally unreasonable. In spite of the inferior administration of Russia and the great military expenditure, its national income is nearly four times as much as that of India, and that of the other European states is much larger still; and they have no "home remittances and charges" to remit, which India has to do from its wretched income of hardly £2 per head per annum.

Mr. Schrottky misunderstands me when he thinks that in the present discussion about the *Material Condition* of India, I mention the necessity of the employment of natives, as any thing more than the only remedy, by which the capital of the country can be saved to itself, to enable the agricultural, as well as all other industries, to get the necessary life-blood for their maintenance and progress. If it be possible that every European coming to India would make it his home, so that

the item of the "home remittance and charges" is nearly eliminated, it would not matter at all, as far as the present question of the material prosperity of the country is concerned, whether the European or the Native is in office. The only remedy is, that either the European must, like the Mahomedan conquerors, become natives and *remain in* the country, or remain *out of office* beyond the exigency of the British rule. If not, then, it is idle to hope that India can rise in material prosperity, or be anything else, but a wretched drudge for England's benefit. On the other hand, a natural and just policy will make India, with its teeming population one of the, if not the best customer for England, and the best field for England's enterprise, and its agriculture will derive all the aid which Mr. Schrottky could desire in the goodness of his heart. Under the present unnatural policy England takes from India's scanty; under a natural and just policy, it will gain from India's *plenty*, and Manchester may have its free trade to its heart's utmost content.

To Mr. Trant I have to say only this, that mere assertions are not worth much, and that all his political economy may be all right, in a Native Governed Country, but when he takes the element of the "home remittances and charges" into account, he will not differ much from me.

In reply to Mr. Collet's remarks, I have to request him to take several elements into account which he appears to have forgotten.

1. To add 15 per cent.* profits to exports (During the American War, the percentage of profits on the exported produce was very much larger).

2. To deduct from Import nearly £140,000,000 of foreign debt (public and railway) incurred during the eighteen years he has taken.

3. To remember that the profits of opium as well as of all India's commerce are as much India's property and resources as the profits in coal, iron and all other exported produce and manufactures of England, are England's property and resources, though all such profits are derived from foreign nations, and that all the profits of opium and general commerce of India are included in my total production of India.

4. To remember, that notwithstanding that opium and the profits of commerce are legitimate property and resources of India, that even after deducting these amounts, or that in addition to these amounts being sent away to England, there is the further amount of about £300,000,000 in principle alone gone to England during the thirty-eight years I have taken; and that Mr. Collett has not pointed out any mistake in my calculations.

* For the following Countries the profits, or excess of imports over exports, are as under, subject to modification for foreign debts or loans.

The United Kingdom..	23 %	(1858 @ 1870)
Australia	15 %	(1858 @ 1865)
British North America	27 %	(do. do.)
(E. I. Association Journal Vol. IX., No. 4, page 263)			
United States	18 %	(1869 @ 1873)
as under:—			
		Imports	\$2,745,141,403
Add 6 % freight (leaving other charges—Commission, Insurance, &c., alone)			164,708,484
			\$2,909,849,887
	Deduct Exports		\$2,600,382,203
		Excess of Imports, or profits—say 15 % above exports..	\$443,260,594

For his eighteen years also, if he will take the items he has forgotten, his result will not differ from mine.

For 1858 to 1875 his figure for exports is	£910,995,000
Add 15% profits	136,649,250
	<hr/>
Total proceeds of exports	1,047,644,250
His imports are	£764,310,000
Deduct loans imported about	140,000,000
	<hr/>
Actual commercial imports	624,310,000
(including Government Store)	
Excess of proceeds of exports	423,334,250
Deduct railway interest	51,133,987
	<hr/>
Transfer to England from India's resources... ..	372,200,263
(excluding interest in railway loans)	
This transfer is equal to the whole of	
the opium revenue	£108,156,107
The whole of profits on exports	136,649,250
And further more from India's resources	127,394,906

or nearly £130,000,000 in addition to the railway interest. The actual transfer is even larger than this, as will be seen further on.

Mark then, during Mr. Collett's eighteen years *all* opium revenue, *all* profits of commerce and guaranteed interest on railways are transferred to England, and £130,000,000 besides, making a total in principle alone of £424 millions, or £372 millions excluding railway interest. Moreover, it must be remembered that during the American War great profits were made, and this having to be added to the exports is so much more transferred to England.

Thus as Mr. Collett's figures are imperfect, I need not trouble the meeting with any comments on the confusion into which he has fallen on account thereof. I have taken his own figures and shown what they lead to as the best way of pointing out his mistake. He seems to have also a somewhat confused notion of a balance sheet. But this is not the time or place for me to go into that matter.

Thanks to my critics, they have led me into a closer examination of some points, and I find the case of India worse than what I have already made out. I have to modify some of my figures* which I now do.

I have shown that the imports into India (*including bullion*) from 1835 to 1872 are £943,000,000. Now, in making out a nation's balance sheet with foreign countries, the balance of profit should be taken between the price of exports at the port of export, and the price of imports, as *laid down* or costing at the port of import, and not the *market* price at the place of import, which include the profit on the import obtained in the importing country itself.

I may illustrate thus. I laid out Rs. 1000 in cotton and sent it to England. There it realised proceeds, say Rs. 1150. This may be remitted to me in silver, so that when the transaction is completed, I receive in my hands Rs. 1150, in the place of Rs. 1000 which I had first laid out, so that the country has added Rs. 150 thereby to its capital. But suppose instead of getting silver I imported say 10 bales of piece

* E. I. Association Journal, Vol. IX., No. 4, page 564.

goods which laid down in Bombay for Rs. 1150. The gain to the country so far is the same in both cases,—an addition of Rs. 150. But any gain to me *after* that, in the sale of these piece goods in India itself is *no* gain to India. Suppose I sold these goods for Rs. 1300. That simply means that I had these goods and another person had Rs. 1300, and we simply exchanged. The country has no addition made to its already existing property. It is the same, *viz.* the 10 bales of piece goods and Rs. 1300; only they have changed hands. Bearing this in mind, and also that the declared value of imports into India, is not the *laying down* price, but the *market** price which means the *laying down* price plus 10% profit, it is necessary for ascertaining the *real* profits from the *foreign commerce* of India to deduct 10% from the declared value of imports (merchandise). Doing this, the total imports from 1835 to 1872 should be taken £943,000,000 minus £62,000,000† which will be equal to £881,000,000. In that case the real deficit of imports under what the imports ought to have been (£1,438,000,000) will be £557,000,000 in place of the nearly £500,000,000 I have given in my paper.

The figure of the amount, after deducting opium and profits of commerce will be £248,000,000, instead of nearly £200,000,000; or the total transfer of wealth to England in addition to the railway interest (£40,000,000), will be £517,000,000, instead of £453,000,000, given in my paper, and the yearly average of every five years of this amount of £517,000,000 will be proportionally large, about 13%:—

Averages will be about.

1835 @ 1839	£6,000,000
1840 @ 1844	6,600,000
1845 @ 1849	8,700,000
1850 @ 1854	8,400,000
1855 @ 1859	8,700,000
1860 @ 1864	19,000,000
1865 @ 1869	27,500,000
1870 @ 1872	31,000,000

This average during the American war would be much increased, if the whole profits on the exported produce of the time could be ascertained.

In preparing this reply I have had to work out all the figures hurriedly, but I hope they will be found correct.

I have not seen the late administration reports, but I trust they give fuller details than the previous ones with which I had to deal, and if so, more precise results could be attained as to the actual annual production of the country, which is the most important point to be settled to give us an accurate knowledge of the actual poverty or otherwise of this country.

Since I wrote the above, I purchased a copy of the latest Administration Report of Bengal (1874-5) to see if I can at present give some more definite statistics about production than I have already done in my paper. Fancy my disappointment when I read Sir R. Temple saying:—

* See the second note at page 8

† Imports-merchandise 1834/5 @ 1872 £618,000,000, 10% of which is nearly £62,000,000. I could not find the amount of enclosed paper given for every year before 1860. I have, therefore, taken the whole amount in 1860, which increases the average for 1830-60 and correspondingly diminishes the average of the previous years, but not to a large extent.

"Again the survey embraced only the exterior boundaries of each village or parish, and afforded no details of cultivation and waste, culturable or unculturable."

To that latter part of Mr. Collet's paper I have simply to reply: any amount of mere assertion or assumption can do no good. The question is a simple matter of facts and science. Is there so much cultivated land or not; is there so much produce or not; and are such and such the prices or not? And then common arithmetic gives you certain results. No amount of indirect reasoning or assumption can falsify facts and arithmetic and make 2 and 2 equal 5. So far as the official statistics are imperfect, it is the duty of the Government to give to the public full details. We know the national production of other countries, and there is no reason why the Indian Government, with all the resources at its command, should not be able to give us such most important similar information. That will be the best and surest guide and test of the actual condition of the people of India, and our rulers will see their way clearly to the most proper and effectual remedies. I have not the least doubt in my mind about the conscience of England and Englishmen, that if they once clearly see the evil, they will *not shrink* to apply the proper remedies. My estimate of 40s a head has been accepted and argued upon by an Under Secretary of State (Mr. G. Duff) and a Viceroy (Lord Mayo), and another Viceroy (Lord Lawrence), has told us that the mass of the people are half fed. It is not the question of the ordinary proportion of the poor in every country. Mr. Grant Duff, in his reply to Mr. Lawson, asked whether the "already poor population of India" was to be ground down "to the very dust," by the removal of the opium duty. So the margin between the present condition of India and of being ground down "to the very dust," is only the opium revenue. This is prosperity with a vengeance. I would not take up more of your time. Mr. Collet's remarks about the United States are already disposed of in the reply to Mr. Maclean. I have been lately reading the expression, "balance in favour of India." The writers evidently suppose that what they call the balance of trade in favour of India was something that India had to receive some time or other. They do not seem to understand that of all the *deficit* of import under the proceeds of exports, *not a single pie in cash or goods* is to be received by India. That similarly, that of all the *excess* of imports in all the other parts of the British Empire to the extent of 15 to 25 per cent. over exports, or 18 per cent. in the United States *not a single farthing has to be paid* to any country. It is, in fact, the profit of their exports, and the deficit of India is so much transfer of its wealth to England. If I sent £100 worth of goods and get back only £80 worth, with no chance of getting the remaining £20, as well as the profits of my venture, *in cash or goods*, and then to call this "balance in my favour" is indeed a very unenviable condition. On this subject I can only request attention to my papers instead of detaining you any longer.

THE REMEDY.

When I wrote these notes in 1873, or read them in 1876, I little dreamt that they would so soon obtain such terrible confirmation as the present deplorable famines have given them.

The chief cause of India's poverty, misery, and all material evils, is the exhaustion of its previous wealth, the continuously increasing exhausting and weakening drain from its annual production by the very excessive expenditure on the European portion of all its services, and the burden of a large amount a year to be paid to *foreign* countries for interest on the public debt, which is chiefly caused by the British rule.

The obvious remedy is to allow India to keep what it produces, and to help it as much as it lay in the power of the British nation to reduce her burden of the interest on the public debt; with a reasonable provision for the means absolutely necessary for the maintenance of the British rule.

For this purpose it is necessary, on the one hand, to *limit within a certain amount*, the total of *every* kind of expenditure (pay, pensions and every possible kind of allowance), for the *European* portion of *all* the services both in England and India, directly or indirectly connected with or under the control of Government (including, therefore, guaranteed railways or other works, manufactures, local funds, &c.); and to guarantee the public debt; and on the other hand, for the important political object of maintaining the British rule, to reserve by law for *Europeans alone*, such places of power as may be absolutely necessary for the purpose with a fair proportion of the army, within the limited amount of expenditure for the European portion of all the services.

Under some judicious arrangement of the kind I propose, the people of India, being allowed to keep most of what they produced, will rise in material prosperity under, what is upon the whole, a good system of administration, blessing the hand that gave such prosperity, and *increasing the benefit to the English people also manyfold*, by the extensive commercial relations that must necessarily be then developed between England and India: and all fears of any danger to the British rule will be dispelled, both from the gratitude, loyalty, and *self-interest* of the people of India, and from the possession of important posts of power and a fair portion of the army by Europeans alone. Then will Macaulay's words be verified to the *glory of England*, as also to her *benefit* :—

“We shall never consent to administer the *pousta* to a whole community, to stupify and paralyse a great people whom God has committed to our charge;” and we shall not “keep a hundred millions (two hundred millions), of men from being our customers, in order that they might continue to be our slaves.”

EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

Instituted for the independent and disinterested advocacy and promotion, by all legitimate means, of the public interests and welfare of the inhabitants of India generally.

20, GREAT GEORGE STREET, LONDON, S.W.

LIST OF OFFICERS.

President :

THE RIGHT HON. SIR LAURENCE PEEL.

Vice-Presidents :

The Most Noble the Marquis of SALISBURY, P.C., M.A., F.R.S., M.R.A.S.	Lord ERSKINE.
The Right Hon. the Earl of SHAFTESBURY, K.G., F.R.A.S., F.S.S., &c.	Major-Gen. Sir HENRY RAWLINSON, K.C.B., K.C.S.I., &c.
Right Hon. Lord STANLEY of Alderley.	Sir JAMES FERGOUSON, Bart., Governor of South Australia, P.C.
Right Hon. JAMES STANSFELD, P.C., M.P.	Sir CHARLES EDWARD TREVELYAN, K.C.B., F.R.G.S., &c.
Field-Marshal Lord STRATHNAIRN, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., Member of H.M.'s Most Hon. Privy Council of Ireland.	His Highness the Nawab of JOONAGHUR, K.C.S.I.
Lord WM. MONTAGU HAY, F.R.G.S., M.R.A.S.	Major-General E. W. S. SCOTT, R.A.
	Major-General Sir R. WALLACE, K.C.S.I.
	Sir DAVID WEDDERBURN, Bart.
	Sir F. M. WILLIAMS, Bart., M.P., F.G.S., F.A.S.L.

COUNCIL, 1877-78.

Chairman—E. B. EASTWICK, Esq., C.B., F.R.S., F.S.A., M.R.A.S.

Vice-Chairman—Sir CHARLES JOHN WINGFIELD, K.C.S.I., C.B., &c.

Members of Council :

Major EVANS BELL, M.R.A.S.	JAMBETJI JIVANJI GAZDAR, Esq., M.A.
General ORFEU, CAVE, &c.	PATRICK PIRIE GORDON, Esq., J.P., M.A.
Sir MOOTOO COOMALA SWAMY (in Ceylon).	JOHN FARLEY LEITH, Esq., Q.C., M.P.
DADABHOY BYRAMJEE, Esq.	Rev. JAMES LONG.
DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq.	STEPHEN P. LOW, Esq., F.R.G.S.
CHRISTOPHER B. DENISON, Esq., M.P.	General Sir GEORGE MALCOLM, K.C.B.
V. K. DNAIYAVAN, Esq.	Major-Gen. W. F. MARRIOTT, C.S.I.
ROBERT H. ELLIOT, Esq.	JOHN BRUCE NORTON, Esq.
Major-General Sir VINCENT EYRE, R.A., K.C.S.I., C.B., F.R.G.S., &c.	Captain WILLIAM CHAS. PALMER.
W. S. FITZWILLIAM, Esq., F.R.G.S., F.S.S.	Colonel A. B. KATHBORNE.
GEORGE FOGGO, Esq.	P. M. TAIT, Esq., F.R.G.S., F.S.S.
Sir T. DOUGLAS FORSYTH, K.C.S.I., C.B.	WILLIAM TAYLER, Esq., Retired B.C.S.
Lieut.-Colonel P. T. FRENCH.	RUSTOMJEE VICAJEE, Esq.

Honorary Secretary :

Captain WILLIAM CHARLES PALMER.

Honorary Solicitor :

T. LUXMORE WILSON, Esq.

Bombay Branch :

Office:—18, Sassoon Building, Marine Street.

President—The Hon'ble Sir JEMSETJEE JEEJEEBHOY, Bart., C.S.I.

Chairman—Dr. BHAU DAJI. | *Vice-Chairman*—W. MARTIN WOOD, Esq.

Honorary Treasurers—ARDABEE R. FRAMJEE MOOS, Esq., and H. A. WADYA, Esq.

Honorary Secretary—BAL MANGESH WAGLE, Esq.

Bangalore Branch :

Honorary Secretary—RAGHAVA CHARIJER, Esq.

Agent at Calcutta—COWASJEE PESTONJEE, Esq., 19, Ezra Street.

Agent at Hong-Kong—PHEROZSHAW PESTONJEE, Esq.

Annual Subscription, including Journal (delivered free of Postage)...	£	1	5	0
Life Subscription ditto ditto	...	14	0	0
Annual Subscription (including Journal) in India	...	13	Rupees 8 Annas.	
Life Subscription ditto ditto	...	15	0	0

No Entrance Fees.

The Council trust that Members will exert their influence to increase the number of Subscribers and otherwise assist in promoting the important object for which the Association has been established.

Although some of the Princes and other natives of Western India have of late recorded to the Association a liberal pecuniary support, yet its income falls considerably short of that necessary to place it on a permanent footing, and increase its sphere of usefulness.

It is hoped, therefore, that Members will individually aid the Council in this respect, by means of donations, presents of books for the increase of the Library, &c.

Resident Members are furnished with Blank Tickets of Admission to the Lectures, for the use of their friends.

Indian, English, and Vernacular Newspapers, as per List, are received and filed in the Reading-room of the Association, in addition to the leading daily papers of the metropolis, and several weeklies.

The use of the Reading-room and Library is free to Members, who can also have their letters addressed there.

The Secretary will be happy to forward Application Papers, Rules, &c., or give any other information desired.

RULES.

I.—OBJECTS OF ASSOCIATION.

Article 1.—The EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION is now instituted for the independent and disinterested advocacy and promotion, by all legitimate means, of the public interests and welfare of the inhabitants of India generally.

II.—MEMBERS.

Article 2.—The Association shall consist of Resident and Non-Resident Ordinary and Honorary Members.

Article 3.—Honorary Members shall have the same rights and privileges as Ordinary Members.

Article 4.—Honorary Members shall be nominated by the Council at any Ordinary Meeting, and shall consist of persons who have distinguished themselves in promoting the good of India.

