

CAN THE HINDUS RULE INDIA ?



Corpes, many those of women and children, being removed after the massacre of Mohammedans by Hindus at Cawnpore, on 24th March, 1931. Twenty lorry loads were counted by someone, and in addition, many were burned alive with their houses, or after killing them the houses were set on fire, and the bodies reduced to ashes.

(From an original photograph, by permission of "The Daily Mail" Blue Book on The Indian Crisis).

CAN THE HINDUS RULE INDIA ?

By

JAMES JOHNSTON, M.A.,

Indian Civil Service (Retired)

Formerly Exhibitionist of Merton College, Oxford.

Author of "The Political Future of India."

LONDON

- P. S. KING & SON, LTD.

ORCHARD HOUSE, WESTMINSTER

1935

**PRINTED BY
F. J. ASHELFORD,
ST. HELIER,
JERSEY.**

P R E F A C E .

If the preface to this book appears to consist largely of quotations, there is a reason for it. The great object of most of our political leaders is to make out that the only method of retaining India, as at least nominally a part of the Empire, is to give up all attempt to rule it, and let the Indians rule themselves in their own way. I show further on what that is, and some of the objections to it. One fundamental objection to the proposal is that we took India from one set of people, and the leaders of all political parties are now attempting to make it over to another. This is not restoring it to the original owners, but trying to pass it on to others who have far less right to it than ourselves. While I was engaged in writing the book I fell ill, and was obliged to enter a Nursing Home. The facts of the case, and the popular misconceptions regarding them, can best be illustrated by an anecdote of what happened to me while I was there. I also give other illustrations showing that what is represented as the considered opinion of our political leaders on the subject is shared by hardly anybody else. It is not that of the late Mr. E. S. Montagu, the originator of the scheme, of some of the ablest of their followers, whether classified as Conservative or Labour Party for electoral purposes, of the Rulers of the Indian States, or of the representatives of the people of British India. These two latter classes it is proposed to jumble together in a manner reminiscent of "Alice in Wonderland," and thereby to give a practical demonstration of the adage that "truth is stranger than fiction."

To return for the moment to the Nursing Home. One day, when I was convalescent, I was sitting doing nothing in particular, and my nurse, who is English, and might be presumed to know something about English politics, asked me what I was thinking about. I replied that I was thinking of a title for the book, and that the one that suggested itself—I have since modified it—was: "Shall the Hindus Rule India?" Then a dialogue took place somewhat as follows:—

Nurse: "Why should they not? It is their country!"

Myself: "No, it is not; the Mohammedans form about a quarter of the population, and ruled a great part of India, and at one time almost the whole of it, for seven hundred years before we supplanted them; the Untouchables, whom

the Hindus treat in a way that we would be ashamed to treat cattle, form nearly another quarter; and even among the Hindus themselves, it is not as among us and the Mohammedans, that one man is as good as another, but a Brahman is a god, while a low-caste man is little better than an animal. I once had a Brahman Court Sub-Inspector who used to refer to the masses as 'those low-class people.' "

Almost the whole British people are under the same delusion as the Nurse, and have been persuaded that we are conferring liberty, when we are handing over power to what has been described by one writer as "a minute fraction of high-caste Hindu reactionaries," and by another as "men of the most intolerant race on earth." One of the Hindu leaders recently said to the latter of the writers quoted, a Mohammedan: "When the English have gone, we will settle with you."

Will they? It is much more likely that the Mohammedans will settle with them. There is a continuous group of Mohammedan States, or of States the population of which is mainly Mohammedan, extending from the North-west frontier of India, in one direction to the Bosphorus and beyond, in another to the borders of Uganda, in a third to Nigeria, and in a fourth well into Central Asia. The total Mohammedan population of the world was stated in 1925 to be 234,814,989, of whom 105,723,000 were under British rule or protection. Both the Indian Nationalists and the British Government appear to expect them to look calmly on while the settling proceeds. Of this they have been given a foretaste in the massacre of Mohammedans by Hindus at Cawnpore on 24th March, 1931, in which at the lowest estimate two thousand people were killed and injured, though some put the figure as high as seven thousand. This is a description of it by a British officer:—

"The Hindus, who were in the majority, attacked the Mohammedans because they refused to close their shops when a hartal had been proclaimed to protest against the execution of murderers. Moslem women and children had their throats cut, some of the women were found hanging to the rafters of buildings by their hair, while fires had been lighted underneath them. . . . In one bazaar every Mohammedan was killed and the women and children burned alive."

A hartal, it should be explained, is a day of public mourning, when all shops are shut, all activities are suspended, and all business is at a standstill.

A hartal was proclaimed by the Congress party, who are almost all Hindus, on the day that His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales, arrived in Patna, and all the shopkeepers were compelled to close their shops, whether they wanted to do so or not. The people who thus openly

proclaim their disloyalty, forcibly impose their views on others, and when the others refuse to accept them, commit atrocities such as those described. These are the people into whose hands power is proposed to be transferred, and who are to be entrusted with the maintenance of order and the administration of justice!

Long before any of the occurrences took place, the following views on Hinduism and Hindus was expressed by an intelligent and unprejudiced Frenchman, M. André Chevrillon, who appears to have visited India shortly before the time of the Fashoda incident, when the relations between this country and France were none too friendly. A translation of his book was published by William Heinemann in 1897 under the title "Romantic India." He is writing of Benares, the chief centre of Hinduism, and now the seat of the Hindu University, and this is how he expresses himself:—

"All our mental habits are set at naught. Imagine yourself to have landed in a country where the inhabitants walk on their heads. This race thinks and feels and lives in a fashion contrary to our own; and one's first idea on arriving in Benares is that insanity is normal here.

* * * * *

"As far back as the Upanishads appears the same faith in the power of articulate speech, the same imperative and innumerable prescriptions, the same singular formulas, the same enumeration of grotesque gestures. Every day, for more than twenty-five hundred years, since Buddhism was a protest against the tyranny and absurdity of rites, has this race mechanically passed through this machinery, resulting in what mental malformations, what habitual attitudes of mind and will, the race is now too different from ourselves for us to be able to conceive. A negro, a Tierra del Fuegan savage, resembles us more than do these people. The negro is more simple than we, nearer to the life of the animals; but, if we divest ourselves of the unstable acquirements of our civilisation, we discover, concealed, yet alive, in the depths of our souls nearly all of his instincts. On the contrary, the Hindu soul is as completely developed as our own; its vegetation is no less rich, but he is entirely different. It is stupefying to see the crowd of ideas, according to us incoherent and absurd, that form the substance of their minds. Each man belongs to a caste, in which, like his ancestors, he is inexorably shut up. At bottom, the idea of caste is as the idea of species among animals. The distinction between a dog and a bull is of the same nature as that between a Sudra and a Brahman. Hence the horror attaching to the idea of marriage between the persons of different castes. Notice that to-day the castes are as numerous as the trades and

professions. Each Hindu is born a priest or a doctor, a scribe or a potter, a blacksmith or an engraver; and he believes himself lost if a man of lower caste touches his food or eats at his side.

* * * * *

"If we look at certain general customs, they manifest no less clearly the strangeness, the contradictions, in the habitual sentiments of this people. Here on every side, in the streets, are birds living unmolested in the midst of the human crowd; here are blue peacocks, that wander through the city at will. Observe the hospitals for sick animals, where are tenderly cared for all sorts of living creatures, dogs, gazelles, eagles. Is it not a sign of the gentle character, the radical goodness of these Hindus? But in 1857 they outbid in cruelty the aborigines of America; and though public human sacrifices have disappeared under the English rule, there is sometimes seen a child's dead body upon an altar of the hideous Kali. Love is unknown in India. Children are married to each other when they reach maturity. After that time, the woman is immured.

* * * * *

"As a widow she becomes a pariah, an object of evil omen, whom all avoid with disgust. The married man is not held to fidelity, or even the merest external decency. Those offences against morality that we surround with so much reserve and secrecy are here paraded in the open day, no religious law requires their concealment. More than this, there is a recognised caste of prostitutes; their trade is a sacred duty; and in the south of India every temple has its troop of bayaderes. A sect of Saktists, worshippers of 'the energy of Siva,' 'the force that develops the world,' on their feast-days are even released from all distinctions of castes and ties of relationship. Men and women assume a mystic character; they are no longer individuals, but direct incarnations of Siva and Kali. 'All men are myself,' says the god to the goddess. After drinking wine and intoxicating liquors, eating fish and meat and rice, the union of Kali and Siva is celebrated with inconceivable orgies, and the worshippers feel the limits of personality disappear; they become absorbed in Siva, identified with 'the soul of the world.'

* * * * *

"It is true this is only a sect amongst the Hindus; but the point to be noted is that these ideas, which to us appear inconceivable and incredible, dwell familiarly in their minds; that the Hindu does not possess those fundamental sentiments and ideas which, with us, would oppose to notions like these an insurmountable barrier and throw them outside the regular action of the mind; that, moreover, certain kindred notions enter into

the daily cult of them all; in short, that, between the Saktist and the ordinary Hindu, the difference is one of degree and not of kind, and that in all the race there exist those germs of mental and moral maladies which, in certain sects, are seen in chronic form and of intentional development."

A few more quotations and I have done. I heard of the incident from a Secretary to the Government of India, who was an official member of the Legislative Assembly, and was present when it occurred. One of Mr. Gandhi's lieutenants had been making the usual type of speech of his class about what they would do when they got Swaraj. When he finished, a stalwart Mohammedan from the Punjab or the North-West Frontier Province, who had been to the War and obtained the rank of Colonel, got up, and instead of addressing the presiding officer, turned to the last speaker and said:—

"And when you get your Swaraj, do you think that we will obey a little spindle-shanked creature like you?"

A somewhat similar conclusion has been reached by a leader of the Labour Party, better known under his former designation of Commander Kenworthy, who has approached the question from a totally different angle, as will appear from the following newspaper paragraph:—

"Lord Strabolgi, speaking at Hull last night, said that he was glad that it was repeated at the Southport conference, and accepted by all the delegates, that the Labour Party were in no way bound to the proposed reforms in India and would judge the final Bill on its merits.

"The White Paper reforms looked well on paper, but they had the fatal defect of satisfying no considerable body of opinion among Indians themselves. Unless the White Paper was radically altered, it would bring chaos instead of peace in our great Indian Empire."

The policy popularly known as that of out-Heroding Herod, is not generally supposed to indicate great practical wisdom, yet that is the one to which most of our political leaders have committed themselves, and appear determined to commit the nation, unless they can be held back by their followers refusing to follow them. Until the Report of the Joint Select Committee cleared the atmosphere in one direction, however much of a fog it may have created in others, it was contended that we had given pledges to India, by which is meant the Indian politicians, and these we are bound to honour. Now that it transpires that this is not the case, and that our hands are perfectly free, the argument will no doubt be altered into one to the effect that

the late Mr. E. S. Montagu having raised hopes in the breasts of certain Indians, the sky will fall, or something equally terrible will happen, if we disappoint those hopes. Let us see what Mr. Montagu himself has said on the subject. When this work was almost set up in type, the following passage in his book, "An Indian Diary," attracted my attention:—

"Until they have learned the customs, traditions, and uses inseparable from representative institutions, the transfer to them of powers of law and order will lead to anarchy, revolution, bloodshed, and starvation, which has resulted in Soviet Russia."

A retired member of the Indian Civil Service, who calls attention to this, remarks as follows:

"Nowhere in the context is there any indication that he would have regarded statutory "Safeguards" as a satisfactory substitute for that 'body of understanding and habits' which, in quoting Lord Bryce, the Report of the Joint Select Committee admits, has not yet begun to develop in India."

For the benefit of those whom it is being attempted to stampede into acquiescence in the policy of retirement from India, I give particulars of an instance which shows the real, as distinguished from the professional attitude of the Hindu politician. I travelled home on the same ship as one of them in 1919. He came from Western India, while all my service has been spent in Eastern, but he was sufficiently prominent to be known to me by name and reputation. I was not acquainted with him personally, but I had a friend who was. This friend one day told me that the Hindu politician had remarked to him that the British had their good points, that the Indians did not really wish to get rid of them, but it was sometimes sound tactics to ask for a good deal more than one expected to get. He gave as an illustration the case of a juggler at a fair, who loudly proclaims that he will not give a performance for less than a rupee, but goes away quite pleased if he is given eight annas. This being the mental attitude of the leaders, to endeavour to satisfy what are described as Indian aspirations, is about as hopeful a task as to attempt to fill a sieve by pouring water into it. If only this fact were more generally recognised, it would be apparent that there is no object to be served by carrying political experiments too far. However much we give them, they will always cry for more, and profess to be dissatisfied with what they have got, whatever may be their secret feelings on the subject.

If what I have written above is in any way a correction of the speech of Mr. Baldwin at the recent meeting of the Council of the Conservative Party, in which he not merely attempted to stampede the Party into accepting the report of the Joint Select Committee, but appears to have succeeded to a great extent in doing so, it is not due to design, but is either a coincidence, or the work of some higher power, which has made me its instrument. The passage was written and taken to be typed before I knew that Mr. Baldwin had spoken at all, what he said, or what was the effect of his speech. As a matter of fact, I did not expect that he would speak in the way he did, if at all, as I interpreted more literally than was justified by the event his promise to consult the Party. As usual, he made a personal question of the matter, as will appear from the following extract from the newspaper report of his speech: "I should like to say here as leader of the Conservative Party, and with a full sense of responsibility, I accept the Report on the basis for legislation, and I recommend the Council to accept it also."

This catchword about the "full sense of responsibility," which I have shown in the body of the book to be only an empty phrase, may prove to be the ruin of about a fifth of the human race. The author of a newspaper article once summed Mr. Baldwin up very neatly. The fox, he wrote, has many tricks, all of which it tries in turn, but in the end it is usually overtaken and killed. The cat has only one, but it never fails. It runs up a tree. Similarly Mr. Baldwin has only one, which always works. He makes a personal appeal. He has lived up to his reputation, made a personal appeal, and stampeded his audience into agreement by telling them that "they had a good chance of keeping the whole of the sub-continent of India in the Empire for ever, but he said deliberately that if they refused her this opportunity they would infallibly lose India whatever they did, before two generations had passed."

This a variant of his old theme about the danger of missing the bus, in regard to which another Member of Parliament, not under the influence of his spell, or of his party discipline, has remarked that it is better to miss the bus than take the wrong one. Somewhat similar criticism might have been made of the argument in its present form, if the opponents of the measure had chosen to be as dogmatic and unguarded in their language as Mr. Baldwin has been. If the scheme goes through, whether India remains nominally a part of the Empire, falls into anarchy, or succumbs to foreign invasion, the connection will cease

to be of any value either to the people of India or ourselves, while most of the liabilities will remain, till we lose it *de jure* as well as *de facto*.

Mr. Baldwin's contempt for the opinions of his followers is as marked as his deference to those of Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, or of whoever for the moment happens to represent the United States of America. He appears, however, to have failed to see the application of a remark of President Lincoln about the extent to which the people will bear to be misled. Of course it never crosses his mind that he may possibly be doing so; like his chief, and another well-known statesman, who has recently turned to literature, he is infallible. His infallibility has been tried and found wanting more than once. His previous mistakes have cost the nation dear, but their worst consequences have been remedied, at a price. In the present instance, however, he is determined that there shall be no possibility of remedy, and has adopted as his motto, the Latin phrase, "*nulla vestigia retrorsum*," which may be freely translated in the idiom favoured by him, "no return bus."

One newspaper which usually supports him, comments on his recent performance as follows, under the heading of "Giving Counsel":—

"The purpose of the meeting was for Mr. Baldwin to 'take counsel' with his followers. 'Take counsel' was Mr. Baldwin's own phrase. The role he adopted to-day, however, was that of a giver of counsel, and he gave it with all the force at his command. His counsel to the Conference was to support the India policy of the Select Committee."

It then proceeds under the heading "Marching Orders":—

"There was a lot of whipping-up in the House of Commons for to-day's conference. The Conservative Whips took the job in hand. Each Whip has a certain number of members under his charge. Members are supposed to obey the Whips. The Whips see that their members attend the House and take part in divisions. Now they have been telling them to attend the Queen's Hall and vote there for the White Paper policy. Four hundred Conservative M.P.s could be drafted to the Queen's Hall and still leave the Government a majority in the House."

The comment of another newspaper appears worthy of preservation. It is as follows:—

"Mr. Baldwin quoted Sir John Simon's words (in reference to the declaration of the Maharaja of Bikaner

in 1931): 'I attach so much importance to the association of the Indian States in the future constitutional government of India that I do not think we should reject this opportunity.' And Mr. Baldwin, on his own behalf, dwelt on the 'great responsibility' of rejecting such a prospect. Then we had Lord Derby, whose words, were it possible to doubt Mr. Baldwin, must have confirmed the mind of the meeting: 'He considered (said Lord Derby) that the fact of the Princes coming in was a source of strength.' And finally we had that Bayard of debate, Sir Austen Chamberlain, to assure the meeting that 'the lonely white man' would find 'by the presence of representatives of the Princes and the native States, new support for all those things for which he specially stands as representative of the King-Emperor and the Empire.'

What, then, these Conservative leaders said in effect was this: "British authority is to be withdrawn from India, but India will be quite safe because the courage and the loyalty of the Princes will be put in its place. Such was the representation upon which these trustful Conservatives were induced to sink their fears and put their faith in this experiment. But, as we have seen, these pretences are unfounded in fact. The Government so far have failed to reconcile the Chamber of Princes to the scheme, or to satisfy its conditions. There is, moreover, another and extraordinary feature of this affair to be concerned. His Highness the Chancellor's letter was written on the 7th April, and Major Courtauld testifies that a copy was sent to the Viceroy and he himself sent a copy to Mr. Baldwin. How is it then, that our trusted leader, with this information in his pocket, gave the meeting, and allowed his colleagues to give the meeting, a contrary impression? Had anyone but Mr. Baldwin acted in this way, we should have almost been driven to suspect his good faith. But of Mr. Baldwin any such thought is unthinkable. He must have forgotten all about the letter, or perhaps he neglected even to read it."

To the information supplied by the newspapers, I am able to add a little of my own. The rushing tactics on the part of Mr. Baldwin, that for the moment appear to have succeeded, were about to be attempted by him in June, 1933, but knowing that the Joint Select Committee was mainly composed of supporters of the scheme, and that the decision of the majority was a foregone conclusion, at the last moment he changed his tactics, and chose a policy of "wait and see," which has enabled him to use the Joint Select Committee as a stalking horse under cover

of which to make the final rush. I know a few members of Parliament, and asked one of them, a Conservative, if he had been present at the meeting. He replied in the negative, saying that the delegates who agreed in advance to support the White Paper, or in other words, to vote blindly, without hearing the arguments on either side, had their expenses paid from the party funds, while those who would not agree to do so were left to pay their own. He was not prepared to support the scheme, but did not care to spend his own money in going to the meeting to oppose it, so he stayed away. Such are the methods by which what is called democracy is worked in England, and is being imposed in India.

The above quotations deal with most of the protagonists of the White Paper scheme, but there is one important omission which I am now in a position to supply. In an issue of a later date of the newspaper last quoted, I find the following in a letter from Lord Banbury of Southam in regard to the Irish Settlement, according to authors, another triumph of British statesmanship:—

“I was in the House of Commons sitting next to Sir Samuel Hoare when Mr. Lloyd George moved the Treaty. He concluded his speech as follows: ‘By this Treaty we win to our side a nation of deep, abiding, and even passionate loyalty; in future, our successes will be her joy and our misfortunes her sorrow.’

“I turned to Sir Samuel Hoare and said: ‘What infernal nonsense,’ He replied: ‘Not at all—he is quite right.’”

It will be noticed that all the political leaders quoted are Commoners. Let us hope that they may long remain so, and that none of them may be tempted to accept a Peerage, and so cease to give a practical illustration of the lines of the poet:—

“Kind hearts are more than coronets,
And simple faith than Norman blood.”

The faith that has survived the numerous shocks which Mr. De Valera has given, and is giving, to the optimism above described, must be simple indeed, but the simplicity does not end there. A leading Congress politician, Mr. V. J. Patel, recommends the Indians to take Mr. De Valera as their model, follow in his footsteps, destroy the Constitution from within, and so attain independence. With this example and this warning before our eyes, it is proposed to give them every facility for following the course indicated.

The Indian politicians have very receptive minds, and

are very good imitators. If they have not mastered it already, they will in a short time have very little to learn in regard to political methods from Mr. Baldwin, or Mr. De Valera, or whoever is at the present moment the "boss" of Tammany Hall. The question is, when they have done so, will they use the knowledge for the benefit of the people, or for ours, or for their own?

The future not only of India, but of Britain, is being staked by our optimistic Government, not even on an off chance, but on a combination of two off chances. One is that the little spindle-shanked creature, and others like him, will be able to secure and enforce obedience. The other is that in the event of their being able to do so, their hatred of ourselves and of the Mohammedans will turn into love. Should either of these chances not come off, a considerable proportion of 352,000,000 people will perish miserably, some in battle and the epidemic diseases that follow in its train, some in the collapse of the social order that will ensue on even the partial break-down of the administration, and probably still more of hunger and neglect.

JAMES JOHNSTON.

Cannon Tower,
Guest House.
Peirson Road.

March, 1935.

CAN THE HINDUS RULE INDIA ?

The inevitable result, if not the declared object of the Government proposals contained in the White Paper, will be the establishment of Hinduism as the dominant force in India as a whole, if not in each of the Provinces into which it is divided, the number of which it is proposed to increase. My object is to show what Hinduism is, how the Hindus treat each other and the "Untouchables," the radical differences and age-long hostility between Hindus and Mohammedans, the attitude of the now triumphant Hindu leaders towards the Mohammedans and towards us, and what is almost certain to happen if the present policy is persisted in.

The Hindus, who have hundreds, if not thousands of gods in the other world, have also various incarnations in this, of which the highest is a Brahman, and the next highest a cow. The cow is so sacred that the Ruler of a certain Indian State, who is of comparatively low caste by birth, becomes, at least for the time being "twice-born" in a golden bath filled with the products of the cow, and is able to lift up his head among his Brahman subjects, but has to revert to his position of inferiority for one day in the year. He is the only Hindu of whom I have ever heard who is allowed to rise in the social scale, even temporarily. For the benefit of those ignorant of India, these products are defined as "milk and butter and the solid and liquid excrement of the cow." Each Indian who crosses the sea becomes polluted, and nothing can efface this pollution but the supreme purification, which consists of giving large sums of money to the Brahmans, and swallowing a paste made of these four products. I wonder if our rulers are aware of this, and if so, whether they would have called so many Round Table Conferences.

From the Brahmans there is a descending scale of castes to the number of 2,300, and below these are the "Untouchables," the descendants of the original inhabitants, whose treatment by the caste Hindus may be judged from the following extract from an article in the "Sunday Express" of May 13th:—

"In a village near Nagpur, in India, last week, a girl of high caste fell into a well. Her shouts attracted the attention of two youths. They rushed to her rescue, but other villagers prevented the boys from entering the well and rescuing the girl. They were 'Untouchables.' Had they touched the water of the well they would have polluted it and made it undrinkable. So the girl was left to drown. That sort of thing happens every day of the year in India. The caste system, more primitive and intolerant than

anything we have ever had in the west, is the greatest force in India."

Such are the people whom our rulers think that they can weld into one, by making over India to Hindu rule, and in their enthusiasm for the principle of uniform distribution of voting power, propose to make over the "Untouchables" to the tender mercies of the caste Hindus, who regard not merely their touch, but the very sight of them as pollution. But while the Government apply this principle against the "Untouchables," in another respect they have departed from it to an extent which must have excited the derision of the rest of the world. The Rulers of the Indian States, several of whom are not of the same race and religion as the great mass of their subjects, others of whom have to be deposed every few years, for anything from instigating murder to gross and continued mis-government, are to be brought in as legislators, and are to be given votes, not even in proportion to the number of their subjects, but as compared with British India, a great many more than they could claim on this basis. While in British India it will probably require tens of thousands of votes to elect one representative to the Central Chambers, a Ruler will be allowed to nominate anything from one to twenty, according to the size of his State, and these will be not merely his delegates, but his creatures. In other words, the pocket-borough system is being revived in a vastly aggravated form, and the authors of this scheme, or at least the sponsors of it, are not the supposed reactionary Conservatives, but the supposed democratic Labour and Liberal Parties.

The carvings in many of the Hindu temples are so obscene that it has been necessary to insert a clause in the Indian Penal Code, exempting from liability to prosecution for obscenity anything in connection with religion. I have seen a temple which had thousands of statues and carvings, all horribly obscene, and hardly one of these depicted natural sex relations, but nearly all some form of unnatural vice. If I could add a photograph of this temple, or of many others, there would be no further need to discuss the White Paper proposals, but the British law regarding obscenity prevents me from using the best means of enlightening Parliament and the public as to what it is being attempted to do. I have however, introduced into the book, in its proper context, a few descriptions of Hindu temples, including one in which, when a few rupees had been given to the priests by a French traveller, two temple prostitutes were brought out for what they erroneously supposed would be his delectation. This institution of temple prostitutes we have not been able to

abolish, and every time that the question is raised, there is an outcry by the orthodox Hindus that we are interfering with their religion.

The Caste Hindus are not by any means the only people in India, though their leaders talk as if they were. The estimated numbers are: that of Caste Hindus 170,000,000, that of "Untouchables" 75,000,000, that of Mohammedans 80,000,000, and that of Christians 6,000,000. We being a fairly homogeneous people, have become accustomed to submitting to the decision of the votes of the majority, but this is only because fighting capacity is fairly evenly distributed. In India this is not so. Most of the Madras Presidency and all Orissa may for practical purposes be eliminated. We have ceased to recruit soldiers from Madras, and never recruited from Orissa. The population of the Madras Presidency is nearly 47,000,000, that of Orissa about 5,000,000 and that of Bengal about 50,000,000, about equally divided between Hindus and Mohammedans. The Bengali Hindus as a rule are not of the fighting class, while the Mohammedans are instinctively born fighters. Their religion teaches that those who die fighting the infidel go straight to Paradise. Some of the professional fighters called lathials, who are hired by the parties who are sufficiently rich, in almost every quarrel of importance, once attacked the Superintendent of Police and myself, when we had occasion to protect the high caste Hindus against a low caste of Hindus, who had called in the Mohammedans as allies, and had we not had firearms, and other Mohammedans from Oudh to support us, we might have come to an untimely end. Within a few months of the passing of the danger, some of the high caste Hindus were planning to shoot me.