Article 5.—Ordinary Members shall be nominated in writing by two Members of the Association, and elected after ten days' notice of such nomination, at the next General Meeting of the Council, if approved by a majority of two-thirds present thereat.

Article 6.—The election of every Member, both Ordinary and Honorary, shall be recorded on the minutes of the Council; and the Secretary shall forthwith notify, by letter, his election to the Member, and request such Member to furnish a standing order on his Banker for his Annual Subscription.

Article 7.—Ordinary Members shall pay an Annual Subscription of £1, or 10 Rs., on the 1st January in every year; or may compound for the same by payment of 100 Rs., or £10, which shall constitute a Life Member.

NOTE.—The Annual Subscription, including Journal (delivered free of postage).. £1 5 0
 Life Subscription ditto ditto .. 14 0 0
 Annual Subscription (including Journal) in India .. 10 Rupees 8 Annas
 Life Subscription ditto ditto .. 150 "

III.—MODE OF MANAGEMENT.

Article 8.—The Management of the Association shall be vested in a Council, consisting of a Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and thirty-three Ordinary Members; five to form a quorum; and eight to retire annually by rotation, but eligible for re-election at the Annual Meeting.

Article 9.—A President of the Association shall be appointed at the Annual Meeting; and the Council may, from time to time, nominate distinguished Indian statesmen, or others, as Vice-Presidents, subject to the confirmation of the next Annual Meeting of the Association.

Article 10.—The Council shall appoint a Secretary, and such other employés as may be necessary, and fix their salaries and emoluments.

Article 11.—The Council may fill up vacancies in their own body, until the next Annual Meeting of the Association.

Article 12.—The Council shall meet on the First Wednesday in the month; but the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, or any three Members of the Council may at any time convene a Meeting by giving three days' notice.

Article 13.—The Council may appoint Special Sub-Committees of not less than five Members of the Association, three of whom shall form a quorum.

Article 14.—At the desire of five Members of the Council, or on the written requisition of ten Members of the Association, the Secretary shall convene a Special Meeting of the Association.

FUNCTIONS OF THE OFFICERS.

Article 15.—The President, or, in his absence, any Vice-President, or in the absence thereof, any Member, shall preside at the Annual or Ordinary Meetings of the Association.

Article 16.—The Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Council, or in their absence, any member thereof nominated by those present, shall preside at the Meetings of the Council.

ANNUAL MEETING.

Article 17.—The Annual Meeting of the Association shall be held in the month of May in every year.

Article 18.—General Ordinary Meetings of the Association for promoting the interests thereof, and for the discussion of subjects connected with India, shall be held at such time and places as the Council may appoint.

Article 19.—A statement of the Accounts of the Association shall be prepared, audited by one of the Members of the Council and one Member taken from the general body of the Members of the Society, and circulated with the Report of the Council to each resident Member, ten days before the Annual Meeting.

LOCAL COMMITTEES.

Article 20.—Local Committees shall be appointed in India by Local Subscribers, subject to the approval of the Council; and the co-operation of independent Local Associations in India is invited by the "East India Association."

BYE-LAWS.

Article 21.—The Council shall have power to make and alter any Bye-laws for the management of the Association.

ALTERATION OF RULES.

Article 22.—No addition to or alteration in these Rules shall be made, except at the Annual Meeting of the Association, previous notice being given in the circular convening the meeting.

JOURNAL OF THE ASSOCIATION.

Article 23.—The Council may, in their discretion, publish quarterly or other wise, a Journal, containing a Report of the several General and other Meetings of the Association. Papers submitted for discussion shall be published *in extenso*, or not, as the Council may decide.

INDIA OF TO-DAY

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL FRENCH

BY

K. K. ATHAVALE

EDITOR, THE PANJABEE.



REPRODUCED FROM THE HINDUSTAN REVIEW
BY
THE KIND PERMISSION OF ITS EDITOR.



PRINTED AND PUBLISHED

BY

THE PANJABEE PRESS, LAHORE.

1906.

Price 8 annas.

INDIA OF TO-DAY

As seen by French Eyes through Indian Spectacles.

INTRODUCTION.

In 1900, in the second November and first December issues of the *Revue des deux Mondes* appeared a remarkable contribution on India from the pen of M. Augustin Filou. M. Filou is a writer of no mean repute amongst the thinkers of France, and the fact that his articles appeared in M. Brunetiere's Review should have ensured for his writings a cordial welcome and thoughtful consideration in the periodical literature of the island country across the channel. But beyond a brief summary in Mr. Stead's *Review of Reviews*, M. Filou might as well have cried in the wilderness as published his views in a periodical of world-wide reputation, one which is also looked upon as the organ of the French Academy, the greatest and most learned literary syndicate in the world, to have evoked any tangible notice from the people most vitally concerned after the Indians themselves, in the ventilation of the views therein expressed. In India, unfortunately, the study of the French language is still in infancy, and consequently what M. Filou wrote did not reach the ears of the Indian public. The formidable array of works on India, a list of which I give below and which the French writer consulted before settling down to the composition of his articles, testifies to his patient care and industry :—

1. *India in 1897*, by B. M. Malabari.
2. *A History of Hindu Civilization under British Rule*, by Pramatha Nath Bose, Vols. I, II and III.
3. *A Manual of the History of India*, by Rao Sahib Mahipatram Rupram, 2nd Edition.
4. *Rise of the British Dominion in India*, 3rd Edition, by Sir Alfred Lyall.

5. *The Colonial Expansion of England*, 2nd part, by Sir John Seeley.

6. *The Bankruptcy of India*, by H. M. Hyndman.

7. *Ramji, A Tragedy of the Famine*, by H. N. Apte.

8. *The Condition of India*, by Dadabhai Naoroji,

9. *The Indian Problem*, by B. M. Malabari.

10. *Les Anglais en Birmanie*, an article published by the *Revue des deux Mondes* in January 1892.

11. *India List and India Office List*, 1898.

12. *Admission of Educated Natives into the Indian Civil Service*, by Dadabhai Naoroji.

13. *The Indian Political Estimate of Mr. Bhownaggee, M. P., or the Bhownaggee Boom Exposed*. 1897.

14. *English Rule and Native Opinion*, by James Routledge.

15. *Indian Village Folk*, 1898, by T. B. Pandian.

16. *The Indian Empire, its People, History, and Products*, by Sir W. Hunter.

17. *Report of the Twelfth Indian National Congress*, 1896.

18. *Life and Life-work of Behramji M. Malabari*, by Dayaram Gidumal.

19. *Le Cinquantieme anniversaire du Brahma Samaj, a study*, by M. le comte Goblet d'Alviella in the *Revue des deux Mondes* of September 1880.

20. *Les castes dan l'Inde*, by M. Emile Senart.

21. *Eastern Castes and Western Classes*, a lecture by Mrs. Annie Besant.

22. *The High-caste Woman in India*, by Pandita Ramabai Śaraśvati, 1890.

23. *The Report of Govind Nath, and articles in the "Indian Spectator"*

In the following pages I have endeavoured to present a correct translation of M. Augustin Filon's views to my educated countrymen, who will, I hope, read and ponder over them with that care and attention which is their due.

K. K. ATHAVALE,
Translator.

INDIA OF TO-DAY.

Several events of considerable moment have, during the last three or four years, directed public attention towards India. Frontier wars, internal troubles, famine, plague, in short, all known scourges of humanity have simultaneously invaded this great country. The problem of India is facing Europe, because there is such a thing as an Indian problem. Many people doubt if it could be solved; and it is certainly a difficult task to state clearly and precisely the data. Where to go for the facts? From whom to seek them? From the English publications say you? Certainly the latter abound. During more than a hundred and forty years past since England commenced the territorial conquest of India, quite an Anglo-Indian literature has sprung up and come to light: an entire human existence would be necessary to strip and lay it bare, and I am not at all sure if this great effort would result in a firmly established certainty. The immense mass of books on the subjects range themselves in two unequal sets: the larger one represents the optimists who are numerous, loud, and listened to with attention, while the smaller group belongs to the pessimists, who proclaim their message as it were in the desert. In trying to reconcile them, one would run the risk of oneself falling into the piteous condition of intellectual nullity which fools dignify by the name of impartiality, and which chiefly consists in accepting and repudiating everything that may be urged in support of a question. Ought one to rely on official documents, public acts, or government statistics? But public acts are hardly of

any moment unless you are well acquainted with their antecedents and results. Official statistics in India, on the other hand, are only of yesterday's growth, and as yet no one dares to take his stand by them. The figures begin to be interesting only when one is able to place them in array against each other. Now, for instance, the census of 1881 is so incomplete that when you wish to compare its figures with those of the census of 1891, the elements of comparison vanish into space; and it is impossible to appreciate in exact numbers the increase of the population, the variations in the public fortune, or in the social and intellectual movement; in certain cases it is even impossible to understand whether this movement is progressive or retrograde.

Would it not be simpler, therefore, to engage a cabin on board one of the P. and O. Mail boats, and go to India to study the country on the spot by traversing it through and through from Bombay to Calcutta? Personal experience and local vision possess advantages which are incontestable or beyond dispute, and in an age like ours, this way of making use of your time is relatively easy. But is it applicable to India? I doubt. For a crowd of reasons, and a few of them are explained in the following pages, India escapes the attention of the passer-by. The tourist who has visited the most interesting parts of the country under exceptionally favourable conditions, that is to say, with his pockets crammed with letters of credit and letters of introduction, will bring back from the land of the Rajas, albums filled with sketches, herbariums full of curious specimens, and the recollection of good European dinners eaten at the tables of English officers. Between sherbert and the coffee, India will have been explained to him, and this will be absolutely the same thing as if he had remained in his corner at the domestic fire-side and assimilated the optimistic literature of which I will speak presently.

There remains a last way of acquiring information which is to interrogate India herself, to ask her of

what she thinks of her masters, and her thoughts about her future. And that is what I have tried to do. They had warned me beforehand that I would be disappointed. One day I spoke of this project to two Englishmen. Both of them smiled. The first Englishman observed, "Interrogate India! 'She won't reply, she is dumb.'" "It is a corpse, India," said the second, "or rather she has never lived. Where will you find India in that medley of races, languages, religions, and opposing interests? Between a Mahratta and a Burman, or a Sikh and a Bengalee, there is no other affinity except that of common obedience to the Viceroy who lives at Simla or at Calcutta. India is not a nation, it is only a geographical expression." But I have already lived some time in this world. In my childhood they used to express themselves similarly regarding Germany and Italy: and before I had fairly left my childhood behind, both the one and the other had become great and powerful nations. Although she may not be near having the same good fortune, from to-day India exists, and she speaks; she speaks very clearly and distinctly. And I will strive to analyse and interpret here the witnesses she has furnished me with, by assigning to them some sort of systematic order as is found in the links of a chain,—the successive terms or stages of a sustained and continued reasoning. I have compared them with the testimony of English witnesses, and checked them by official statistics, but without permitting myself to exaggerate the value of the former or the precision of the latter. As I have to condense within the space of a few pages facts and ideas to express which a whole volume will hardly suffice; it is but right that I should leave the complete justification of my brief statements to native writers. I have followed their reasoning even to its conclusion; I have gone further than they themselves ever went. Where they make a dead halt, hesitating and a bit frightened, I have allowed myself to take up the thread and carry it to its legitimate conclusion. To sum up—they have revealed to me, and some of them

without wishing it or knowing it, the psychology of their race, its gifts, aspirations and infirmities, its strength and its weakness, its chances of rising higher as well as the internal causes which have retarded its liberation, and prevented it up to this time from taking place among the great nationalities of modern times.

I.

The first thought which occurs to our mind when we take up the Indian problem is to separate or distinguish, among the events which afflict India, the transitory and accidental facts from the profound and permanent causes ; which latter, brought about by the same circumstances and operating under the same conditions, tend to the same sad and always aggravated results. We are very soon convinced that the famine and the plague belong to this latter class of phenomena, that they are the direct, necessary and inevitable consequences of the people's misery, a misery without analogy and without name, beside which the indigence of our great Western cities will appear as good as a condition of well-being and comfort. There have been local famines in the past, produced by years of exceptional drought. But since the creation of railroads, famines in the original sense of the word, that is to say, those which are the result of absence of food-stuffs in the land, have become impossible. In case of scarcity, Burma will find the necessary nourishment of the Punjab or of the North-West Provinces, and *vice versa* ; similarly, Madras and Bombay will succour each other when necessary. Actual famine is not necessarily absence of food, but absence of money to buy the food with. Thus large numbers of starving people have perished in districts, which at the same time have exported millions of tons of grain. This latter kind of famine is more acute at certain moments, but it is really chronic and endemic ; it never ceases to exist, but is always present. One is appalled at the idea that during the first eighty years of the century (19th), eighteen millions of human beings had died of inanition

or starvation in India ; and yet one is only half-way of the atrocious truth. Here is the utterance on the subject of a Bombay journalist, Mr. Malabari, the wisest and most sincere of witnesses I have here cited : " In 1875, it was calculated that 40 millions of natives of India died of hunger in that year. To-day, there are 80 millions." Explaining his idea further, the writer adds that these importunate people have to subsist daily on a single light meal. " It is just sufficient to keep the body and soul together, but not enough to live and work." Now comes the plague : it found only spent-up organisations to oppose it, incapable of offering resistance long enough to give science the necessary time to go to their help. It simply touched them and they fell prostrate at once. The plague is at home in India, it reigns supreme and absolute in those sordid quarters which an administration, remiss even to the extent of meanness, has not known how to make wholesome ; the filth and the misery which are inseparable companions, have prepared its apartments and have assured its triumph.

But why is India so poor ? Has she always been thus ? It is very easy to answer this question. Two hundred years ago, India was the richest and most fertile country in the world. Mr. Pramatha Nath Bose, who has prepared the balance sheet of Hindu civilization under English rule, and who ceaselessly compares the present epoch with that of the Musalman domination of the country, leaves us no doubt on the question. The testimony of passengers from Spain, Portugal, Norway, and China will be found recorded in his book. But the most conclusive evidence of all is that of our countryman (French) Francois Bernier, the doctor who passed several years of his life at the court of Aurangzeb. He describes with admiration and sympathy the wonders accomplished by Indian industry, embroidery on cotton and other stuffs, carving in wood and ivory, painting on metal and on mica, tumblers and glasses elaborately worked out in colours, the different kinds of pottery, incrustations, mosaics,

damaskeened and embossed arms; above all, the tissues and fabrics over which the West wrangled at prices of gold, and that marvellous stuff called the "morning dew," so joyous, and brilliant and fine, and almost invisible to the eye because of its transparency. Why! Versailles and her grand Monarch are poor, mean and semi-barbarous beside Delhi and the splendours which surrounded the Great Mogul. India appeared to Bernier an unfathomable well of riches, into which came to lose themselves, and never to come up again, the precious metals of the entire world.

It might be thought that this extraordinary opulence was concentrated in the hands of a few great lords of the land; but it was nothing of the kind. Those who will take the trouble to study the constitution of the castes and the collectivist organisation of the Hindu village, will easily comprehend that such an accumulation of the profits of agriculture and industry for the benefit of a particular class was a thing impossible in India. Nothing will be found there resembling in a near or remote degree the employers of labour and their capital. In rural communities (and this particularly applies to Bengal) the Zamindars were the managers or custodians of public property. As to money earned by artisans it remained in their hands. Skill or dexterity, experience, and personal taste, in addition to a very modest stock of tools having been the sole capital necessary for any business, the existence of the common people was assured. Mr. Bose gives us the budget of receipts and disbursements of a street porter in the reign of Akbar (close of the 16th century). The scale of wages was then comparatively higher than to-day; rents and cost of clothing, as well as the commodities of consumption were much more cheaper. There is only one conclusion to be drawn from these facts. With a population less than half of the present times, India furnished to her government a revenue equal to that of the India of to-day, say about 750

millions of francs, of which not the smallest portion went out of the country.

This last point is very important. The anarchy which followed on the heels of the 18th century, the religious persecutions inaugurated by Aurangzeb, have sorely tried India, it is true ; but the acts of brigandage which have signalized this period made the public fortunes of the country to fluctuate in a violent manner, and deprived her right hand to enrich the left, it is none the less true that the country taken as a whole was not sensibly impoverished.

With the entry of the English into the Peninsula, every thing changed. From the day they set foot in Bengal dates the exploitation of India for the benefit of a foreign nation. To this period belong the names of Lord Clive and Warren Hastings. The former committed forgery, which has been fully proved ; but the glory of Plassey prevents English historians from perceiving his peccadilloes. As to Warren Hastings, whom they made a scape-goat of, it must be said in his defence that, like Richelieu, he only struck the great. His acts of violence and of treachery were aimed at princes or rivals in authority, so that even to-day the people venerate his memory. These two men have had in their life-history some glorious pages. But nothing will redeem the infamy of the vulgar herd of adventurers who threw themselves against Bengal after them, and who showed themselves there equally cruel with, but more rapacious than, the Spaniards in the New World. The Spaniards at least had a tendency to linger long in the countries beyond the sea, or even to establish themselves there in a definite manner ; the English plundered everything that was worth having and then very soon departed with their booty in order to leave the land to a new batch of famished invaders.

The arrival, in 1786, of Lord Cornwallis, the first Governor-General nominated by the Crown, with more extensive powers than those of Warren Hastings, inaugurated the second period of the English occupa-

tion of the country, a period which had lasted till 1358. In this period regularity, method, and decency were introduced in the exploitation of India; the intrigues and the manners were different now; gentlemen took the place of adventurers and broken down speculators. At bottom, however, the system remained the same, and the results slowly began to show themselves. In 1838, Montgomery Martin raised a cry of alarm, and calculated that by the continual withdrawal of money sent to England, at compound interest, more than 700 millions of pounds sterling, had been removed from the wealth of India.

In 1858, the Hon'ble East India^m Company ceased to exist, and the third epoch of the British occupation commenced. Has it arrested the progressive spoliation of India by her foreign masters? No: on the contrary it has imparted to it an increasing speed. The sum annually forwarded to the capital (London), which was three millions of pounds sterling in 1838, and five in 1859, rose to eighteen millions and half in 1883; to-day according to the authority of Mr. Hyndman it has attained the figure of thirty millions of pounds.

Here we must renounce any idea of the application of our usual standard. The balance of commerce, in admitting the considerable excess of exports, over imports, might give rise to the belief in the existence of a most flourishing condition, if things are interpreted in the same way as we in Europe do; but nothing would be farther from the truth than such an interpretation. Salaries, pensions, annuities, commercial profits, industrial dividends, in a thousand different forms, and by a thousand different ways,—it is in reality, the substance, the very nourishment on which the lives of her children depend, that goes away from India without compensation and without return; or if it makes a return it will be disguised in the form of a loan to the State. They lend money to India, which they had previously extorted from her, in order to carry it away a second time, augmented by a new extortion. Everything, which appears to enrich

India, and which in truth enriches western nations, has contributed to her impoverishment. The great irrigation works, which should render the recurrence of famines impossible, have been conceived and executed after European methods, without a sufficient knowledge of the needs and the nature of the lands watered by them, to the contempt of those humble and old practices which made modern science laugh, but of which time had proved the efficiency. Often unserviceable, at times hurtful, they always remained a heavy burden on the tax-payer. In twenty years, from 1858 to 1878, seven thousand miles of iron ways had been constructed ! Six-sevenths of this net-work owe their existence to private initiative. Made by English engineers with English capital, their profits go direct to England, and India gets nothing out of them. If, during the period of construction, they have assured the means of existence to thousands of native workmen, the exploitation of these lines to-day is almost exclusively in the hands of foreigners, and the question before us is if the facility and cheapness of freights, have profited, in the end, the agricultural producers of the land. It seems the majority of observers have answered this question negatively. A seventh of the total net-work of railways has been constructed by the State at a cost per mile of more than half a million sterling. At such extravagant cost, we need not be astonished to learn that these State Railways return a very trifling interest on the capital sunk in them.

I have not been able to find out that even the lowest portion of the external commerce of the country belongs to the natives of India ; provided a few rich Parsis of Bombay are excepted. Besides, the spirit of enterprise and capital are totally wanting.

Native writers are quite justified in asserting that towards the close of the last (18th) century, India and England, from an industrial point of view, found themselves occupying nearly the same level, and that, in some respects, India had the advantage. The sudden

transformation of the stock of tools after 1815 took India by surprise. While the era of machines was being opened in Europe, and a new class, that of employers to wit, was coming into existence to profit therefrom, and which in fact grew rich rapidly, India, paralysed by her immutable social system, assisted this new movement and submitted to the counter-blow without the power to imitate it. It was necessary to give time, to this ancient society, in order to make it reconcile itself with the exigencies of a new age, to protect it during the period of apprenticeship and of trial against a very well-armed opposition. This was not at all done, and free trade came on the field to deliver the last blow against this industry without capital, all genius and effort being personal and purely individualistic. It (industry) died slowly, and lastly, the trades from which had sprung up such marvels of delicacy and taste, disappeared one after another; the "morning dew" of other times had given place to hideous calicoes printed in Manchester.

A new industry has at last come into existence, but it is foreigners who have created it. They alone could support the cost of study and the initial establishment, the legal expenses, the costly experiments, the long gropings in the dark, publicity or advertisement under its different forms, in fact all the hundred and one expenses necessary to the successful launching of a great enterprise. There is, in the meantime, an exception to the above rule. Half of the cotton industry belongs to the natives. When, at the time of the War of Secession, the supply of cotton from the United States ceased, India allowed herself to take advantage of this unique opportunity. During two years, the production of cotton goods gave good results; but, after the war, the English industry, which is neither generous nor sentimental, gave her orders for the American cotton, which is better than the Indian variety. China, the only customer which Indian cotton manufacturers have as yet retained, being solicited by able rivals, is little by little withdrawing her custom from India.

Thus, by a movement contrary to that which is taking place in the west, all those who formerly depended for their existence on manufactures and industries are betaking themselves to agriculture for their subsistence. It is calculated that 90 per cent. of the population are engaged in land cultivation to-day. To understand the importance of this appeal which is daily becoming more energetic, to the productive resources of the soil, it should be borne in mind that the number of the inhabitants is continually increasing at a rate of speed which is ill-understood, but which ought to be formidable in a country of precocious and compulsory marriages and where the religion pitilessly closes the gates of Heaven against any one who dies without leaving behind him a son. Now, in proportion as the soil of India has more mouths to feed, her fertility becomes less, as well as the means of repairing such loss. It is urged that for 30 or 40 years past vast lands have been brought under cultivation in different parts of the country. It is true that marshy and swampy grounds have been drained and made fit for cultivation; that at certain points or centres, new cultivations, more profitable than the old ones, have been introduced with the simultaneous employment of modern methods and perfected implements; that model farms have been established in order to teach the natives the use of such methods and implements. But the good produced by the remedies or palliatives is hardly noticeable in the presence of the evil which is becoming worse every day. It is less apparent in the portions of the country which have remained under the direct administration of the native Rajas. There they do not tax grass lands or fallow lands, or, if they do at all, the impost is a nominal one. In times of famine or scarcity, the ryot is allowed time to pay his revenue in instalments; and occasionally, in exceptionally bad times, the entire revenue is remitted. No kindness, no accommodation of this nature could be expected from the English law, which is always rigid and strict, and which becomes humanized only after having been

obeyed to the letter. This law justifies its severity by a curious legal and economic doctrine regarding which I wish to say two words in passing. It goes back to the administration of Lord Cornwallis, and dates from the organisation which was then granted to the proprietors of land in Bengal. For centuries, the English had forgotten the patriarchal socialism which is, ordinarily, the first stage of village life. And hence they had committed in Bengal the same mistake which they had before perpetrated in Ireland; they saw in the zemindar the hereditary chief of the village community and the only manager of its property, a sort of feudal lord, quasi-proprietor of the soil. Afterwards they discovered the truth, but without accepting it frankly. As they did not wish to have local communism, they took refuge in the collectivism of the State. Some of their theorists profess the doctrine that in India all land is the property of Government. So that the annual revenue paid by the ryot is not a tax, but a rent or hire-money.

Tax or rent, the charge is very heavy for his lean shoulders. A ryot in the British territory could not give his land the complete rest of the fallow land, or the relative repose of the varied succession of crops. His plough only scratches the surface of the soil; it does not scoop out a deep furrow, where the grain might lie hidden deep enough for it to draw on the nutritive elements of the lower beds. The manure of cattle (dung), which should go to renew the loss of richness of the soil, is reserved for fuel. The cattle themselves perish for want of pasturage. Epizootic distempers carry away every year a number valued at 7½ millions of pounds sterling. The race is deteriorating and growing weaker: and soon, it will be incapable of doing any work. Man and beast, both suffer from the same disease; they die of hunger.

In fact, examine the miserable budget of the ryot, established by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji more than twenty years ago by taking for his basis the official statistics of the Punjab, and by Mr. Bose, who deals with docu-

ments still more trustworthy, and above all, spread over an extensive ground, who took in hand the same calculation. It has even been possible for him to interpret the tables giving the variations in the wages of agricultural workmen in the different districts of India during the ten years which intervened between the census of 1881 and that of 1891. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji found out that during the year 1877-78, the total production of the Punjab had been £35,350,000 sterling against a population of 17,600,000 inhabitants: this gives an average, per head, of £2-9s-5d stg. To appreciate the utter wretchedness of these resources, we should call to mind the fact that in England the average income per head of the population is £33-0 stg. Here are the figures of what was in 1887, according to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, the proportion of receipts and disbursements for a family of four persons. The expenditure side includes three different heads: (1st) Foods; (2nd) Clothes; (3rd) Rent and other absolutely necessary expenses. Under the first head of food, no meat or wine appears, nothing but rice, flour, vegetables, tea, and for males a pinch of tobacco. Under the heading of clothes, the working garments alone figure, and nothing for holidays. In the third heading of different expenses, no item for pleasure or amusement appears, and nothing for marriages, births, and funerals, the only occasions likely to cause the ryot to indulge in some cost. It foots up to a total of Rs. 34 per individual, or Rs. 136 for the entire family. The income works out to Rs. 20 per head, or Rs. 80 for all the household. The rupee then equalled 2 shillings or 2 francs 50 centimes. Our family budget, therefore, shows these net results: expenditure 345 francs, income 200 francs, and an actual annual deficit of 145 francs.

Mr. Bose's figures demonstrate, unhappily, that the situation has, in the interval, become worse. Wages have never exceeded the average of 4 pence a day; they have gone down, in certain districts, and in particular years, to a penny and a farthing a day.

Mr. Bose estimates the annual income of the ryot as 33 shillings.

Out of these 33 shillings, the state takes away 5. It is really with these five shillings wrested from the miserable starveling called the ryot that are kept going the grand entertainments and receptions of the Viceroy, the Commander-in-Chief, the Lord Chief Justice (*sic*), the Members of Council, and the officers of the Civil Service. It is the ryot who pays for their champagne, their stylish landaus, the laces of their wives, the wages of their Musalman butlers and Hindu valets. This man who is unable to feed his own children feeds a foreign army of occupation numbering 75,000 men. In the last year of the East India Company, the cost of maintaining a soldier in India had mounted up to £19 annually. The insane waste, which is the characteristic trait of the British administration, has carried the figure, in twenty years, to the absurd sum of £79, which in its turn, is, no doubt, already exceeded to-day. It is India who pays the cost of the little wars, which are often abominations of injustice and cruelty, that England takes care to maintain on her North-west frontier of India; it is India—a detail which was quite unforeseen—who had to face the expenditure of the Egyptian war of 1882. They had created a famine fund to provide against a recurrence of the scarcity. When in 1897 they looked for this fund, they found an empty safe. Money destined to buy bread for starving natives had helped, by a turn which was doubly murderous, to kill the Afridis. Finally, it is again India who surrounds with comforts and luxury the old age of her former administrators, who return to England to pass there the evenings of their lives. All that with the five shillings of the ryot; and whoever has once dined in one of those beautiful houses adjoining Hyde Park, where the Anglo-Indian usually makes his gorgeous retreat, has devoured a fraction, however infinitesimal, of that wonderful treasure made of accumulated human misery.

“ We bleed India ” Lord Salisbury one day exclaimed. Twenty years have passed since his lordship made the utterance, and the bleeding still continues ; and Lord Salisbury has been in the ministry all the time. And I have nowhere heard it said that his lordship passed very bad nights, and that bleeding and enfeebled India was the cause of his troubled sleep. To bleed the labourer whose strength is our capital—since he works for our benefit—is it a humane policy, is it an intelligent policy either ? They say that the Spaniards have made a hell of Cuba, or the Turks of Armenia. May be ; but what is certain is that the English, in many respects, have made the people of India regret the Musalman domination. I do not make this remark, but it is the observation of Lord William Bentinck, whose competency or sincerity no one would call in question. A Hindu writer goes further : in his eyes, the English rule in India is worse than all the modes of primitive conquest, including the one which consisted in slaughtering all the adult males of the conquered nation, and in making the females concubines and the children slaves of the conquerors. The conqueror installed himself in the house and the bed of the vanquished, but little by little he submitted to the influences of his new surroundings and of the conquered race ; he restored to circulation and the general wealth of the country all that he took before, like a rain-cloud which gives back to the earth the water absorbed by the rays of the sun. In the case of the English in India, nothing of the kind takes place. In place of an hour of pillage, we have a hundred and fifty years of systematic, graduated and progressive spoliation. Instead of the massacre after the battle, we see there a people condemned to die a slow death, confined in the Tower of Hunger, and,—it is horrible to contemplate—the population in this prison house is always multiplying. A frightful mortality, and a still more frightful birth-rate. Will this really be the last word of the colony of exploitation ? Will it be the master-piece of the ‘ superior race,’ which they always propose for our imitation ?

II.

What is the remedy for such diseases? What should India do? Should she rise, arm herself, and chase the English from the land? The idea is so childish, so madly absurd that no one would think seriously of discussing it. To refute it, an incredulous smile or shrug of the shoulders would be enough. With their twenty thousand officials and their double army, the English hold India in a grip of iron, and they would relax their hold only when it pleases them. But it would never be their pleasure to do so. In times past, a few of their political theorists counselled such surrender, but we have left those times far behind and now the tide has changed. "If you no longer need us," said an English officer to Mr. Malabari, "why don't you send us back to our country?" And the writer, bowing down in the face of this cruel caprice, answered: "You know well that we could not do without you." Nothing is truer, the English have made themselves indispensable to India. "If they all take it into their heads," Mr. Malabari further remarks, "to embark at Bombay one fine morning, and abandon India to her proper destinies, they would find, on reaching Aden, a telegram-praying them to return."

To what phase of her political emancipation has India come to-day? What dose of autonomy is she capable of digesting? What distance still separates her from the end to be attained, that is to say, complete autonomy? That is exactly what I am seeking. But for the moment I content myself with the assertion which has been furnished to me by competent and painstaking observers:—India is not prepared to govern herself. A revolution, therefore, in addition to being impossible, will be useless; it will only give rise to nameless anarchy; far from arresting the country's ruin, it will simply make it complete. It is necessary, therefore, to look for less radical and more peaceful means for retaining the wealth of India with, or bringing it back to, the Indians themselves.

Here are the two principal ones which have been suggested :—give a share—the largest possible—to the natives in the ownership and exploitation of the innumerable commercial and industrial enterprises, which have the working of national resources in their hands ; gradually substitute native functionaries for foreigners filling high administrative offices with big salaries and large retiring pensions, and thereby put a term to the continued exodus of millions of public money.

On the first, it is worth remarking that all the good things are already in the hands of Englishmen. It is forty years since they commenced to build railroads in India, and it was only in 1896 that a line constructed with native capital was opened to the public for the first time. I do not know the results of this line, but I fear to divine them. All the world knows that in the matter of railway construction, the speculators to arrive last on the field are rarely better served. We have already seen above the disastrous entry of India in the cotton industry. She could not think of the metallurgic industry, owing to the sinking of enormous funds which would be necessary for the purpose, and could only take to the mining industry on a very diminutive scale. What she wants even more than capital, is the initiative, the imagination, and the industrial audacity, all of which qualities are found so marvellously developed in her present masters, and even the taste and bent for such things. The Indian people, we must not forget, have given money or wealth the third place in the social hierarchy, after courage and intelligence. Their aristocracy is an intellectual aristocracy, and it must not be imagined from this word that it is an ambitious and wealthy corporation who pass by literature in order to reach political power and fortune ; but a particular category of thinkers, or, if you will, of dreamers, all whose authority is moral. They are generally in rags and all bow down before them. It is beautiful, certainly, this homage rendered to the pure superiority of the spirit,

but it is troublesome from a certain point of view, for, as Mr. Bose excellently puts it, it is good that the intelligence should remain in contact with the living forces and should direct them for the greatest good of humanity. These forces should not be permitted to work all alone, aimlessly, under the sway of animal passions. They did well, therefore, to combat the ultra-idealistic tendencies of the Hindu soul, by developing the study of experimental sciences among the members of the high classes, as well as technical instruction for the sons of artisans. At the same time, it will be understood by all that by association, the economy of the poor might struggle for power with individual capital and vanquish it.

But all that will take place slowly. A century is but a single day in the lifetime of a society, which plumes itself on having already lived five or six thousand years. "We labour," says Mr. Malabari, who puts one in mind of the fact that he has been a poet, and whose thought therefore is naturally clothed in a metaphor, "we labour, the next generation will see the seed sown; then will come another when it will be time to reap." When I see the advance made by their competitors, I tremble for their harvest-time which is so far off.

The question of the *Civil Service* is quite different. The natives have made great efforts, immense sacrifices, moral and material, in order to penetrate it. Legally speaking, the door has been opened to them, but, in the meantime, they cannot enter it. Why?

It was Macaulay who endowed England with the system in 1853. Had he borrowed it from us (the French)? We may be tempted to think so. For the *Civil Service* competition is the same thing as our *baccalaureat* (degree of bachelor), but a *baccalaureat* enlarged and strengthened, a *baccalaureat* in compartments, with obligatory and optional sections. All the same, it is entirely opposed to the principle of natural selection which obtains in England in the recruitment

for all other careers. Macaulay took in the idea and applied it, with all the decisive energy and authoritative precision which characterized him. He was a man who was never in doubt even for a moment as regards his principles or his talents, his chance, or opportunity, or his friends. To prescribe to the candidates a version of Seneca, to question them on the versification of Horace, to test them in Roman history, in French and German grammar, in geometry in the space, and in the differential calculus, all that in order to find out if they were fit to govern India well;—it would have been a bit silly, had it not been very Machiavellian. Macaulay and his colleagues simply desired to reserve the good, highly paid appointments of the *Civil Service* for the students of the Universities, that is to say, for the young scions of the old families, and also for the new-comers of the aristocracy of finance, commerce, and manufacture, who had linked themselves to the governing class since the passing of the Reform Bill in 1832. M. Chailley-Bert designates them an *elite*. An *elite*, may be, but do the *elite* of society or even of intellect necessarily make, under the peculiar conditions of India, an administrative *elite*, a pick of administrators ?

With this brand new regime, and still more recently when the East India Company had quitted the scene, they perceived that the man as well as the traditions had changed. But the change became worse from 1877. At this time, Lord Salisbury, who was Secretary of State for India in Mr. Disraeli's last administration, reduced by four years the maximum and the minimum of the age prescribed for the candidates. To enable one to compete, it was necessary, henceforth, for him to be at least 17 years of age and not more than 19. It was tantamount to closing the door against the students of the Universities, and, at the same time, opening it wide to the democracy of the land. From gentlemen the standard was lowered to the level of the sons of the petty but ambitious middle-class tradesmen. They came out of the *cramming shops*, where they had been stuffed

with an artificial, mechanical, and provisional science put in condition, in fact, to pass the terrible ordeal and obtain possession of the key—the 'open sesame' of the Civil Service.

For a hardy, energetic race of men, inured to physical action, and endowed by nature and heredity with the faculty of government, was substituted, a generation of bureaucrats rivetted to the interest of the cabinet. The former had treated the natives like the chief his soldiers, taking a personal interest in their traditions and progress; the latter know nothing of the Indian life, and do not seek to know it. They hold the natives at a distance by their haughty reserve, which is made up of timidity and pride. Frequent transfers and continual departmental changes do not permit them to dive deeper into things.

It was in fact the administrative nomadism, which France knows well with all its consequences. The older generation of officers loved the large and facile life of the East, played at Rajahs without much trouble, and spent money like water about them.