If we eliminate the Madrasi Hindus, who comprise about 93 per cent. of the population of the Presidency, which would reduce the total to about 43,500,000, add 4,500,000 for Orissa, and 25,000,000 for Bengal, this gives 73,000,000 to be deducted from the caste Hindus, so far as serious fighting strength is concerned. I have included the Mahrattas and the Rajputs among the fighting classes of Hindus, and treated the Sikhs as Hindus for the purpose of estimating the relative strength because though they are not properly Hindus, they are just as antagonistic to the Mohammedans as the Hindus are.

Nor is this all. Hyderabad is a State governed by a Mohammedan Ruler, with a population about 89 per cent. Hindu. The total population is about 14,500,000, which gives about 13,000,000 Hindus. Assuming 3,000,000 of these to be "Untouchables," this would leave another 10,000,000 to be deducted from the fighting strength of the caste Hindus, or 83,000,000 in all, which would bring

the number of caste Hindus of whom serious account would have to be taken down to very nearly the same figures as that of the Mohammedans. The Nizam has a very fine army, which in 1905 stood at 30,000 men, and any number of irregulars. It is probably much stronger now, as the Rulers of the Indian States, who have armies, are reported to be strengthening them, in view of the expected anarchy when the Reforms take effect, and the Nizam being the only Mohammedan Ruler of importance, is very unlikely to allow himself to be left behind in the race. Mr. Gandhi apparently forgets this, when he contemplates with such complacency that after Swaraj is established, communal disturbances "may perhaps end in the exhaustion or destruction of one community or the other."

So apparently does another Hindu leader, who remarked to the Nawabzada Muhammad Azim Khan of Toru:—"When the English have gone, we will settle with you." They also forget that the Afghans, between the tenth and eighteenth centuries, invaded India nineteen times, the last being in 1761. Since India came under our rule, we have twice invaded Afghanistan, always with more or less disastrous results. In the first Afghan war, in 1842, we lost our whole army, with the exception of one man, and in the second, in 1880, we suffered a severe defeat at Maiwand. The following description of this battle is given by Lord Roberts in his "Forty-one Years in India," published by Macmillan & Co. Ltd in 1897. I quote from the cheap edition, dated 1911:—

"The Afghans . . . soon outflanked the British. Our artillery expended their ammunition and the native portion of the Brigade got out of hand, and pressed back on the few British infantry, who were unable to hold their own against the overwhelming numbers of the enemy. Our troops were completely routed, and had to thank the apathy of the Afghans in not following them up, for escaping total annihilation."

In 1919, at the instigation of the Bolsheviks, they invaded India, and gave us a good deal of trouble. Are they likely to refrain, when the Hindus are dealing with their co-religionists in the manner they propose? While the Hindus are divided into about 2,300 castes, all Mohammedans are brothers, so much so that it is stated in "The Moslem World in Revolution," published by The Church Missionary Society, that when at Damascus, the author tried to find out who the pilgrims were, the invariable answer was "Muselmeen," and it was only after a few questions that they guessed that he wanted to know their country.

Afghanistan is, generally speaking, a poor and barren

country, with a virile and war-like population, to whom the prospect of loot has a great appeal. I once had a very striking illustration of this. My first district was Cachar, which is on the eastern border of India; east of it is Manipur, an Indian State, and east of that is Burma. Afghans penetrated even there in search of loot. There was a remote tea garden, lying at the head of a narrow valley running down towards the Lushai Hills, with impenetrable jungle on each side. The tea planters have to keep a considerable amount of money with them in order to pay their coolies, and owing to its remoteness, this seemed a good place to loot, so a gang of about twenty Afghans came all the way from Afghanistan to loot it, which they did successfully. They also looted the house of a Hindu money-lender, one of whom is generally to be found by the edge of a tea garden. The police had got wind of the affair beforehand, and went out to catch them, but were out-witted and out-manoeuved. One thing however had been overlooked by the Afghans, which was that the mouth of the valley was only a mile wide. Besides the ordinary police, it being a frontier district, I had at my disposal two companies of Ghurka Military Police. I sent out one of these, with instructions to spread themselves across the mouth of the valley, and arrest every Afghan they saw. In order to enable them to reach the place in time, I had to hold up the mail train for half an hour. We succeeded in capturing eighteen out of twenty, and the aggregate sentences that they received amounted to over 250 years. Apparently one of the Afghans escaped and succeeded in getting hold of the spoil, which had probably been buried. With this he purchased a small estate, settled down in the locality, and became so highly respected that four or five years later he was a Member of the Local Board.

When Afghans will go so far and take such risks, for a comparatively small sum, what will they not do when the doors of India are practically thrown open to them, and in addition to the motive of greed, there is added the call of religion, and in view of what happens in communal disturbances, one might almost add, the call of humanity, but for the fact that humanity has no appeal to them? The late Amir told Lord Curzon that he had put to death 150,000 people and blinded with quick-lime a large number of others. Nepal is also a poor and mountainous country, with a virile and warlike population, and if India is thrown open to the invader, its inhabitants the Ghurkas, cannot reasonably be expected to refrain from having their share of the loot, and seizing as much territory as they can over-run, some of which was taken from their own State in former

times. At present they are only too happy to serve as soldiers and police for us.

I have not heard what justification, if any, the Afghans put forward for their invasion of India in 1919, but should they do so again, when Swaraj is established in India, and Dr. Moonjee and his friends have begun pulling the ears of the Mohammedans, they will find plenty of historical precedents. The history of Ireland is one long record of calling in foreign aid. The English first went there at the invitation of an Irish king, who had a dispute with another. In the time of Queen Elizabeth they called in the help of the Spaniards, during the French Revolution that of the French, and in the present reign that of the Germans, which did not reach them owing to our having then the command of the sea, which it is more than doubtful if we have now. Elizabeth, even before we were formally at war with Spain, helped the Dutch when they rose against the oppression of Philip II. The English Protestants, when James II. attempted to re-establish the Roman Catholic religion, called in the help of William of Orange and placed him on the throne. If the Mohammedans require any further excuse for calling in Afghan aid, it has been supplied to them by the Hindu politicians themselves; vide the following telegram that recently appeared in the Press:—

“The new programme for the revived Swaraj (Indian Home Rule) Party was adopted yesterday by the Conference at Ranchi (Bihar Province).”

* * * * *

The Party claims (says the Exchange) that India has the right to self-determination, and demands authority to convene a constituent assembly of all sections of Indians to frame an acceptable constitution.

* * * * *

The new programme includes:

Repeal of repressive measures;

Release of political prisoners;

Resistance to all legislation likely to add to the exploitation of the country and the introduction of Bills to displace bureaucracy.

Other points in the programme are:

Securing administrative economies in the defence and public-debt department;

Preventing or opposing all forms of imperial preference;

Freeing labour from serfdom, and forming peasants and workers' unions;

Organising agencies abroad for Indian propaganda and securing foreign support for India's struggle for complete independence.”

To this party Mr. Gandhi has given his adherence, as he has come to the conclusion which ought to have been obvious to him and everybody else for the last sixteen or seventeen years, that British rule can be more effectively destroyed from within than from without. The following is the newspaper account of the subject:—

“Mahatma Gandhi, the Indian Nationalist leader, to-day announced his withdrawal from the ‘Campaign of Civil Disobedience,’ which he himself began.

“He has recently been conferring with leaders of the Indian Nationalist Congress, and finally agreed to the formation of a Swaraj (Home Rule) Party to oppose the White Paper proposals on Indian self-government by legislative action.

The Party thus formed primarily by those Congressmen who had already withdrawn from the civil disobedience campaign will contest the forthcoming elections in India.”

Why Mr. Gandhi or anyone else who desires to see the end of British rule in India, if rule it can be called, should oppose the White Paper proposals, is a question either of Hindu mentality, or the psychology of British politicians, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say, the psychology of bluff.

Assuming that there is no foreign intervention, and that no Cromwell intervenes, not with the words: “Remove that bauble,” but saying instead: “Remove those babblers,” they have only to apply the White Paper proposals in order to make themselves as independent of British influence as The Irish Free State now is. The Irish are an intelligent people, but the Hindus, for all their cleverness, can hardly ever see the wood for the trees, and make the most stupid mistakes. They think they can do what the Irish have done, without having the qualities which enabled the Irish to do it. Besides this, tame as most of the members of all political parties are, Britain is not now under a Government which has been described by a well known writer as “The Dictatorship of Mr. Lloyd George.” He has had his imitators, but the imitation falls almost as far short of the original as the Hindu revolutionist does of the Irish.

Apart from these considerations, the Afghans have yet another claim, in support of which they can quote our own action in regard to the Jews in Palestine, which has been out of their possession for nearly 2,000 years, and which has not increased our popularity in Mohammedan countries. Map 50 of Gardner’s “Atlas of English History” shows that in 1785, at the close of the administration of Warren Hastings, the boundaries of Afghanistan extended to the Indus and beyond, and included the whole of what is now The North West Frontier Province. It would be rash to assume that the rulers of Afghanistan have given

up the hope of recovering this boundary, and in the situation that the Hindus are doing their utmost to create, if they recover it, they are not likely to stop there, but will try to overrun most of Northern India. This will appear from the following note in "The Growth of the Empire," by Arthur W. Jose, Revised Edition 1910 (John Murray), in regard to the negotiations between the Amir Sher Ali and the Russians, which led to the second Afghan War:—"He offered them free transit and the right to build railways across Afghanistan, in return for their help in making the Indus his eastern boundary."

Since then aviation has become practicable, and the Russians can intervene effectively, or render effective assistance to the Afghans, without waiting for the construction of railways.

They may not even have to go to Russia for help; may find it among their own co-religionists. Certain words possess an influence that is enough to cause one to believe in magic. Self-determination is one of them. I seem to remember reading that one of the Secretaries to the inventor of the term described it as a phrase charged with dynamite. Among the results that it has produced up to date are the breaking up of the British Empire, and what a German diplomatist has described as the Balkanisation of Europe, the economic effects of which we are now deploring. Our rulers, under the enchantment of the spell, when they might have done something to prevent it, cheerfully concurred, and attempted, or encouraged the attempt, to extend the process to Asia, till it received a rude check from Mustapha Kemal Pasha, when he drove the Greek army into the sea, and a good many of the Greek civil population along with it. The final result has been that Turkey, instead of being the sick man of Europe, is now the strong man of Asia, and intends to become stronger on both continents; vide the following extracts from "The Daily Telegraph" of 29th June:—

"The Shah of Persia and Mustapha Kemal Pasha, the Turkish President, have developed such deep mutual sympathy that his Majesty has decided to prolong his stay for at least ten days and perhaps further.

Yesterday afternoon the Shah visited the Turkish 'Sandhurst' with Mustapha Kamal, and was so interested that he did not leave until ten o'clock at night. To-day he has visited the artillery schools and it is possible that he will eventually inspect the Thracian defences."

* * * * *

"Hundreds of Jews are being mysteriously expelled from the Dardanelles region, especially Chainak, and from the Black Sea ports and Thrace. These people, all of them Turkish subjects, are arriving here with their belongings

tied up in sheets and blankets, for they have been forced to leave without having had time to pack their furniture or make arrangements for the disposal of their dwellings.

Many of them are rich merchants and landowners, but all are in a lamentable condition. No explanation is given them.

The conclusion is drawn, however, that an all-round plan of extensive fortifications is to be carried out in the near future."

From this it appears that not merely is Turkey improving her defences, but she is cultivating very friendly relations with Persia, another Mohammedan country, that was supposed to be sick, until its former rulers were replaced by a vigorous soldier, and now, like Turkey, it appears to have renewed its strength.

Has this any connection with recent events in India, one of which was a terrible massacre of Mohammedans by Hindus at Cawnpore on the 24th March, 1931, because they refused to close their shops as a sign of mourning for the execution of some Hindu and Sikh murderers, whom the Hindus chose to regard as martyrs?

In this connection it should be remembered that in theory all Mohammedans are brothers, that starting with an army of 3,000 men, within a hundred years of the death of Mohammed they had defeated the Persian and Byzantine Empires, and over-ran Western Asia, with the exception of the portion of Asia Minor that remained under the Byzantine Empire till later. In addition to this, they over-ran Northern Africa and Spain, and penetrated further into France than ever the Germans did. As recently as 1683 they besieged Vienna. They have, as already mentioned, invaded India nineteen times, carried off an enormous amount of loot, ruled a considerable part of it for about 700 years, till in their decadence we replaced them, and for a time ruled nearly all of it, except a comparatively small portion in the extreme South. These are the people whom we expect to look on as calmly as our politicians did, while their co-religionists are being not merely massacred but tortured, when the call of religion is reinforced by that of self-interest, and when in case of an invasion by them, a considerable section of the Indian population would be likely to join them, or at least assist by destroying communications, and creating trouble in the rear of the defending army, whatever might be its composition.

We won India from the Mohammedans mainly because at the Battle of Plassey Clive had a secret arrangement with the opposing General, by which a considerable part of the enemy's forces were kept out of action, and when he had succeeded in defeating the remainder, they came over to our side. Are we the only people in the world

who can make such arrangements, and if the Mohammedans lost India in this way, can they be blamed if they employ similar methods to regain it, not of course by an arrangement with any of the commanders, but by propaganda among the troops? Have we not seen in the Great War the results to which this may lead, of which the debacle of the Russian army is only one of many.

Cawnpore is a place notorious for its massacres, of which the following account of that of the British in 1857 is given in "Battles of the British Army," by Charles Rathbone Low, published by George Routledge & Sons, in 1890:—

"At length they were compelled to capitulate to save the lives of the surviving women and children, and on the 27th June, the garrison quitted the entrenchment under a safe conduct to Allahabad, given by the so-called Nana Sahib, an adopted son of the ex-Peishwa of Poona, who resided at Bithoor, about ten miles from Cawnpore. But on embarking in the boats provided for them on the Ganges, these helpless people were slaughtered from the banks, and the few that escaped were pursued and ultimately only two soldiers and Lieutenants Mowbray-Thompson and Delafosse effected their escape, after a series of wonderful adventures, in which they killed many of the enemy and swam for six miles down the river until they were sheltered by a friendly Oude Rajah. Those who were not killed were taken back to Cawnpore and confined in a building.

Here, on the 15th July, they were ruthlessly massacred, under circumstances of revolting barbarity, by orders of the infamous Nana Sahib, and the whole of the bodies, dead and dying alike, with some who had escaped the assassins' daggers, were cast into a well. The number who thus perished were five men and 206 women and children, the victims being increased by the surviving fugitives of Futtehghurh, who, unconscious of the state of affairs at Cawnpore, had fled thither for refuge."

The number of victims is given in a footnote as follows:—

"Of 900 souls who perished during the siege of Cawnpore, and in the subsequent massacre, 210 were European soldiers, 100 officers of the staff and from revolted regiments, and 376 European women and children, the rest being civilians. Sir George Trevelyan, in his graphic work, 'Cawnpore,' estimates the total loss at 1,000 people."

The massacre of the Mohammedans in 1931 is thus described in "India and Reconciliation," by Brig.-Gen. F. D. Frost, C.B.E., M.C., I.A. (Retd.), published by Pickering & Inglis in 1931. It is as follows:—

"The Result of Gandhi-ism.—During the Hindu-Moslem riots in Cawnpore a British Officer writes that there were

5,000 wounded and hundreds killed. The Hindus, who were in the majority, attacked the Mohammedans because they refused to close their shops, when a hartal had been proclaimed to protest against the execution of murderers. Moslem women and children had their throats cut, some of the women were found hanging up to the rafters of buildings by their hair, while fires had been lighted underneath them. Indians everywhere ran to Europeans for protection, but the troops were not allowed to interfere. In one bazaar every Mohammedan was killed and the women and children were burned alive. One Mohammedan begged some British Officers to help him find his family. Six accompanied him, armed with sticks. They followed closely behind him into the bazaar. A crowd of Hindus, about 200, on seeing him, thought he was alone, and immediately decided to kill him, but the sight of the six Britishers put them to ignominious flight.

Most of the English newspapers keep these shocking details away from the people, and the Government prefer not to discuss it."

A hartal, it should be explained, is a day of mourning, in which all the shops are shut, and all business is at a standstill.

Another account of the same incident is given by Mr. E. Hayward, a business man in India, now on holiday in England, in a letter to "The Morning Post" of 16th July. It is as follows:—

" under the weak Viceroyalties of Lord Chelmsford and Lord Irwin, an artificial unrest was created, without let or hindrance from Government, by Congress leaders employing a large army of so-called Volunteers (in many cases paid agents) whose chief weapons were intimidation by picketing and false promises to remit rents and taxes under the forthcoming rule of Gandhi. Before the return to normal exercise of Government's powers in 1931 this campaign culminated in the ignominious spectacle of the Government negotiating with its opponents under threat.

The consequent damage to British prestige was so serious as to render the maintenance of law and order more difficult than ever before. The latent antipathies between Moslem and Hindu broke out with increasing frequency, and in the last months of Lord Irwin's regime occurred the terrible massacre of Cawnpore, in which more than two thousand persons were done to death in circumstances of appalling savagery."

I find from other sources that the statement that the troops were not allowed to interfere is not quite correct. They did interfere, though after some delay, but could merely clear the main streets, while the murders and

atrocities went on in the lanes and alleys, into which the troops could not penetrate, except as patrols. Estimates of the casualties vary. An officer who was there places the total at about 2,000, but admits that this is only conjectural, and states that the Government estimate was ridiculously low. Someone counted twenty lorry loads of corpses being removed, and as each lorry would carry about thirty corpses, assuming the proportion of killed to wounded to be about the same as that of a battle, this would agree fairly well with the estimate of 2,000 total casualties. The exact number does not greatly matter, except to the victims and their relatives, but the terrible feature of the situation is that, with this object lesson before them, and the one that they gave us in 1857, the leaders of all the British parties appear to be determined to hand over power, if not to the actual murderers, to other members of the same party and religion.

There is in the "Morning Post" of 27th July the report of a decision of the Privy Council relating to this incident. *Dacoity* it should be explained is robbery committed by five or more persons acting in concert. The paragraph is as follows:—

"The communal riots between Hindus and Moham-medans at Cawnpore in March, 1931, were recalled by a judgment delivered by the Privy Council yesterday. Six Indians were the appellants. The appellants and eighteen others were charged with dacoity and other offences, and murder. The Sessions Judge and two assessors acquitted them all, the judge remarking that the whole case was 'riddled with perjury.' The Public Prosecutor appealed to the High Court at Allahabad against the acquittal, and that Court reversed the acquittal judgment of the Sessions Judge. In the judgment prepared by Lord Russell it was stated that appellants contended that, on an order of acquittal on a matter of fact, it is not open to the Appellate Court to interfere with the findings of the trial Judge. In the opinion of their Lordships, said Lord Russell, there was no foundation for that view, and there was no reason to think the High Court had failed to take all proper matters into consideration. The appeal was accordingly dismissed."

It will be seen that owing to the law's delays, and what was in the first instance a failure of justice, it has taken three years and four months to secure the punishment of some of the perpetrators of these atrocities. Had the White Paper scheme taken effect, they would probably never have been brought to book at all, as the Public Prosecutor can appeal against an order of acquittal only under the orders of the Local Government, and a Local Government controlled by Hindus, as that of the United Provinces would have been, this part of India being one of the chief centres

of Hinduism, would have been very unlikely to order the filing of an appeal.

People in this country need not be unduly alarmed because the finding of the first Court was reversed. I have tried Sessions cases, sometimes with Indian jurors, and sometimes with assessors, and my experience of them is that it is as hard to get an opinion out of them adverse to a person of their own religion, as it was to get a conviction for cattle-driving in Ireland fifteen or twenty years ago. On the other hand, they are quite willing to convict a person of a different and hostile religion, especially if the aggrieved parties are of their own religion. I remember one case that I tried, in which some Mohammedans were accused of rioting and homicide. There were discrepancies in the evidence, and the Public Prosecutor, a Hindu, came to me after the case had proceeded about half a day, called attention to these, and asked if it were any use proceeding with the case, or would I permit him to withdraw it? I replied that three days had been allotted to it, that if it were withdrawn there was no other work ready to be taken up, and that one never knew what a jury would do, so it had better continue. The case proceeded, and the jury brought in a verdict of "guilty," by a majority of three to two. There were three Hindus and two Mohammedans on the jury; under Indian law a majority is sufficient for conviction, and the accused got about seven years each. I did not suspect anything at the time, but later on I heard rumours about this Public Prosecutor, to the effect that he had his price, and I greatly doubt if his interference was disinterested.

Such are Indian ideas of justice, and these have enriched the English language with certain phrases which would be quite unintelligible here. When an event takes place which affords materials for a case, the person aggrieved frequently takes advantage of it to accuse not merely the actual participants, but as many of his enemies as he can manage to bring in with any plausibility. Two common legal terms are "made him an accused", and "included in the sweep of his case." I have seen the latter phrase used in the judgment of an Indian Magistrate. An additional reason, I have been told, for the inclusion by a complainant of innocent persons "in the sweep of his case," is that sometimes the witnesses refuse to give evidence unless some of their own enemies are "made accused." Another term in common use among them is that "so and so was present and gave orders." This often means that he is the person who organised the riot, or whatever the occurrence may have been, but is usually too clever to be present himself, so the other side try to get at him in this way. He has probably anticipated the

move, and if he succeeds, he is said to have "proved his good alibi." The whole system was described by a Sessions Judge in Bengal, who wrote a volume of light verse, as "diving in wells of perjury for truth." Another legal term is "providing evidence of identification." While at the same place, I once tried a murder case, which the same Public Prosecutor did not withdraw, but might with advantage have done so, as with the best intentions in the world, someone had blundered badly over the point that I have mentioned. A man was killed while out in the fields alone, and before the body was found, it had been eaten up by vultures and jackals, so that there was nothing left but the bones. His relatives however swore to its identity, stating that they recognised it by the buttons of the coat. The fatal flaw in the story was that the right arm had been severed above the elbow, while the sleeve of the coat was intact. The skeleton had evidently been clothed, with retrospective effect.

Some further illustrations of Indian legal methods may be of interest to the general public, if not to those who are endeavouring to place the Indians in a position to rule each other, and as many of our unfortunate fellow-countrymen as are forced by circumstances to live there, and perhaps die there. One of the phrases in common use that I have mentioned is "to include in the sweep of the case!" I had a very amusing illustration of this in my last district, to which Mr. Gandhi paid a visit. Addresses were presented to him by the District Board, or whatever it was called there—the designation varies in different districts—and the Municipality, the members of both of which were mostly Swarajist Pleaders. This was quite irregular, but in view of the facts mentioned elsewhere, one can hardly blame them for disregarding rules, or turning from the setting to what was considered the rising sun by one Viceroy, and was shortly to be by another, not to mention the attitude of the British Cabinet towards Mr. Gandhi when in London. That of the local officers was less enthusiastic, and the nearest British equivalent to it is that of the Police towards the orators in Hyde Park, a position to which he is rapidly approaching. We took no notice of him, beyond adopting the usual precautions to control the crowd, which the Swarajists took care to see was collected to receive him.

A Hindu married woman of fourteen, whose house was close to the railway station, was abducted by a Mohammedan youth of eighteen, who lived about a mile away, nearer the centre of the town. As soon as her absence was discovered, an information was lodged at the police station, a search was made for her, and she was found hiding in a bamboo clump close to the house of the Mohammedan

in question. The sub-inspector who went to search for her was a Mohammedan, and it shows how little the members of the two religions trust each other, that it was alleged before me that he had intentionally delayed going to the house, for a sufficient time to enable the other Mohammedan to get her out of it. If she had been found there, as she was under age, the case against him would have been complete. There were still enough materials to place him on trial, and the case in its final form was that she had been conveyed from her husband's house to that of the Mohammedan's on the municipal motor lorry that was used for watering the roads, the driver of which was also a Mohammedan. Both were sent up for trial. This motor lorry being about the most public conveyance in the place, the presence of a woman on which would have attracted universal attention, the Deputy-Magistrate, a Brahman, could not believe this part of the story, and acquitted. The main portion of the case being undoubtedly true, the other side applied to me, requesting me to move the Local Government to appeal against the acquittal. This is purely an executive matter, but before taking any such action, I have usually considered it advisable to hear arguments, and I issued notice to both sides. The arguments were conducted in chambers, as it would be called in England, and there was nobody present but two or three Pleaders and the Bench Clerk. The Pleader who appeared to oppose the application was a young Brahman, who was a candidate for a Government appointment, in connection with which he had shortly before come to me for a certificate, which I had given him. His contention was that the story was incredible, as the occurrence took place on the day that Mr. Gandhi left, and there was such a crowd to see him off that it was quite impossible for the motor lorry to get anywhere near the railway station. I remarked that no doubt there was a large crowd to receive him, but he had been there for two days, curiosity had abated, and it did not follow that there was an equally large one to see him off. He replied that when he was a student in Calcutta, he used to go to the Howrah Station every time that Mr. Gandhi came, both to receive him and to see him off. "And yet," I said, "you are a candidate for Government service." "Yes," he replied, "but I have not got it yet." As he appeared to have been running with the hare and hunting with the hounds, I could not resist asking him: "If you get it, will you change your politics?" "Yes," he said, "if I get it, I will change your politics to morrow."

Such is, was, and will be, Hindu mentality. I remember reading in Col. Malleon's "Recreations of an Indian Official," that the assault on Delhi during the Mutiny had to take place prematurely, and our losses were much

greater than they need have been, because some Punjab Chiefs informed Sir John Lawrence that if Delhi fell before a certain date they would come in on our side, but if not they would come in against us. With such facts before us, to a people one of whose leading characteristics is to back what they believe to be the winning side, we have announced our impending abdication, and are trying to nominate our successors, on the very optimistic assumption that the rejected candidates will accept our nomination.

The instance mentioned is an example of both the phrases, "including in the sweep of his case," and "making him an accused," but if it can be done, it is considered still better to "make her an accused." It is common knowledge that when Indians abuse each other, they do not usually do so directly, but by means of their female relatives. In the same way, if they want to humiliate an enemy, and think that there is any chance of success, when they bring a case, they include among the accused at least some of the women of their enemy's family. Most magistrates, however dull they may be in other respects, are all aware of this trick, and very rarely summon a woman, except after a preliminary enquiry.

The only instance in my experience where this sound general principle was disregarded was by a certain landlord who was also an Honorary Magistrate, and had been granted the rather unusual power of taking cognisance of cases, that is of instituting them, as well as trying them. Ordinarily a case has to be instituted before a paid magistrate, but if it comes within the competence of the latter, it may be made over to an Honorary Magistrate for trial. The appeals of this Honorary Magistrate came to me, and I noticed that in almost every case instituted before him, a woman or two were accused, were summoned and put on trial, and nearly always were discharged on the first day of hearing. The residence of this landlord was in a very remote part of the district, where one would have expected to find conditions of nothing but rustic, if not primitive simplicity.

One of my duties when touring was to inspect the dispensaries, not of course from the medical point of view, but the administrative. I saw whether the local subscriptions, if any, were collected, whether the allotment for the supply of drugs was sufficient to meet requirements, and what were the most prevalent local diseases. This being a place in the depths of the country, I should have expected venereal diseases to be almost unknown, but on inspecting this Dispensary I found that one of the most prevalent diseases was syphilis, in fact the proportion of cases of this disease was greater than in any Dispensary that I had seen, even in towns of some size. A thing that

I noticed in my inspection of Dispensaries is that venereal diseases are generally prevalent near the residence of a rich landlord, but this place surpassed all previous records in that respect.

To get the women folk of his enemy into the dock is a great triumph for a Hindu litigant, but the greatest of all is to get his enemy hanged on a charge of murder, of which everybody knows him to be innocent, except the judge who tried the case. I have seen an instance of this, and was just able to prevent it. A young Rajput was sentenced to death by an Indian Sessions Judge, in the district of which I was Magistrate and Collector. His father, an old man, was terribly distressed, and used to come to the jail every morning, protesting his son's innocence. The Superintendent of the jail, an Irish doctor in the Indian Medical Service, was impressed, and mentioned the matter to me. I determined to look into it, and went out to the place to see for myself. On reaching it, I found that every prosecution witness except one whom I could not catch out, had obviously been lying. One of them stated that he had seen the occurrence from a certain tree close by, among the branches of which he was doing something. It was between a quarter and half a mile away. And so with all the others, except the one already mentioned, who had not tied himself down so definitely as having seen from a particular place. A glance at the ground would have shown the whole case to be a fabrication, but using the results of a local inspection is so hedged round with High Court rulings that it is like walking a tight rope to avoid falling into some legal error, and in practice it is hardly ever made. I afterwards heard unofficially, but cannot vouch for the truth of the story, beyond that it appears to me extremely probable, that the condemned man had nothing whatever to do with the death of the man he was accused of having murdered, but that the latter was killed in a quarrel that had suddenly arisen among the members of his own party. There being a dead body, it was thought a pity to waste it, so they made up their differences, and determined to utilise it to get hanged on a charge of murder one of the members of what is called in the English of India their anti-party. They would have succeeded, but for the devotion of his father, who came to the jail every morning while his son was under sentence of death, so that he attracted the attention of the Superintendent, and ultimately mine.

In the parts of Bengal and Bihar with which I am familiar, almost every village is divided into two factions, the members of which will stop at nothing to crush each other, not even at getting an innocent man hanged. In the Bengali language there is a special word to describe this,

“daladali,” which means the continuous strife and rivalry that goes on between the two factions in a village. The phrase anti-party is in common use among Indian lawyers everywhere that I have been.

To return to the subject of the Cawnpore massacre, the Mohammedans were butchered for their loyalty, and we could do little to help them. We shall be unable to do anything, when British troops are withdrawn from India, which is part of the programme, the alternative being to keep them there to fight for people who hate us, and not merely make no effort to conceal their hatred, but proclaim it from the house-tops. Not only are British soldiers likely to be required to do this, but also the Mohammedan soldiers of the Indian Army are expected to fight for a Government controlled by the party which comprises the oppressors, murderers, and torturers of those of their religion, and possibly of the parents, wives, and children of some of them.

There was an Indian regiment stationed in my first district, which was raised in Cawnpore and the vicinity, the soldiers of which were all Mohammedans. It is not at all improbable that some of the relatives of the soldiers of it perished, or were wounded in the massacre. Soldiers, like other people, have their feelings, and cannot be transferred from one master to another like dumb driven cattle. The nearest analogy to what our democratic Government is attempting to do with the Indian Army is that of the Rulers of the German States in the 18th century, who used to sell their subjects to the British Government to be soldiers for us. The present British Government does not even sell; it gives. Did it make over any part of the British Army, or of the Royal Irish Constabulary to the Irish Free State, when it was established? It left it to raise its own army and police, and equity as well as common sense requires that an Indian Government, of the type that it is proposed to set up, should be left to do the same, if it can find anybody to fight for it. If not, those of the soldiers who do not care for their new masters are likely to solve the problem for themselves, by choosing their own masters.

What reason have our rulers to believe that the word of the present Hindu leaders is worth any more than that of Nana Sahib, or even if it is, that they will be able to control the forces that they are doing all in their power to arouse? As a matter of fact, the Hindu leaders have not even given their word, but on the other hand their attitude and ours, is shown by the following passage in “The Daily Mail Blue Book on the Indian Crisis, 1931” :—

“Mr. Gandhi, whose leadership the Hindu majority

blindly accepts, denies ("Times," April 4) that British troops are necessary in communal disturbances, and with inhuman callousness he contemplates that after his Swaraj is established these disturbances 'may perhaps end in the exhaustion or destruction of one community or the other.' Yet this is the man with whom Lord Irwin negotiated on equal terms and to whom the Government here have humiliated themselves to secure his coming to London as India's plenipotentiary and an Apostle of Peace!"

These negotiations greatly aggravate matters in the eyes of the Mohammedan world, and it is stated in "The Moslem World in Revolution," by W. Wilson Cooke, D.S.O., O.B.E., published in 1925, that out of a total of about 234,814,989 Mohammedans in all countries, there are 105,723,000 in the British Empire. These, as well as all the Mohammedan States that are still independent, are being antagonised in the vain attempt to conciliate a few thousand irreconcilable high caste Hindus, whose only weapon is the tongue, and that of their followers, the revolver and the bomb.

If the rulers of Mohammedan States read, or get a summary of what appears in our newspapers, they must be aware of Mr. Gandhi's attitude towards communal disturbances, and the manner in which he was treated on terms of equality by the Viceroy and the British Government as the de facto ruler of India.

If their memories, or their newspaper files go still further back, they must have seen how another Viceroy desired to confer with him, and the request was haughtily refused. Very shortly after the signature of the pact, this horrible massacre of Mohammedans took place. We have seen what Mr. Gandhi's views are, and how indifferent he is to the amount of blood and suffering it may cost to give effect to them.

What the feeling must be in Mohammedan States may be judged by an episode in our own history. Those familiar with British literature will remember one of Milton's noblest sonnets, that "On the late Massacre in Piemont," the opening lines of which are:—

"Avenge, O Lord! Thy slaughter'd Saints, whose bones,
Lie scatter'd on the Alpine mountains cold;
Even them who kept Thy truth so pure of old
When all our fathers worshipt stocks and stones.
Forget not: In Thy book record their groans
Who were Thy sheep,"

Mutatis mutandis, it equally applies to the recent massacre in Cawnpore, as the Mohammedans worship the same God as ourselves, and have an equal right to call

on him for vengeance. Cromwell intervened in regard to the massacre in Piemont, or Piedmont, and by diplomatic action succeeded in putting a stop to it. The Cabinet are so attached to the White Paper scheme that the Mohammedan powers must realise that this method is useless, and are apparently preparing for the only method that will be effective, the application of force. If so, there may be a fourth battle of Panipat, of which this is a description of the third, which took place so recently as 1761, taken from the second edition of "The Growth of the Empire," by Arthur W. Jose, already referred to:—

"Meanwhile in Upper India things were happening in which the English took no share, but which proved of immense importance in aiding the consolidation of British rule. Mogul rule even at Delhi had become a mere pretence, controlled at one time by the Afghan chief, Ahmed Shah, at another by the Mahrattas. Either of these powers could have made from the ruins of the Mogul Empire a formidable barricade against the spread of Company rule. But the Mahrattas, who were nothing if not audacious, could not leave their rival alone. In Delhi Ahmed Shah might have left them, but they invaded his favourite province of the Punjab and seized Lahore. All Upper India was drawn into the conflict, which roused to its utmost the perennial hatred of Mohammedan for Hindu. The Afghan Prince swept down from his passes across the Indus, in three fierce battles drove the invaders back upon Delhi, and struck across into the Ganges Valley by the old route that conquerors had used since the days of pre-historic legend. At Panipat on the Jumna he met the whole Mahratta army, a little smaller than his own. No battlefield has seen more thrones lost and won: Babar, the first, and Akbar, the greatest of the Moguls, found their empire there; and they were only the last of a line that runs into the semi-mythical times of the Trojan war. This, the final battle, was worthy of the place. A hundred and fifty thousand trained soldiers, besides innumerable masses of guerillas, charged each other desperately from morning to night; and when the Mahrattas at last broke and fled, the slaughter among them was so great that for all practical purposes their army had disappeared. Even the victorious troops were too demoralised to be trustworthy any longer for conquest; the last victor of Panipat was compelled to stay his progress just where the triumphant career of his predecessors had begun. Ahmed Shah retired to Afghanistan to reconstuct his army, and when after many years a fresh invasion from that quarter was thought of, the Sikh Confederacy had made itself an

impenetrable barrier across the road now closed for ever."

With such object lessons before their eyes, can we be surprised if the Mohammedans have ceased to rely on us, and are apparently relying on the Mohammedan States instead, or that the Mohammedan States are beginning to make preparations which will enable them to intervene effectively when the necessity arises, and to assure that if one community or the other is to be destroyed to please Mr. Gandhi, it will not be their fellow Mohammedans?

Persia is for some distance coterminous with Turkey, and Afghanistan is bounded on the west by Persia. Iraq intervenes for part of the way between Turkey and Persia, and the use of the railways and rivers of Iraq would greatly facilitate the passage of a Turkish army proceeding eastwards. It is not likely that it would oppose the passage of an army going to the rescue of true believers from the oppression of idolators, and incidentally to establish what would in effect be a Pan-Mohammedan Confederacy, this being another magical word which may exercise the same charm over other people that Federation does over us. In the improbable event of its offering any opposition, Iraq is quite a small State in comparison with either Turkey or Persia, and could be over-run even more easily than Belgium was by the Germans. Persia and Iraq contain some of our most valuable oil-fields, and so long as the Navy depends on oil fuel, and a good many of our merchant ships use it, a combination such as that described could almost paralyse our power of resistance, without sending a single soldier to India.

These are some of the risks that the Government is taking in pursuance of its policy in regard to India, which is to place power in the hands of people who hate us as much as they hate the Mohammedans, and the Mohammedans hate them, who massacred our women and children in 1857, and Mohammedan women and children in 1931, and are likely to do so again on the first opportunity if the women are not reserved for a still worse fate, which was the programme for the rising in Chittagong a few years ago, which all but succeeded.

Should the Afghans overrun Northern India, the effects will not stop there. I have heard that there is talk of a Pan-Islamic Confederacy, extending from Cairo to Calcutta, or rather, if it is to be really Pan-Islamic, from Fashoda to the frontiers of Burma. There is in Palestine friction enough as it is, and such a Federation is very unlikely to tolerate in its midst an intrusive Jewish colony, claiming special rights and privileges. The result of the endeavour on the

part of our rulers to establish a system involving Hindu domination in India, in which, regardless of their professed monotheism, Jews have taken a leading part, may be, not the object aimed at, but the establishment, or rather re-establishment of Mohammedan domination in Palestine, and the loss of the Jewish National Home. This would only be an application of the principle of rule by the majority, which for some obscure reason that I have not been able to discover, is to be applied to India at all costs, while it is considered quite unsuitable to the conditions of Palestine, which are very similar to those of India. In each country there are two hostile races ready to fly at each other's throats, and occasionally doing so, in spite of all our efforts to prevent it.

The Mohammedan soldiers of the Indian Army are apparently expected to take part in resisting invaders who come to the relief of their co-religionists, and the Royal Air Force to fight on behalf of people who hate us, and make no attempt to conceal their hatred. This is a very large assumption, in view of the fact that certain Mohammedan regiments showed some reluctance to fight against the Turks, simply because they were of the same religion. What is much more likely is that in the event contemplated, which is one that the Hindu leaders have given us fair warning that they are determined to bring about, the Hindu and Mohammedan regiments and class companies of the Indian Army would take part in the struggle on behalf of their respective religions, and start fighting each other. For this purpose the Sikhs and Ghurkas would count as special kinds of Hindus. Let us assume however that this does not take place, and that the Frontier Provinces and the Punjab do not rise in support of the invaders, though I have been assured by officers who have served there that they are extremely likely to do so. With all the conditions in our favour, what are the chances of successful resistance under the new conditions?

The distance from the Frontier to the two chief ports, Bombay and Calcutta, is about 1,500 miles, and the gun and shell factory is at Cossipore, a suburb of Calcutta. Formerly, for military reasons, a considerable number of Anglo-Indians were employed on the railways, but in the passion for economy and Indianisation which followed the War, these have mostly been turned adrift and left to starve, so that the railways are now mainly worked by Indians. We learned in the Boer War the difficulty of maintaining communications through a hostile country, and with India in a state of civil war, which it almost is already whenever communal disturbances break out, the whole country will be sporadically hostile, and anyone who derails a train, or causes a collision, may endanger the

safety of an army. Karachi is nearer to the Frontier than Calcutta or Bombay, but if it were used as a base, the whole line of communications would be through a Mohammedan country, the inhabitants of which, whether they had risen or not, would be in sympathy with the invaders. The events in the Punjab in 1919, when telegraph wires were cut, and communications destroyed, show that the Indians did not go to the Great War for nothing, and that many of them have now learned the art of interrupting communications, and its importance in warfare. So far as the railways are concerned, this can be done by a mere coolie. One such instance occurred a few miles from where I was stationed, in which a train was derailed in a very simple manner. A few stations back it had got ahead of a troop train, which according to programme would have run in front of it. We simply cannot hold the Frontier with our lines of communication unsafe, and these are so long that it would take a whole army to guard them. Even if there was no sabotage, a railway strike would serve the same purpose equally well, and I have known one nearly started because a native mechanic thought himself badly treated by a foreman. I succeeded in preventing it, but only by threatening to exercise powers which I did not possess.

Apart from such crude methods as that of placing a sleeper across the rails, I know of three ways of derailing a train, which would not be noticeable to the driver, and could only be detected by a person patrolling the line. They are all within the power of a single person to effect.

There are further great possibilities open to an enemy in the way of producing collisions. There are very few safety appliances on Indian railways, such as interlocking points and signals; except in some of the large stations. There are usually not even signal cabins, and the points are worked on the spot, which is about a quarter of a mile outside the station, as Indian trains, and consequently the siding to take them, are so long. They may be worked by a coolie on pay of Rs. 10 or Rs. 12 a month, or about £8 to £10 a year. In my own districts alone I have had three collisions, one the result of the mistake of an Assistant Station Master, and two of those of pointsmen, but also partially due to that of the Station Master or Assistant Station master, who ordered the lowering of the signals, without verifying that the points were set correctly.

I have a friend who went through most of the Boer War in the Imperial Yeomanry. When discussing the subject with him, he told me that he was a member of what was known at the time as "The Starvation Division." Although the country in the rear was occupied, the Boers had succeeded in destroying the railway behind this

division, and cutting off their supplies. They had to live on the country for a considerable time, and later on got extra pay in lieu of the rations which never reached them. I asked him where they were when this happened. He said it was at Winburg, which is a town in the Orange Free State, about two hundred miles from the border of the Cape Province, and still less from that of Natal, both of which were British. When the Boers could produce this effect with only two hundred miles of railway to be guarded, what is not possible when the distance to be guarded is fifteen hundred miles? My friend summed up the situation by saying that it would require the whole British Army to protect the lines of communication. If an enemy, who will not be in uniform, except perhaps a railway uniform, should succeed in derailing a train, or causing a collision, the Indian frontier is so barren and rocky that a regiment, much less a division or an army, would find it quite impossible to live on it when their supplies became exhausted. In that event we shall have the disasters of the First Afghan War, from which one man returned, and of Kut-el-Amara, repeated on a far larger scale. We recovered from these, but Athens never recovered from the effects of the expedition to Syracuse, and we shall never be able to recover from a disaster of similar magnitude, which this would be.

Of the railway accidents of which I have personal knowledge, the first was the collision of a train with a light engine, that is one proceeding separately, and caused the loss of only one life. Of the two latter railway accidents, one caused the loss of fifteen lives and numerous injuries, and one the derailment of a train which was thrown completely on its side into the ditch. Fortunately it was a goods train, and there was no loss of life.

Were a train containing munitions to meet with an accident, the accident itself would be the least part of the matter. The munitions would explode, and everything in the neighbourhood would be wrecked, and the line perhaps blocked for days, while the safety, or even the very existence of the army at the front depended on the regular receipt of supplies. Similar results would be produced by a strike among the munition workers at Cossipur or Bombay, a railway strike, or neglect on the part of a Railway Administration to supply rolling stock promptly and in sufficient quantities.

There was yet another instance in one of my districts, of which my knowledge is only hearsay, as there not being an accident there was no enquiry, at which I would have been present; but the incident is not of a nature likely to have been invented, and if true, shows the extent to which the working of Indian railways depend on the human element. The headquarters of the district were on the

bank of the Ganges, and were the terminus of a branch line about five miles long. On the main line, a mile or so from the junction, there was a tunnel. By some carelessness on the part of a pointsman, a main line train was diverted to the branch line. The driver did not notice this at first, but after proceeding for a few miles he wondered what had become of the familiar tunnel, the absence of which attracted his attention, and on taking his bearings, he found that he was on the wrong line, backed the train, and had it put on to the right one. He had a clear run of twelve miles to the next station on the main line, and had it not been for the fact of there being a tunnel intervening, the absence of which he noticed, almost anything might have happened, if he had run into the terminus of the branch line, behind which, at a distance of a few feet, was the Ganges.

I thought that I knew a good deal about how railway communications may be paralysed, and railway accidents brought about. The simplest of all, however, I overlooked, but the Indian revolutionaries did not; vide the following extract from the newspaper report of a note on "Terrorism in India," presented to the Joint Select Committee by the Secretary for India, Sir Samuel Hoare:—

"A new wave of terrorism, the note points out, following the launching of the civil disobedience movement by Gandhi's march on Dandi early in 1930.

"On the night of April 18, it is recalled, the Chittagong Armoury raid took place, the four raiding parties having set out from the Congress office in Chittagong. The success of the raid was followed by intense terrorist activity.

"In May, the leaders of the main Jagantar party in Calcutta drew up a programme of terrorism and made arrangements for the manufacture of bombs," it is stated. "Information in possession of the Government shows that the principal features of this programme were:

1. The murder of Europeans in hotels, clubs and cinemas simultaneously in Calcutta, and the districts, by bombs.
2. The burning of aerodromes in Dum-Dum with petrol.
3. The destruction of the Calcutta gas-works and electric power station.
4. The cutting off of the petrol supply of Calcutta by destroying the depot at Budge-Budge.
5. The disorganisation of the railway service in Calcutta by cutting overhead wires.
6. The destruction of telegraphic communication between Calcutta and the districts of Bengal.

7. The destruction of bridges and railway lines by dynamite and hand grenades.

"With the Irwin-Gandhi Pact of 1931 and the withdrawal of the Press Ordinance, it is pointed out, the Press reverted to the old habit of glorification of assassination and propagation of the cult of murder. No fewer than 67 outrages, including nine murders, occurred in 1931."

From the above it will be seen that it is not even necessary to interfere with the permanent way; equally good results, from the point of view of paralysing the working of a railway can be obtained by cutting the telegraph wires, or breaking the insulators. Ordinarily a train cannot proceed till it has obtained permission from the next station, which is called getting "line clear," and if that station is unable to give "line clear," it can only proceed at a snail's pace, without the risk of a collision or serious accident. The proposed remedy is to appoint the wolves to guard the sheep, and to make over both the working of the railways and the protection of them, to the political friends of those who have shown such intelligence and callousness in their plans for wrecking them, and every other public utility on which modern life depends; not to speak of the wholesale murder which is the first item of their programme.

When the Viceroy travels, the village watchmen, usually called chaukidars, are collected to guard the railway, and stationed at intervals of about 100 yards, so that nobody may be able to approach it unobserved. In the Provinces with which I am familiar, they are partly under the Police and partly under a village committee called the Panchayet, who are entrusted with the duty of collecting their pay. Hitherto the chaukidars have acted as eyes and ears for the Police, and the swarajists found in one or two districts that the whole system could be paralysed by deliberately neglecting to collect the pay of the chaukidars. Now the Police are to be put under a Minister, and neither they nor the chaukidars will have any motive for serving us, but a great many for turning from the setting to the rising sun.

The lines of communication from Calcutta and Bombay to the frontier are about 1500 miles long, it would require 72,000 men to be constantly on guard for the purpose of preventing the telegraph wires being cut by stealth, and any section of these might easily be overpowered. My friend, who had experience of the Boer War, said that it would require the whole British Army to guard the lines of communication to the North West Frontier. With the

Police and the chaudikars not available, or not to be relied on for this work, it would require most of the Indian Army as well, assuming that there is then any Indian Army.

To the best of my recollection the duties of chaukidars prescribed by law are confined to their villages, and guarding the railway is an extra. Many of them are so wanting in intelligence that an order had to be passed in at least one Province that they should remain outside the railway fencing. Indians of the lower classes are accustomed to sleep on the ground, the rail formed a convenient pillow, and numbers of the chaukidars got run over and killed.

It may be objected that these difficulties can, to a great extent, be overcome by equipping the trains and railway stations with wireless. This, however, would be effective, or only to a very limited extent. The train might be equipped with wireless, but a railway station would not usually have the necessary power to send out messages; any that had would be likely to be attacked, and to have their equipment smashed. Railway stations are sometimes attacked even as it is in order to obtain money for political purposes, and the difficulty of guarding the stations would be quite as great as that of guarding the line. If once we give up control of the police administration, I can see no means of doing either.

If railway communications are interrupted, an army operating on the Indian frontier will find itself in the same position as that of the Athenians before Syracuse. The whole Athenian people were enthusiastically in favour of the Syracuse expedition, and when it not merely proved a failure, but involved the loss of their whole army, they could only feel that they had nobody to blame but themselves. The majority of the British people, or even of the Members of Parliament, are not in favour of the policy of abandoning India to Indian rule, and would be still less so if they had the faintest idea of what this involves, either to India or to Britain. It is being imposed on Parliament and the public by blind leaders of the blind, who never deal, or attempt to deal with the facts, in avoiding which they are wise in their generation, as they do not appear to have the slightest knowledge of them. Instead of even attempting to do so, they silence criticism, either making a personal appeal by saying: "I accept full responsibility," or endeavour to stampede the nation into agreement with them by the use of such phrases as: "If the scheme is adopted we may possibly lose India; if not, we certainly shall lose it." We shall, not by refusing to adopt the scheme, but by allowing it to be imposed on us.

When we have done so, it is an interesting subject for speculation, whether the political leader who has been so fond of the use of the phrase in the past, will have the courage to come forward and say: "I accept full responsibility."

The Afghans, in the event of an invasion, would be supported by the Mohammedan Powers, if not formally, at least by munitions of war, loan of officers, aeroplanes, etc. The strength of the Royal Air Force in India is given as eight squadrons, or ninety-six machines. The Royal Air Force would be overwhelmed in fighting one set of enemies on behalf of another. In fact, we have nothing to gain and everything to lose by fighting at all; and it would be far more to our advantage that the Mogul Empire should be re-established under a new dynasty, than that a Government should be set up such as that proposed in the White Paper. Should the Afghans over-run most of Northern India, Hyderabad, if there is not a revival of the Mahratta Confederacy, would be pretty certain to over-run most of Southern, and Hyderabad is our oldest ally in India, and has been consistently loyal. With the Afghans we have no particular quarrel, and even if they take Russian help, they are such a fighting race, and communications through the country are so difficult, that I doubt if the Russians could keep India under control permanently. Mohammedans do not, as a rule, combine business with politics in the way that many of the leading Hindus do. Above all, India would be governed by men, not by a caucus of log-rolling politicians, whether Congress leaders, or the delegates of the Rulers of Indian States. Just as the orthodox Hindus despise the Untouchables, so are the talkers of the Congress despised by the fighting races. One of the former, who had made a speech in the Assembly in regard to what they would do when they got Swaraj, was told to his face by a leading Mohammedan:—"And when you get your Swaraj, do you think that we will obey a little spindle-shanked creature like you?"

Mr. Jose states, incidentally, that in 1761, the Afghans ruled the Punjab, and writing as late as 1909, mentions as a commonplace "the perennial hatred of Mohammedan for Hindu," and ends with a reference to "the road now closed for ever." Little did he dream that within a few years the road which he supposed to be closed for ever would be likely to be opened again, and that by the British Government, which has deluded itself into the belief that the magic of the word "Federation" will overcome what the author describes as "perennial hatred," and that by

means of it murderers and murdered, oppressors and oppressed, Hindus who worship cows and Mohammedans who eat them, Rulers of Indian States with jewellery valued at millions of pounds, golden baths, golden cannon, pearl necklaces and all the extravagances of Sardanapalus or Cleopatra, or a star of the films, and peasants who in all their lives have never had enough to eat for themselves and their families, can be combined into a homogeneous State. It is represented that this will be a tower of strength to the British Empire, though the leading Hindu politicians lose no opportunity of declaring their hatred of it and all that it represents, and those Indians who profess their attachment to the scheme apparently expect a handsome reward for doing so. Among many similar items of news appearing almost daily, I select the following extracts from the "Morning Post" of 23rd July:—

"The request for a reward of territories made by the Aga Khan was cited in a message from the Special Correspondent of the "Morning Post" in Bombay, on Saturday, as further evidence that the Government is seeking to obtain support for the White Paper surrender policy by rewards and menaces.