The new civilians were of an age and a class in which they were adepts at calculation. All economies like all the thoughts of the modern Anglo-Indian are for the family which he has left behind him in Europe, and to whom he escapes whenever he is able to obtain a few weeks of leave. Sons at Eton or at Rugby; younger children at watering-places under the care of governesses, the while their mothers passed their grass or semi widowhoods gadding about here and there in their elegant ennui, which mayhap, did not always reject consolations. Add to this the pre-occupations on account of health which is being shattered, and which towards the fortieth year sees life, that is men and things, painted in only sombre hues. Such is the civilian of the present day, and you will no more find in him, save in exceptional cases, the high sentiment of authority and the consequent duties and obligations, which during half-a-century, atoned in a way for the

errors and faults of the Company's agents. In 1892, they perceived the gross blunder they had committed, and so reinstated the age limits at 21 and 23 years. In this way they have again opened the door of the Civil Service to the graduates of Oxford and Cambridge. But alas! too late. During the last 15 years, the new spirit has invaded the old abodes of the Universities, and it is to be feared that the level of the administrators furnished to India by the metropolis will never be given up. Of course, there is no doubt that the venality and peculation of former times have disappeared; and from this point of view, it is conceivable why Lord Dufferin, a former Viceroy of India, in writing to M. Chailley-Bert, observed that "there was no body of officials in the world comparable to the Indian Civil Service"! But of what earthly good is it to India if the virtue of to-day costs her far dearer than the corruption of other days?

We are thus brought back to the question: Why not admit the natives into the Civil Service? Every native officer you introduce into the service will diminish in an appreciable manner the budget charges and the hole made in the national capital. In fact, if I take for the base of my valuation the comparative scale of emoluments of the subordinate officers—Indian, European, and Eurasian—the result is—and the figures before my eyes leave no room for doubt in the matter—that administration by the natives is five times cheaper than administration by Englishmen. It is superfluous to reiterate the fact that all moneys earned by native functionaries remain in India and add to the general riches of the country.

The appointment of natives of India, Hindus, Mahomedans, or Parsis, to high offices of State will have other advantages besides. It will open an outlet to the activity of the cultivated classes; it will put a stop, or, at all events, bring some relief to the singular state of languor and uneasiness which consumes and etiolates them. It will re-establish intercourse or relation between the governing and the governed races. The

Indian officer will place at the service of the Government his profound, and in some way instinctive knowledge of the manners and inmost sentiments of the people, a knowledge which is so cruelly wanting in the modern Civilian. Thus, interest, policy, and justice will all be seen in accord, and it is a long time since the English have found such harmony between the three of them. Since 1834, at the time when Lord William Bentinck, that great man of honest and virtuous purpose, was Governor-General, the Government declared that "no subject of His Majesty living in India could be considered incapable of filling a place or office however important, in the public service, on account of his place of birth or extraction, or on account of his skin". These are the same words which in 1858 they put in the mouth of the Queen, when Her Majesty owing to the disappearance of the East India Company assumed direct sovereignty over her Asiatic Empire. "We hold ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects; and those obligations, by the blessing of Almighty God, We shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil." * * * * "And it is Our further will that, so far as may be, Our Subjects, of whatever Race or Creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our Service, the duties of which they may be qualified, by their education, ability, and integrity, duly to discharge." These are noble words; and I find in them the perfume of ancient sagacity (sobriety) and ancient virtue. They remind one of the far-off times when the King was the Judge as well as the father of his people. But these words, no more than the promises of 1834, have not been followed by practice. The Indians are, in principle, eligible for admission into the Civil Service, but on condition that they go to London to pass the examination instituted by Lord Macaulay. The provision designed to assure to the great middle class the monopoly and exclusive exploitation of India helped them also in another way in that they were able to keep at a dis-

tance Indian candidates, because all these corollaries presuppose five or six years of study and application, which could only be made in London. At the decisive period of his physical and intellectual formation, the young Hindu—who perhaps may be already married and the father of a family—has to go and live in that great foreign town, where all the acts of ordinary life, aye! the least word or gesture, profoundly hurt his beliefs and traditions. There he must assimilate himself to all the science of the West, and nobody can tell that the operation will not at the same time lend him some of the vices of the West also. What a pecuniary and moral sacrifice this for his family!

I have known some young men who passed this difficult proof—this difficult test. One of them struck me very much at the time by his sweetness and melancholy gravity, by his great ardent and sad eyes, full of day-dreams, and, even then, of regrets. Frail body, delicate manners, and as sensitive as a young girl, he appeared to me at times behind his companions, but at other moments it were they who appeared as children beside him. So that he alternately suggested the idea of the inferiority of his race, and then the contrary view. He is dead, killed by the English climate, far from his parents and his gods, far from the Indian sun and the waters of the sacred rivers. His story is, I fear, repeated in the case of many others.

The first blow awaiting a high class child at the threshold of this hazardous enterprise, is the loss of his rank or position in society. No one could cross the seas without incurring social forfeiture. I know well that the Brahmans, relying on an ancient precedent culled from the political history of bye-gone kings, do give back his caste to the young candidate who has succeeded in the competitive examination. But the unsuccessful one is not at all benefited by a like favour. He returns to his country, impoverished, saddened, and diminished both in body and mind, no longer loving things he loved before, or believing in the things of his

former faith. Our (French) word *rate* (one who has failed) is, in its cruel insolence, too feeble to point the profound and incurable misery of such a life of failure, of such destroyed fortune, and of such intelligence which is for ever troubled.

Since the year 1869, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has been dinning into the ears of all concerned the inconveniences of this state which, in proclaiming absolute equality, has only perpetrated the most shocking inequality. "If you wish to justify the noble promises of 1833 and 1858, establish simultaneous examinations in London and India; so that the journey to Europe may only be exacted from successful candidates, and be performed during the year of probation". For more than 20 years Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has ceaselessly pleaded the cause of his countrymen, but the Government has turned a deaf ear to all his pleadings. In 1892, out of 960 members composing the Civil Service only 21 were natives of India.

At the General Election of 1892, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji was returned to Parliament not by a hole and corner constituency but by one of the most important electoral divisions of the metropolis. He was smilingly called 'the member for India,' and, in fact, in spite of the constitution, he really represented at Westminster the ideas and sentiments of India. In 1893, he obtained from the Liberal majority a resolution which sanctioned or confirmed the principle of simultaneous examinations in London and in India, but it was after all a fruitless effort. One knows how the precarious Liberal majority of 1892 was swept clean away in the elections of 1895. Dadabhai Naoroji did not return to Parliament. In his place the Conservatives raised up a false prophet in the person of a certain Bhownaggee. This personage came to deny "in the name of the people of India, all the truths affirmed by Dadabhai Naoroji, and to gather to himself all the sophisms which the latter had demolished. After which he went to show himself off before his countrymen. In those very provinces in

which, only the year before, Dadabhai Naoroji was loudly acclaimed, they organised an ovation to the pseudo-member. Banquets, toasts, music, banners, nothing which money judiciously spent could procure was wanting in a country where the cries of enthusiasm are meaningless. But this parody got all the success it merited, and the echo of the hurrahs which saluted Mr. (now Sir M.) Bhownagree lost itself in an immense laughter.

The situation, therefore, has not at all changed and the Parliamentary resolution of 1893 has simply become a dead letter. And the number of natives who succeed in entering the Civil Service does not increase.

What reasons are given by Englishmen for holding back the Indians from the administrative offices? The authority of an Indian officer, they often give out, is mediocre among his countrymen, and next to nothing among Europeans. But is it not the fault of the Europeans, who proclaim in all seasons the consciousness of their pretended superiority? They appear sometimes to suspect the integrity of the natives. A happy suspicion truly on the part of a people who have given to the world in general and to India in particular such astonishing examples of financial corruption. *Apropos* of this question, Mr. Dadabhai has rescued from oblivion the fact that in 1833, the East India Company had "bought" the House of Commons. Everyday experience proves that cases of venality are very rare among native officers. Some of the latter, and especially those holding magisterial powers, have been models of disinterestedness and sublime charity. Such for instance was a Judge of the Supreme Court of Calcutta, a veritable Vincent de Paul under the judicial ermine, who gave his thoughts to God, his time to the afflicted, and his fortune to the poor.

Do they say that India is incapable of producing statesmen? If they would not mind referring to history and turning their gaze towards the India of the Rajahs, facts will give them a complete refutation.

This (*i. e.*, where native rule still survives) part of the country has been the most prosperous. In France, it is commonly believed that the Resident, or the English (Political) Agent is the real ruler of the territories which are still under the authority of native sovereigns. But it is an error. In a majority of cases, the English agent is only an inconvenient witness—a haughty spy, who can do anything but who does nothing, as per secret reports. Of all forms of government it is certainly the most demoralising and the most degrading equally to those who exercise it as well as to those who have to submit to it. However vexatious and troublesome it is, it still allows a certain field of action to the exercise of the talents of the indigenous politicians. As types of this class I will cite two men whose memory will live long in India : Dinker Rao and Madhava Rao. The latter showed, as Dewan of Travancore, financial and administrative capacities beyond comparison, and his talents were brought into daylight by an article in the *Calcutta Review*. Now, who was the author of this article? The Prince of Travancore himself, a distinguished writer and thinker, and one of those beings who should be questioned as to the secret of the religious opinions of their time and their race. As to Dinker Rao, he was, at the time of the Sepoy Mutiny, Dewan of the Maharaja Scindhia, the ruler of Gwalior. The Prince and his minister both remained faithful to the English. The mutinous soldiers massacred their European officers and then precipitated themselves into the palace with their swords dripping in blood. "Hand over to us," they cried to the Maharaja, "the traitor Dinker, the friend of the English." "Never" stoutly answered the Prince, and laying his hand on his minister's shoulder, added that "he was his servant, and that none dare touch a hair on his head." Several days passed before an armed force arrived for their succour. The danger passed, but do you know how the English recompensed these two men for their devotion? Simply by keeping in their hands Scindhia's forts and by taking no account

of the promises made in his name. It is for this reason that twenty years after, old Sir Dinker Rao, shaking his white head with great sadness, said :—" Formerly the word of the English people was like an inscription engraved on a rock with a steel point. To-day, it has as much vale as a bill payable at sight drawn by an unscrupulous debtor."

III.

The race which has produced a Madhava Rao and a Dinkar Rao is neither incapable nor unfit to govern itself, or at all events, to help the English in the Government ; in the same manner as it did during long centuries furnish administrators and statesmen to its Musalman masters. The cause which holds the Indians outside the *Civil Service*, is, therefore, before everything, the decision arrived at not to admit them into it at all costs. Meanwhile the political education of India has been commenced and is progressing, very often in spite of the Englishmen, at times in spite of their hostility, and at others with their consent and under their inspiration. For, on one side, there is always some movement taking place in even the most stagnant life, and, on the other, generous inconsistencies might oppose, and in fact have opposed the execution of the egotistic or selfish plan which refuses to participate the government and the riches of India with India herself. From this somnolent race have come out the apostles of emancipation and progress. They have found that some Englishmen are devoted to the self-same cause to the point of sacrificing to it their fortunes and their lives. India has come across some administrators whose sole desire was to be just and to do good. Among these is placed Lord Ripon, who was Governor-General of India during Mr. Gladstone's second administration. In England Lord Ripon served as a target for the marksmanship of caricaturists and insignificant satirical journals. Why, it may be asked : I could see no other reason except his conversion to Catholicism. Lord Ripon is not a first-class statesman, but he has been in our time, one of the last

This (i. e., where native rule still survives) part of the country has been the most prosperous. In France, it is commonly believed that the Resident, or the English (Political) Agent is the real ruler of the territories which are still under the authority of native sovereigns. But it is an error. In a majority of cases, the English agent is only an inconvenient witness—a haughty spy, who can do anything but who does nothing, as per secret reports. Of all forms of government it is certainly the most demoralising and the most degrading equally to those who exercise it as well as to those who have to submit to it. However vexatious and troublesome it is, it still allows a certain field of action to the exercise of the talents of the indigenous politicians. As types of this class I will cite two men whose memory will live long in India : Dinker Rao and Madhava Rao. The latter showed, as Dewan of Travancore, financial and administrative capacities beyond comparison, and his talents were brought into daylight by an article in the *Calcutta Review*. Now, who was the author of this article? The Prince of Travancore himself, a distinguished writer and thinker, and one of those beings who should be questioned as to the secret of the religious opinions of their time and their race. As to Dinker Rao, he was, at the time of the Sepoy Mutiny, Dewan of the Maharaja Scindhia, the ruler of Gwalior. The Prince and his minister both remained faithful to the English. The mutinous soldiers massacred their European officers and then precipitated themselves into the palace with their swords dripping in blood. "Hand over to us," they cried to the Maharaja, "the traitor Dinker, the friend of the English." "Never" stoutly answered the Prince, and laying his hand on his minister's shoulder, added that "he was his servant, and that none dare touch a hair on his head." Several days passed before an armed force arrived for their succour. The danger passed, but do you know how the English recompensed these two men for their devotion? Simply by keeping in their hands Scindhia's forts and by taking no account

of the promises made in his name. It is for this reason that twenty years after, old Sir Dinker Rao, shaking his white head with great sadness, said :—" Formerly the word of the English people was like an inscription engraved on a rock with a steel point. To-day, it has as much vale as a bill payable at sight drawn by an unscrupulous debtor."

III.

The race which has produced a Madhava Rao and a Dinkar Rao is neither incapable nor unfit to govern itself, or at all events, to help the English in the Government ; in the same manner as it did during long centuries furnish administrators and statesmen to its Musalman masters. The cause which holds the Indians outside the *Civil Service*, is, therefore, before everything, the decision arrived at not to admit them into it at all costs. Meanwhile the political education of India has been commenced and is progressing, very often in spite of the Englishmen, at times in spite of their hostility, and at others with their consent and under their inspiration. For, on one side, there is always some movement taking place in even the most stagnant life, and, on the other, generous inconsistencies might oppose, and in fact have opposed the execution of the egotistic or selfish plan which refuses to participate the government and the riches of India with India herself. From this somnolent race have come out the apostles of emancipation and progress. They have found that some Englishmen are devoted to the self-same cause to the point of sacrificing to it their fortunes and their lives. India has come across some administrators whose sole desire was to be just and to do good. Among these is placed Lord Ripon, who was Governor-General of India during Mr. Gladstone's second administration. In England Lord Ripon served as a target for the marksmanship of caricaturists and insignificant satirical journals. Why, it may be asked : I could see no other reason except his conversion to Catholicism. Lord Ripon is not a first-class statesman, but he has been in our time, one of the last

specimen of a disappeared class, whose disappearance is always most regrettable: the liberal Englishman, that is to say, the honest man who tried to apply principles of morality to politics. Now, political morals, whose voice is as loud and as clear as that of private morals, in the conscience of a free and healthy man, will never recognise the subjection of a people to another except for a limited period. "As long as we remain there," evidently thought Lord Ripon, "there we must find our reckoning, but all the same England is bound to teach her Indian subjects to do without her." In this spirit, he sowed the seed of *self-government*, of which the following are the principal characteristics:—At the bottom of the administrative ladder the moral agglomeration of the village is allowed to remain, its character, after being long misunderstood, having been at last comprehended. With its arbitration tribunal (*punchayat*), its own custom or usage, its undivided property, the produce of which is shared in common, its inn or public-house (evidently *dharmshala*) which is at the same time an alms-house, its poet, its washerman and barber, who are public functionaries—very often hereditary like its magistrate, its priest, its accountant, and its village guard, the Indian village is one of the most curious social formations that exist in this world; and, by its duration, it has proved its vitality. Rather than remain stationary this vitality will diminish, in proportion as the ryot becomes conscious of the vaster and more important political community of which he is a member and out of which he should derive the greatest benefit.

Over this ancient institution is superposed Lord Ripon's organisation which scarcely dates back from fifteen years. It is composed of Local Boards which I will call cantonal councils, and District Boards which are circuit or provincial councils. Two-thirds of the Local Board members are elected. They have the privilege of naming their presidents, and delegate a notable proportion of the members who sit in the superior assemblies. The native element in these

councils is becoming stronger every day. During the decennial period from 1882 to 1891, the number of Europeans returned to these councils by election diminished by one-half or two-thirds, and in certain cases by four-fifths. Eight hundred towns, whose territory embraces a population of 15 to 16 million inhabitants have got municipal institutions. And at last the principle of elective representation has penetrated even into Legislative Councils which surround the Governor-General and the governors of Bombay and Madras. A certain number of the members of these Councils are, if not elected, at least proposed for the choice of the Government by an electoral body composed of the Municipalities and local boards, several of whom unite for the purpose of nominating delegates, of University Senates and Chambers of Commerce, and lastly, of representatives chosen by groups of landed property owners.

How does this complete machine—an ingenious (too ingenious!) combination of weights and counter-weights—work? I know not, and I believe nobody knows it. Occasionally, symptoms here and there appear which give place to sad reflexions. When the plague first broke out in Bombay, the native authorities were very slow to comprehend that in certain cases devotion is no virtue, but a strict duty of public men. The municipal magistrates did not know how to give to the cause either their persons or their money, or their voice. They left to the English officials the odiousness of adopting certain measures, which under the circumstances were absolutely justified and necessary. Such a weakness makes me uneasy. Outside of the family circle the Hindu does not know to arrive at a decision, or to regulate and prescribe. He has not yet acquired or regained the sentiment of responsibility, neither does he know to take, like the Japanese, the courage of his newly acquired western notions.

If the local institutions, established by Lord Ripon, work in a sort of relative obscurity and do not

yet give clearly appreciable results, the operations of the Congress, on the contrary, have been, from the first day, ardently enlightened by contradictory discussions in the press, like the crossing of a hundred electric projections. This (Congress) movement does not emanate from direct action of the Government, but it owes much to the initiative of certain Englishmen, as for instance, Sir William Hunter, the highest authority extant on Indian questions, and the best friend of India in England. Sir William Hunter sees in the Congress "the awakening of India", "the commencement of a national life", a "great force working, not for the dissolution but for the consolidation of the Empire." Among the Indians, the Congress has given rise to the liveliest enthusiasm; but it has at the same time to meet with violent opposition from certain classes and in certain coteries: both have contributed to its success, if success in politics means the making of much noise.

What is the Congress? The word itself is a happy equivocation. A Congress is, sometimes, an assembly regularly elected and invested with legislative powers constituent or even sovereign. A Congress, more often, is a gathering of men without any precise mandate, whose role, merely critical and consultative or advisory, as it is, chiefly consists in enlightening public opinion, formulating objections and protests, and devising solutions of difficult questions. The Indian Congress belongs to this second category, but it copies the procedures and observes the forms of sovereign Congresses. If we look only to the ostentation and show with which it surrounds itself, and also to the nature of the subjects it deliberates over, it is identical with our great political bodies. Like the Parliament of Paris of 1648, it owes a portion of its importance to a homonymy, to a windy confusion of words; and that its resolutions will not become laws, and that this platonic Congress, this Congress of amateurs, would transform itself into no effective congress like the one which sits at Washington. But it is not and cannot be so. It is simply a case of passing

by a halting place without stopping in the history of the progress of India. As one of its best interpreters has observed, "the time to govern has not yet come for it, but only the time to criticize."

The Congress meets every year in the month of December in one of the large towns of India, and its session lasts for only three or four days. The number of delegates varies from six hundred to twelve hundred. Scions of princely houses play an active role in it side by side with men of inferior castes, whose sole recommendation is a special talent or competency. The Parsis who, following the expression of one of my correspondents from Bombay, are "the salt of India," freely mix with the Hindus in the Congress; and the Mahomedans, who at first were set up against the Congress, but who have since altered their mind, hold in it a place superior to their numerical proportion in the nation. The Congress discusses a set of twenty questions, some of which, if necessary, are sub-divided for the sake of convenience. Two or three members, on an average, speak on each question; then a division is taken and the Congress passes a resolution. Some of the resolutions are simple manifestations of loyalty or courtesy towards the Queen-Empress, the metropolitan Government, the Viceroy or some equally important personage. If a good reform had been introduced during the course of the closing year, they greet it with an expression of collective gratitude; on the other hand, if a doubtful law had made its appearance in the statute book, they discuss it, and propose correctives and amendments. They examine old complaints and point out fresh wants. Administration, works of general utility, imposts, education, sanitation and public aid; industrial and commercial legislation: proper measures to relieve the distress caused by famines, to circumscribe the plague, or to develop the well-being, the liberty and the instruction of the people; in fact the Congress passes in rapid review all these problems, and makes a survey of social and political India.

If a Frenchman read these discourses and resolutions, two words will at once occur to his mind—two

words of our political vocabulary of bye-gone times : the *cahiers* (copy-books) and the *remontrances* (objections or remonstrations). It was nearly in this tone that our ancestors spoke in the assemblies of the ancient regime, and the sittings of the Congress sufficiently recall to our minds those of our States-general, *minus* the latter's vote for the subsidies, which gave peculiar authority to the political dissertations of our deputies of old. It is the same spirit of submission and independence, which seeks its way, its measure of limits, and its form. Like the deputy at the States-general, the Congress orator oscillates between large declarations of principle and a little personal or local detail. Astonished by the echo of his own voice, he is afraid of being eloquent and fights shy of rhetoric as it might prove treacherous, but he has still to acquire the agile and familiar dialectic of the debater—has still to find the true oratorical pitch of deliberative assemblies.

The final impression produced is one of respect, sympathy, and of faith in the future. But a strain of anxiety and uneasiness is found intermixed with it. How long will the Indian Congress maintain this difficult, ungrateful, and nearly mournful role of a parliament which criticises without acting, which censures but does not govern? It needs almost superhuman virtues to continue perseverance in it, lest it might one day be brutally recalled to modesty. Whatever happens, it has already accomplished a great task. By its discussions it has demolished the old sophism on the question of the political incapacity of the natives. In grouping together in its breast or heart the religions, the provinces and the classes, it has refuted, not once but three times, the particularist or exclusive idea, has given expression to the moral unity of the race, and has pleaded in favour of the fact that India is a nation.

The first journal in a native language was founded by missionaries in 1823, in Bengal. From which it

must not be concluded that the native press of India owes its birth to the initiative of Englishmen ; all that might be said is that India owes her progress to their (Englishmen's) toleration. It was able to develop and grow only after the suppression of the high postage and the impost on paper. But it has to meet an obstacle to its full growth in the diversity of dialects which shut each organ within a comparatively restricted zone. The scarcity of advertisements, the general poverty of the people, even the multiplicity of the sheets (journals), the absence of talent, of good faith, and of authority in a large majority of the editors, these are the chief causes which keep the Indian Press in a sort of infancy. Many of the journals, including those which are edited by natives and published in English, vegetate with a circulation of eight hundred to four thousand. They cite as an exception a weekly journal in Bengal, which has reached a regular circulation of twenty thousand. The famous issue of the *Kesari* published in Marathi, which made so much noise two years ago, and which brought such a severe condemnation to the writer, did not attain a practical circulation of more than seven thousand copies. But the journals pass from hand to hand and their influence is greater than we might conclude from their humble circulation.

I have read a certain number of these journals : I find them much inferior to what I expected from the proceedings of the Congress. The Indian journalist has a poor conception of economic facts, and he ignores the history of his own country as much as those of Western nations. His articles are ill-written and worse-conceived, No series of connected or consecutive arguments, no progression or flow of dialectic, no demonstration which gradually makes its way from the premises to the conclusion could be seen in them, but instead a collection of phrases without any connection with each other, of metaphors, of hyperboles, and above all of personalities. On this point, the Indian journalist appears to have adopted as his model and type the vile press of New York and San Francisco.

Practically speaking, the journals of India are free. For want of a special legislation, the Government is under the necessity of either ignoring altogether the excesses of the press, or of transforming into "crimes" what we (Frenchmen) might call its "delits".

It ordinarily adopts the former part. Only twice in twenty-eight years, it remembered that an article inserted in the criminal law in 1870 permitted it to liken every "attempt to sow disaffection" to patent or obvious sedition and to effective treason. Disaffection is a word of hypocritical and vague meaning which should be disliked by a jurist who is an honest man.

It is with this article or section of the Penal Code that Mr. Tilak was hit in 1897. Certainly Mr. Tilak is not the first to be so struck with it. Born in 1856, he was, twenty years ago, a student in Bombay and often passed his nights in impassioned discussions on the present miseries and future greatness of India. He then took the oath of never accepting Government appointments at the hands of the oppressors of his country. After taking his degrees in Arts and Law, he returned to Poona, where he successively launched with the co-operation of his friends, a journal in English (the *Mahratta*), a journal in the Marathi language (the *Kesari*), a printing press, an artistic studio, and a college of secondary instruction. Afterwards, owing to dissensions which took place between the colleagues, the enterprises were separated and Tilak remained the sole master of the two journals. It was not enough for his devouring activity. Mathematician, legislator and philologist, he lectured on geometry, established a course of lectures for 'prentice lawyers, published a volume on the chronology of the Vedas which attracted the attention of Max Muller. He essayed to prove in it, by the very nomenclature of the constellations that the Greeks had not yet been detached from the Aryan trunk or stock, when the sacred books were composed, and he carries them back to about 4,000 B.C. In 1895, he was charged to organise the reception of

the Congress at Poona, but he fell out with his collaborators and retired into his tent. He is a true Mahratta, proud, generous, combative and authoritative ; nothing is wanting in him of the characteristics of his forbears when they fought with us, not even the fatal spirit of discord which at the decisive moment paralysed their resistance, and delivered them, in a definite manner, to the yoke of the stranger.

Strictly orthodox, Mr. Tilak stands up in all circumstances for the defence of the old religion, perhaps because he sees in it the lever for emancipation, the cement of the future national unity. But will this unity work well when it resuscitates the recollections proper to cherish the particularist or exclusive spirit, the rivalries of races and religions? Thus he has found his hero in Shivaji, a Rajah, who in the 17th century chased the Mahomedans and gave independence to his countrymen. At his instigation, the tomb of the great Mahratta has been restored, and every year a solemn festival brings together the devotees of this patriotic cult. In 1897, owing to the plague, this festival was put off till the 13th of June. A few days after the *Kesari* published a piece entitled "the words of Shivaji". The old warrior coming out of his tomb, cast a glance around him and exclaimed :—"Oh my friends, why have you awakened me? To-day as before the strangers dominate my country. They compel the Goddess Laxmi to exile herself from the land ; they slaughter my mother—the sacred, the divine cow...." The meaning of this language was clear to the readers of the Marathi journal. It was simply two economic facts rendered into parables. Laxmi who exiles herself, is the regular and progressive or growing drain of the country's wealth, a mention of which has been made above. To transform the oxen and the kine into butcher's meat, is to ruin the cultivator, who, in order to live, wants their work, their milk, and their manure, and who, in the absence of meadows, could not multiply his cattle. This we apprehend is the import of the symbols.

In the same number, in giving an account of the ceremony of 13th June, are reported the inconsiderate utterances of a professor, who had declared that all arms were good against tyrants, and to kill the latter was a laudable action. This oratorical effusion appeared in print in 6,700 copies on the 15th of June and seven days after, Commissioner Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst fell at Poona, assassinated by fanatics who remained unknown for a long time.

Mr. Tilak was held responsible for the words he had published and denounced by his excellent contemporary of Calcutta (*), the *Times of India*, as having excited to murder and preached "disaffection"; and was tried for it in the month of September, before a jury composed of six Europeans, one Parsi and two Hindus. Compare English justice in England and English justice in India. In England, the accused is judged by twelve men of his own nationality who must all be of one mind; down there (India) he is condemned by a majority of six against three, by foreigners who understood nothing of what was written and who had to rely on the testimony of a translator. And the Judge pronounced the sentence: eighteen months' imprisonment! It was too much for an hyperbole and two metaphors. That the flowers of rhetoric should cost so dear in a country in which those of nature cost so little!

The condemnation of Mr. Tilak was an out and out murder of the sentiment of justice, which could no longer be entertained. They did not wait long to commute it into an insignificant punishment. And this was a double blow to the Government. Its severity was taxed with cruelty and its clemency was looked upon as a weakness.

Behramji M. Malabari is a journalist of quite a different type from Mr. Tilak's. Of Parsi origin, he came of humble parents, from the old town of Surat,

* This is obviously an error on the part of M. Filon. It should be Bombay and not Calcutta.—Translator.

which was formerly opulent and munificent, but which now mourns its departed glory. He has preserved in himself, in his person, in his ideas, and in his talent something of complete sadness and mournfulness, the outcome of his far off atavic heritage or the profound impressions of his childhood; the exiled race, the decayed town, and the poverty of his first home. His mother, who became a widow while still young, and without resources, in order to give a protector to her child, married again an old merchant of Surat. But the merchant fell on evil days and met with great losses in his business, and little Behramji at 12 years of age, was obliged to provide for his own wants and in addition, to contribute to the family expenses. Student and teacher at one and the same time, he was occupied with his studies all day long; his mornings and evenings he passed, in his turn, in giving lessons. His first sensations of a schoolboy, of games, afflictions, and dreams, of tender caresses, of childhood, of vagabondage of body and soul alike, all that was cut short by the sudden apparition of death which snatched away from him his well-beloved mother, and in a few hours, made a man of the child: Malabari has recounted these things in some fragments of autobiography which no one, I think, could forget after having read them once, and which stick in certain regions of one's memory, along with the beginning of the *Confessions of David Copperfield*, the first book of the *Petite chose* of Alphonse Daudet, and other pages of the same kind, wherein are revived, in an artistic form, fine and precious emotions. Malabari is not a scholar like Tilak. He was plucked three times in the matriculation examination* of the Bombay University, and after having succeeded in the fourth year, he did not push very far. But he has natural gifts which no diploma will ever confer on a man, the imagination of the poet and the instincts of a writer. He has published two volumes of collections of Gujarathi verses, at first in the Parsi sub-dialect of that language, and afterwards in that of the Marathas (?M. Filon here evidently means Gujarathi Hindus).

I cannot judge these poems myself and I refer the (French) reader to Mlle. D. Menant's competent appreciations of them. I know nothing at all of his volume of English verse, *The Indian Muse*. But his prose has given me particular pleasure. His English is very pure and perspicacious, refined, with a colouring of its own, flexible, touching, easternised, and stamped with the impress of a strong but seductive intellectual personality.

Mr. Malabari has also done the work of a historian by chronicling in his *Gujarath and the Gujarathis*, the curious past of his native province; but he early found his true vocation in journalism. He bought for 25 Rupees the *Indian Spectator*, which in his hands soon became one of the most influential and respected sheets in India. He made it an instrument of propaganda rather than of polemics; it is an organ for the discussion of measures and principles and not of individuals. He has not taken an oath never to accept wages at the hands of Englishmen, but he has done more and better than that. In 1887 he refused the shrievalty of Bombay, an office which in that Jubilee year might have brought him the honours of *knighthood*. On the other hand, he accepts and even solicits the co-operation of Englishmen in good works—of public benefit, and to their honour may it be mentioned—he has very often obtained it from them.

I have dwelt at length on these two men, because they represent the two parties into which the pick of the intellectual men of India are divided, *i. e.*, the orthodox and the reform parties. They oppose each other in all things: by their origin, by their character, by their aspirations, by their programmes and by the means they employ to accomplish their ends. Tilak has thrown himself on the ground-plot of political demands; Malabari, on the contrary, takes his stand on that of social reform. He thinks that the real stumbling block to the regeneration or revival, to the progress of India, was in the constitution of the society and of the family, and that the work of regeneration must be commenced

in that region. Between European culture and homely native ideas, between the thoughts and the customs, a deadly antagonism has sprung up. Two civilizations and two conceptions of life between them have raised a close contest, and the Hindu soul is thereby nearly torn in two even to the extent of its death agony. It is a cruel but useful spectacle, without any analogy, I think, in the history of humanity. In taking for our guides Mr. Malabari and those who think with him, we might get it—the analogy we seek.

PART II.

EUROPEAN EDUCATION AND HINDU SOCIETY.

I

Since the commencement of the conquest England has several times changed her system in respect of education. When the monstrous brigandage of the first thirty years had died out, and when the administration of the country passed into the hands of honourable men, a few of the conquerors, who had their attention turned towards philological and ethnographical researches, bethought themselves of asking India, the venerable mother of nations, and the primitive teacher of mankind, for certain treasures to which the exploiters of Bengal scarcely, if at all, gave a thought. They put themselves into intimate relations with the Pundits, and did their best in order to encourage the study of Sanskrit as well as the republication of old literary monuments of all sorts. We might well conceive how rudimentary was the system of public instruction then prevailing in India, after a century of brigandage and military anarchy: a majority of the village schools taught to speak the popular languages, to read, and occasionally, to write them, with a few hazy notions of calculation or reckoning thrown in: here and there were miserably provided Sanskrit schools, in which starving students worked day and night to acquire a knowledge of the sacred language. The stories told of their zeal, their patience,

and the destitution in which they lived, recall the semi-legendary traditions of the mediæval Universities. A strange love of the old writings, disinterested but blind devotion to a sterile knowledge, and a passion for reading without the remotest idea of profit or progress, these are things which an utilitarian generation like our own, given to have a practical eye on the main chance while cogitating all questions of learning and literature, will hardly understand, but which were accepted on their part without difficulty, by the Joneses and the Wilsons of an earlier generation.

Thus they founded in 1791 a Sanskrit College at Benares. In 1813, when renewing the charter of 1793, the Government imposed on the Company the obligation of disbursing annually a lakh of rupees for the encouragement of oriental studies. Twenty-five thousand francs was allotted every year for public instruction in India during a period of twenty years. With this insignificant amount, augmented occasionally by special donations, they made some progress in the same direction. In 1821, they opened a Sanskrit College at Poona; in 1824, another one at Calcutta; and in the following year one each at Agra and Delhi. Elphinstone, the Governor of Bombay, was of opinion that the vernaculars should be taken as the foundation of national education. At Madras a mixed school was started in order to reconcile these two systems. As to the natives, they implored with energy and passion for instruction in English. "Eat this fruit", said the tempter to the first parents of Mankind, "and you will be equal to God." The Indians thought that they would become the equals of Englishmen, the day they would be able to read and write their language. From this thought sprang up a movement, the extraordinary vehemence of which shook those somnolent races. A traveller tells that on landing at Calcutta he was assailed by beggars of a new kind. They were small boys who implored with tearful entreaty for English book. The Government had closed its ears to these prayers; and it was outside the Government altogether that were

opened in 1828 the first English schools which soon grew up into the "Hindoo College" of Calcutta and the Elphinstone College of Bombay. The success of these experiments did not for a while disturb the repose of the "Orientalists." This was the nickname given to the partisans of Sanskrit among the educational advisers of the Company to distinguish them from their opponents the "Anglicists." The entry of Lord Macaulay into the Council dispossessed the former of their majority and wonderfully changed the spirit of their deliberations. He persuaded his colleagues to his way of thinking, that the diffusion of English was the only means of assuring intellectual progress to the Natives and of assimilating or merging them into the conquering race. And when renewing the Company's charter in 1833, the annual grant for public instruction was doubled. It was almost entirely devoted to imparting instruction in English. In three years in Bengal forty schools were started having on their rolls 10,000 students. Those who aspired to the blessings of Western education were so numerous that there was not enough room to seat those who applied for admission. One was compelled to take his chance and await his turn to gain entrance to the Colleges. A fresh step was taken in 1844 when Lord Hardinge established a public examination after passing which a diploma or a certificate of the course of studies gone through was conferred on the successful candidates, the possession of which it was thought would give them the right of admission to the public offices. Very few succeeded in passing this examination, and even those few did not obtain the coveted offices. The illusions were again revived in 1853 when the Company's charter was once more renewed. This solemn opportunity served as a pretext to make many promises and the occasion to do something, however slight. A Minister of Public Instruction was appointed. He elaborated the plan of the three Universities which were founded in 1857 at Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay; and whose number was strengthened later on by the creation of

the Allahabad and the Punjab Universities. We have already seen how the organisation of the *Civil Service* had given rise to ambitions in the hearts of the natives, and how such ambitions were sadly nipped in the bud. India counts only a score of her children amongst the holders of high administrative offices; on the other hand she possesses many thousands of University graduates. The reader must have already understood and will understand much better presently, what an irony there is in such insignificant compensation.