"The receipt of a confidential communication containing the request was admitted by the Foreign Secretary of the Government of India in the Legislative Assembly on July 18."

The Aga Khan is the High Priest of a sect of Mohammedans who have many peculiar customs, and occupies a unique position in the world in being the only head of a religion who is able to devote a large portion of his time to horse-racing. Not satisfied with what most people would consider his good fortune, he now apparently wants to be the Ruler of an Indian State, as do a great many of the big Indian landlords. I knew one who was wire-pulling for years with this object, and another, who for all practical purposes had converted a good portion of his estate into one. It is apparently assumed that if everyone who is supposed to command influence is paid his price for his support of the White Paper scheme, all will be well.

According to the official theory, there is no connection between the request of the Aga Khan and his support of the White Paper; so if a State is created for him, it will presumably be mainly due to his services to the cause of racing. This theory does not, however, find universal acceptance, and there is a very general and well-grounded belief that entry is to be rewarded, or at least compensated,

and non-entry is to be penalised; vide the following extract from the Duchess of Atholl's pamphlet: "The Main Facts of the Indian Problem":—

"Entry into Federation, however, will bring material advantages to some of the Princes. Negotiations are proceeding for some concession to Hyderabad in respect of Berar, to Mysore as regards the British Residency and its cantonments. There will also be gradual remission of tributes ceded at different times to the British Raj, less the value of privileges now enjoyed in respect of customs or the manufacture or sale of salt. The total net cost to Federal revenues of these remissions is estimated at about £750,000 per annum. No State standing out of the Federation will benefit.

Other States will lose the privileges mentioned, without any compensating advantage. They can hardly be expected therefore, to regard the Federation with favour. Is it fair, under these circumstances, that a few of the larger States which may benefit as indicated above, should be able practically to commit the whole body?"

That the Duchess is correct in what she states is proved (1) by the fact that J. C. C. Davidson's Committee on the financial relations of the States to the Federation recommended that remissions of tribute should be made only to those Princes who adhere to the Federation; and (2) by the replies of the Secretary of State for India on March 19th to questions about Bangalore and the Berars; which show that these offers have a connection with the White Paper. The official report of the latter, published by His Majesty's Stationery Office, is as follows:—

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 19th March, 1934.

(Official Report).

The House met at a Quarter before Three of the Clock, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Oral answers to questions.

INDIA.

BERARS.

1. DUCHESS OF ATHOLL asked the Secretary of State for India the present situation in the negotiations which have been taking place between the Government of India and the Government of the Nizam of Hyderabad as to the position that the Berars would occupy under a federal constitution: what changes do these negotiations involve in the present status of this territory; and is the change dependant on his adherence to the proposed All-India federation?

THE SECRETARY FOR INDIA (SIR SAMUEL HOARE): A provisional agreement has been reached with His Exalted Highness the Nizam as to the constitutional position of the Berars in the event of the establishment of Autonomous Provinces and a Federation. This question, which is separate from that of the adherence of Hyderabad proper to a Federation, arises out of the unusual and complicated status of the Berars. The practical effect of the agreement is that the method of governing the Berars in conjunction with the Central Provinces would be changed only to the extent necessary to bring it into line with the proposed political developments in other parts of India. The ratification of the agreement with the Nizam must naturally depend upon the decision of Parliament as to the scheme as a whole.

DUCHESS OF ATHOLL: Will my Right Hon. friend say if it is the case that the proposals that have been made will add to the prestige or position of His Exalted Highness in regard to the Benars?

SIR SAMUEL HOARE: It is difficult to give a general answer to a question of that kind. The negotiation is a complicated one, covering a number of points, but my Noble friend may rest assured that the Joint Select Committee are considering all those points.

DUCHESS OF ATHOLL: Are we to understand that the negotiations with the Berars are subject to what the Committee recommend?

SIR SAMUEL HOARE: I have said that in regard to certain aspects of the case, the ultimate decision must be with Parliament.

HYDERABAD RESIDENCY BAZAAR.

2. **DUCHESS OF ATHOLL** asked the Secretary of State for India whether His Majesty's Government are considering the restitution to the Nizam of Hyderabad of the area known as the Residency Bazaar and of the city of Secunderabad,

SIR SAMUEL HOARE: The area hitherto known as the Hyderabad Residency Bazaar, with the exception of the Residency and its grounds, was restored to His Exalted Highness the Nizam in May last. No change as regards the Cantonment of Secunderabad is proposed.

BANGALORE.

3. **DUCHESS OF ATHOLL** asked the Secretary of State for India what agreement has been reached with the Maharaja of Mysore in regard to the proposed cession of the residency civil stations and British cantonments at Bangalore; and is the cession dependent on the adherence of the Maharaja to the proposed All-India federation?

SIR SAMUEL HOARE: I am not yet in a position to add anything to the statements which I made on 1st May last, in reply to my Hon. and gallant friend the Member for Wycombe (Sir A. Knox).

DUCHESS OF ATHOLL: Are we to understand again that these negotiations with the Maharajah of Mysore are subject to the decision of Parliament in regard to the setting up of the proposed Federation?

SIR SAMUEL HOARE: I would not like to exclude the possibility of dealing with these cases independently, but, speaking generally, I would say that they come within the constitutional problem which the Joint Committee are considering, and to that extent the decision will be subject to the decision eventually taken by Parliament.

BRIGADIER-GENERAL SIR HENRY PAGE CROFT: Has the Right Hon. Gentleman received a memorandum expressing the anxiety of traders and others in Bangalore?

SIR SAMUEL HOARE: I do not think that I have received such a memorandum, but these questions are, I know, being taken into account by the Resident in the negotiation which is now going on between him and the Maharajah.

The reason usually given for the Government proposals in regard to India is that, enjoying as we do the blessing of self-government ourselves, it is our duty to confer the boon on others. How far the assumption in regard to ourselves is true is open to considerable doubt. Owing to our adherence to the system of single-member constituencies, on more than one occasion it has happened that a minority of voters in the country elected a majority of members in the House of Commons. Unless a person is not only wealthy, but also possesses considerable local influence, it is almost impossible to get elected to the House of Commons without being taken up by the party machine of one or other of the principal parties. On the other hand, if he is so fortunate as to have wealth, the gift of public speaking, or any other quality which will render him a useful and obedient member of a political party, it is possible to find for him a constituency, the voters of which, till he was brought forward as a candidate for parliamentary honours, may have been totally unaware of his existence. This explains the indifference, almost approaching to contempt, with which the leader of one of the great political parties treats the opinions of the members of it, while that of another laments the fact that Dominion Status is not being conferred on India at once, while one of his principal lieutenants has disclosed that it would be ruinous to the great mass of people to do so.

I have made an analysis of the distribution of seats that is proposed in the Central Chambers, which will, I trust, make it clear that we are abdicating in favour, partly of a narrow oligarchy, and partly of autocratic rulers, and that the effect of our doing so in favour of either or both, will be most disastrous to the welfare of the common people, if the scheme works according to plan, which it is most unlikely to do. If not, our rulers, who have been apologising for our presence there for the last seventeen years, will at least have the moral satisfaction of having restored India to the condition in which we found it.

The Indian politicians are even more in the grip of the party machine than our own. I knew a member of the Legislative Council of a Province, who had considerable local influence, and who had gone to jail for what he considered the cause; yet although he would have preferred to stand as an independent, he could not get elected without signing the Congress creed, and taking his orders from the caucus in control of the Congress organisation. In the Chambers, as it is proposed to constitute them, there will be practically no freedom of thought or action; one set of Members will take their orders from the Congress, and another from the Rulers of the Indian States, and these two will form considerably more than half of the total.

No further remarks are necessary about the nominees of the Congress, as they are in very much the same position as a good many Members of Parliament here, but the working of the system by which it is proposed to grant representation, not to the people of the Indian States, but to the Ruling Chiefs, requires examination in some detail.

The Rulers of the Indian States, several of whom are not of the same race and religion as the great mass of their subjects, and others have to be deposed every few years for anything from instigating murder to gross and continued misgovernment, are to be brought in as legislators, or rather as the masters of legislators, and given votes, not even in proportion to the number of their subjects, but as compared with British India, in one House at least 45 per cent., and in the other at least 73 per cent. more than they could claim on this basis. These figures may require slight modification, if the Rulers of the existing Indian States are rewarded for entering the Federation by cessions or retrocessions of territory, in regard to which negotiations are in progress; in addition to the money of about £750,000 a year that they are to receive, camouflaged under the designation of financial adjustments.

This conception of democracy appears to be decidedly novel, but it is not all. In the majority report of the Joint Select Committee, it is proposed that Federation may be introduced when the Rulers of States, representing not less than half the total population of the States, and entitled to not less than half the seats to be allotted to the States in the Federal Upper Chamber, express their desire to accede. In case the inducements above described prove insufficient to secure this object, it is recommended that until the majority of the States have acceded to the Federation, the acceding States should elect additional representatives to both Houses, up to the number of half the vacant seats, until 90 per cent. of the States have acceded, or twenty years after the establishment of the Federation, whichever is earlier. It will thus be seen that great as is the disproportion of voting power already given to the Indian States in the proposed Federation, this may be still further increased, up to nearly another 50 per cent.

The British public, which is being deluded with the idea that democratic institutions are being introduced into India, may be interested to learn that according to the proposed scheme, a quarter of the members of the Lower House, and three-tenths of those of the Upper House may be nominated by nine Rulers, assuming that they enter the Federation, and by doing so place themselves in a position of subordination to a Federal Court, a good many of the Judges of which would not have been Judges, if when starting their careers they could have got a Government appointment with an initial salary of the equivalent, in our money, of £150 or £200 a year. Something of this kind happened in the case of the late Lord Sinha, who was an unsuccessful candidate for the Provincial Judicial Service, became a leader of the Bar, and was raised to the Peerage, in order to administer soothing syrup about the capacity of Indians to govern themselves. Naturally he did not give details of their methods of doing so. I used to hear rather amusing stories about his own methods. It was said that he would leave his hat in one Court, his bag in another, and appear in person in a third. In the other two Courts juniors would be put up to talk against time, and explain that Mr. Sinha, as he was then, was unavoidably detained in another Court, but would arrive in a few minutes. This was regarded with amused tolerance by the Indian public, but Rulers who have inherited vast fortunes are likely to chafe at submitting themselves to

persons who have made their way in the world in this manner.

Let us now examine in further detail the method according to which it is apparently intended that the proposed scheme will work. For this purpose it will be necessary to give statistics of the population of some of the larger States. Representation in the Lower House is to be given to the Rulers in proportion to the number of their subjects, and in the Upper, according to various considerations, left discreetly vague, the two most important of which are population, and what may for convenience be called gun power, the latter being calculated, not on the military value of the guns in the armies of the Rulers, where they possess armies, but on the number of guns in their salute. The following table gives the figures of population for some of the larger States:—

Total Population of Indian States, 1931, 81,310,845.	
Population of Individual States.	
Hyderabad	14,436,148
Mysore	6,557,302
Travancore	5,095,973
Gwalior	3,523,070
Kashmir and Jammu	3,330,518
Jaipur	2,634,775
Baroda	2,443,007
Jodpur	2,125,982
	<hr/>
	40,146,775

This gives a total population of 40,146,775 for eight Indian States; very nearly half the total. The next State in point of population appears to be Patiala, but the Maharaja is said to be somewhat less than enthusiastic on the subject of Federation; so I shall take instead another large State, Cochin, with a population of 1,205,066, which gives a total of 41,351,841, that is more than half. If by hook or by crook, the assent of these nine Rulers can be obtained, the scheme goes through. The members of the House of Commons have received their orders, and those of the House of Lords are, if anything, even more complaisant.

I do not propose to give particulars of the Rulers of all these States, but in a recent newspaper article it is mentioned that the grandson of the Nizam of Hyderabad, who on his mother's side is descended from the late Sultan of Turkey, will inherit £100,000,000 and fifty palaces. The late Sultan was, it may be remembered, the Caliph of the

Mohammedan religion, that is, according to the "Oxford Pocket Dictionary," "Successor of Mohammed, official head of Islam." A person of such descent and such wealth, with a powerful army, cannot be expected to submit to a Federal Court largely composed of Hindu Judges, most of whom started in much the same way as the late Lord Sinha. I am confirmed in this view by a recent newspaper article written by a former British Resident at Hyderabad, which deals primarily with the Maharaja of Patiala, but in which there is a reference to the Nizam:—

"If in that capacity he has felt misgivings about the proposed Federation—which in the words of the representative of the great State of Hyderabad, 'the Secretary of State and his colleagues are relentlessly holding us to,' and which the late Chancellor described as 'injurious alike to the Indian States, and the British connection'—who has a better right to express an opinion?"

The Ruler of Travancore is described earlier in the book as being temporarily raised in the social scale by bathing in a golden bath filled with the products of the cow. The peculiarity of his position naturally places him very much in the power of the Brahmans. Nearly a third of the inhabitants of the State are Christians, mainly Syrian Christians, who claim to have existed there from Apostolic times. They are treated as an inferior race, are excluded from certain branches of the public service, and according to a note by one of them that I have seen, get barely a third of the seats in the Legislature that a section of the Hindus of only half their numbers is able to secure. One retired official, who has held a high appointment in the State, in his address as President of a Hindu Conference, went so far as to say that the Syrian Christians ought to be hounded out of Travancore, even as the Jews have been expelled from Germany, a sentiment which was applauded by his audience, and approved by the entire Hindu press of the State.

Of the Ruler of Kashmir and Jammu some details are given elsewhere. A reference to the "Statesman's Year Book" will show that Kashmir formed part of the Mogul Empire from 1581, and was ruled by the Afghans from 1756 till it was overrun by the Sikhs in 1818. Jammu was made over to a feudatory, Gulab Singh, by the famous Sikh Ruler, Runjit Singh, in regard to whom Dr. Murray Mitchell, in his "Hinduism Past and Present," states as follows:—

"The writer must be pardoned if he appear to speak

too strongly; but when he went out to India the Suttee flames were still blazing in Native States; and he well remembers the thrill of horror and indignation which he felt when he read the account of the burning alive of nine women along with the corpse of old Runjit Singh. Four wives and five slave girls who were concubines were thus murdered. But nine was only a small number; there are cases on record in which the holocaust consisted of sixty or seventy women, and even more.²¹

In 1846, after the Sikh War, Kashmir was made over to Gulab Singh, on payment of the indemnity demanded from the Sikhs. It will thus be seen that the inhabitants of the State, most of whom are Mohammedans, were sold like cattle, and by all the accounts that I hear from persons who have lived in Kashmir, their position has been little better than that of cattle ever since. Such it will remain so long as the system lasts, which our political leaders are to establish, and which they are persuading the British people will give happiness and contentment to India. In "The Statesman's Year Book" it is mentioned that the bulk of the population are Mohammedans, though the ruling race is Hindu. This is by no means peculiar to Kashmir. In almost every Indian State there is a dominant race and a subject race, and in a great many Indian States the members of the subject race are treated very much as the Helots were by the Spartans. The whole basis of the scheme is that this condition can be made permanent in the Indian States, simultaneously with the introduction of the most democratic institutions in British India.

The conditions in Cochin are similar to those in Travancore. I know a clergyman who has worked there as a missionary, and he told me that the Untouchables are in such a depressed condition that even the Mohammedans, though the State is governed by a Hindu Ruler, in which case recent happenings in Kashmir and elsewhere show that they are not exactly the ruling class themselves, can with impunity give the Untouchables what we call a good hammering, and the latter are not in a position to seek redress.

Apart from the injustice to the people both of the Indian States and of British India, owing to the Rulers of the former being appointed to represent their subjects, and to have a very large voice in the government of the country as a whole, while not allowing any interference in their domestic concerns, the proposed system does not even attempt to do justice as between the Rulers themselves.

If they were given representation in proportion to the population of their States, the system might not be exactly democratic, but it would be at least intelligible. The introduction of gun powder has had the effect of making it as undemocratic among the Rulers themselves as between them and their subjects, or the Ruler of a State and the people of British India. So far as one can judge from the figures in the "Statesman's Year Book," no Ruler appears to have a salute of more than twenty-one guns, and none of less than eight or nine. This still further tilts the scale in favour of the Hindus. The Nizam of Hyderabad, who probably rules more subjects than the head of any other Mohammedan State, has a salute of twenty-one guns, while petty Hindu Rajahs, with perhaps 25,000 subjects or so, have a salute of eight or nine. No principle having been laid down in regard to the respective weight to be attached to population and gun power, scope is left for endless wire pulling, and endless dissatisfaction, according to the amount of importance that it is chosen to attach to the one consideration or the other.

Hardly any attention appears to have been called to the fact that the Rulers of the Indian States have succeeded in obtaining assent to the claim which they were putting forward last year, and have secured two-fifths of the representation in the Upper Chamber. It has been pointed out that the introduction of the element of gun power tilts the scale in favour of the Hindus, but even if this were not so, and representation were given on the basis of population, the calculations that I have made show that the Rulers of the Mohammedan States will have about a fifth of the total allotted to the Indian Princes in the Upper Chamber, that is one-fifth of two-fifths, or roughly one-twelfth. It is understood that as the result of one of these pacts, which Parliament in recent years has contented itself with registering, the Mohammedans are to get a third of the representation in each Chamber, and I shall be very much surprised if they allow this number to be made up by means of nominal Mohammedans, who are merely the servants and mouthpieces of Hindu Rulers. If the Mohammedans get a third in each Chamber, which they have been promised, and the Rulers of the Indian States get two-fifths which it is proposed to give them, even after including in the share of Mohammedans those nominated by Mohammedan Rulers of Indian States, a very simple calculation will show how little is left for

everybody else, including the General Electorate, which is mainly Hindu, the Untouchables, the Indian Christians, the Sikhs, the Europeans, and the Anglo-Indians. How it will be possible even to attempt to satisfy the claims of all parties passes my comprehension. The system has been made entirely lopsided by the attempt to bring in the Rulers of the Indian States, who are making a hard bargain as to the conditions on which they will enter, but as this places them in a position of submission to a Federal Court likely to be composed of persons of the class that I have described, I do not blame them. The only way to reduce the scheme to any possibility of being workable is to scrap Federation, and with it Dominion Status. If this is done, Parliament will still be supreme, and if the miracle does not happen, and the system fails to work, it will be possible to abolish it. If Dominion Status is granted, we shall have to look on at the most terrible oppression, be unable to interfere to check it, and shall in all probability be under treaty obligations to fight and maintain it. If so, those of our soldiers who fall in the vain attempt to sustain one of the most oppressive systems on earth, whichever party may be successful in getting the upper hand, will not even have the satisfaction of having earned the epitaph:—

*“Qui ante diem perit,
Sed miles, sed pro patria.”*

That of the millions, or tens of millions, who perish in the ensuing confusion, will be:—

*“Qui ante diem perit,
Non miles, pro stultitia.”*

One almost insuperable difficulty in connection with Federation appears to have been completely overlooked. It has struck me with regard to an incident in my own career. One of the greatest landowners in the Province was, when I first knew him, an impecunious collateral relative of the last owner of an impartible estate, whose widow was said to have made an adoption, and under Hindu law an adopted son has all the right of a real son. Government recognised the adoption, and took the estate under the Court of Wards, of which, among other duties, I was in charge for that district. The adoption was disputed, and the claim of the collateral was taken up by a syndicate of speculators, on condition that, in the event of success, they were to receive several times the amount advanced. That soi-disant patriot, the late Mr. C. R. Das, was engaged as the leading Counsel on their side. The

suit was tried by a Subordinate Judge, on a salary of about 1,000 or 1,200 rupees a month, while the fee of Mr. C. R. Das was said to be 1,500 rupees a day. They were so friendly that when they went to Calcutta, which they did on almost every possible opportunity, both having their home there, the Subordinate Judge, instead of using the ordinary train, travelled with Mr. C. R. Das in his reserved carriage. I have frequently seen them getting into it together, as well as the brother of Mr. C. R. Das, who was also engaged on behalf of the claimant, and who was subsequently made a High Court Judge. When the judgement, which was said to be type-written, appeared, every single point was found to have been decided in favour of the claimant, although I was told by the lawyers on the Government side, one of whom also became a High Court Judge, and has acted as Chief Justice of the Province, that in the course of the arguments, the Subordinate Judge on several occasions told them that they need not proceed any further, as he was quite satisfied on that point. The claimant felt so certain of the result that he had a special train, with steam up, waiting in the station, to enable him to take over the property as soon as the judgement should be pronounced. He subsequently was made a Non-Official Member of the Executive Council of the Province, and was placed in charge of the Law Department, which contained the correspondence relating to the case against him, when Government did not recognise him as the heir to the estate.

If Federation is introduced, the Federal Court will be supreme, and what happened in regard to this estate in British India may happen in regard to every Indian State. At present, if there is a disputed succession, the Government decides who is to succeed, and that is the end of the matter. Under the proposed system, if the succession is disputed, it will apparently be open to every candidate who thinks it worth while, to institute a case in the Federal Court to have his claim decided, and the Rulers of the Indian States, many of whom do not allow lawyers to practice within their dominions, will themselves be at the mercy of lawyers, and hold their office just as long as the Federal Court decides. The Federal Court, if the Indian politicians and our own have their way, will be composed of lawyers of the type that I have endeavoured to describe. Our system forces all classes to employ them, but very reluctantly, and instead of being the leaders of the people, which is their favourite pose, I am by no means sure that they are not the best hated class in the community, even

more so than the landlords and the money lenders, except the very worst.

The common people of India have no friends except the British. Their soi-disant friends of the Congress party have piled up tariffs enormously, which greatly increases the cost of living, and the burden of which falls almost entirely on the poor. The same may be said of the Salt Tax, but we did not invent it; we took it over from our predecessors. It could be abolished, but for one thing. The landed interest has been sufficiently powerful to put such an interpretation on the Permanent Settlement, that they are able to escape all other forms of taxation on their income from landed property. I remember once discussing the subject with another member of the Indian Civil Service, who, like most of us, considered that this interpretation was wrong. He said that Income Tax would never be imposed on the landlords. I asked him why, and he replied that if it were, the amount which one great landholder alone would have to pay in the first year would be sufficient to buy up the whole Legislative Assembly.

When the amount that one landlord could spare for political corruption would more than pay for itself in the first year, what results may not be expected from the wealth of the Rulers of the Indian States? I know personally an instance that goes far to support the view mentioned. One of our Provincial Legislators was a petty landlord, whose politics when first elected would in France be described as those of the Left. They swerved considerably to the Right, when his son was given the Indian equivalent of a French tobacco shop, which was practically a sinecure. The Legislator naturally could not get re-elected on quite the same programme, so he adapted his politics to the changed situation, and very diplomatically, as he thought, put a placard on the back of the motor car used for electioneering purposes containing no definite profession of what he stood for, but the words: "Vote for so and so, the tried man." Unfortunately for him, the language of that part of India contains a great many compound letters, and the addition of a single stroke to one of them may completely alter the meaning of the word. The Congress Party, with whom he had previously been friendly, saw their chance and took it. They added a stroke to one of the letters, without its being noticed, and for a week he toured the constituency, bearing on the back of his motor car a slogan, of which the nearest English equivalent is: "Vote for so and so, the half-wit."

Another abuse which has now become rampant, as a result of, the supposed necessity of vote-catching, is the method of appointment to the public service, at least to those of Deputy and Sub-Deputy Magistrates, who try all the Revenue, and most of the Criminal cases. There are usually more than twenty candidates for each vacancy. A Committee consisting of the Commissioner of the Division and the Collectors under him, makes the preliminary sifting, and the final selection is made by a Selection Committee at headquarters, of which a few Legislators are appointed members. One year the Legislator selected was the one just described. Another year, it was a landlord who was constantly fighting with his tenants, many of whom I once found in such a state of starvation that I could count the ribs of the children, and the Civil Surgeon described them as living skeletons. One old woman we found trying to sustain life on a soup made not even from grass, of which there is very little in the locality at that time of the year, but on a weed which the Civil Surgeon said was very irritant to the stomach. The landlord in question was an honoured guest at Government House, and was subsequently made Non-Official Member of the Executive Council of the Province, most probably by a Labour Government. One of the candidates was the son of a Magistrate who was then trying cases brought by him against them, and the son in question was by no means brilliant. The latest instance of which I have heard is that of a Minister, whose nephew was appointed over the heads of far more qualified candidates. When such things are constantly occurring under the Reforms that we have introduced, what may not be expected when the process is completed?

While the book was in the press, some further information came in with regard to a resolution of the Chamber of Princes, which will, I hope, open the eyes of those who think that we are introducing democracy into India. The following is an account of it given in the "Daily Telegraph" of 23rd January, under the heading: "Nessus Shirt of Democracy":—

"The resolution was moved by the Maharaja of Pialala. 'The Princes were willing to join in the proposed federation,' he said, 'but must await the publication of the India Bill. He wanted the instrument of accession drawn up in consultation with the Princes.'

"'While we are willing to enter the Federation, we

are equally prepared to stand out of a federal scheme if British India is not anxious to have it,' he said.

'Replying to those Indian politicians who favoured federation in the hope that the Princes would be forced to introduce a democratic form of government, the Maharaja said: 'If British India is hoping to compel us to wear on our healthy body politic the Nessus shirt of a discredited political theory, they are living in a world of unreality.' "

(The flesh of Hercules was torn off by a garment steeped in the blood of Nessus, a centaur who had been slain by Hercules with a poisoned arrow).

If anything will enable the British people to understand what is being done, I hope that this will. Under the pretence of introducing democracy, we are endeavouring to guarantee the vilest system of absolutism that ever existed.

I have lived side by side with what we are now pleased to call Indian States for several years, and although I was a Magistrate in British India, I was Sessions Judge for some of them, and was required to go to them to try murder cases. The atmosphere of corruption could almost be felt. The only ones with which I came into contact, and which were decently governed were two, in one of which the Rajah had followed the example of the one immortalised in some lines of Kipling, whose works I have not by me at the moment, but of which this is my recollection:—

"This is the reason why Rustem Beg,
Rajah of Kolazai,
Drinketh the "simpkin"* and brandy peg;
Maketh the money to fly,
Vexeth a Government tender and kind,
Also—but this is a detail—blind."
secret-blind."