Up to 1854, scarcely any attention had been given to popular instruction. The continued progress of democracy in the metropolis has reversed the proportion which existed between University and Primary education to such an extent that to-day the budget for the latter costs three times more than that for the former. It is but proper to mention here that the Indian Universities are only examining bodies and have no teaching functions; and that, in consequence, superior education is left to private initiative. The primary education is of two kinds. In the lower schools is taught reading, writing, the first principles of arithmetic and of mensuration; the middle schools give instruction, among others, on some notions of geometry algebra, chemistry, botany, physical geography and history. Vernacular languages only are used to impart instruction in the lower schools; while in the middle schools English, which every year takes a firmer hold, is partially employed. According to the latest figures which I have been able to obtain, here is the distribution of the natives who have received some kind of education, out of the three orders of public education. Out of 1,000 'literates,' 939 would be found to have received the primary education only, 57 to have received the mixed or middle schools education, and only 4 who had received the superior or collegiate education. The proportion between the 'literates' and 'illiterates' has varied from year to year; in 1881 there were 91 'literates' to every 909 'illiterates'; in 1891, 109 'literates' to 891 illiterates. As to female

education, it was taken in hand only yesterday, so to speak, and we could understand the rate of progress when we know that in the Presidency of Madras 4 girls out of a thousand can read, and in the Presidency of Bombay 10 can boast of the accomplishment. Meanwhile, I find that in 1893 one young lady took the degree of Bachelor of Arts of the Calcutta University, and that six others passed the entrance or matriculation examination. I admire them though at the same time I pity them profoundly. Nothing more strange or odd and more painful could be conceived than the lot of a girl graduate in a Hindu home.

The inference from the foregoing figures is that 25 to 30 millions of Indians (out of a total population of 287 millions) receive some elements of instruction; that twelve or fifteen hundred thousands know the blessings of the superior primary education, and that more than a hundred thousand follow a course of education analogous to that of our (French) Colleges of secondary instruction. The programme of studies which I have briefly indicated above, also leaves the impression on your mind that the authorities strive to give to the education of the people a scientific character appropriate to the wants of an agricultural population. But that is an error, for scientific education in India does not, as a matter of fact, possess the necessary teaching staff or appliances. The collections are rare and the laboratories insufficient, and if there were competent teachers, it is not certain that they would get pupils. Only one University, that of Bombay, grants bachelor's diplomas in the faculty of science; and these diplomas are less sought after than those of the bachelor of arts. An idea cherished by us (Frenchmen) for a long time, has taken hold of the minds of the Indian people: it is that education is an ornament and not a tool or implement, that its object is not to arm the intellect for the struggle for existence, but to make it refined, and to prepare it, I know not for what secret display, to augment, in a word, its own value and not its productive energy. To its hereditary tendency towards reverie and vain

speculation has been added the mirage of officialdom. To obtain a particle of authority, by assimilating the Greeco-Latin culture which served as a passport for entrance to the civil service, was during more than forty years the hope of all who, in India, raised themselves a little above the level of general poverty and intellectual mediocrity. The new generation is to-day undeceived, but the hopeless longing after a phantom has left the Indian intellect tired, discouraged, distrustful of its own resources, and equally disgusted with itself. It is wearing itself out in the void, not knowing where to find a footing.

If we follow a hundred thousand of these young men in the different walks of life they might elect to pursue, we will find that many of them had resigned themselves to accepting inferior offices; some those who possess some capital, will be found engaged in the cotton industry whose prospects are already so uncertain. A good number become engineers; others,—disregarding Brahmanical prescriptions which identify dissection with crime and fill the place of experimental by revealed anatomy—study medicine under European masters. The lawyers are very numerous and it is said, remarkably able. In the popular languages, which serve the purposes of the daily needs of the people, quite a literature of imitation has sprung up. The popularity of the poets might be gauged by the fact that every village has its own versifier. Bengal, during the last fifty years, has given birth to many novelists, at the head of whom stands the celebrated Chatterji, whose reputation has even reached Paris. Calcutta has five theatres, which are the exact reproductions of the European ones, save in this respect that the ladies who assist at the representations are invisible to the spectators. It was in 1850 that the first modern drama was brought out on the stage, and the production ever since has gone on uninterruptedly, and a piece is cited which has been played for years successively, like '*Charley's Aunt*.' 'Modern', have I called it? The word is scarcely fit to

describe the pieces which put in scene the oldest myths or episodes of religious history contemporaneous with the Musalman domination of the land. The novel paints the latest manners, but with so evident a desire in the writer to follow the English models that the situations described at times appear to be reproductions rather than fresh inventions. Besides, a preliminary question confronts us here: is it possible to write plays or novels in a country in which love is, if not quite suppressed, at least condemned to silence, and where woman has lost her place, as I will presently point out, not only in the social life but in the intimate life as well?

Very few people are rich enough to buy books. Again, there is a singular misunderstanding between the public, which is so rare, and the authors who are so numerous. The latter, in fact, prefer to write in the vernacular; while the cultivated public, by fashion, by vanity, and by curiosity insatiable for things western, demand English books. From this results a loss of harmony and equilibrium between the offer and the demand in the literary market. Apart from some journalists and the authors of school books which are indispensable for imparting primary education, no one has lived by his pen, no one has maintained himself by his thoughts. I am assured that even Chatterji had never earned more than three thousand francs a year by his books. This example is very little encouraging. The time is past, when, in India, writers lived like courtiers by the munificence of princes; and the hour has not yet arrived for the public to vote a civil list for literary royalty.

Mr. Bose gives a last reason for the inferiority of the Hindus in these new domains in which they have called forth an imitation of the literatures of Europe. This reason, not being of my province, I submit to competent physiologists. The Indian author whom I followed step by step does not at all think that vegetarianism could be compatible with great intel-

lectual efforts. The waste of energy provoked by cerebral work urgently requires a reparation of the fibres which is not furnished by the miserable nourishment of the Indian. No beefsteaks, no master-pieces. Hindu thought suffers from anæmia, and it requires to be put on a sustaining regime. But does the climate permit this change of dietary?

III.

Then, there goes that graduate bent under the weight of that immense mass of knowledge with which he is loaded and which he does not know what to make of. Nothing of all that weight is incorporated by him in his system, neither has it penetrated to the core of his being. That block of facts, and sentiment, and ideas, which make up western civilization, fashious for him a second soul, all artificial and external, which superposes the first one, hiding and enveloping it within its cover. No mixture or union of the two is possible. The notions acquired are profoundly impregnated with Christianity. Monotheism and monogamy, liberty, justice, equality between the classes, between the sexes, and between individuals, love for the woman, respect for the mother, adoration for the child, every line, every word of the authors he has read contains and pre-supposes all these things. Anon he re-enters his home and his thoughts. That which surrounds him, his true self, everything gives the lie to what he has been taught, to what he has endeavoured to assimilate.

And first, his gods.

His religion is an insurmountable obstacle in his path, not owing to the absolutism of its dogmas, but by the invincible resistance and the unalterable rigidity of the social forms with which religion has identified itself. Brahmanism is of a unique tolerance: it authorizes all creeds, or rather, it annexes them; and more singular still, it conserves them all. India has not up to the present time acquired the historic sense.

She is not conscious of her religious evolution. Her past appeared to her in a simultaneous vision, which makes her never of the present. What she believed at one time in her history, she thinks she still believes, and she does not dare to disavow it. Brahmanism is a religion into which every thing has entered and from which nothing has come out.

The four Vedas alone, moreover, if we add to them the Brahmins and the Upanishads, cover a period of long centuries, and indicate a condition of considerable evolution. Max Muller has found an ingenious word to characterise the religious condition of the first Aryans who conquered India several thousands of years before our (Christian) era. It is neither monotheism, nor polytheism, but henotheism. They adored many gods, but worshipped one only at the same time. It is the one to whom they addressed themselves, who was the master, the Almighty, the God of all other gods. Those who passed their lives in meditating on such things and in instructing the people, felt the weakness of this conception and explained it in this way: that the different gods were only the different names given to the Divinity of the Supreme One.

At first the religion was all contained in the various rites and sacrifices, some sort of exchange market between men and the gods, and at which the priests served as intermediaries. But in the second epoch the two doctrines of *Bhakti* and *Jnyana* made their appearance—*Bhakti* and *Jnyana*, that is to say, the two currents which raise the soul towards Divinity: on one side Faith and Love, and on the other knowledge of the Supreme Being. No sooner had it taken its birth, than the philosophical spirit, which could not yet distinguish itself from the religious spirit, immensely enlarged the idea of God. It enlarged the idea to such an extent that it goes beyond and even envelopes all nature. And from it has grown up the pantheism of the Upanishads, which enchanted Schopenhauer and extorted from him this admiring expression:—"There

is no study higher, more beautiful, and more beneficent than that of the Upanishads. It is this study which has consoled me to live, and which will console me to die."

What do the Upanishads teach? That Brahma is the spiritual source of everything that has life. It engendered the ether, which gave birth to the air, which generated the fire, which again bred the water, and which in its turn begot the earth. Then comes the inevitable divorce, for Pantheism has two absolutely antagonistic expressions, according as God is everything or that everything is God. Whilst Pantheism guards its theological form with Vyasa in that terrible Vedanta which is the despair of metaphysicians and of which they speak little simply because they are not sure of having understood it, it borders upon, on the other hand, the very clear atheism of Kapila, who does not acknowledge any other spiritual substance in this world other than the human soul. At the other pole of the religious globe, Buddhism was born and made its way among the humble people. Was it a reaction against the abuse of religious rites and sacrifices? Or a development of the doctrine of Faith and Love? Or, is it, as Mr. Bose assures me, an anti-Aryan, or a more or less extra-Aryan movement? Well, it is for the able ones in such matters to pronounce. But it is certain that the movement has turned to the profit of the non-Aryan peoples, that those peoples have made it an instrument for emancipation, propaganda, and expansion, and that they have finally degraded primitive Buddhism by imposing on it their idolatrous and fetishist tendencies. Buddhism was vanquished and chased from India after twelve hundred years of struggle, but not without leaving behind profound impressions of its passage.

Poetical efflorescence, which succeeded the philosophical and scientific period, prepared the way for the offensive return of Polytheism to the land, which was signalized by the Puranic period. The ancient divini-

ties re-appeared with all the graces with which the *Mahabharata* and the *Ramayana* adorned them. They bear new names, or, if they still guard the old ones, the latter have received some improvement. They have been advanced from class to class. The heroes of old pass for demi-gods, and the demi-gods themselves become real gods. The old Vedic divinities are revived, transformed and materialized into their modern avatars. The Hindu religion is bifurcated into Vaishnavism and Sivaism. The cult of Vishnu and that of Siva, have both in their turn, so many sub-divisions, and often of so diverse a kind, that the self-same doctrine engenders the most suave or charming idealism, and the most rigid asceticism, at the same time that it covers the last excesses of priapism and delirium.

In a country in which religious thought has so often changed, and so many times moulted (cast its skin), how could you take note of any proscribed heresy? No heterodoxy is possible in a place where there is no well-defined orthodoxy. It appears as if the Indian spirit refuses to conceive the verity as opposed to its contrary, or as distinct from its analogy. Under the circumstances it could never recognise religious proscription. As the frontispiece of their laws, the Brahmins have inscribed not only toleration but the equality of religions as well. "The more the blooms in a parterre, the better and more beautiful the garden will look." The submission of autochthonic races by the Aryans, gradual and pacific as it was, was more a conquest than an apostleship. After the Musalman invasion the two cults, Hindu and Moslem, lived, down to the reign of Aurangzeb, in an intimacy which at particular moments appeared to promise a fusion. Ramananda, Kabir and Chaitanya, the great preachers of the middle age, drew to their side, without distinction of faith, both Hindus and Musalmans; and one of these men presented examples, for the devotion of the faithful, of Krishna and Ali as two avatars of the Divine Being. And only the persecutions of Aurangzeb,

the Musalman Louis XIV of India, changed for a time this state of affairs, and transformed the religious sect of the Sikhs into an armed confederation. But India had resumed her habitual toleration when the English period commenced. She met with an equal toleration at the hands of her new masters. Every one of the latter was absorbed in making the most of his conquest. The Company asked for dividends and not conversions. They greatly feared that a sudden awakening of fanaticism among their Hindu or Moslem subjects, might cause trouble to their commercial operations. The Company's officials therefore persecuted Christian Missionaries, and one is greatly amused to find that in 1792 some ardent ones amongst them were compelled to take refuge with the Dutch at Serampore, or with the French at Chandernagore. But the bishops were powerful in the Metropolis (London) and gradually the Company's hand was forced. A vast propaganda was organised and since then has never been arrested. To describe the results two words would suffice: a theological defeat quite pronounced, and an immense moral victory on the heels of a powerful reaction. After a century of missionary efforts, all the Christian communities together would number only two millions of communicants out of a population of 287 millions of human souls. New conversions take place among the ancient indigenous tribes, who have remained half savages, chiefly amongst the Dravidians, and it might be added that these conversions are particularly numerous in times of famine: this circumstance requires no explanation for those who know that pastors distribute with the bread of the soul the bread of the body also. But the material resources with which an Anglican preacher is so abundantly provided are very often detrimental to his success. He has his wife, carriages, servants; he gives alms instead of asking for them. This does not in the least accord with the popular idea of the man who brings to them a message from Heaven. How could he persuade them to renounce everything when he himself has given up nothing?

And meanwhile the influence of Christianity has been and is to-day much more considerable than the miserable number of conversions could make us believe possible. Nothing would make us appreciate better, in its vicissitudes, this indirect influence than the abridged history of a well-known sect, the Brahma Samaj, which, at different times in the last century, drew to itself in the self-same effort and a common thought, the noblest minds of India.

It was founded by that Rammohun Roy, whom I think I am right in describing as great, since, according to Max Muller, he possessed the three elements of grandeur or greatness,—disinterestedness, honesty and courage. As a matter of fact, he never gave a thought to himself; and he only enlisted his services in just causes. He had never been daunted by any labour, peril, or insult. I cannot resist the temptation of recounting here briefly his beautiful life. Son of a zemindar, his father banished him from the paternal roof on account of the liberty and freedom of his opinions. Returning to his country after four years of exile, he filled high administrative offices in the service of the East India Company (1800—1814). He had a thorough knowledge of English, Arabic, Persian, the vernacular languages (Bengali and Hindi) and Sanskrit. His works on linguistic subjects still command the respect of our modern Orientalists. Retired from the service, he established himself at Calcutta in 1814, and there founded a society for the preaching and the propaganda of the pantheistic doctrines contained in the Upanishads. Always over the breach, we see him engaged in hot discussions with Christians, equally with Hindus, in speaking and writing, multiplying his brochures and lectures, editing a journal in Bengali, giving his co-operation for establishing the Hindu College of Calcutta, and simultaneously attacking all the abuses then existing, for instance, polygamy, and the suicide of widows, and still finding time, in this all-embracing and indefati-

gable activity, in this existence which was a battle throughout, for writing treatises on Geography and Grammar.

In January 1830, he rented an apartment in Calcutta, where the members of the Brahma Samaj met every Saturday for prayer. The service was very simple, and was composed of readings from the Vedas, a sermon, and the singing of hymns. The doctrine professed by the Brahma Samaj was a Unitarian Christianity under an Oriental garb. Rammohun Roy was so much in accord with English Unitarianism that he converted, it is said, a Baptist missionary to his belief.

The Brahma Samaj was still in its first novelty when Rammohun Roy made a voyage to Europe. He went there as the envoy of the Great Mogul, who had invested him with the title of Rajah, and he obtained from Parliament the definitive abolition of Sati (suicide of widows by fire). But he was not destined to revisit his native country, and the bones of this great savant of India repose in a distant land, in a cemetery near Bristol.

The Brahma Samaj appeared to be knocked down by the death of its chief. It numbered only 83 members on its books when Devendra Nath Tagore resuscitated it by bringing it nearer still to rationalistic deism and by dividing it more and more from Hinduism. Rammohun Roy had remained faithful to the Vedas, interpreted, of course, in the monotheistic spirit; his successor acknowledged the Vedas as only an edifying reading, but refused to look upon them as sacred books equal to the Bible and the Koran. Young Anglophiles of this generation expressed in a thousand ways, all of which were not conceived in good taste, their contempt for the Vedic 'old rubbish.' To eat beef was not enough for them to show their defiance of the old religion; they even went the length of throwing the bones into the garden of the devout,

who did not know how to purify themselves of this pollution. In short, it was the positivist wave, which, after having passed over our (Westerners') heads, happened to break on the banks of the Ganges.

But in 1857, with Kheshab Chandra Sen, a new spirit entered into the Brahmo Samaj, and consequently into the cultivated youths of the country. He was a mere youth, with the sacerdotal temperament, and endowed with a fascinating eloquence which enveloped him in a kind of religious atmosphere. Called to the ministry of the Brahmo Samaj, in 1866, he fell out with Tagore and the other promoters of the movement, carrying away in his train, into his schism, all the perennial and ardent elements of the society. Suddenly enlarged, the new Brahmo Samaj sent its missionaries in all directions. In the same year, *i. e.*, 1866, Kheshab gave lectures on Christ, whom he declared as standing on a higher level than mankind, and whom he saluted as "the regenerator of his race." He did more than simply adopt Him: he claimed Him "It was in Asia," he said, "that Christianity first appeared and spread; it owed its birth to us Asiatics, for Jesus was an Asiatic. Oh! When I think of that, I feel His presence near my heart; and my love for Him becomes a hundred times greater; yes, He is the representative of the most noble thing in humanity, but there is in him I know not what greatness which Asia alone can give. Let them think of this, and perhaps their cogitation will diminish a little the sentiment of aversion and disdain with which European Christians regard Asiatics." We find in his words an adhesion, an acknowledgment of the divinity of Christ. In his new lectures delivered five months after in the Town Hall at Calcutta, he explained his thoughts which he impressed with a Carlylean meaning. "Every great man," he said, "is both human and divine." But he proceeded to recognise from his personal experience, how dangerous it is to confuse these two elements. During his lecturing tour in

gable activity, in this existence which was a battle throughout, for writing treatises on Geography and Grammar.