In the other, the Rajah was said to have committed a murder, and had been deposed, which was also governed by an officer lent from the British Service. The worst was one in which the Rajah had followed the example of Rustum Beg, but had not gone quite so far as to be deprived of his ruling powers. Some of the others were such nonentities that I lived in close proximity to them for several years without knowing anything about them.

The reasons in favour of Federation have been thus set forth in a statement made to the "Morning Post" by

* Simpkin is the Indian pronunciation of champagne.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer, Deputy Leader of the Nationalist Party in the Indian Legislative Assembly, and published in that paper on August 9th, 1933. They are as follows:—

“Mahatma Gandhi, on behalf of the Congress, agreed to an All-India Federation, which was an important part of the Gandhi-Irwin Pact. Extremists in the Congress supported the Pact in the hope of making an All-India Federation a stepping-stone to sovereign independence. They thought that it would give them an immediate opportunity to start an All-India-propoganda for independence. Hitherto such propoganda has not been conducted in the Indian States.

“The Constitutionlists, like myself, who welcome an All-India Federation, do so for three reasons.

“Firstly, under a Federal Scheme, the conservative forces and the Indian States would prove a check on British India, making progress steady and administration easy.

“Secondly, the British Indian democracy will be in intimate contact with the mediæval autocracies in the States, make the rulers of the States more constitutional and their Governments responsible to the people in the Parliamentary sense.

“Thirdly, without an All-India Federation there can be no hope of welding the two Indias—British and Indian—into one united whole.

“Federation is necessary to preserve the British connection and strengthen the constitutional movement, because British Indians by their association with the representatives of the States and their rulers, who have time-honoured traditions of loyalty to the Crown, will be able to form a strong rival to the Congress.”

He omits what are, no doubt, the strongest reasons of all from the point of view of the Indian politicians, who are usually lawyers, that Federation will bring any amount of grist to their mill, as under it almost every act of the Government and of its officers will be liable to be questioned in the Courts as unconstitutional or ultra vires, and will offer to the legal profession a number of super-prize appointments, as Judges of the proposed Federal Court. This will make them kings of kings and lords of lords, in fact emperors for the time being, for even a king, if rumour is to be believed, will have in theory to bow down before them. Whether in practice he and the other Rulers will do it is another matter, in regard to which I have my doubts.

Apart from these, which appear to me to be the main reasons, the other reasons given are extremely curious. Mr. Gandhi is in favour of the Federation as a stepping-stone to complete sovereign independence. Mr. Iyer is in favour of it as a means of preserving the British connection,

and harps on the popular chord of the loyalty to the Crown of the Rulers of the Indian States, ignoring such inconvenient facts as that one Hindu Ruler created something of a scene at the Delhi Durbar of 1911, another displayed his loyalty by having a man, who had supplanted him as the recipient of the favours of his Mohammedan mistress, murdered by his servants in the city of Bombay, which is British territory, and was deposed in consequence, while his servants were hanged. As he took with him an allowance of £50,000 a year, he appears to have come out of the affair much better than either his servants or his subjects. A few months ago, yet another ruler is reported to have deserted his State and gone to live in the ashram of the notorious seditionist, Arabindo Ghose, in French Territory at Chandernagore. Ashram is a word untranslatable in English, it means a place where one retires from the world for meditation and religious exercises, but among Hindus, religion and politics are inextricably intermixed.

The Maharaja of Alwar, who was given two years holiday some time ago, on account of long continued oppression and misgovernment, which had brought his State to the verge of ruin, so far from displaying a spirit of devotion when he came to London with an enormous retinue, and had the railway carriages in which they travelled specially upholstered, because his religion forbids him to touch leather, anticipated the proposed state of things, when he told the representative of the "Daily Herald" that he would stay in London for some time, and that there would be "discussions," a term only used among equals.

In spite of his extravagance and misgovernment, the Maharaja of Alwar was long regarded as a "picked" Ruler; he was selected as one of the Indian representatives at one of the Imperial Conferences, and according to Mr. P. L. Chudgar in his "Indian Princes under British Protection," published by Williams & Norgate, Ltd., in 1929, he was described by the Secretary of State for India in the then Labour Government in the following glowing terms:—"A remarkable man who shines in every walk of life, and whose State bears the marks of the good administration of its Ruler!" The quotation ends with a note of exclamation, but whether this indicates admiration on the part of the Secretary of State, or astonishment on the part of Mr. Chudgar, is not clear. The grammatical construction supports the former view, while the internal evidence points towards the latter. I find in the same book that two years previously, this Maharaja built a palace at Mount Abu, hundreds of miles away from his State, at a cost, it is said, of £350,000, which according to the Political Agent, "is in richness and splendour not remotely reminiscent of

a scene in the Arabian nights." To estimate correctly the full enormity of this extravagance, it must be remembered that the Alwar State has a population of only 700,000. The average income of the subjects of the Indian States is estimated by Mr. Chudgar at £3 10s. a head, out of which, he writes, "the villager must feed and clothe himself and his wife, children and dependents." Such are the conditions which, judging from the eulogium quoted, met with the full approval of those who in this country call themselves Socialists, but whose actions show that they believe as firmly as any Imperialist poet that "East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet"—except at Round Table Conferences and social functions.

The other reasons given by Mr. Iyer are self-contradictory, and depend on the system of checks and balances, which was so popular in the 18th century, and has been finally thrown overboard with the passing of the Parliament Act of 1911, which has reduced the House of Lords to a position of comparative unimportance, and has made the House of Commons supreme, or rather the Cabinet, which can usually impose its will on the House of Commons, or even the Prime Minister, who can usually impose his will on the Cabinet. The autocrats of the Indian States and the democracy of British India are to be made to run in double harness, so that the first may make the second go slower, and the second make the first go faster. Our Government is trying an experiment with human beings that no sane person would dream of attempting with horses or mules. There is also some sentimental nonsense about welding the two Indias into one, when Federation is being linked with Provincial Autonomy, more and more new Provinces are being created, and each Province is to be for all practical purposes an Independent State; far more so than exists in any other part of the British Empire, or even in the individual States that constitute the United States of America.

Another reason that Mr. Iyer may have had at the back of his mind is that most of the Rulers of Indian States being Hindus, by including them in a Federation, Hindu supremacy will be established in the Central Government, and almost all the Hindu Politicians, including Mr. Gandhi, are Hindus first and democrats afterwards, that is if they are democratic at all, which they very rarely are.

The attitude of Hindus and Mohammedans to each other is illustrated by an incident described in the "Morning Post" of August 3rd, 1933. Hindus and Mohammedans are expected to work harmoniously in the task of governing India when, at a time when we are still supposed to be doing so, the Hindus cannot keep from killing and torturing the

Mohammedans, and their leaders cannot keep from squabbling, even in the presence of the Joint Select Committee. The report of an incident of this kind is as follows:—

“Dr. Moonje was examined by Sir Andur Rahim and Mr. Ghuznavi on a statement made some time ago by the witness that ‘Hindustan is the land of the Hindus.’”

‘Mr. Ghuznavi: You gave a statement to the ‘Times of India’ last year. There you said that ‘the Hindus as elder brothers are to develop courage and strength to pull the Muslims by the ear.’ I may give a reply? It is a reply to the argument that is used against me that, the Hindu being the majority brother—the elder brother—he should be generous enough to the younger brother, the Muslim.”

“So as to pull his ear?”—“My reply is that if the elder brother is called upon to exercise his obligation as the elder brother in making concessions to the younger brother, he has also another obligation, to put right the Muslim, the younger brother, by pulling him by the ears if he is going astray.”

What sublime effrontery! This Hindu witness talks as if they were already the rulers of India, and everybody else is to be allowed to live there only on sufferance, which involves the repudiation on the part of the British Government of the promise made by Queen Victoria in 1858, when India was taken over by the Crown, “to administer the government of the country for the benefit of all our subjects resident therein.”

It also involves a repudiation by Parliament of its own pledge given in the Act of 1919, where it states its own responsibility for “the welfare and advancement of the peoples of India.” All idea of promoting their welfare has been abandoned, and the advancement is to be confined to that of a small group of orthodox Hindu politicians and their friends, whose aspirations are voiced rather indiscreetly by Dr. Moonji, and that of the Rulers of the Indian States, who in return for nominating some of their creatures to help to replace us in governing India, are to be rewarded on a scale in comparison with which our own Cabinet Ministers are badly sweated workers, whose plight would arouse universal compassion, did not the remedy rest in their own hands. Why do they not continue to do the work, and vote themselves some extra remuneration, rather than try to get other people who are already enormously wealthy, to relieve them of it? I greatly doubt if money will succeed, however lavish the expenditure of it, as when people have as much money as they require, and a great deal more, their minds are set on other things; vide the following extract from the Jersey “Evening Post” of September 6th:—

"Professor Voronoff has arrived in Vienna to submit to an operation on his jaw. When convalescent he will leave with his young wife—a niece of Mme. Lupescu—for India, to perform a rejuvenation operation on a Maharajah."

Women, rather than politics, being the chief preoccupation of so many Hindu rulers, I fear that the Government proposals are doomed to failure. There is also another difficulty in the way, which appears to have been overlooked. The Muslim, the younger brother, may not tamely submit to having his ears pulled. A friend who has not been to India, but has seen something of the African Muslim, on hearing of the incident mentioned above, remarked that he would as soon think of pulling a lion by the tail as a Muslim by the ear; and I entirely agree with him.

It was said of the Bourbons that they learned nothing and forgot nothing, but they have been completely left behind by our politicians, who have an instance before their eyes of the consequences of forgetting the amount of truth contained in the proverb that honesty is the best policy. The Union of Great Britain and Ireland was forced through in 1800 by means of bribery and corruption, against the will of the Irish people, and against the better judgment of their leaders and representatives. Unless the Duchess has been grossly misinformed, and the rest of her pamphlet is remarkably accurate, similar methods are being employed to force Federation on India. There is a highly inconvenient officer called the Auditor General, and rewards cannot be given in money, as they were then, but they can be given in territory and titles, with which the Auditor-General has nothing to do. Steps in the Peerage were given in 1800, and it is stated that the reluctance of the Ruler of one Indian State is about to be overcome by giving him a higher title, which will place him on a level with such of the crowned heads of Europe as are still left. How did the former application of these methods end? In bloodshed and anarchy, and the formation of the present Irish Free State, which is a republic in everything but name, and may possibly openly be declared one shortly. Have we any reason to expect better results in India, where religious differences are far more acute than in Ireland, and where the religion of the Mohammedans requires those who can afford it to sacrifice a cow once a year at the Bakrid Festival, which the Hindus regard as worse than homicide?

A few Members of Parliament appear to have realised that what the Government is attempting to do is to establish, not a democracy but an oligarchy. In the newspaper report of the proceedings of the Joint Select Committee, I find the following passages:—

"Sir Austin Chamberlain.—How does the Witness

expect Parliamentary Government to work in India if a distinguished individual can cause a whole Party to vote against their convictions by threatening to fast to death?— I had better not reply to that question.”

* * * * *

“Colonel Wedgewood stated that his chief objection to the White Paper was its finality. Any further reform depends not upon the Houses of Parliament, not upon England, but upon the new Assembly which you are setting up. We abdicate our responsibility to a narrow oligarchy.

“To whom do we surrender our powers? The Princes, who are absolute rulers, many of whom survive only on our bayonets; who have no experience of governing in democratic fashion; by training and heredity alien to the views felt and expressed by all parties in this country . . .

“They contribute nothing to the Federation, neither revenue, nor authority, nor liabilities.

“There is no precedent on earth for a federation on those lines, where some parties to the federation are completely independent of the administration into which they enter.”

The attitude of a good many Members of Parliament however, has been one of wait and see what the Joint Select Committee reports. This would be all very well if the Joint Select Committee were a judicial body, but a number of members of it have already expressed themselves in favour of the White Paper scheme. I fear that my faith in Parliamentary Committees has received a shock from which it will never recover, by an incident that I remember reading in connection with what was described at the time, at least in the Conservative newspapers, as the Marconi scandal. A Parliamentary Committee was appointed to enquire into the matter. After everything was over, one of the members of it was reported in the Press as having stated that he knew the facts all along, but so far from enlightening his colleagues, he did all in his power to drag a red herring across the trail, and to prevent them from finding out. I am far from suggesting that anything of this nature is likely to happen now, but the evidence has been so voluminous and so conflicting, that it is very difficult for anyone who has borne the labour of hearing or reading it, to see the wood for the trees.

Another false assumption underlying the scheme is the idea to which Mr. Ramsay Macdonald has given expression, that the Hindu is a saint. As one of my correspondents, an Indian, rather neatly puts it, he is as much of a saint as Mr. Ramsay Macdonald is a prize-fighter. Two other false assumptions are pointed out by my correspondent; one which he describes as the curious idea on the part of the British proletariat, that Mr. Gandhi is a

Christian, or about to become a Christian, whereas he is a Bunnia of Bunnias. So far from Mr. Gandhi having any intention of becoming a Christian, he has announced that under Swaraj, the British and other Christian Missions will be expelled. He is also so indifferent to the loss of life, and the human suffering caused by communal disturbances between Hindus and Mohammedans, that he is reported as having said that they "may perhaps end in the exhaustion or destruction of one community or the other." As the two communities in India alone, excluding the adjoining countries that are likely to join in the fray, number well over 325,000,000, this "Apostle of Peace," if our Government continue to allow him to dictate to them, as they did over the representation of the Untouchables, may easily be the means of causing a greater loss of life, and a greater amount of human misery, than all the great conquerors of history put together.

To the people of this country my correspondent's remark that Mr. Gandhi is a Bunnia of Bunnias will convey no particular meaning, but to one who knows India it is very significant. The Bunnias are the trading and money-lending class and are looked down upon by the higher castes as such, and are hated by both higher and lower for their extortions as money-lenders, which sometimes exceed 100 per cent. per annum. In reality the interest is more than this, as it is always compound, is calculated monthly, and that for the first month is deducted from the loan.

In the Punjab, a special law had to be passed, on the lines of the Homestead Laws of some American States, because, to quote from Sir Henry Craik's "Impressions of India:—

" the bunyah of the large town stretches his spider-like claws of usury over the countryman, and the only defence against his blood-sucking lies in a parental administration which forbids the alienation of mortgaged land except with official sanction."

In Bengal there was no such law, and the Bunnia was allowed to pursue his ravages unchecked. In one case that I tried, a money-lender, probably a Bunnia, though he may have been a Kayesth, another caste which we are raising into power, though one of them once said to me: "We Kayesths have always been the slaves of kings," had got the whole countryside into his clutches. His debtors held a meeting to consider what was to be done with him, and arrived at the very sound conclusion, from their own point of view, that the only thing to be done was to kill him. They then proceeded to call for tenders for the work, and one man offered to do it for Rs.75, or

about £5 at the then rate of exchange. However a hitch arose, as the potential murderer wanted payment in advance, and the others wanted to pay when they had got their money's worth; neither side would trust the other, and there was a deadlock, till a young Mohammedan of good family, which had been ruined by the exactions of the money-lender, whom they thought that they had paid off, but found themselves deeper in debt than ever, offered to do it for the mere pleasure of the thing. The money-lender came to a fair to collect his dues, started for home at nightfall, but never reached it. The next day various parts of him were found scattered over a distance of almost a mile, and some were never found at all.

When Mr. Gandhi gets his Swaraj, if ever, his fellow caste-men will be the first to have their throats cut, but there are such numbers of them who have earned this attention on the part of the lower classes, who are their usual victims, that there will probably not be time for any further artistic carving, such as happened in the case that came under my notice.

I reported the facts of the case, with a strong recommendation for legislation that would prevent the Civil Courts from being mere machines in the hands of greedy and unscrupulous money-lenders, and after some time the Usurious Loans Act was passed by the Central Government. In regard to it the Royal Commission on Agriculture reported that an enquiry was needed as to why this Act, which should have given effective protection to many small cultivators against the exactions of money-lenders, had been allowed to remain a dead letter.

No enquiry is necessary; the reasons are obvious to anyone who knows India. The subordinate judicial officers who deal with such cases are nearly all Hindus of the "twice-born" class, that is the three or four highest castes, most of whom practice money-lending themselves, and have no sympathy with what one of my Brahman officers once described as "those low class people." Even if they had, when they depart from the terms of the contract, reasons have to be given, to write out which involves time and trouble, and causes a lesser apparent output of work. Thus their statistics are spoiled. It is much simpler and quicker to write: "Decree according to the bond." The statistics may also be spoiled in another way. If the discretion is exercised, the money-lender, being a rich man, is sure to appeal, and the order may be upset. The cultivator, being ruined, cannot afford to appeal, so the order stands. Every motive therefore of class sympathy and self-interest operates to prevent modification of the terms of the contract, however exorbitant or iniquitous they may be.

Indian judicial officers are generally very susceptible

about their decisions being upset on appeal, and police officers of cases that they send up ending in acquittal. In one instance, where a landlord had collected men, forcibly cut and removed the crops of a tenant with whom he was on bad terms, and practically ruined him, the police report ended somewhat as follows: "The complainant has no doubt suffered great oppression, but the accused is a rich man, and will employ pleaders and barristers to defend him, so the case is not likely to end in conviction. I, therefore, in consultation with the Inspector, return it in C form True." That is, he did nothing. When I saw the papers while inspecting the police station, more than six months had elapsed, and it was too late to intervene.

Deputy Magistrates and Collectors, who have to try criminal and revenue cases, are generally credited with having a greater sense of justice than Munsiffs, who do purely civil work, but even in their case I found them allowing themselves to be made the means of perpetrating gross injustice. In Orissa, rent suits are tried by the Revenue, not the Civil Courts. When the rent is payable in kind by division of the crop, and the landlord does not receive his half share, or says that he has not done so, he can sue for the value of it at the maximum rate. In inspecting the department, it struck me that the value was usually placed very high, and on going into the figures of crop-cutting experiments, and the weekly price-lists of the principal crops published officially, I found that the landlord nearly always put down as the value of his half share about double the value of the whole crop, and if the suit were uncontested, which was usually the case, the tenants being too poor to engage a lawyer, a decree was given according to the demand. I put a stop to this by insisting on the Deputy Collectors checking the landlord's valuation. When this was done, in the course of a year or so, the number of holdings sold annually for non-payment of rent fell from about 1,500 to about 500.

If the landlord and the tenants are fighting, and the rent is payable in kind, a favourite legal device is this: A petition is filed on behalf of the landlord to the effect that the tenants are about to cut the crop surreptitiously and asking for a deputation of a peon, for whose services he is willing to pay, to guard the crops. An Indian officer generally grants such an application *ex parte*, without verification. The peon prevents the tenants from cutting the crops, the landlord takes no steps to have them cut, and the crops rot in the ground, which is the landlord's object. He then brings a suit for the value of his half share, the tenant is unable to prove that owing to the landlord's action there was no crop to divide, gets a decree, and the tenant is ruined. I remember an instance

in which this would have happened in regard to a large number of tenants if a European I.C.S. officer in the Settlement Department, who was working in the locality, had not called attention to it, and asked me if it was being done with my approval. It was the first that I had heard of the matter. This landlord carried his oppression too far, and some time afterwards he was found with his throat cut from ear to ear. The perpetrators were never discovered, but everybody believed that it was done by his own tenants. In another instance, where the landlord, a Member of the Legislative Council, was doing the same thing, the tenants grew desperate, and cut the crops rather than let them rot. He took advantage of a ruling to the effect that the cutting of the crops by the tenants in the absence of the landlord's representative constituted theft, and had them prosecuted and convicted. The appeal came before me, and I set the conviction aside on the ground that when the landlord deliberately refrained from sending a representative, in order to cause the loss of the crops, the ruling was inapplicable. In yet another instance, where the rent was payable in cash, the landlord got an attachment on the crops, let them rot on the ground, and then sold the holding on the allegation that he had been unable to recover the amount of the decree. He did not want to do so, but only to ruin the tenant.

I had another very interesting case, that of some Pleaders whom I tried for political offence at the end of 1921, or the beginning of 1922. They told me that they refused to recognise my jurisdiction, or any but that of the Congress, after which they maintained a stony silence when I addressed to them the questions which I was obliged by law to put. Shortly after the trial commenced, some of their friends came to the window, and called in to them, telling them not to mind what sentence was passed, that a conference would shortly be held between the Viceroy—then Lord Reading—and Mr. Gandhi, that Swaraj would be granted almost immediately, on which all political prisoners would be released. A month or two afterwards I saw in the Indian newspapers that overtures had been made to Mr. Gandhi for holding such a conference, but that he had refused to confer. By his refusal he saved the British Empire, at least for a time. He had absolutely no authority to speak for the Mohammedans, while the amount of his influence with the high-caste Hindus is shown by his utter failure to secure admission to the temples for the Untouchables, after his promise to do so had been one of the inducements to get them to give up their separate electorate.

The case described was the last of the kind that I tried, for a reason that would be incredible, were not almost

all the doings of our various Governments incredible, since we were overcome by the passion for self abnegation that has characterised our policy since 1917. I have mentioned in the Preface that a hartal was declared on the day that the Prince of Wales arrived in Patna in 1921. Things went, however, much further than this, and his visit, instead of stimulating loyalty, was made the occasion of bringing the Government to its knees. For some psychological reason which I have not seen explained, in almost every age and country the lawyers, as a class, have taken the most prominent part in fostering disloyalty. Those of Patna eagerly seized on the opportunity presented to them by the Prince's visit. As usual, on such occasions, a Durbar was held, to which the leading lawyers were invited. Shortly before, under the powers conferred on it by a certain law, the Local Government had issued a Notification making certain organisations, the object of which was to overthrow or supplant the Government, illegal associations, to belong to one of which was a criminal offence, and it was for belonging to one of these, and not for the more serious offence of sedition, that the Pleaders, whose behaviour I have described, were tried. The attitude of some of the other lawyers was even more insolent, but was displayed in a manner which kept inside the law. Dressed in khadar, the coarse homespun, the use of which Mr. Gandhi hoped to make universal, before the Bombay millowners took up the movement for their own ends, wearing Gandhi caps of the same material, about the most inartistic and unsightly head-dress ever invented, and headed by a Barrister who had acted as a High Court Judge, and in that capacity had gained a great reputation for the originality of his decisions, they went in a deputation to Government House, and presented their ultimatum. The Notification must be withdrawn, or they would boycott the Durbar. The proper answer to such a demand was to make a list of their names, cancel the invitations, and inform them that they would not attend that Durbar or any other. As it is considered a great honour to be invited to a Durbar, and still more so when the Heir to the Throne is present, this would have brought them to their senses, but the Local Government probably knew of the pourparlers that were going on between the Viceroy and Mr. Gandhi, and temporised in a manner that to some extent saved its face, but which appears to me to be in direct conflict with one of the provisions of the Bill of Rights, 1689, which runs as follows: "That the pretended power of suspending of laws and the execution of laws by regal authority without consent of Parliament is illegal." It was agreed that the Notifications should remain in force, but that no prosecutions for violation of

them would be instituted without the consent of the Local Government, and on these conditions the lawyers consented to attend the Durbar.

Under Section 197 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, prosecutions for certain offences against the State cannot be instituted without the sanction of the Government, but this was not one of them, and by executive order, an offence not included in it had been added to those specified in this section. I was thus deprived of the powers conferred on me by another section, of taking cognisance of offences, so far as this particular offence was concerned. The demonstrations of the volunteers in question usually consisted of straggling processions of a dozen or two schoolboys, headed by a faded Gandhi flag, and so far from constituting a public danger, was a striking demonstration of the slight popular hold of the movement, so I let them demonstrate till they were tired, which they soon were, and like all Indian political movements that I have seen, when not artificially stimulated by the British Government or British politicians, it soon fizzled out.

Another incident which took place in connection with the Prince's visit to Patna will show very clearly that the dominant motive of the Congress party is hatred of us, not love for their fellow-countrymen. I was in charge of a good many of the arrangements. Among other ways of celebrating the occasion, it was decided to give over a thousand woollen blankets to the poorest of the poor, mostly old men and old women, which is a real luxury to them in the cold weather, and is usually quite beyond their means. There was such a demand for them that rather elaborate plans had to be worked out to prevent the crowd from making a rush, and trampling down the persons in charge of the distribution. The blankets, I may mention, were Indian made, and were purchased from the handloom weavers of another district, so that the purchase incidentally assisted Mr. Gandhi's scheme of reviving home industry. The recipients went away delighted, but the pleasure of many of them was shortlived. On the way home, they were set upon by the emissaries of the Congress, which had decided that the visit was to be boycotted, the blankets were snatched from them, and torn up and burned.

During the agitation against the partition of Bengal, still more effective methods were adopted to enforce the boycott of British goods. The shops there are frequently made entirely of corrugated iron, both walls and roof, as this is both easy to erect, and makes it difficult for burglars to effect an entrance. As a further precaution, the shopkeepers frequently sleep in their shops. Many of them were compelled, against their will, to give up the sale

of British goods, by the threat that if they did not do so the door would be fastened on the outside, and the shop would be set on fire. They could hardly be expected to carry either their attachment to Britain, or their desire for profit, up to the point of being roasted alive. I have known instances of the same thing in connection with private feuds.

The effects of Mr. Gandhi's interference have in the recent instance been deplorable, and will be disastrous if the Government do not realise in time that they allowed themselves and the Untouchables to be made the victims of what is in Indian Law criminal intimidation. Chapter XXII of the Indian Penal Code is headed: "Of Criminal Intimidation, Insult and Annoyance," and Section 508 enacts as follows:—

"508. Act caused by inducing person to believe that he will be rendered an object of the Divine displeasure. Whoever voluntarily causes or attempts to cause any person to do anything which that person is not legally bound to do, or to omit to do anything which he is legally entitled to do, by inducing or attempting to induce that person to believe that he or any person in whom he is interested will become or will be rendered by some act of the offender an object of Divine displeasure if he does not do the thing which it is the object of the offender to cause him to do, or if he does the thing which it is the object of the offender to cause him to omit, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to one year, or with fine, or with both."

What an extraordinary situation! The British Government, which professes to be democratic, not merely looking calmly on, but agreeing in advance to abide by the result, while a person supposed to be educated, by means of a form of criminal intimidation which took advantage of a popular superstition, and by holding out promises which he must have known to be delusive, forces 44,000,000 people, which is, according to the Simon Report, the number of Untouchables in British India alone, to give up their rights, and allow their representatives to be chosen for them by the votes of other persons the great majority of whom regard them not even as animals, but as vermin. Their attitude may be seen from the following extract from a letter that appeared in the "Manchester Guardian" of the 15th August, 1933:—

"The Untouchables had suddenly got religion or ambition. A leader had arisen among them who exhorted his brethren to cleanse themselves from their filth and rise in the world of Hinduism. Accordingly, among other good resolutions of less importance, the Untouchables determined

to give up the dearest and deadliest of their sins, the occasional Sunday dinner of beef, roast or raw.

So when the next village cow died and was duly skinned there followed no funeral feast, only a simple burial ceremony amid unfeigned regrets for the loss of the departed.

Next morning, however, the regrets were succeeded by a proud consciousness of virtue which expressed itself in their demeanour, and thus attracted the unfavourable notice of caste villagers, good conservative farmers and ploughmen. Inquiries were made, and before evening the facts were known beyond a peradventure; the village custom had been violated, and a Panchayat sat to consider the situation in all its aspects.

The speeches made at that Panchayat were unfortunately not recorded, but it is not impossible to restore conjecturally the main lines along which the argument developed. This was the thin edge of the wedge. The Untouchables would be wanting to send their children to school next. This was gross impiety; rebellion against the sacred law of Karma; this was a monstrous violation of custom—that is, of the constitutional law of the village. Again, 'if these fellows give up their filthy customs and get clean they will think themselves as good as us, and then who is to do our dirty work for us without expecting any pay but kicks and curses?'

Whatever the arguments, there emerged from the debate a unanimous resolution, and this resolution was promptly acted on. Orders were sent through the appropriate channels to the Untouchables to the effect that they should disinter the poor cow—which had now been not much more than 24 hours underground—and eat her.

The thing was done. Whether the Untouchables liked what they had to swallow history does not relate, but some years probably elapsed before another uplift movement threatened the sacred foundations of the village constitution."

It is stated that this was forty years ago, and now the higher castes occasionally attempt to wheedle the Untouchables and give them a more polite designation, but the spirit at the bottom is unaltered, and to quote once more from the "Manchester Guardian," the condition is that "they will desist from seeking to force their way into the temples of the caste Hindus."

The inducement which Mr. Gandhi held out to the Untouchables for giving up their separate electorate, of their being allowed to enter the Hindu temples, he had no power to give, as the temples are in charge of the local priests, over whom he not merely has no authority, but who look down on a person of his caste from a very lofty

eminence. They have naturally disregarded his promises. In other words Mr. Gandhi has successfully bluffed both the Untouchables and the British Government, the Members of which can, if they choose, sacrifice the Untouchables who have been accustomed to nothing but kicks for 2,000 years; but it is a very different matter when they attempt to do this with the Mohammedans, who ruled the greater part of India for 700 years before we established our power there.

Mischievous as has been the result of Mr. Gandhi's recent attempt to guide the universe, this should not permit us to forget the great service he rendered in 1922, by refusing to confer, when according to all outward appearances the powers that be were only too anxious to lay India at his feet.

If the Irish Free State persists in the design with which it was credited when I was there a year or two ago, of removing the Nelson Pillar which forms one of the landmarks of Dublin, a project deserving of consideration would be to purchase the materials, and re-erect them in Trafalgar Square, by the side of the Nelson Column, but surmounted by a statue of Mr. Gandhi, as the two persons who in modern times have done most to save the British Empire, the one from its enemies, and the other, however unintentionally, from its rulers. The work of Mr. Gandhi in some ways surpasses that of Nelson, who no doubt won great victories, but at a considerable cost of blood and treasure. We conquered India mainly because we had gained the confidence of the Indians to such an extent that they conquered it for us, also at a great cost of blood, if not of treasure. Our policy has been reversed. The work of Clive, Warren Hastings, Wellington (when he was a Sepoy General), Lake, Gough, Nicholson, the brothers Lawrence, Havelock, Outram, and Colin Campbell, was about to be undone, and India restored to the condition in which we found it, when by one brilliant stroke, and in strict accordance with his principle of *ahimsa* or non-violence, Mr. Gandhi prevented it. Perched on the top of another Nelson pillar, the scantiness of his attire and the general neglect of his personal appearance would be less noticeable, while a touch of the picturesque might be added by making it a hircestrian statue, and including the famous goat. Such a monument would be sure to attract crowds of visitors to London, as being the only one of its kind in the world, and supplying at a glance an object lesson in our political methods, which our rulers admire as greatly as the rulers of Russia do theirs, and are with equal self-assurance attempting to impose them on other people, most of whom do not want them.

It is fairly obvious that the Hindu politicians have taken the Irish for their model, and when they obtain Swaraj, they will imitate them, not merely in financial methods, but in that of removing objectionable statues: Calcutta and the other large towns in India have in their public places, statues of men like Lawrence, Havelock, Outram and others, whom we used to regard, and some of us still regard as heroes of the Mutiny, but according to the views that now prevail in high places, who ought rather to be regarded as the instruments of the mistaken policy of trying to rule India, instead of allowing Indians to govern themselves, and any other Indians over whom they can establish their authority, or persuade our Government to make over to them.

At one time I thought it might be possible to secure these statues and place them in the British Museum, along with those of Assyrian kings, Egyptian mummies, and other representatives of vanished empires. Even of this I have given up hope. For some time before I left India, I used to see accounts of at least one of the statues of Queen Victoria being tarred, or having similar outrages perpetrated on it. As to what is likely to happen, let us again turn to the Irish Free State. As compared with those of the Great War, the battle of the Boyne was only a skirmish, but it marked a turning-point in history, and was commemorated by an obelisk. The day after the signing of the Treaty, which our Government find so difficult to enforce, the obelisk was partially blown up with dynamite, and is now a shapeless heap of masonry. Have we any reason to believe that a similar fate will not happen to the statues of those whom at one time we delighted to honour, at the hands of those whom we delight to honour now?

Sir William Orpen painted a famous picture, "The Signing of Peace in the Hall of Mirrors, Versailles, June 18, 1919." Unfortunately he died before he had an opportunity of painting what would have been a very famous trilogy. The second would have been the signing of the pact between Lord Irwin, as Viceroy of India, and Mr. Gandhi, in the early part of 1931. The third need not have been a painting at all, but merely a touching up of the photograph in "The Daily Mail Blue Book on the Indian Crisis, 1931" of the Mohammedan corpses being carried off on motor lorries. The first picture might bear its original title, the second might be called "Facilis descensus Averni," and the third might be described "The Reward of Loyalty." The second and third subjects are so simple, in comparison with the first, that it ought to be possible to get another artist to paint them. Were these placed in the National Gallery, and a statue of Mr. Gandhi in Trafalgar Square, almost

every foreigner visiting London would be able to see at a glance one of our leading national characteristics, and that understanding between nations, which is one of the principle aims of our present policy, would be much easier of attainment.

What has been the result of the policy of self-abnegation, and of apologising for our existence in the world in general, and in India in particular, initiated by Mr. Montagu's declaration of 1917, and proclaimed from the housetops ever since by politicians of all parties? The immediate effect will be seen from an anecdote told me by one of my Commissioners. Shortly after the declaration was made, he was sitting in the train at a rather important railway junction in Bihar. A Hindu Pleader, well-known for his seditious proclivities, was talking to one of his friends on the platform about the promised reforms. He said, raising his voice so that the Commissioner could overhear: "Now we shall beat the salahs with shoes."

Salah is a common term of abuse, meaning a person with whose sister one has held sexual intercourse, and beating with shoes is the favourite unofficial method of inflicting corporal punishment, as it degrades as well as hurts. The Indian shoe, I may remark, is really a slipper.

I once, when I was Sub-divisional Magistrate, had a case of a woman who put in a complaint before me, when her landlord thought that she ought to have gone to him. On her return home, he sent his peons for her, had her fetched to his kachahri, or rent-collecting office, tied up to a beam and beaten with shoes on the buttocks. When she was released, she came and put in another case relating to this occurrence. I asked her if she would submit to medical examination. She agreed, and the Bengali Assistant Surgeon found the marks of the shoe-beating on her person. Should the Pleader and his friends succeed in giving effect to their threat, though recent events in Cawnpore as well as those of 1857 would indicate that they may find it difficult to stop at this stage, and when they have us in their power, the Hindus may proceed to throat-cutting as well, it is an interesting subject for speculation whether Mr. Baldwin, if still in politics, and questioned on the subject, will have anything to add to his usual reply: "I take full responsibility."

The case had rather an interesting sequel. Shortly afterwards my transfer was gazetted, but instead of leaving within a fortnight or so, as I should have done in the ordinary course of events, owing to various accidents of circumstances my departure was delayed for about two months. During the interval a report came up from one

of my process-serving peons, with a recommendation from the Deputy Collector in charge of the department for prosecution, alleging that the woman who was the complainant in the two cases mentioned above had abused and assaulted him in the performance of his duty. I remembered her name, and that of the village, and examined the report carefully. The peon had no business to be there at all, the woman had no connection with the matter in regard to which he alleged that he was there, and there was no earthly reason for her behaving as she was said to have done. What had happened was obvious to anyone who knew India. The landlord was determined to have his revenge, as his men, if not he himself, had been convicted by me, but if he had put up anybody belonging to the village to institute a case, coming so shortly after the other two cases, his hand would have appeared at once, and it would have had little prospect of success. These difficulties would be got over if the case were instituted by somebody that appeared to be an impartial outsider, and a Government servant as well, and what I am morally certain happened was that he bribed one of my peons, who happened to be in the neighbourhood, to submit the report against the woman, trusting that it would lead to prosecution, which it would almost certainly have done if my transfer had not been delayed, and it had come before a new officer who did not know the previous history of the matter. The plot failed, ingenious as it was, owing to my being still there when the report came in, but I have little doubt that the landlord succeeded sooner or later in teaching her the desired lesson, that justice is a luxury for the rich, not a right of the poor. Of such men, if our political leaders have their way, will be composed the future rulers of India.

What is the history of the Reforms? They are primarily due to one person, and that person not even an Indian. I have never known the part of India with which I am familiar so quiet as it was during the early years of the Great War. People were shocked and frightened by the German atrocities, and the Indians of all classes realised that to exchange British rule for German would be to make a change for the worse. Even the Entry of Turkey into the War, and later the publication in the Duma of the secret treaty by which Russia was to get Constantinople, caused little excitement. Internal dissension was largely stilled in the face of the common danger, until it was started in an aggravated form by a renegade white woman, who combined a fanatical hatred of England and of Christianity with a fanatical admiration of Hinduism and Hindus. Dr. Horton, one of the leading English Nonconformist

ministers, who visited India just before the War, and wrote a book called "Three Months in India," published by Cassell & Co., Ltd. in 1913, described her work as "probably the most serious obstacle in the country to Christian missions." If her friend, Mr. Gandhi, succeeds in carrying out his programme, it will be the end of them.

Mrs. Besant, the wife of an English clergyman, deserted him, and stumped England with Charles Bradlaugh, preaching atheism. Then she took up the question of birth control. Whatever views one may hold on the general question, most people will agree that it is not a very suitable subject for a Press campaign by a woman. Later on she devoted herself to Theosophy, went to India, became more Hindu than the Hindus themselves, so much so that she defended and justified the obscenity of many of the Hindu deities, and the representations of them on Hindu Temples, withdrew her pamphlet from circulation, and published a counterblast to it called "Theosophy and the Law of Population," in which she explained that the practice of birth control was inconsistent with Theosophical ideals of man as a spiritual being.

During the Great War Mrs. Besant stumped India, recommending the Indians, by which she meant the Hindus, to take advantage of our difficulties to demand Home Rule, and succeeded in persuading some of the politicians to do so. She and her two principal lieutenants were interned by the Madras Government. The circumstances of her release are thus described by her biographer, Gertrude M. Williams, in "The Passionate Pilgrim, A Life of Annie Besant," published by John Hamilton, Ltd. :—

"All summer Mrs. Besant and her two aides rusticated. In August the Secretary of State for India, Mr. E. S. Montagu, raised India's hopes by the memorable statement that Britain's goal in India was the development of self-government institutions with a view to responsible government. Mr. Montagu was to visit India during the approaching cold weather. The Viceroy would arrange to have him meet deputations representing every shade of political opinion with the object of recommending constitutional reforms to Parliament. Indian Nationalists were gratified and hopeful. While the move was made ostensibly in appreciation of India's loyalty during the war, there is no doubt that Mrs. Besant's Home Rule agitation had hastened it by many years. . . . Anxious to secure a harmonious atmosphere for the Viceregal conferences, the Government and Mrs. Besant reached a compromise and the three prisoners were released after three months."

Were she still alive she might justifiably take the credit

or otherwise, of having imposed her views on the leaders of two of the British political parties, whose views on the subject have been adopted by that of the third, who rarely takes the trouble of thinking things out for himself, and is a great believer in the policy, or want of policy, generally known as "muddling through." The great mass of the Hindus however, had something much nearer at heart than obtaining votes, the question of cow-killing, and a good many of them determined to take advantage of the situation to suppress it forcibly.

The storm burst in Shahabad. When I was in charge of that district from 1909 to 1912, except for the usual riots about land, which are to be found in almost every district in Northern India, it was perfectly quiet. When His Majesty The King, during his visit to India in 1911, halted at Arrah, the headquarters town, in order to attend Divine Service in the Church there, the people flocked in from the district in tens of thousands in order to see him, and the roads by which he passed were lined four or five deep, by those anxious to catch a glimpse of him. When His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales visited Patna in 1921, a hartal was declared, and most of the city was like a city of the dead. Such were the results of the agitation started by Mrs. Besant, and of the policy of apologising for our presence in India, which our rulers have adopted, apparently as a result of it.

Whenever they have the opportunity, the Hindus attempt to prevent cow-killing, and if it had succeeded or the conflagration had spread, one such attempt might have set India in a blaze, and caused us to lose the Great War, that in the Shahabad district in 1917. Those Mohammedans who can afford it are required by their religion, or believe that they are required, to sacrifice a cow at the Bakrid Festival. Hindu pressure on the Government has caused this to be restricted, at least in that Province, to those places where it has been customary to do so. This only evades the difficulty, but does not solve it, as whether such a custom exists in a particular place is a matter of evidence, and in a question of this kind both sides have no hesitation in perjuring themselves freely. A dispute on this point broke out, and almost immediately bands of Hindus were roaming over the district, beating the Mohammedans, looting their houses, and as I was told on good authority, that of one of my Indian officers whose home was in the neighbourhood, raping their women. This is a usual accompaniment in India of a successful riot, but through shame it is nearly always suppressed when the case comes into Court.

The programme of the Chittagong revolutionaries, who

all but overwhelmed the European population two or three years ago, was even more drastic. It was to hang the principal officials, to flog the rest of the white men, and to rape the white women; but either the Indian authorities did not think it worth while to report this, or a sense of delicacy, and possibly a fear of imperilling the proposals contained in the White Paper, prevented the British newspapers from publishing much about it. The person through whom I heard about it, an ex-Captain in the Indian Army, who obtained his information when he visited Chittagong, knowing how slight was the chance of a British newspaper publishing anything which would damp the optimism that prevails about the results of the White Paper policy, sent his account to a Danish newspaper instead, including the detail that when the revolutionaries had surprised and captured most of the magazines of arms, they overlooked one which contained a machine gun, and it was this that saved the European residents from a fate worse than that of those of Cawnpore in 1857, in which everybody, men, women and children were killed, but we read nothing of the men being flogged or the women outraged.

To suppress the Shahabad riots taxed to the utmost the police resources of the Province, so far as I remember the military had to be called in, and in the end the number of persons arrested ran into thousands. A special prison camp had to be arranged for them, as if they were prisoners of war, which they practically were, but of civil war.

I know Shahabad well, having been in charge of it for three years. Almost all of it belongs to Hindu landlords, the influence of some of whom will appear from the following incident. One of my successors was touring in the interior of the district; hearing screams proceeding from a village near the road, he asked the reason, and his orderly, a native of the district, replied in the calmest manner possible that the landlord was flogging his tenants to compel them to give him an advance to meet the cost of the cases in which he was engaged, litigation being one of his favourite amusements. Such advances are never repaid or set off against the rent, but are treated as the "benevolences," which used to be levied in England by the Crown down to the time of Charles I. When landlords can treat their tenants in this way, they can almost certainly control their actions in other respects, if they so desire.

The district of which I was then in charge was one of the largest in the Province in point of numbers, having a population of about 3,000,000. Most of it was owned by a Maharajah, who was then the Non-Official Member of the Executive Council, and he and all the other principal landlords were Hindus. As the Bakrid approached, information came in from all sides that the Hindu landlords were

determined to put a stop to cow-sacrifice. The Mohammedans were in a state of terror. The forces available were quite insufficient to quell disturbances at more than one or two places, and most of the police were themselves Hindus.

The circumstances obliged me to have recourse to diplomacy, which proved successful. I shared the general belief that the Hindu landlords were at the back of or in sympathy with the movement, but it would have been worse than useless to say so. Instead I invited them to a meeting, in which I pointed out that to detain troops in India to quell civil disturbances was equivalent to helping the enemy, and asked them, if there were any apprehension of trouble in their locality in connection with the Bakrid, to use their influence to suppress it, and if unsuccessful to report the matter at once. This placed them between the devil and the deep sea, as if trouble took place, and they had not reported the likelihood of it, they practically admitted that either they had no local knowledge or influence, or were themselves the instigators of it. Everything passed off smoothly, but it was a time of great anxiety. When the festival came round again, the danger had passed, the Germans had definitely lost the War, the Armistice was within sight, and disturbances in India would not have produced the same disastrous results as they would have done a year or two earlier.

The number of persons arrested in connection with the Shabad riots did not fall far short of the number of Boers captured with Cronje. Had the trials taken place under the ordinary law, they would have lasted for years; so a Special Commission, consisting of a Sessions Judge and two Magistrates, with summary powers, was appointed to try the rioters. So far as I remember, the legality of this was questioned in the High Court, and it was held that it was within the competence of the Legislature to appoint such a Commission. As constituted at present, it is very doubtful if any of the Legislatures would enact such a law at the request of the Government, and even if they did, every measure of this kind, or any other in which a political object can be served by obstruction or delay, is practically sure to be questioned in the proposed Federal Court, and the administration paralysed while the case is pending. The ingenuity of the lawyers can spin out a case for months. I have tried several political cases, in nearly all of which the lawyers took it in turn to defend the accused free of charge, and handled them so that they lasted at least five times as long as an ordinary case would have done. If a Federal Court is established, India will be handed over to two classes, the lawyers and the lawless, who when

political or religious questions arise, will work in the closest co-operation.

How can we account for the great change that apparently came over many of the Mohammedans in the course of three or four years? In 1917 the Hindus could hardly be restrained from attacking them, and in 1920 or 1921 many of the leaders of the two communities were apparently allied. Like most of our troubles, it was due to our own folly and want of statesmanship. During the latter years of the War, Britain was for all practical purposes under a dictator, whose general ignorance was only exceeded by the flamboyancy of his language. Turkey was the only independent Mohammedan power of any importance left in the world, and she had been attacked by the so-called Christian Powers in a manner which it is impossible to justify. Tripoli had been seized by Italy, without even the shadow of a pretext, except perhaps that it once formed part of the Roman Empire. We had used our position in Egypt, which was nominally under Turkish suzerainty, to prevent Turkish troops being sent by land to defend Tripoli, and Italy having the stronger navy, they could not be sent by sea; so it fell an easy prey. A Mohammedan barrister, whom I met in Europe at the time of the War of the Balkan States against Turkey, told me that it was organised behind the scenes by Russia, which is extremely probable. In the Great War we found ourselves the ally of Russia. Still, the circumstances under which our Government entered it, and Turkey entered it, were such that we were able to represent to the Indian Mohammedans that it was a political and not a religious war, to keep them quiet, and even to get Mohammedan troops to fight against their fellow Mohammedans. The Punjab sent 349,000 combatants to the front, and 53 per cent. of the population of the Punjab is Mohammedan. Then, almost in the twinkling of an eye, the work of years was undone, and the Indian Mohammedans were largely driven into the hostile camp, by a speech of the dictator above-mentioned, in which he stated that one of the fruits of victory would be to plant the Cross instead of the Crescent on the walls of Constantinople. This portion of the speech ought never to have been made, and when made it ought to have been promptly censored, and never allowed to reach India, or any part of the Empire in which there is a considerable Mohammedan population, as they quite naturally regarded it as the proclamation of a new Crusade against their religion. It was probably a glowing metaphor, intended to capture the imagination of the audience at the moment, and uttered either in complete ignorance, or regardless of

the ulterior consequences. It has been stated, with what amount of correctness I do not know, that the speaker had held his high office for a considerable time before he discovered that there were Mohammedans as well as Hindus in India, and judging by the way in which his lieutenant tried to make it over to Mr. Gandhi in 1921-1922, the information appears to have percolated into his mind very slowly. As a matter of fact there are 80,000,000 Mohammedans in India, about 11,000,000 in Nigeria, over 3,000,000 in the Sudan, and 1,276,000 in Tanganyika, so England is about the last country in the world that should think of starting a Crusade, as about 45 per cent. of the total Mohammedan population is under British rule or protection, using the terms in their legal sense. The Indian Mohammedans have discovered to their cost, at Cawnpore and elsewhere, that they may be under British rule, but are not always under British protection, in the ordinary sense of that term.

Regardless or in sublime ignorance of Mohammedan feeling, the dictator, who had inherited from Mr. Gladstone the tradition of "the unspeakable Turk" carried on his Crusade, which he was enabled to do unhampered, through having a Foreign Office of his own, which was often carrying out schemes of which the Foreign Office was ignorant. In the same way, in addition to his Cabinet, he had also a number of unofficial advisers, the position of whom in British politics was as irregular as that of Rasputin was in Russian. In this way I have seen it stated the Greeks were encouraged to undertake the adventure in Asia Minor that ended so disastrously for them, without, it is said, the Foreign Secretary being even consulted in the matter. Some of the Indian Mohammedan leaders did not know or realise this, and supposing that we had a policy, which we rarely have, but are satisfied with allowing whoever is for the moment at the head of affairs to indulge his prejudices, fads and fancies, to his heart's content, or till disaster ensues, put the worst construction on our actions, and saw in everything that our Government did, an insidious attack on their religion, to bring about the downfall of which we had induced the Indian Mohammedans to help, by what, in the light of events, they regarded as insincere statements and promises.

In connection with a political case which I tried, I made the acquaintance of the Secretary of the Khilafat Committee, a Barrister who was a scholar rather than a lawyer, a Doctor of Philosophy at a German University, and a thorough gentleman. He had been sent to jail for expressing his opinions too freely, and the Hindu Pleader

who was then the Public Prosecutor, in cross-examining him, chose to treat him as an ordinary convict and put to him insulting questions. With memories of England and Scotland in the time of Charles II and James II, I did not think it showed grave moral turpitude to go to prison for one's religion, and tried to get the Public Prosecutor to treat him with greater consideration, but he flatly refused, said that under such and such a section of the Evidence Act he was entitled to attack the character of the witness in this way, and he intended to exercise his rights. He was technically correct, and I could do nothing. When the case was over, the Secretary, supposed to be the leading spirit in an organisation that was the deadly enemy of British rule, wrote me a letter in which he thanked me for my efforts to save him from insult at the hands of the Public Prosecutor, and adding that if the same spirit had been displayed twenty years earlier, there would have been no sedition in India. It was obvious that at heart he had no antipathy to us, but had been forced into his position by the course of events. I had examined in connection with the case a book that he had written, called "England and the Khilafat Question," of which great capital had been made by the Public Prosecutor, because the Khilafat Committee had taken over a thousand copies of it for the purpose of propaganda, which was represented as a piece of jobbery on his part. It was one of the most interesting books that I have read; and proved conclusively, as it appeared to the writer, that British policy had been systematically anti-Mohammedan. In support of this contention, a speech of Lord Palmerston at the time of the Crimean War had been unearthed and was quoted, in which it was stated that we were going into the war in our own interests not for those of Turkey, and that if our own interests had not been involved, we would have kept out of it. What he wrongly assumed was that we have anything like a definite foreign policy, and he overlooked the fact that Cabinet Ministers speak so as to carry with them the audience of the moment, not with a view to what some future historian will think or write about the speech sixty years later. He also overlooked the extent to which our policy was influenced by the exigencies of the European situation.

Some of the Mohammedan leaders being at the moment very angry with us, for what they considered the war that our Government were waging against their religion, and their immediate object being to save Turkey from complete dismemberment, formed a rapprochement with the Congress Party, in order to embarrass us, and secure their help towards this object. The Hindu leaders cared nothing for

Turkey, but were only too happy to do anything which would hamper the British Government, and might buy off the Mohammedan opposition to the Hindu supremacy, to which they looked forward as the outcome of the Reforms. The resolution and military skill of Mustapha Kemal Pasha rendered unnecessary any outside efforts to save Turkey, and when this motive ceased to operate, the Indian Hindus and Mohammedans soon resumed their normal attitude of mutual hostility, so much so that between 1923 and 1927 there were 450 persons reported killed and 5,000 injured in Hindu-Moslem fights, and the real casualties were probably many more. The massacre at Cawnpore in 1931 already described, put these figures into the shade, as in it more Mohammedans were killed in one day, and probably at least as many injured, as in the whole of the four years for which the figures are quoted.

As if there was not already a sufficient number of subjects of discord between the Hindus and Mohammedans, yet another was created by a decision of the Privy Council in regard to the subject of processions with music. It was given in connection with a dispute between two Mohammedan sects, but the Hindus took advantage of it to annoy the Mohammedans at their prayers whenever they found an opportunity of doing so, and the Mohammedans retaliated by flatly defying the law as laid down in the decision. I am rather reluctant to write on the subject, lest the Salvation Army should be tempted to imitate the Hindus, in which event, unless prevented by the Police, they would be able to drown the service in any Church in Britain abutting on the street, or within earshot of it, to which they devoted their attention.