In January 1830, he rented an apartment in Calcutta, where the members of the Brahmo Samaj met every Saturday for prayer. The service was very simple, and was composed of readings from the Vedas, a sermon, and the singing of hymns. The doctrine professed by the Brahmo Samaj was a Unitarian Christianity under an Oriental garb. Rammohun Roy was so much in accord with English Unitarianism that he converted, it is said, a Baptist missionary to his belief.

The Brahmo Samaj was still in its first novelty when Rammohun Roy made a voyage to Europe. He went there as the envoy of the Great Mogul, who had invested him with the title of Rajah, and he obtained from Parliament the definitive abolition of Sati (suicide of widows by fire). But he was not destined to revisit his native country, and the bones of this great savant of India repose in a distant land, in a cemetery near Bristol.

The Brahmo Samaj appeared to be knocked down by the death of its chief. It numbered only 83 members on its books when Devendra Nath Tagore resuscitated it by bringing it nearer still to rationalistic deism and by dividing it more and more from Hinduism. Rammohun Roy had remained faithful to the Vedas, interpreted, of course, in the monotheistic spirit; his successor acknowledged the Vedas as only an edifying reading, but refused to look upon them as sacred books equal to the Bible and the Koran. Young Anglophiles of this generation expressed in a thousand ways, all of which were not conceived in good taste, their contempt for the Vedic 'old rubbish.' To eat beef was not enough for them to show their defiance of the old religion; they even went the length of throwing the bones into the garden of the devout,

who did not know how to purify themselves of this pollution. In short, it was the positivist wave, which, after having passed over our (Westerners') heads, happened to break on the banks of the Ganges.

But in 1857, with Kheshab Chandra Sen, a new spirit entered into the Brahmo Samaj, and consequently into the cultivated youths of the country. He was a mere youth, with the sacerdotal temperament, and endowed with a fascinating eloquence which enveloped him in a kind of religious atmosphere. Called to the ministry of the Brahmo Samaj, in 1866, he fell out with Tagore and the other promoters of the movement, carrying away in his train, into his schism, all the perennial and ardent elements of the society. Suddenly enlarged, the new Brahmo Samaj sent its missionaries in all directions. In the same year, *i. e.*, 1866, Kheshab gave lectures on Christ, whom he declared as standing on a higher level than mankind, and whom he saluted as "the regenerator of his race." He did more than simply adopt Him: he claimed Him "It was in Asia," he said, "that Christianity first appeared and spread; it owed its birth to us Asiatics, for Jesus was an Asiatic. Oh! When I think of that, I feel His presence near my heart; and my love for Him becomes a hundred times greater; yes, He is the representative of the most noble thing in humanity, but there is in him I know not what greatness which Asia alone can give. Let them think of this, and perhaps their cogitation will diminish a little the sentiment of aversion and disdain with which European Christians regard Asiatics." We find in his words an admission, an acknowledgment of the divinity of Christ. In his new lectures delivered five months after in the Town Hall at Calcutta, he explained his thoughts which he impressed with a Carlylean meaning. "Every great man," he said, "is both human and divine." But he proceeded to recognise from his personal experience, how dangerous it is to confuse these two elements. During his lecturing tour in

Bombay and in the North-Western (now United) Provinces, he raised manifestations of enthusiasm, which were really embarrassing. At Monghyr, people threw themselves at his feet, touched his garments, and called him "lord, master, saviour, and the younger brother of Christ." "I feel that I am becoming God" he might have observed, while repeating the famous sentence, not with the ironical disenchantment, expressed in the last word, of scorn for himself and for others, but in the disorder of a troubled imagination and of conscience which had lost its traces in arrogance.

Meanwhile he struggled against the legend which enveloped him and threatened to choke him. He contradicted all pretensions to divinity through the medium of the papers, exactly like some people in France who disown their candidature for the Academy. After this, he went to England, where they did not deify him, but lionized him. He appeared at 70 religious or popular meetings and harangued 40,000 individuals. In a monster meeting, held in Hanover Square, representatives of eleven different sects met to bid him adieu and to listen to him for the last time.

Alas! They found a snob in the whilom prophet. In 1878, Keshab was dazzled by the idea of giving his daughter in marriage to an idolator—to wit, the son and heir of the Maharaja of Cooch-Bihar. The Brahmo Samaj cried loudly and long. The laws of the association prescribed, for its members, a certain ritual which had received legal sanction, and which excluded from it all pagan ceremonies. Keshab protested that his daughter's marriage would be celebrated in the desired form and conditions. It was one of those providential unions in which love plays the role of the missionary, and which gives provinces to (the service of) God. A telegram received two days before the ceremony informed him that the marriage must be solemnized in all the old Hindu forms or not at all, and Keshab succumbed. A great number of his dis-

ciples abandoned him. He was left alone, with his personal friends, in his deserted sanctuary, under the protection of the police. Then the 'master' took it into his head that idolatry had some good in it. "After all," he wrote in his organ, the 'Mirror of India' *: "What is idolatry? It is the idea of God decomposed into numerous little fragments. The gods are but the pieces of God. Every one of them is only the concrete realization of a divine attribute considered separately." It was thus that Keshab, for having desired the union of his daughter with a Rajah's son, was brought back to the henotheism of the Vedas and the cycle of five thousand years encompassed.

This lamentable history does not end here. Keshab having died in 1883, a new schism appeared ready to proclaim itself among the few inheritors of his wavering doctrine. Protap Chandra was elected minister, but it was not permitted to him to sit in the chair of Keshab. He tried to mount it several times, and on every such occasion he was made to descend. This lasted nearly as long as the quarrel between the canons and the law-clerk, immortalized by *le Lutrin*, and the denouement was not less comic, or—if you will—less sad. Protap Chandra at last received permission to occupy the chair, but not the cushion (the *gadi*) of the master. Thus perished this little church which had proposed to itself the task of enlightening the East and West.

What is actually the state of mind of the men who belong to the Brahma Samaj, or to other similar associations? The answer is that many of them are to-day for all practical purposes atheists, that is to say, they have reached a condition of perfect religious nihilism; others, in a greater number, have quietly returned to the ancient faith and have been reappropriated by subtle influences of idolatry which emanate from their surroundings and traditions. Perhaps, it is

*This is one of M. Filou's little slips. It should read the *Indian Mirror*, —Translator.

all a question of climate, who knows? Like the tropical Nature which transforms into large trees the shrubs and bushes of more temperate regions, India makes gods of those whom we call great men. The only difference is that we vote them a pedestal and India gives them an altar. About 12 years ago, there died a curious personage in a little village on the banks of the Hoogly, a few leagues from Calcutta. He passed all his life in that village. What did he do? Absolutely nothing. He meditated. People went to see him, talked with him, and little by little, they fell into an exquisite intellectual condition, which was made up of torpor and enthusiasm.

On returning from a visit to Ram Krishna, for that was the name of the solitary individual, one of the principal leaders of neo-Hinduism indited the following characteristic lines: "My mind is still floating in the luminous atmosphere which that wonderful man diffuses around him whenever and wherever he goes. My mind is not yet disenchanted of the mysterious and indefinable pathos which he pours into it whenever he meets me. What is there in common between him and me? I, a Europeanized, civilized, self-centred, semi-sceptical, so-called educated reasoner;—and he, a poor, illiterate, unpolished, half-idolatrour, friedless Hindu devotee? Why should I sit long hours to attend to him, I who have listened to Disraeli and Fawcett, Stanley and Max Muller, and a whole host of European scholars and divines? I who am an ardent disciple and follower of Christ, a friend and admirer of liberal-minded Christian missionaries and preachers, a devoted adherent and worker of the rationalistic Braluno-Samaj—why should I be spell-bound to hear him? And it is not I only, but dozens like me who do the same. He has been interviewed and examined by many, crowds pour in to visit and talk with him." Ram Krishna was too humble to become a teacher, but he let fall from his lips parables which dimly illuminated the problems of the human soul by comparisons with the phenomena of

the physical world. He had observed for a long time the practices current among Musalmans and respectfully inclined his head at the mention of the name of Jesus of Nazareth. It seems as if, for him, all religions gave out something which was the Religion: a supreme abdication of the human being in humility and in love.

Since his death, Ram Krishna has been looked upon as a new-incarnation of the Divine one. Every year the anniversary of his birth is celebrated, and in the sanctuary they have raised to him, a learned professor of chemistry presides over the ceremonies of the cult. Twenty young men who have received the blessings of a superior education have founded a kind of a convent near the spot where Ram Krishna passed his life. There they lead an ascetic existence, and twice a day they meet together to adore the photograph of the god, placed alongside of his wooden slippers on an altar, and smothered every morning with heaps of fresh flowers.

The worship of the wooden slippers of Ram Krishna! There, that is the end a century of Christian influence and Western culture have led to. After this, one could easily understand how the popular sects of the 15th and 16th centuries, which owed their birth to the generous conceptions of equality and soildarity, should gradually have happened to shut themselves up in a circle of grossly pagan practices. Their theology is of little import, and they all have one common trait: the worship of the *guru*. One who bears this name is a living idol, and this form of idolatry is the worst of all. A piece of wood or a bit of stone might be a symbol; a man, howsoever a saint he be, is after all a man, and the *guru* is very often quite the contrary of a saint. To top all, his divinity is hereditary save in certain cases in which adoption intervenes. He goes about over the country in order to show himself (give his *darshan* that is) to the faithful and in addition to collect the imposts (his tithes) which feed his revenue. Elephants, camels, and musicians form a cortege

rivalling in appearance the procession of a menagerie on the move. It must not be inferred that the orthodox look with contempt on such mountebank or empirical exhibitions. The Brahmans themselves approach the *guru* with respect and piously swallow the leavings of the *guru's* luncheon.

Nothing could be expected from these sects in the matter of the moral regeneration of India. The total number of their adherents does not to-day reach the figure of two million individuals. At the same time it should be mentioned here that numbers signify nothing. I must employ in this case the method so long applied to ancient civilizations, the exclusive study of the *elite*. The history of religious thought in India during the course of the 19th century, could only be the history of the Brahma Samaj, the Arya Samaj, and some other analogous societies, that is to say, the history of a few thousand intelligent personages. They have tried to reform Hinduism, and Hinduism has simply absorbed them.

IV.

In this way Brahmanism opened itself out before the Christian idea, effaced and likewise humiliated itself in order to give it passage, then slowly stood up again, and closed the door behind it, like the jungle behind a horseman. Everything else was its mode of action, its system of defence against social encroachments. There she has shown herself intractable and irreducible. Some few reforms, it is true, have taken place. First of all, the childish and unlucky reform of the dress, which has consisted in the adoption of the European clothing, with the exception of the hat and the cravat or shirt-collar; followed by the useless reform of house-furniture. A few cushions piled up in a corner were formerly the only pieces of furniture we might have seen in a Hindu house. We see now, here and there, chairs and sofas which have generally come from the shops in Tottenham Court Road. In a century the Hindus have nearly learned to sit. Lastly,

there is the important reform of food : the abandonment of vegetarianism, which, in many points, has identified itself with the religious belief of the people. This last reform is still very far from being universally accepted, and we know that the sight of the Mahomedan butchers' stalls,—a spectacle always disgusting but particularly offensive in India,—has provoked furious riots at Calcutta and elsewhere. The Hindus have resigned themselves to the drinking of water brought to their doors through iron pipes or aqueducts, instead of the water of the sacred streams. The ex-communication pronounced against those guilty of having crossed the seas has lost much of its force. The classes appear to mix a little in the official drawing-rooms, at tables d'hote, on board steam vessels, in railway carriages, and on school benches. But this fusion is only apparent. The ancient organisation has remained intact. The castes resist the action of the Western spirit as they did, three or four centuries ago, the efforts of the great preachers.

Does it portend good or does it portend ill? In a lecture delivered not long ago, Mrs. Annie Besant demonstrated the institution of castes as the best social system humanity had ever witnessed. Must it not be so that there should be a class which produces by its labour : that of workmen and peasants ; a class which distributes the products of such labour : that of merchants and tradesmen ; a class which governs, conserves and defends society : that of the kings, the magistrates, the soldiers and the marines ; and lastly, a class which thinks, and instructs and offers up prayers : that of the professors, the priests, the artists, and the men of science? With this natural division of the functions and forces, correspond the four castes of the Shudras, the Vaishyas, the Kshatriyas, and the Brahmins. Thus far there is nothing which differentiates the East from the West, nothing which distinguishes modern societies from the ancient ones. Where India rises superior to us, affirms Mrs. Besant,—and she is right in her

affirmation—is that she has never made social slavery as the base of her system, nor wealth as its crowning piece. The hierarchy of the castes is a moral hierarchy ; to pass from one caste to the other is to assume heavier and heavier duties, and higher and higher responsibilities. And by what means can one make this passage, bridge this distance between caste and caste ? Will it be, as in our European democracies, by the furious competition of the talents, the passions, and the interests, by the more or less fortuitous though legitimate accumulation of wealth in particular hands, or of knowledge in certain brains ? No, but by the mysterious promotion of souls through reincarnation on to the advancement list held by the Supreme Judge. They make their first appearance in the lowest class, raise themselves from one caste to the other, live in the intermediate stages for longer or shorter durations, according as they have more or less numerous faults to expiate and contaminations to purify of, at last to end in absolute and sublime renunciation. When the souls have thus terminated their earthly pilgrimage, then only are they considered ripe for heaven.

There ! that is a beautiful plan, if only the reality would come up to it. Mrs. Besant is obliged to confess that the system of castes has lost much of its original purity. If she will consult her friends in India on the historical origin of the castes she will discover that this "original purity" has never existed, that the castes are, essentially, a human institution, sprung from the needs, the ambitions, and the prejudices of society, in other words, from a combination of good and evil ; that it has owed its present existence to successive formations, down from the time when a theological conception decreed its sanctity and immutability.

Originally, there had been only two castes ; the white-skinned people, viz., the Aryan conquerors from the North, and the dark-skinned people, that is to say, the autochthonic tribes which inhabited India before the Aryan invasion. These Aryans were already divided

into a religious and a political race. They possessed a thousand hymns. The art of writing not being yet invented, they could only preserve these hymns by confiding them to the best endowed memories. This circumstance gave birth to a class of men similar to the rhapsodists of old Greece or the bards of Europe in the middle ages. From being useful they took good care to make themselves necessary and indispensable by complicating in a thousand different manners the chanting of the hymns, by attaching a tradition to the omission of each syllable, and fastening to it certain gestures which, with time, acquired the character of rites and sacrifices, the secret of which they retained with themselves. When the Sanskrit, which was the sacred language, became the exclusive depository of science, the Brahmins found themselves in the position of its keepers. Those who had made the conquest of India and who continued to extend their dominion day by day felt jealous of these psalm-singers ; and thus the rivalry of these two groups separated them from the rest of the nation, who became the third Aryan caste ; the word *Vaishyas*, which denotes the men of this caste, being derived from the word *Vish* signifying the entire people. Innumerable sub-castes have come to make this organisation infinitely more complicated. They are local or professional—clans or corporations.

Thus it will be seen that the system of castes is a composite machine. It has had for its successive factors—colour, function, and locality ; but once established it has not lent itself to any alteration. Men of the lowest class have exercised the highest functions. There have been *Shudra* kings and even *Shudra* gods. Some Brahmins have been reduced by poverty to become butchers, musicians, falconers, camel and elephant-keepers, workmen and labourers. Brahmin cooks may often be seen in rich *Shudra* households. Strange as it may appear to us, such a fact does not involve the forfeiture of his high caste. The Brahmin remains a Brahmin and the *Shudra* a *Shudra*. In the same way

the little castes guard their rank jealously, even when their professional occupation has gone through the strangest of vicissitudes, when from infamy or opprobrium this occupation has become dishonorable, or inversely. The caste defies the laws of evolution; it pretends not to feel the action of time, and in this world where every second brings its change, to remain ever what it has been at any given time in history. Mr. Bose observes that "caste obstructs both the rise and fall of India. It hinders progress, and it places obstacles in the way of a revolution." It may be so, but the experience of Western people in such matters entitles them to remark that a dead and blind conservatism is also a danger of revolution, and that once the dike is breached, the current precipitates itself with the greater fury the longer it is held in check.

As to the contempt of riches it is a sentiment greatly approved of by philosophers, but which economists could never share with them, because, after all, they see in wealth the product of labour and the creation of intelligence. They ask themselves if it is not extracting the best use out of the disposable forces to separate reason and virtue, and in heaping honours on those in a high sphere where they could do everything for the direction of society. Moreover, is it well according to reason and virtue that the Hindus address their homage? In the man of the superior caste they reverence in a unique manner the privilege of birth, which they believe to be divine. When a Brahmin seeks a husband for his daughter, he considers neither beauty, nor youth, nor the fortune of her future husband. He shows little concern for his prospective son-in-law's intelligence or his amiable qualities. Is he of the same caste? Does he belong to an equal or a superior clan? That is all the question. There exists in Bengal a curious class: they are the inheritors of a brevet of sanctity conferred on their ancestors by a king of the eleventh century, and they live by turning to account this hereditary sanctity from a matrimonial

point of view, in the same manner as a ruined gentleman amongst us makes use of his pedigree. Polygamy permits these traders to extend the circle of their operations, and to transform matrimonial speculation into a profession. While passing through villages they get married, pocket their premiums and depart in order to continue their circuit in the neighbouring towns. This is called *Kulinism*.

In a society which reposes on such principles, I do not see either any plan for merit, or chance for personal effort, for the organisation of the family is much more anti-individualist than that of the caste. A Hindu family extends, if I might say so, both ways, in length as well as in breadth, much farther than the limits we assign to our families. It is composed of all the *sapindas*, that is to say, of all those who receive a morsel of the *pinda*, or the funeral cake. As a matter of right, seven generations could claim their share of the family property and live under the same roof; and in fact four generations are often seen assembled under one roof. Certain families number, in this way, even as many as twenty-four members, and were it not for the growing exigencies of modern life, this system might develop and grow instead of being checked and restrained. It is socialism in miniature save the obligation to work. Each could draw on the common fund; no one is obliged to furnish thereto his quota, none called upon to 'earn his livelihood.' It is the paradise of 'poor parents' and of the lazy ones and the parasites.