I have been present at two communal conflicts, in connection with the question generally known as "music before mosques." Mohammedan worship is almost entirely silent, while that of the Hindus is noisy at times. Conchs are blown to summon the god, and on the occasion of certain festivals, and on that of every marriage, there is a procession accompanied by nearly every musical instrument ever invented, drums and cymbals taking the leading parts. A sarcastic Commissioner once remarked to me that what appeared to him the most extraordinary aspect of the whole question was the very wide extension given to the word music. A decision of the Privy Council held that, subject to Police regulations, each religion had the right to worship in its own way, with the result that the noise of the Hindu music, or what passed for music, disturbed the Mohammedans at their prayers. In issuing licenses for Hindu processions, we took care that they should not

pass a mosque during the usual hours of prayer, but this did not satisfy the Mohammedans, who alleged that there might always be someone praying in a mosque, whose prayers would be disturbed. In the licence form in the Police Code of the Province, instead of leaving the matter to the discretion of the district authorities, which was what the law prescribed, a clause had been inserted to the effect that music should cease when the procession was passing a place of worship. The Mohammedans sheltered themselves behind this form, and refused to allow a Hindu procession to pass at any time.

In the district of which I was then in charge, the Mohammedans formed 3 per cent. of the total population, and that 3 per cent. did not allow a single Hindu procession, except one which took them unawares, to pass a mosque without a police escort, and even then there was sometimes a riot. At the two at which I was present, in the one instance less than twenty Mohammedans held up at least four hundred Hindus who were holding a religious procession, though they knew that the armed police were little over a mile away, and were probably being called out to shoot them. Fortunately I arrived before them, did the shooting myself, and got the procession past by firing two shots from my automatic pistol into a drain. They did not see where I was aiming, and thought that I had fired at them and missed, which was the impression that I wanted to create.

In the other instance, a few Mohammedans, probably not more than half a dozen or ten, attacked a marriage procession consisting of well over a hundred people. I did not see the actual attack, which was on the rear of the procession, but after we reached the other end of the village, seven or eight people came in with broken heads. This was in a place twenty miles from headquarters, where I happened to arrive quite unexpectedly, having gone for a run in my motor car when the day's work was over, and taken the other local officers with me. I hastened back to headquarters, turned out the armed police, and rushed them out in my own motor car, and every other motor car that I could borrow. The Mohammedans were furious at the procession being taken past what they called a mosque, though it was not properly a mosque, but only a building informally used for prayer, and it was not even visible from the road. Reinforcements were brought up by motor car by them also, from the opposite direction. The armed police won the race by half an hour, and those who came to fight, on seeing the armed police there, underwent a sudden transformation into peaceful merchants, who, as they alleged, had come to buy hides. The weak point of their story was that there were no hides in the

village. Had the armed police not arrived in time, I have no doubt that the village would have been looted, and probably burned down, and the inhabitants, who were almost all Hindus, would have been severely maltreated, though as a matter of fact the marriage procession came from elsewhere, and was merely using the road passing through the village.

An interesting aspect of the matter is that though the marriage procession held a police license authorising it, and it was held up for nearly two days, and there was a police station in the village, and a Railway Station from which telegrams could be sent, it never struck them to apply to the authorities for an escort. Instead of this, I found that they had sent off to an Indian State close by, to hire men to fight for them, and were awaiting their arrival, when I unexpectedly came on the scene. I happened to have with me the Superintendent of Police, and we took the procession through ourselves, with the help of the local police. When a decision of the Privy Council is disobeyed in this way, by mere peasants and labourers, how much attention is likely to be paid to that of the proposed Federal Court by Rulers of States with armies of their own? And are people who shelter themselves behind a form in the Police Code likely to neglect to make the most of Queen Victoria's Proclamation?

While this was being written, within three or four days, I have seen the reports of six communal conflicts, and doubtless there were many more which were not cabled to this country. Of the six, four were in British India and one in a petty Indian State, the Ruler of which has a European wife, and is very much in evidence in Indian hill stations and in Europe.

In only one of the conflicts in British India are the police reported as having fired, and two people were killed. In the Indian State ten persons are reported as having been killed and twenty injured.

Shortly after the Mutiny, when our prestige was at the highest, and our rule seemed fixed on an unassailable basis, one of the leading Mohammedans of his time, Syed Ahmad Khan, who was the first to introduce into Islam the culture of the West, and whose efforts were crowned by the establishment in 1875 of the famous Aligarh College, now a University, prophesied that if ever the Mohammedans were oppressed, their brethren the Pathans would swarm from their hills like locusts in order to come to their relief. At that time the Mohammedans had no reason to apprehend oppression, as the Proclamation of Queen Victoria, just after the Mutiny, had guaranteed to them the free exercise of their religion, and admission to all public offices that their merit deserved.

Afghanistan was then, as it still is, a more or less barbarous country, but now it has become civilised in the sense of having a well-equipped army, trained and armed on modern lines, an arsenal, cannon, machine guns, aeroplanes, and all the requirements of modern warfare, with Russia behind it ready to supply it with officers, munitions of war, and anything else that it requires. The Russians have now one of the finest air forces in the world, and at the May Day celebrations in Moscow, 250 bombing and 400 lighter planes took part. They have also almost a monopoly of horses, and have recently ordered in England 3,000,000 horse-shoes.

The Hindu leaders have left no room for doubt that the Mohammedans are going to be oppressed, as will appear from the passage at arms before the Joint Select Committee, when Dr. Moonjee told Mr. Ghaznavi that the Hindus, as the elder brother, claimed the right of correcting the Mohammedans, the younger brother, by pulling his ear, and the threat by a Hindu leader to the Nawabzada Muhammad Azim Khan of Toru: "When the English have gone, we will settle with you."

If the Pathans start swarming, the Afghans are pretty certain to swarm after them, and the Afghans in the past have shown themselves practical Socialists in carrying off all the treasure they could lay their hands on.

One need not be considered altogether a Bolshevik if the thought crosses one's mind that the application of a little practical communism would do no harm to Rulers who have a golden bath like the Rajah of Travancore, or a diamond necklace worth £200,000, a golden cannon weighing 280 pounds, the howdah of an elephant, a structure almost as large as a hansom cab, made of gold, and other howdahs of silver, which are a few of the treasures of the Gaikwar of Baroda shown to Dr. Horton, who remarks that the whole place gave him a sense of the barbaric wealth of India, of which one reads in stories. What he saw is the use made of the wealth of one of the Rulers. The average income in India was estimated at £2 a head a year in the time of Lord Curzon, that is about thirty years ago. A more recent unofficial estimate has put it somewhat higher, but it does not exceed £3 a head a year, and the purchasing power of money has fallen considerably in the meantime owing to the boycott of Manchester goods and the protectionist policy imposed by the Congress and its wealthy supporters, the Bombay mill-owners, who are so unwilling to share their profit with their workers that as I write 65,000 of them are on strike, and thirty-five mills are closed. Cloth is the principal item of expenditure of the cultivating classes, and the

great increase in the price of cloth has diminished their real income, and increased their taxation far beyond the 40 per cent. which is admitted to have been the cost of giving them so-called representative institutions, just when most of the European States are closing them down, and even the U.S.A. has done so, for almost all of its most urgent and important problems. If there is an Afghan invasion, or even serious internal disturbances, most of these rulers will be of about as much use to us as their golden cannon would be in modern warfare.

As for their much vaunted loyalty, I fear that a good deal of it is largely self-interest and cupboard love; except in the case of the Nizam of Hyderabad, whose fidelity must have been genuine to have withstood the strain placed on it when we were fighting against Turkey, the last Great Power of his religion, and who was rewarded by what was described in the Indian newspapers as a sharp despatch from the Viceroy, Lord Reading, over the question of Berar, just at the time that Mr. Gandhi was being treated as the uncrowned king of India, and efforts were being made to induce him to assume the rule of his kingdom. The Nizam is a very orthodox Mohammedan, and when the Sultan of Turkey was deposed, he gave him a handsome pension. He has married his two sons to two princesses of the late Sultan's family, and evidently believes that though the Caliphate may for the moment be in abeyance, it is by no means extinct. If the Hindu leaders give effect to their expressed intentions, and the Pathans over the border come to the assistance of the oppressed Mohammedans, can he, the Ruler of the second largest Mohammedan State in the world, with an army of 30,000 men, and any number of irregulars, be expected to remain passive? Loyalty cannot be transferred, and although he is loyal to the King, it is beyond the power of any Government to transfer his loyalty to an Indian Government dominated by Hindus who have had no secret of their intentions in regard to the members of his religion.

Should this happen, it can hardly fail to give rise to the revival of the Mahratta Confederacy, which united in 1795 to crush the Nizam, who is our oldest and most faithful ally in India, while with the Mahrattas we have waged desperate wars, some of them have never really accepted our rule, and they were the first to start the practice of political assassination, though in recent years the Bengalis have got ahead of them in this respect. We have guaranteed to the Nizam the defence of his dominions against all enemies, and we may look forward with confidence to a fine system of complications, which may easily end in restoring India to very much the state in which we found it, not merely in regard to the condition of the people, but to that of the political boundaries.

There was a very unpleasant incident at the Delhi Durbar of 1911, when the Gaikwar of Baroda, described by Mr. H. M. Hyndman in "The Awakening of Asia," published by Messrs. Cassell & Co., Ltd., in 1919, as "the leader of the advanced party among the higher section of the Hindus," acted in a manner which was disrespectful to the King, and thereby in the words of the same author: gave "evidence of temporary independence." To continue to quote from Mr. Hyndman: "This was apologised for and explained away at the time. But the impression remains, and Asiatics are quite subtle enough to overlook the apology and rejoice at the offence. And it was the Gaikwar of Baroda who was put forward to champion the cause of his fellow-Princes and himself to Lord Chelmsford!"

That he has done so to some purpose is evident from recent events in Kashmir, the Ruler of which is described by Mr. P. L. Chudgar, in "Indian Princes under British Protection," as "Mr. A., well known in the £150,000 cheque case." A retired member of the Indian Civil Service, Sir Albion Bannerjee, K.C.I.E., who took up employment in the State, and was for some time Foreign and Political Minister of Kashmir, according to Mr. Chudgar, "found himself unable to continue longer than eighteen months in office." After he left the service, he made the following statement to the "Hindustan Times":—

"A large section of the population is absolutely illiterate and poor, governed like dumb-driven cattle, no touch between the Government and the people, no means open to them to represent their grievances. The administrative machinery requires overhauling from top to bottom. The intellectual classes are also in a sense depressed classes, hardly any public opinion, even bare subsistence is denied under the existing conditions of life."

In spite of the previous record of the Maharaja, the fact that while he is a Hindu, 77 per cent of his subjects are Mohammedans, in comparison with whose position that of the Helots in Sparta was enviable, and are little if anything better off than the "Untouchables" in India, a year or two ago a British regiment was sent to save this Maharaja from the fury of his subjects, who if left to themselves, would have made things very unpleasant for him, and the system of rule which he represents. More recently Lady Nethersole, the widow of a former Chief Engineer of the State, lent from British Service, who presumably knows the condition of the people, has been expelled by the Resident, on the ground that she had encouraged agitation against the State. The newspaper report of one of the questions in Parliament and of the reply are as follows:—

"Colonel Aplin: Is it not a fact that she was turned

out of the State because she protested against the public flogging of women which she witnessed?

Sir Samuel Hoare: No, the information at my disposal goes to show that she was stirring up a great deal of trouble. There was a very critical situation in Kashmir, and in the interests of safety it was necessary to expel her."

The reflection of the ordinary person will be that whatever trouble there may have been, it was not stirred up by Lady Nethersole or anybody else, but has been there all the time, since the authorities in 1846 were so ill-advised as to make over a predominantly Mohammedan population to a Hindu Ruler, who imposes his ideas so thoroughly on his subjects that until recently the penalty for killing a cow is said to have been death, and at the time my informant was there, that is about 20 years ago, it was punishable with seven years imprisonment. He told me that there was a very strict Customs examination at the frontier, not for the usual things for which Custom's Officers are on the look out, but for any preparation of beef, such as Bovril or Oxo, which, if found, was ruthlessly confiscated.

During the week or so that a portion of my district was temporarily out of hand, a member of the class which it is proposed to make rulers of India, whose home was in the affected area, threw himself prostrate at my feet, clasped my ankles, and offered me any sum I chose to charge for the services of a single policeman; otherwise, he said, his house would be looted and his women outraged. This is a usual accompaniment in India of successful rioting, though through shame nothing is said about it when the case comes in Court. I could not spare him even one, and had to supplement the police by revenue peons, though this was actually no part of their duty. Their uniform was similar to that of the armed police, and later I completed the illusion by having rifles served out to them, though they had never been taught to use them, and at the beginning hardly knew one end of a rifle from another.

I have heard from the officer then commanding, of a Congress leader who, when disturbances broke out in his native town, asked for the deputation of troops to guard his house. A detachment of Native Infantry was sent, and he wrote back objecting, stating that he wanted British troops. Such an attitude would be inconceivable on the part of any other people, and the toleration of it inconceivable on the part of any people but ourselves.

The views expressed above, receive support from the following passage in "A Vision of India," by Sir Sidney Low (Smith, Elder & Co., Fourth Edition, 1911), a work

highly commended by Lord Morley in the House of Commons, who described the author as "a gentleman of proved competence in political subjects—a man who knows what he is talking about," and by Lord Curzon in terms equally complimentary:—

"In India we are drawing our contingent from a somewhat restricted circle. We depend more and more upon the 'fighting races,' and these form only a small fraction of the vast population of the Empire. And the proportion has been steadily diminishing of late years. The Mahrattas, once great warriors, now prefer intrigue and other civil pursuits; the Rajputs, a fine people but no longer quite what they were, do not now enter our armies as freely as in former times; the high-caste Hindus, the Brahmans and 'Pandies,' who formed the staple of the old pre-Mutiny army, scarcely offer themselves at all. Thus we are relying mainly on the two hill-peoples beyond the frontier, the Pathans and the Ghurkas, whose numbers are limited, and on the Sikhs and Punjab Mohammedans. The Sikhs are brave and excellent soldiers; but they are also keen lovers of money, and they are finding many profitable avenues open to them as policemen, railway servants, and watchmen."

The ancient Greek philosopher and mathematician, Archimedes, who understood the principal of the lever, is reported to have said: "Give me a fulcrum, and I will move the U iverse." Unfortunately for the experiment, a fulcrum was not available. One of my most brilliant contemporaries at Oxford, a man who has made his name both as a scholar and a historian, was greatly perturbed when the payment of Members of Parliament was introduced, and prophesied that it would demoralise British politics, destroy all independence on the part of Members, and make them the mere slaves of the party machine. His forebodings have been more than justified, and almost any politician is now able to say: "Give me control of the party machine, and of the party funds, and I will govern the Empire." Having attained this position, he does not even take the trouble to govern it, but spends more time than it would involve to do so, in endless conferences and bargainings with anybody and everybody who is willing, on terms, to take the burden off his shoulders.

A system which allowed the German spy, Tribitsch Lincoln, to be elected as the representative of an English industrial constituency, and the Jewish banker, the late Mr. E. S. Montagu, to represent an English agricultural constituency, obviously leaves much to be desired from the point of view of the electors, though very convenient from that of the party managers. Mr. Montagu, having become the representative of a constituency, most of the residents

of which can never have even heard of him till he was produced as a candidate for Parliamentary honours, was then made Secretary of State for India, when he was as unknown to the nation as he had previously been to his constituents. His selection for this position as been described as "probably the most disastrous appointment ever made in British political history." This is the impression that he produced on the then Commander-in-Chief, Sir Charles Munro:—

"When I am with Mr. Montagu I feel as if I were walking with a man who is steadily edging me towards a precipice, and when he gets me near enough will push me over."

He did not succeed in pushing over Sir Charles Munro, but he did something infinitely worse, and pushed over the British Cabinet, by committing them to a scheme of self-government for India which appears to me to be a direct violation of the pledge of Queen Victoria "to administer the government of the country for the benefit of all our subjects resident therein," but probably he or they had either never heard of it, or forgotten all about it.

Mutatis mutandis, something very similar to this must be the feeling of the more thoughtful members of all parties towards their leaders, but only those who have private means and local influence can venture to say what they think, without a very grave risk of losing their seats, and with them one of their principal means of livelihood. Is it worth the sacrifices that, on their own admission, the Government are prepared to make, of which the ruin of Lancashire is only one of many, in order to have institutions which give facilities for such abuses, thrust on India?

That the establishment of Hindu supremacy is the real object aimed at, will appear from an article by Sir Verney Lovett, K.C.S.I., in "The Indian Empire Review" for November, 1933, from which the following is an extract:—

"A Soviet India is apparently also the ideal of prominent members of the Congress. It has perhaps been adopted with the object of capturing the masses for it has no real appeal for caste-Hindus; and the Congress mainly consists of caste-Hindus, and is generally supported by the Hindu Mahasabha, a considerable and influential body. It is clear that there is an outside circle of Hindu sympathisers to whom the terrorists appeal on the ground of the underlying common objective which is Hindu supremacy. Of late years, they have been able to command ampler funds than the spoils of "political" dacoites, and have strengthened their hold on Bengal. The exclusively Hindu character of the movement there is illustrated by passages in the evidence of Mr. Chatterjee, a Bengali

Hindu witness before the Parliamentary Committee (pp. 1183—5). If, he said, in accordance with the White Paper proposals, a Mohammedan communal majority materialises in Bengal, terrorism will receive "a tremendous fillip." This menace has since been repeated by other prominent Hindus and incidentally exposes the futility of the argument put forward by some people, that terrorism would disappear were the British Raj to become a fainéant power. Lord Lytton, speaking to his Council in January, 1925, pointed out that terrorism, once established, would be resorted to by a discontented minority under any form of government. Sir John Anderson lately said 'Unless the nettle of Indian terrorism is firmly grasped, it will thrust its roots so deep that no government will ever be stable, and human life will never be safe.'

The words were almost prophetic. Since then an attempt has been made on his life, which would have been successful, but for the fact that the Hindu assassin is usually so highly strung, or gets so little practice, that his shooting is very liable to miss, even at a comparatively short range.

A good many Viceroys make such mistakes as to take Mr. Gandhi at his own valuation, while an Irish Nationalist, who came out with a great admiration for him, after a fortnight's close intercourse, correctly summed him up in this description: "That man is the biggest impostor that ever fooled a credulous people or frightened a cowardly Government."

These Viceroys when they return, are treated as experts on India, whereas the conditions are now such that they are prevented from discovering anything about it, except the views of the politicians, see everything through other peoples' eyes, and learn less in three or four years than an intelligent traveller could learn in three months. This is the natural result of the Morley-Minto Reforms, and the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms. Formerly, when India was administered by the Indian Civil Service, whether the members of it were European or Indian, it was the tradition of the Service to report the facts as accurately as possible, without regard to consequences, and act as the informants and the advisers of those in authority. This simple duty began to be complicated by other considerations, such as advancing the interests of the community or the class to which the adviser belonged, and securing or preserving a majority in the Legislature, whether Provincial or Imperial. Now that the advisers have become very largely Indian and non-official, the unadulterated truth is about the last thing that a Viceroy or Governor hears, and these advisers

form an almost impenetrable screen between him and the local officers who could supply it, uncoloured by class or self-interest.

How colossal the ignorance of a Viceroy may be is shown by Lord Reading's taking Mr. Gandhi at his own valuation as the de facto ruler of India, and attempting to persuade him to enter into his kingdom, or rather his empire, and by Lord Irwin's signing a pact with him, which confirmed people in the belief that the Government was abdicating in his favour. Fortunately for myself, I had retired before witnessing this humiliation, but it created a very awkward situation for those officers who were still in service, and led to considerable loss of life in a district of which I was formerly in charge; which in my time, except for the usual disputes about land, was perfectly quiet. According to what I have been told, the Congress Party announced that the Viceroy had surrendered to Mr. Gandhi, and the Bhumiar Brahmans, a rather turbulent caste having some analogies both to the Brahmans and the Rajputs, and very numerous in that locality, flocked into the headquarters of one of the Subdivisions to hail the new government, or to help instal it. Both the Subdivisional Magistrate and the Deputy Superintendent of Police were Indians. There were a number of armed police at their disposal, largely composed of Rajputs from another district. The Subdivisional Magistrate tried to reason with the mob, in doing so got separated from the police, and was unable to get back to them. He called on them to fire, which they did, and there being nobody to control the firing, they kept it up till a considerable number of persons were killed, some of them innocent spectators. If the version I have heard is correct, the affair was mismanaged, but I have sympathy with the Subdivisional Magistrate, who like all representatives in India of what used to be considered authority, found himself between the devil and the deep sea. The position was accurately described to my informant by one of the leading landlords of the Province, who expressed great satisfaction when Mr. Gandhi was arrested. My friend pointed out to him that at a ceremony that he had recently held, a leading Congress politician was given a place of honour, and that he was known to subscribe to Congress funds. The landlord replied by asking how could he help himself, when he did not know if within six months the Government would not make him over to Mr. Gandhi. As a matter of fact, it would have made him and everybody else over to Mr. Gandhi two or three months previously, if he had not been suffering from

a rather worse attack than usual of swelled head, and refused to accept as a gift what he demanded as a right.

Mr. Gandhi made better use of his opportunities in 1931 than he did in 1922, according to what my friend informs me of the conditions of the pact between him and the Viceroy, one of the objects of which, on the part of the latter, was to secure the raising of the boycott on British cloth.

Mr. Gandhi, for all his professions of saintliness, is a very astute lawyer, and secured that the wording of the agreement should be that there would not be a boycott of British goods *as such*—the emphasising is mine. He got the best of the bargain, but for the moment everybody was delighted. Our Government had got signed yet another pact, which in spite of the unfortunate habit that other people have of treating them as scraps of paper, or finding that they mean something quite different from what we thought they meant, always pleases them for the moment. The Congress party were jubilant at the official recognition of Mr. Gandhi as the uncrowned king of India, a pose on his part which suits them excellently when he is dealing with us, but not at all when he is dealing with themselves. The boycott of course went on as before, except that British goods were now declared to be boycotted as non-Indian, which suited the Bombay mill-owners even better. Between them and the Congress party a perfect harmony of interests exists. The latter enforce the boycott of British goods, and use their political power in the Legislative Assembly to impose prohibitive duties against them. This naturally puts up the price, and the Indian manufacturer makes large profits, out of which he is able to pay large subscriptions to the Congress funds. The unfortunate cultivator has to pay more, or go in rags and let his family do so, but who cares for him or them nowadays?

To return to the former Viceroy, I find this statement in the speech of Sir Henry Page Croft at the recent Conservative Conference in Bristol:—

“The White Paper policy was initiated by the Socialist Government, whilst it was Lord Reading, the Liberal, as Sir Archibald Sinclair now boasts, who was responsible for the revolutionary policy of Federation.”

I have endeavoured to give some idea of the sort of persons whom it will make rulers, but volumes would not suffice to make anyone who had not come into close contact with them realise their mentality, though the Maharaja of Alwar has been of some assistance in that respect. The policy is certainly revolutionary, especially when taken in conjunction with the demand that in future all Judges in

India should be Indians, and the proposal that the supreme authority is to be the Federal Court; but so far from being either Socialist or Liberal, it is the very antithesis of everything for which in this country those parties are supposed to stand, and equally opposed to Conservative traditions, in surrendering without a fight, and scuttling without necessity.

The way in which a proposal so unjust and so reactionary was sprung on everybody concerned, and was hastily accepted by the leaders of the two political parties that represent themselves as the special friends of the common people, is thus described by the Duchess of Atholl, in her excellent pamphlet, "The Main Facts of the Indian Problem":—

"It is only fair to say that we owe the dual proposals in the declaration made by a majority of the few but influential Princes present at the first Round Table Conference, that they were prepared to enter a Federation at once, provided responsibility were transferred to it from the Governor-General in Council; but they had no authority from the Chamber of Princes for the pronouncement. It was believed, however, that the States would be a stabilising factor in the Federation, and the proposal was speedily accepted for the Liberal Party by Lord Reading, and for the Socialist Government by Mr. Ramsay Macdonald. Unionist leaders were committed only to continued investigation until the National Government endorsed the policy of its predecessor."

I have given particulars on earlier pages of the cost to India of Federation, exclusive of the salaries of the proposed Federal Judges, of the methods that are being adopted to induce reluctant Rulers of Indian States to enter it and to submit to them, and of the way in which, with the best intentions in the world, and an Indian lawyer when he gets on the Bench does not shed his prejudices as a snake does its skin, their mere existence will make administration impossible. The Indian lawyer, whether at the Bar or on the Bench, delights in technicalities, and is never so happy as when he has demonstrated to his own satisfaction, but to that of very few other persons except the successful litigant, that words mean something entirely different from what a person of ordinary common sense would understand them to mean. One Hindu High Court Judge, at the time of the agitation over the petition of Bengal, allowed sedition to run rampant, by a decision that Swaraj, which etymologically means independence, only meant Colonial Self-government. There may not be much difference now, but there was considerable difference then. The Barrister who obtained the decision told me afterwards

that he was greatly surprised at it, and had only put forward the contention as a forlorn hope, never expecting that it would be accepted. However, in doing so he showed great common sense, not to say wisdom.

Having already taken a degree elsewhere, I had passed all the examinations for the B.A. at Oxford before I had kept a sufficient number of terms to be eligible for it, and when I came home on my first long leave I had to "pernocitate," that is reside within the prescribed area, for an academic year. Having nothing to do, I thought of filling up the time by taking the B.C.L., and went to the Law Tutor of my College to consult him about it. He had no illusions on the subject, and as a matter of fact neither had I, but I was surprised to find the matter put so frankly. He told me that I had passed some other examinations with insufficient preparation, but I must not think that I could pass this one by the light of nature, there was no such thing as a science of law, it was only a collection of arbitrary dicta.

The proposed Judges, if the Indian politicians are to be satisfied, need not even be Barristers, or have been to Europe at all, but will in all probability be largely composed of Pleaders, whose outlook is narrower, who are more susceptible to religious and caste prejudice, and to pressure on communal, personal, or political grounds. Yet to them everybody will have to bow the knee, and their word will be final. The new Indian Government, if it is given the power, is practically certain to follow the the example of the Irish Free State in abolishing appeals to the Privy Council.