All the burden of the accumulated injustices of the caste and of the family falls on the woman. Her destiny from the cradle to the tomb is so despairingly doleful, so horrible, so denuded of all joy and consolation that one hesitates to describe it, from fear of being accused of exaggeration. First of all the question is if they will permit her to be born. The intruder by coming into the world puts in danger the soul of her father. For only a male descendant could give him heaven. "If you give me only daughters and no sons,

I will marry again, and your junior will put you to the hardest tasks in the house," says a Hindu husband often to his young wife. In the family of the Brahmin, they have yet another motive for regarding with a kind of terror the arrival of an infant of the female sex. He must get his daughters married and married to Brahmins—at all price. The nuptial ceremony is a very costly affair. One cannot get out of it for less than a thousand francs. Only the fact of having three or four daughters is sufficient to work the ruin of the father. The above calculation, which like everything else in this study, I have borrowed from a native author, proves how great is the poverty, I could almost say the misery of the high class in India.

They, therefore, have recourse to all the means, human and divine, in order to preserve themselves from daughters. During pregnancy they call in a saintly man who knows the most efficacious prayers for changing the sex of the forthcoming child. If the saintly one's prayers have somehow miscarried, and the little mite of a girl persists in being born, then why! one could with a little pillule of opium, render her passage here below very short-lived. Or again one could fill her mouth with a handful of burning ashes, unless one prefers to throw her to the beasts in the jungle. The most tender among them strangle her in her baby sleep, the while they murmur a prayer to Bramha: "Lord! send her back to us under the form of a son!" When the English laws assimilated this fact to a crime, India was more surprised than if they had declared punishable thrifty housewives for having wrung the necks of chickens in their poultry yard. Has this kind of infanticide entirely disappeared then? One becomes incredulous when he finds that in India the number of females is inferior to men by about five millions.

Ordinarily, however, one resigns oneself to the inevitable. Friends have come and are awaiting the *accouchement* (delivery). If it is a boy, the father beaming over with happiness, brings the news; it is the signal for rejoicings without end. In the other

event, he coldly dismisses his guests by saying, "there's nothing, nothing at all, it is only a little girl."

The child is born, and she grows. Alas! if a little brother dies premature before her advent into the world, the misfortune is laid at her door, for in that case they will accuse her of having stolen his place, and all day long the members of the family will heap insults and injuries on her. But we will suppose that she is spared the infliction of this first woe. Then during the next few years she might grow in liberty, play at her ease, and go where she willed. At all events no teachers would torment her: they teach her nothing except a few prayers and the things of the household. But now she is five years old and her marriage must be thought of. The village barber throws himself into the affair with all his might. Sometimes a chance meeting on the road suffices to decide the great event. The union is got over in a hurry; she, a child of six or seven years—is married, and handed over to a stranger, probably an old man, of whom they know nothing except that he is of the desired caste and of the most convenient clan. She leaves for an unknown home at the other end of the country and would never see her kith and kin again. But let us put aside the exceptions and only consider the normal cases. We will imagine that the little girl is married to a small boy whose parents are perfectly known to her own. She now passes under the authority of a mother-in-law who thinks it her duty to "break" her. The child learns her new 'metier', which is that of the maid servant. She lives confined in the inner court, in the women's apartment. The time arrives when the marriage must be consummated. It is hastened, I know, by the Asiatic climate, but very often it is also hastened by the lust of the husband. When a man, who at times might become the grandfather of his wife, takes possession in this way of a little girl of ten, and makes her submit to his desire, by what name should such a marriage be called? Mr. Malabari was still very young when one night, in Surat, he heard the cries of

one of these victims. He still continues to hear them, and the recollection of it was one of the first causes of his apostleship.

Does English justice, it might be asked, not intervene in like circumstances? English justice retrenches itself willingly behind its hypocritical respect for indigenous institutions and for private life. But in this case it does more, it lends its strong arm to the outrage; it grafts Britannic coarseness on the Hindu immorality. There exists an ancient law which soils the statute as the law of the congress soiled our (French) codes. This shameful and brutal law will hardly dare to show itself in the full day-light of an English court of justice. The judge who will try to administer it, will be pursued to his door by the old women of his quarter armed with broom-sticks. In India it made a good exhibition of itself only ten years ago. It is this law which makes over to the man the possession of his living property, which condemns the woman to a cohabitation which is sometimes worse than a convict prison. It is called the "Restitution of conjugal rights." It is good to give the name of the law here, just as one gives the description of a malefactor.

In 1887, a young girl, who was noble, pure, intelligent, and admirably brought up, refused to give herself up to a miserable specimen of a man to whom she was affianced when only a suckling infant. She is called Rakhmabai. The first judge allowed her protest, but a second judgment, passed, on appeal, by more than one judge sitting on the bench, pronounced in favour of the restitution of conjugal rights. She refused to obey the order and was thrown into prison. In a letter addressed by the poor prisoner to the author of "*The Woman in India*", announcing the sad result of the proceedings, she says:—"There is no hope for the woman in India. They pretend that my unhappy trial will have the effect of ameliorating their condition. But I believe there will be no such result. The husbands, egged on by their implacable mothers, will not hesitate to claim their rights, now that they have the

certainty of winning their cause in the law-courts. Are we living under the English laws which boast so much of being just to all? Is it true that we have a lady as our sovereign?" The Queen-Empress did not heed the cries of the afflicted. It was the fell cholera which went to her succour by delivering her from a detested existence.

AS SEEN BY FRENCH EYES THROUGH INDIAN SPECTACLES.

All the husbands are not despicable, neither are the mothers-in-law all cruel; but what could not be altered is the position of the Hindu woman in the society and in the family. Fiancee or wife, after as well as before marriage, she does not know the sweetness of being loved. No romance of love, no conjugal idyl, no honeymoon for her: nothing beyond the legal union. The husband, in the open part of the house, attends to his affairs and receives his friends. The wife has no other society than that of other women, and no other occupation than the one of kitchen and household work. She rises respectfully when her husband or her father-in-law enters her room, no speech unless spoken to, no joining her lord at table, but to be well content with what he has left for her in his plate. When one is pleased with her, he gives her a few jewels and some dainties. Of intellectual life, there is none for her. The religion is too high; they forbid her to read the Vedas. Even as she has no civil status in this world, except by her husband's side, even so has she no chance of entering heaven unless he conducts her to it. In all things her life and her thoughts are but the prolongation, the shadow, and the reflection of another life and another's thoughts.

They are right in forbidding her the reading of the Vedas and the old Sanskrit books. She would see in them how the existence of the Hindu woman in olden times was different from what it is to-day, how more honorable, freer, and sweeter it was. The woman had then a character, a personality; she lived her own pro-

per life, thought, worked, loved, and was loved. In the heroines of the primitive legends, the grand virtue, then as now, was devotion to man; but it was devotion to the man chosen by herself, the devotion which ennobled an Inogene and a Griseldia. Probably the Aryan woman abused the liberty allowed her: whence the puritan reaction which followed and which, after the lapse of so many centuries, is still crushing her under its weight. The man has always and everywhere loosely denounced his companion: "It is through her that I have fallen!" The hatred for the woman appeared among the poets and the philosophers. Her heart is "more wicked than the heart of the viper"; she is the "sweet poison"; she is the "gate of hell"; she is as "impure as a lie". You must guard yourself and even guard her against herself. Manu, Vashishtha, Yajnyavalkya, all the moral legislators, who, to the eternal misfortune of India have confounded the religious with the civil law, the catechism with the code, think much more ill of her than did La Rochefoucauld or Stendhal. They tax their ingenuity to invent precautions against her wiles, ruses against her artifices. It is true that after having abominably traduced woman, Manu lays down: "Thou shalt revere thy mother like a god!" But this word signifies nothing in a country where there are thirty-millions of gods, who for the most part are squalid. A strange god, whose lot is to obey! for Manu expressly enjoins: The woman, when young, is governed by her father; married by her husband; old, by her sons. She should never be independent."

Howsoever painful a married woman's condition may be, her lot would appear enviable in comparison with that of the widow. Widowhood is not, as with us, a proof calling for one's sympathy; it is a forfeiture and a shame, for it is looked upon as the punishment for a crime perpetrated, in a former destiny (life), against conjugal fidelity, or even against the life of a husband. It is for this reason that they take away the widow's ornaments from her; they shave her head.

Henceforth she must pass her life in penitence, and live exclusively on "flowers, fruits, and corn." The human joys are no longer meant for her. She no longer exists, she is withdrawn from the number of the living.

Such a custom would appear very cruel even if it concerned only women arrived at the last stage of their life, whose earthly hopes are withered up and whose thoughts naturally turn towards the ultra-terrestrial horizon. But among these Hindu widows there are some very young; many of them are virgins; and some are mere children of less than five years. They must ever remain faithful to that dead whom they had scarcely, if ever, seen properly, and live forgotten. To marry herself a second time is forbidden. If the widow yielding to the suggestions of nature, permits herself to be seduced, and that her fault results in conception, she has no other resource but abortion or infanticide. Her family, in case of need, impose on her the frightful dilemma. Open enquires on this question have revealed heart-rending facts. They have shown to what degree of ferocity human beings, apparently civilized, could descend to save themselves from dishonour.

I have said above that widowhood was a kind of civil and religious death. By dint of drawing the quintessence of this idea and by refining it, the Pharisees of Hinduism brought themselves to think that the real and effective death of the condemned one would be a still more edifying application of their principle. A simple syllable changed in a passage of the Rig Veda altered its meaning in a very clear manner, and prescribed the suicide of the widow. In order to make up her mind for the sacrifice, they surrounded the ceremony with a sort of triumphal pomp; they persuaded the victim to the idea that the short moment of suffering assured her her redemption as well as that of her husband and of all her kith and kin. Many allowed themselves to attempt this canonization, this apotheosis of an hour. Others, poor souls! thought they saw across the flames, the husband

whom, in spite of all and even in spite of himself, they had loved. Those who failed in their conviction and courage, were stimulated and put to sleep, following the practice in such cases, by an intoxicating and stupefying beverage. The day having arrived, if the anguish was most severe and if the unhappy victim sought to make her escape, the circle of assistants barred her passage. Her brothers, her own children, and her near relatives pushed her towards the flames with phrases in their mouths which might very well have fitted into the text of a mad burlesque, had they not referred to an accomplished tragedy: "Thou wishest then to dishonour us? Thou dost not love us, thou didst not love our father, our brother, thee hast not heart! Come, come, it's only a little moment to pass. Remember that thou wilt save us even to the seventh generation." Is this kind of language quite new to us? Is it not thus, and in a manner still more cowardly and selfish that Admete speaks to his parents in the tragedy of Alcaste?

Whatever it might be before, the custom established itself and remained the exclusive privilege of the high castes. If the widows of a Sudra had aspired to such an honour, they would have at once replied that the funeral pyre was not made for low people, those who are born only once. In order to comprehend the extent to which fashion and snobbism are blended in this matter, I am obliged to accentuate the terms in their extreme significance, to immolate oneself alive on the funeral pyre of a husband was the last word of being *chic*.

The English found *satism* in full vogue. With the indifference "regular administrations" are very often capable of, they sanctioned this institution with some limitations. Nothing was more opposed to the spirit of English law, which likens the suicide to an assassin (*felo de se*), but then they had promised to respect Hindu customs. So they contented themselves by requiring of the *sati* a declaration, duly certified, to the effect that she would burn herself freely and

and with her full consent. I have before my eyes the statistics of such suicides by fire from 1814 to 1829; it is frightful. At last, Ram Mohan Roy unmasked the obstinate and murderous misreading which had cost so many human-beings their lives. Since this exposure the cruelty of the Brahmins had no longer any excuse. At last India got for her Viceroy the honest and liberal peer, Lord William Bentinck. The Parliament—very different then from what it is to-day had a movement of generous indignation which put to defeat the selfish policy of non-intervention, and the burning of widows was abolished. The Hindus submitted. Within the period of sixty-three years only a single instance of open revolt could be cited, and a few furtive infractions of which the latest took place some five or six years ago.

To prohibit the suicide of widows was the first step; to authorize the second marriage was the next. In order to come to it they followed in the footsteps of Ram Mohan Roy. They breached the religious prejudice by proving that the Vedas permitted and even encouraged the second marriage of a widow. They had no difficulty in bringing to light this decisive text: "Woman, rise from the corpse from which life is extinct, and take the hand of the man who desires to be your husband." Even Manu and Vashishtha, who, we have seen, are so severe on women, acknowledge the legitimacy of a second union for the widow whose marriage has not been consummated. These texts with all the moral and historical commentaries which were available, were collected and discussed in a book published in 1855 by a celebrated man of letters, Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar. Mr. Bose thus sums up in a word the character of this honest and virtuous man: "He made his fortune like an Englishman and spent it like a Hindu;" by which he means that he (Iswara) gave everything away for the relief of misery in all forms and for moral propaganda. Twenty-thousand copies of his book were sold in a few months. The Government, always timidly honest, and disposed to work on condition that the natives themselves took the

first initiative, passed, in the following year, a "Resolution in Council" which had the strength of law, and which authorised the remarriage of Brahmin widows.

I regret to say that custom proved more powerful than a legal institution in this case. During more than forty years it is hardly possible to name a hundred widows who have dared to turn to advantage the faculty conferred on them by the Act of 1856. At the same time I must mention that the movement to which the respected name of Vidyasagar was attached, was a necessary stage, and I should give him a place between the two reformers of Hindu Society—Ram Mohan Roy and Malabari. It was reserved for our contemporary to discover and to show that the injustice from which widows suffered was only an aspect, a detail, and a corollary of a much more grave and extended evil: infant marriages. To unite children in marriage is to encroach on the liberty of the grown-up man and the adult woman; it is equivalent to withdrawing from marriage, love and free choice, the things which consecrate, purify, and strengthen it. It is to condemn the whole and entire race to external childhood, by imposing or abandoning for the high mission of procreating the humanity of to-morrow, too weak, imperfect creatures, whose intellectual and physical growth is not achieved. Mr. Malabari exposed this to the Viceroy, at His Excellency's Simla residence on a particular morning in the spring of 1884. Lord Ripon, who was at first cold and reserved, allowed himself to thaw little by little. "But," he said, smiling, "you wish to lead me into a road in which the path will be crossed by devouring lions." Malabari humbly replied, "My lord, I will march in front of you, and whilst they eat me, you could beat a retreat or pass beyond." He kept his word.

He went all over India, gave lectures, met with a terrible opposition in certain refractory, retrograde milieus (surroundings), but warmed, in favour of the reform all generous hearts and intelligent spirits. On

the other side, the Government opened an enquiry, and took counsel of its agents. Faithful to the old policy of routine and prudence, which was already transmitted from generation to generation for five or six generations of Anglo-Indians, the officials responded, almost unanimously advising Government to keep aloof from interfering in domestic legislation.

Malabari understood that it was in London that he would gain his cause. He therefore left India and passed the spring of 1890 in the metropolis. From this voyage and this sojourn he brought back to India his book, now famous, *The Indian Eye on English Life*, one of the most personal and suggestive volumes which have ever been written.

In reading it, no one could doubt that this dreamer, lost in the crowd, this reveller in sensations so delicate and with a judgment so fine, who has the leisure to see and meditate about everything, employs every hour and every minute of his time to plead before one race the cause of another race. Then there is, besides, the fact that he found time to draw up his eloquent *appeal to the daughters of India*; that he united into a powerful league the charitable and distinguished ladies, with the men who stood at the top of politics, literature, and art; that he obtained at the same time the patronage of the Archbishop of Canterbury, of Cardinal Manning, and of the chief Rabbi, and that he at last converted to his view Gladstone and Herbert Spencer. He triumphed over the scruples of the statesman, and the objections of the philosopher, by proving to the one that the honour of the liberal party was concerned in the enterprize, and to the other that in the matter of matrimonial legislation, true individualism consisted in assuring the liberty of the contracting parties. Soon after the return of Malabari to Bombay, the bill designated the *Age of Consent Act* carried from ten to twelve years the minimum limit of the effective marriage of women.

It is little, certainly, but it is something. How many years will pass before a new step is taken, or

before fresh progress is accomplished? No one could tell, but, in the meantime the road is clear, and it will be enough simply to march forward. Otherwise, the beautiful speeches in the Congress would become vain, and vain also the efforts of India in assimilating European science. Even if she succeeds in getting rid of the economic peril which holds bankruptcy suspended over her head; in removing all the flails of famine, plague and misery; and in weakening the spirit of caste which paralyses her progress, she will still be not saved. It would be well for her to evolve out of the chaos of her beliefs a monotheistic religion impregnated with the Christian thought. Her regeneration will be assured only when she borrows from Christianity one of its noblest and most fecund conceptions, the equality of man and woman, with a shade of respect and tenderness for her, who being the weakest, has yet the most difficult task to perform.

If I had before me one of the young graduates of Bombay or Calcutta, who carry in them the future and the thought of their race, I will ask him what he feels when, after, being penetrated with what has been said and written by our great men on the august role of the wife and the mother, he enters his house whose very construction reveals the moral divorce of sexes; when seeking his wife, he perceives a little servant of fourteen years who spreads stable litter in the courtyard to get rid of evil spirits; when, seeking his mother, he finds a female eating the remains of her master's dinner, or who squats on a cushion enjoying the repose of the brute by inhaling the fumes of her hooka or by chewing her betel-leaves. He will be obliged to confess to me how difficult it is for him to love the one and venerate the other of these two creatures who are fit only to receive orders or caresses, but who would never understand a word of what passes in his brain or in his soul.

And I will tell him :

Oh my friend ! you who have learned so much and who know so little, the fall of those women explains

yours ; their servitude justifies thy servitude. However harshly selfish and awkwardly destructive might be the policy of your masters, in its appearance of moderation and justice, they will continue to govern you all the same ; they will have the right and, up to a certain point, the mission to do so, so long as among you the constitutive element of society, the family, shall be tainted by an abominable iniquity, so long as she who ought to share with you the cares, the joys, the responsibilities, the education of your children, and the burden of life generally, shares only your couch and nothing more. Remember, that the union of the master and the slave will never give birth to free men. Your law-giver, Manu observed one day : " Where the woman is not honoured, there the family perishes." Certainly the sage contradicts himself, but after all what else is more human ? It is the only way, we know, of being occasionally right. That day, he was really inspired. Yes, the family perishes where the woman is not respected. When the woman receives that which is her due, she raises herself, and with her the society, the manners, the laws, the public life, and the moral ideal. Then listen to Manu, or, better still, to the voice of your heart and your reason.