Were it not for the tragic results to which her action has led, and the still more tragic results to which it appears to be about to lead, unless common sense obtains a hearing with our rulers at the eleventh hour and fifty-fifth minute, the extract quoted from the biography of Mrs. Besant would form amusing reading to anyone who knows India. The effect of the Morley-Minto Reforms has been to throw even greater power than they formerly possessed into the hands of the landlords and the lawyers, since it is invariably one or other of these who is selected as Non-Official members of the Executive Council. In any event, the interests of the two classes are largely identical, since the landlords are the best clients of the lawyers, and almost every lawyer, as soon as he has made some money, invests it in landed property, of which he has probably also inherited some, however little. The Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms carried this process still further, by creating a special Landowners' Constituency, the members elected by

which usually, in their own interests, support the Government, and in return expect to be allowed to manage their estates and treat their tenants as they please, the idea of a good many of them on this subject being much the same as that of the American champion of liberty, in the days before the Civil War, who declared that "every man has the right to wallop his own nigger."

In the parts of India with which I am familiar, the lawyers gave no help whatever towards winning the War, and the landlords very little. I had to hold a large number of meetings in connection with it, in order to obtain contributions to War Funds, etc. These meetings were usually held between 4 and 5 p.m., when the day's work in the Courts was over or almost over, and took place in the Municipal Office, which was situated close by. The only lawyers who ever put in an appearance were the Government Pleader and the Public Prosecutor, who did so as part of their duty, being semi-officials. I used to see the others going home, as sublimely indifferent to the Great War as they doubtless are to that between Paraguay and Bolivia regarding El Chaco, if it is still proceeding.

The landlords appeared to do more, but in reality, beyond taking up a certain amount of War Loan, most of them, in the part where I was, did very little. Some of them offered remissions of rent to those of their tenants who would enlist, or join a Labour Corps, which appeared very attractive, till the flaws in it were discovered, which was after the return of those of the tenants who did return. There is usually a considerable amount of rent the recovery of which is barred by limitation, but the landlords do not write it off, but keep it on their books, in the hope that a lucky chance will enable them to realise it sometime. The supposed remissions were generally taken out of this in the first instance, and were in reality no remissions at all. Beside, it is one thing to announce remissions, and quite another to ensure that the tenants get them, which involves a great deal of clerical work, calculation of the amount due, the remission admissible in each particular instance, etc. No landlord will take the trouble of going into such details himself, so what happened, as I am informed by one of my colleagues who had special means of knowing the facts, was that the landlord announced a remission, and troubled no further about the matter, his collecting staff pocketed the amount, if it was supposed to be deducted from the rent legally recoverable, and the tenant in most instances got nothing. However, for this vicarious loyalty, rewards and honours were distributed among them so liberally that one who did not know the facts would be

persuaded, and a good many of them appear to have persuaded themselves, that they saved the British Empire.

The Indians who did most to save the British Empire were the peasantry, especially that of the Punjab, which supplied 54 per cent. of the Indian Army. It sent 349,000 combatants to the Great War, while Bengal sent 7,000. As 53 per cent. of the population of the Punjab is Mohammedan, most of the soldiers must have been Mohammedans. The Punjab is usually associated in our minds with the Sikhs, but they are not very numerous, being only about a seventh of the total population, while the Mohammedans are more than half. Both are fighting races, but it is evident that the Mohammedans must have supplied the greater number of soldiers.

That the returned soldiers were not very well satisfied with the way in which they were treated is evident from what took place in the Punjab in 1919, which I have heard attributed by an educated Indian in Government service, whose home was there, to over-hasty demobilisation. Those were the days of the Geddes axe and the Inchcape axe, in which persons who had done very well for themselves out of the war, were called into council by the powers that be to see how many of those who had helped to win it could be got rid of, and how quickly and cheaply this could be effected. They succeeded in their immediate object, but helped to create a hostile population, a large number of which had seen war service, and turned against us the knowledge that they had gained, by cutting telegraph wires and destroying railways.

I have heard a more detailed account of what happened in the Punjab in 1919 from a European official of a department which had no connection with the general administration, whose duties involved a good deal of touring at certain seasons of the year. His Indian assistants were sent out beforehand to collect certain information, which he checked in a number of instances, and they were instructed to keep him informed of their movements, so that he might arrange where to go for the purpose of checking the work. About the beginning of April in that year they went out as usual, but no reports came in, and it seemed as if they had disappeared into the void. At last one of them, a Mohammedan, returned, and was asked to explain why he had not submitted any reports. He replied that he was afraid to do so, that he had seen what he had never seen before in his life, Hindus and Mohammedans eating out of the same dish, that there was a conspiracy to kill all the Europeans in Northern India, and that if my informant had gone on tour, as he would have done in the ordinary

course, he would almost certainly have been murdered at some lonely dak bungalow or rest house, that he could not have saved him, and might have been accused of committing the murder himself. It must be remembered that this was at the height of the Khilafat movement, when Turkey was still fighting for its existence, and in order to save Turkey from destruction, the Mohammedans had for the moment entered into an alliance with the Hindus. I asked my informant which party took the lead in the matter, Hindus, Mohammedans, or Sikhs. He replied that they all were in it, but the agitation was mainly worked up by the Hindu lawyers. It was a source of wonder to me at the time why such a tremendous outcry arose against the Rowlatt Act, which was a piece of legislation which did not affect the lives of the people at all. It was rendered necessary by a practice which I omitted to mention in my remarks on Indian legal methods. It is known as "spoiling a case." The surest way to spoil a case is to murder the chief witness before the case comes on for trial. I nearly had an instance of it in my subdivision, where I had to commit for trial a gang of dacoits, numbering between 30 and 40, who had terrorised the district for years, and were very successful in persuading the owners of the houses that they attacked to disclose their valuables, by tying pieces of jute-stalks between their fingers and lighting them, or similar methods. One of them turned approver, or what is called in England King's evidence, but could not be released till the case was finished. His former associates succeeded in poisoning his food, even in the jail, and he might have come to an untimely end if I had not happened to visit it that morning, noticed his symptoms, sent for the doctor, and had the contents of his stomach pumped out, on which he recovered. The murder of witnesses was specially prevalent in political cases, and in order to render it useless for the purpose aimed at, it was enacted that under certain conditions, the deposition already taken of a witness who had been murdered to prevent his giving evidence, could still be used at the trial. There was also some strengthening of the law of conspiracy, which was found to be defective in regard to the earlier stages, before anything had taken place in pursuance of the common object. So far as I remember, it also provided that certain cases might be tried by a special tribunal, consisting of three High Court Judges, whose decision would be final. This struck at the dilatory procedure, and endless appeals and applications, which are the delight of the Indian lawyer, as well as a considerable contribution to his means of livelihood, and a tremendous agitation was engineered

against the Act, though it was never put into operation. In the Punjab the people were actually made to believe that if three persons were found talking together, they might be arrested by the police, and their passions were inflamed in every possible way. When one of the principal agitators was arrested, the mob rose in Amritsar, attacked the Bank, poured kerosene oil over the manager and burned him alive, killed some other Europeans, gave a severe beating to a lady missionary, and generally acted like incarnate devils. Similar scenes took place elsewhere, and I have heard of two unarmed British soldiers travelling by train, who were taken out and beaten to death. Then General Dyer appeared on the scene, and of what happened afterwards we have heard a lot, but very little of what preceded. I am not concerned to defend everything that he did, still less the explanation that he gave for doing it, and if I had been in charge of operations, I should probably have contented myself in the first instance with picking off the mob orator who insisted on addressing the crowd after it had been ordered to disperse, and a few of the ringleaders, and then waited to see the effect on the other people. Apart from the danger of meeting the same fate oneself, there is not much inducement to remain at a public meeting, when the chief speaker has been shot.

Now that the occasion for it has passed, this unnatural alliance has fallen to pieces, the Sikhs have demanded and received separate representation, and one of the great friends of the Hindus in the House of Commons is complaining in the Press, though I believe erroneously, that the Mohammedans are using their majority to pass class legislation directed against them. The Mohammedans are no longer concerned with saving Turkey, which has saved itself. The position is now reversed, and the problem with which they are concerned is not that of saving other people, but of saving themselves from Hindu dominance in the proposed Federation. One solution that has been put forward is that the Provinces in which the Mohammedans are in the majority, of which the Punjab is one, should form a separate Federation. If their wishes are met there will be two Federations, loving each other as little as Northern Ireland and the Irish Free State, or perhaps even as the Confederate and the Federal States of America at the time of the Civil War. If the method that has been applied in Ireland should be applied in India, what a task it will be for the Governor-General to keep the peace between the rival groups! The Maharaja of Kashmir will presumably prefer to join the Hindu rather than the Moham-

medan Federation, while the majority of his subjects will be of the opposite opinion, which will involve further complications. He is almost certainly one of the Rulers who have been described by Col. Josiah Wedgwood, M.P., in his evidence before the Joint Select Committee, as surviving only on our bayonets. How is he to survive if the bayonets can only reach him across a hostile country, to be absorbed in which would be the dearest wish of the great mass of his subjects? As I write I am irresistibly reminded of a Latin phrase, not in regard to the scheme, which is as complicated as human ingenuity can make it, but to the sponsors and defenders of it, "Oh sancta simplicitas!"

What will be the effect in the rest of India of a discontented population in the Punjab, can be judged from the following extract from the Introduction, by Sir W. W. Hunter, to W. & A. K. Johnston's Atlas of India, 1894. At that time, it should be noted, the process of splitting up Provinces, which is now so popular with our Government and with Indian politicians, had not commenced, and the Punjab included what is now the North-West Frontier Province. The passage is as follows:—

"The Punjab has from time immemorial been the main line of invasion of India. At a prehistoric period the Aryans of the Veda penetrated Hindustan by the route Alexander the Great entered with his Greek army in, 327 B.C. Successive hordes of Scythians and Græco-Bactrians followed. The Mohammedans from Central Asia began to make their appearance in force in the Punjab about 1000 A.D., and the Moghal Emperors (sixteenth to eighteenth centuries) claimed sovereignty during its prime alike over India and Afghanistan."

The Punjab and the North-West Frontier control the gates of India, and can at any time admit the foreign invader, or paralyse the defending army, if it should advance to the frontier to meet him. How are we treating the inhabitants? It should be mentioned in this connection that those of the North-West Frontier Province are mainly Mohammedans. One Mohammedan leader has stated that 75 per cent. of the community are opposed to Federation, but do not dare say so. Another states that 100 per cent. of the Mohammedans of the North-West Frontier Province are opposed to it. Yet another has given us and the Hindus plain warning that they will not obey the Government which it is proposed to set up. All these warnings are disregarded, and it is assumed, in complete opposition to all the experience of history, that the people of India will obey whatever form of Government we choose to set up,

or rather which can be induced to take over from us, on terms.

Should the Indian Mohammedans refuse to submit to Hindu domination, they may possibly have nearly the whole Mohammedan world behind them, or at least all the independent States, and what Alexander the Great could do, marching through a hostile country, they will not find impossible, marching through a friendly one. For a precedent they need not go back as far as Alexander the Great. In the Great War we were able to send troops across Persia to the Caspian, and if Persia can be crossed in one direction, it can be crossed in another. Should such an army invade India, it will require something more than a fast on the part of Mr. Gandhi to stop it, and our present policy is doing everything possible to lead to such an invasion, and to open the way for it.

Such are not the views of Babu Rajendra Prasad, the President of the Congress, from a Press report of whose opening address the following extracts will be of interest, in view of the fact that, according to Lord Willingdon, who ought to know, the Congress Party is the only effective political party in India. He commenced by a modest definition of the aims of the Congress, which are:—

“Independence, including complete control of the army, finances, foreign relations, and internal administration of the country.”

He then referred to the Communal award, his remarks regarding which have been summarised as follows:—

“He said very little about the Communal award, except that there was nothing more calculated to perpetuate communal animosity than the special power of the Governor-General under the White Paper to safeguard minority interests. He warned the minorities that this and other safeguards were not meant for their advantage The Communal award was decided by the British Government from its own point of view, and was anti-national. All Congress hoped for was to be able, in course of time, to replace it by an agreed settlement. To that end it was wise for Congress not to divert the attention of the country by creating an agitation in favour either of accepting or rejecting the Communal award.”

Reading between the lines of this, it is fairly easy to see that while it is considered advisable to lie low for the present regarding the Communal award, it will be torn up as soon as a suitable opportunity offers, and replaced by an “agreed settlement,” that is one dictated by the Hindu majority.

He then proceeds to describe in glowing terms the golden age that will ensue when India obtains her independence, a thing which it has never had since the dawn of history, as the Untouchables are now the only genuine representatives of the original inhabitants, and all the rest are the descendants of invaders from the North-West, some of whom have kept their blood pure, and others have taken as wives the women of the country. According to Babu Rajendra Prasad, whose name as well as his sentiments proclaims that he is not one of the martial races, this is what will happen:—

“On the happy day that the country achieves independence, India, having no design on others will not then need a large army, either for its protection against foreigners or the internal peace, which will stand guaranteed in the goodwill of the inhabitants. Having no designs on others, she will be able to claim immunity from the evil designs of others, and her safety will be buttressed and protected by the goodwill of the world at large. . .

“The way to achieve this end was active, dynamic, non-violent mass action.”

After seeing through their eyes for so many years, it is rather surprising to find that a difference of opinion has arisen between Mr. Ramsay Macdonald and his Congress friends; yet such would appear to be the case, as, in a newspaper of a few days earlier I find the following extract in a speech of his which shows a very wide departure from his usual sentiments:—

“In the world to-day example alone was not going to advance peace very quickly. If they assumed potential aggressors, a vulnerable nation with great possessions, unarmed to defend itself if need be, might be an element in the creation of war rather than a contribution to the peace spirit and peace practice of other nations in the world.”

Mr. Ramsay Macdonald is right for once. China is a country which fulfils all the conditions of Babu Rajendra Prasad, was independent from time immemorial, did not maintain a large army, had no designs on others, and only desired to be left alone by them. In this it has been singularly unsuccessful. We have annexed Hong Kong, the Germans annexed Kiao-Chow, the Russians have annexed the district east of the River Amur, and had practically annexed Manchuria until the Japanese drove them out, and have now established there what appears to the rest of the world something very like a tributary

kingdom or a protectorate, while they have openly annexed Korea, Formosa, the Liao-Tung peninsula, and a few other unconsidered trifles. Every now and then they put forward claims which virtually amount to a protectorate over China, the other Powers protest, and they lie low for a while, just as Babu Rajendra Prasad advises his friends to do over the Communal award; but there is as little ground in the one case as the other to suppose that they have relinquished their ambitions. Is there any reason to expect that an independent India would fare better than independent China has done? Except the Russians, who had to travel thousands of miles in order to reach it, the various Powers that annexed slices of China had to cross the sea, which the warlike neighbours of India do not require to do, but have only to walk in, as the strong man armed into the house of the man who leaves it unguarded. Are we going to make over India to people who openly declare that they are aiming at independence, that they propose, as soon as it suits them, to tear up the conditions laid down by us, and that their policy is one, the only possible result of which can be either to reduce India to the state in which we found it, or to leave some other nation to step into the place that we have vacated?

The whole object of our policy, if policy it can be called, is to get away from India, but that is just what we cannot do, as the Rulers of the Indian States insist on our fulfilling our treaty obligations toward them; vide the following recent newspaper paragraph:—

“Sir Annepu Patro, who was a delegate to the Round Table Conference, declares that ‘British troops are a necessity in India.’ He made this statement in an address to the Young Men’s Indian Association Parliament in Madras.

“Sir Annepu explained that Indian States, by virtue of their treaties and engagements, insisted on the retention of British forces. Further, communal antagonism in India required the maintenance of a neutral force.

“He added, according to Reuter, that the question of whether the number of troops should be reduced was a matter for expert opinion, both Indian and European.

“Sir Annepu considered that, in regard to the Indianisation of the Army, it must take time to officer the Indian Army with Indians, but he suggested that the rate of admission into the Indian military academy should be increased.

"He considered that the period of preparation might be reduced without reducing efficiency."

If the speaker had substituted eternity for time, he would have been nearer the mark. The following is a summary by the Military Correspondent of the "Morning Post" of the review compiled by the Army Secretary of the Defence Services in India:—

"No question is at once more difficult or more crucial than the future organisation, recruitment and control of the Army in India."

"That was the view expressed in the report of the Simon Commission.

"The Indianisation of the Indian Army began sixteen years ago. In a review compiled by the Army Secretary in India, dealing with the Defence Services there, the emphatic declaration of the Simon Commission receives considerable support. The Proceedings of the Interview and Record Board at the October (1933) examinations for the Indian Military Academy (the Indian Sandhurst) at Dehra Dun states that there were a small number of candidates whom the Board regarded as exceptionally suitable. Following those were a larger number of candidates not much inferior to the best. Below these last the deterioration was marked, and the 'tail' again comprised a greater number of candidates who, both physically and mentally, appeared to be utterly unsuited for the career of a commissioned officer in the Indian Army."

"The number of these was so large that the Board would like to see something done to obviate the trouble and expense of examining large numbers of unsuitable candidates and to spare such candidates and their parents both expense and disappointment.

"The number of candidates for this year's (March) examination was less than half of that for the four previous examinations, except March, 1933, when the number was 131. Even with this diminished number there were, in the opinion of the Board, far too many candidates who had obviously no chance of success and were quite unsuited for a military career."

Whatever may have been the case in the past, a military career at present requires a certain amount of ability and education, and the attitude of most of the educated classes towards it is that described in a phrase put into the mouth of one of them, which even if apocryphal is psychologically true to life: "The Army is an excellent occupation in time of peace, but in time of war it is one damned dangerous profession."

It is not only in military matters that the Indians and

their advisers are being encouraged by our rulers to attempt to eat their cake and have it too. Another example of the same attitude of mind appears from the following telegram from Delhi published in "The Times" of October 17th:—

"The 'Statesman' has received summaries of the memoranda submitted by counsel and others engaged in London as advisers to the late Jam Sahib towards the end of his term as Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes. The papers, now published for the first time, are without the authors' names, but these are known to be a King's counsel and others 'peculiarly fitted for their task.'

"The advisers accord general approval of the Indian Princes' initial welcome to the Federal idea, and wholly accept and agree with the decision of the Chamber of Princes that it will be to the States' advantage to enter a Federation if they are satisfied about paramountcy and obtain adequate safeguards.

"The advisers indicate that the advantage accruing to the States from a Federal scheme must be proportionate to the extent of Indian India's united co-operation in it. They reject the idea that entry by 50 per cent. of the States is sufficient, and prefer to put the essential figure at a minimum of 80 or 85 per cent., with the suggested proviso that the States be at liberty to secede en bloc if the number federated has not reached 90 or 95 per cent. at the end of five years from the start of the Federation. A bicameral Legislature is favoured, and the advisers strongly approve of the proposal for a Confederation of Princes to concert action in their common interest, appoint their representatives to the legislature through an electoral college, and exercise disciplinary control over those delegates' conduct. The importance of this is emphasised on the ground that the necessary group action by all the States' delegates in the Legislature must be difficult to secure unless they owe their final appointment and mandate to one common authority."

The comments on this of one of my friends, who was for some time a Member of the Council of State, are very interesting. He remarked that most of it is not legal opinion at all, but political advice, and what probably happened was that the lawyers were given something more than a hint of what to say, and now that they have said it, the Rulers will be able to shelter themselves behind the opinion of the lawyers in coming into the Federation only on their own terms. These are in effect that they will remain in it if it suits them, and leave it if it does not. The bargaining power which they are exercising to such good effect in regard to coming in, is still to be retained

by the retention of the right of secession, and our Government will no more be able to settle the Indian question in the manner it proposes, than the victim of blackmail can escape his difficulties by a single payment. I am not of course suggesting that the Rulers are blackmailers, and in view of the great anxiety that is being displayed to secure their adherence to the scheme, it is only natural that they should prescribe their own terms for doing so. Personally, I think they are too cautious. I know one Provincial legislator whose views, when he entered politics, were thought to be rather advanced, but which moved considerably to what on the Continent would be called the Right, when an opium shop was settled with his unemployed son, which he usually managed by deputy, and which brought him in a modest income sufficient for his wants. A certain number of similar appointments in their respective States, or a diversion to political purposes of some of the money now spent on jewels, race-horses, European wives, and other luxuries, and the Rulers of the Indian States, if they can agree, will control the Chambers as effectually as it is the ambition of our political leaders to control their respective parties.

It has been pointed out in my other book that the Princes, while insisting on having a leading voice in the proposed Federation, are not disposed to contribute anything to its revenues, except in times of emergency, and then only at their own will and pleasure. Since that book was published things have advanced a stage further, and I have shown earlier in this book that they are to be paid or relieved of payments of about three-quarters of a million sterling annually, as a reward for entering it. Even so, they are unwilling, unless they are at liberty to secede from it when they please, which is contrary to the fundamental principle of a Federation, and nullifies the whole idea with which they are being brought into it, that of conferring stability; just as the mere fact of their being brought in, and allowing them to represent or misrepresent their subjects, nullifies the whole idea of democracy.

Yet another of what is supposed to be our leading political principles is proposed to be set aside, that elected legislators are representatives, not delegates, and when they are elected should act and vote according to the best of their own judgment, and not be mere mouthpieces for the views of the persons who elected them. This principle is clearly enunciated in Burke's speech to the electors of Bristol, and has never been seriously challenged inside Parliament, though certain outside bodies have occasionally attempted to dictate the political conduct of the Members

that they have helped to return. All this is now altered, and the fact that I have already pointed out, that these nominees of the Rulers will not be Representatives, in the sense that we understand the term, but mere creatures of their masters, or advocates sent to the legislature to fight for their interests, or those of the class to which they belong, is to be emphasised by rendering them subject to disciplinary action if they fail in their duty, in this narrow sense of the term. It was laid down by Lord Brougham that a lawyer's first duty is to his client, whose interests he must serve even if it should bring about the ruin of his country, and the same principle is now sought to be applied to the legislators appointed by the Rulers of the Indian States.

Another incidental effect of this proposal is that it will still further strengthen Hindu supremacy. Were each Ruler allowed to nominate his own delegates, the Nizam of Hyderabad, being the Ruler of the largest State, would be able to nominate nearly one-fifth of the delegates of the Indian States, and would naturally nominate Mohammedans. In the proposed electoral college, the vote of the Nizam will be swamped by those of the Hindu Rulers, and the delegates of the Indian States will either be all Hindus, or Mohammedans who are prepared to subordinate the interests of their own community to those of Hindus, and whose liberty of action will be still further restricted by the possibility of "disciplinary control" should they display any independence.

What a solemn farce the whole thing is. Why do we not begin at home to give effect to those principles? To do so it would be necessary to repeal the Great Reform Act of 1832, and restore the pocket boroughs. Even that would not go far enough, as there was at least the appearance, if not the reality, of free election. Let even this be abolished, and let the pocket boroughs be restored to the landowners, to whom in fact they belonged, with a further proviso that they are not to nominate their members direct, but through an electoral college, who will have the power of depriving of his seat any Member who fails to fight with sufficient zeal for the interests of the landed proprietors. If this is found to work satisfactorily at home, by all means let us impose it on India. As our experience of one which did not go nearly so far was anything but satisfactory, a sense of decency, if nothing else, should prevent us from imposing on others a system that we found so little satisfactory ourselves, that we were forced to abolish it, or run the risk of civil war, which was the view of the Duke of Wellington, of whose character timidity

was not a leading feature, but whose military career had taught him the importance of making a correct estimate of the hostile forces. And if such a system nearly led to a civil war in a law-abiding country like England, in which it was the result of a long course of historical events, what can we expect in a country like India, when the chains are being rivetted on one set of the people, just when the other set are being given a degree of what we choose to call liberty, which is likely to amount to license?

Assuming, and it is a very big assumption, that these dangers and difficulties can be avoided or overcome, there still remains one which not merely cannot be escaped, but which will become more menacing, the more thoroughly the government succeed in giving effect to the White Paper scheme and its implications. The Indian intelligentsia, or what passes as such, have adopted the same policy as Mr. de Valera and Herr Hitler, and are out to make India as far as possible self-contained. They have been piling up Customs duties against our goods, and so far as they can, mean to shut them out altogether. Even if this is not done by direct legislation, the same effect is being produced in another way. The only thing that the Indian cultivator has to sell, and it must be remembered that the great mass of the people are cultivators, agricultural produce, has fallen greatly in price within the last few years, while that of cloth, the principal item of expenditure of the masses, has been artificially raised by Customs duties, in the interests of the Bombay mill-owners, and in pursuance of the policy of national self-sufficiency. Owing to the fall in price of what he sells, the cultivator has less money to spend, and what little he has is being diverted to the purchase of Indian-made goods instead of foreign. Under these conditions, it is highly improbable that any increase in the rate of Customs duty will compensate financially for the falling-off in the quantity of goods imported, and the ideal aimed at is to shut out foreign goods almost entirely, except articles of luxury which cannot be manufactured locally. Customs is one of the principal sources of revenue of the Government of India, as distinguished from the Provincial Governments. If there is any considerable shrinkage in it, the Central Government will not merely be unable to find the money for new Provinces, new Capitals, more Governors, Ministers, Secretaries, etc., but will be unable to meet current expenditure, and India will be faced with national bankruptcy. Meanwhile our politicians, British and Indian alike, go gaily on their way, following simultaneously two mutually conflicting policies, as happy as the girl who thought that

she had plenty of money to spend, so long as any cheques remained in her cheque-book.

Should the Army be Indianised to any great extent, and the Indian politicians enabled to give effect to one of their favourite schemes, that of reducing expenditure on it, they may find themselves in much the same position as the Long Parliament did with Cromwell, or the Chinese Presidents do with the various War Lords who spring up like mushrooms in that country, since it obtained what was supposed to be liberty. It is only about a hundred and fifty years since soldiers of fortune carved thrones for themselves in India, including the founders of three at least of the principal Indian States, one of whom, not much more than a hundred years ago, murdered his brother and his nephew in the process, while Gardiner's Atlas of English History shows that in 1785, at the close of the Government of Warren Hastings, Hyder Ali, another soldier of fortune of humble extraction, who to the end of his days could neither read nor write, was in possession of most of Southern India, including the greater part of the Madrās Presidency. The Indian politicians, in their usual short-sighted way, are agitating for the Indianisation of the Army, not realising that if the Army is Indianised, it will be as supreme in India as it was in England in the days of Cromwell, and its leaders will pay as much or as little attention to them as he did to the remnant of the Long Parliament which he allowed to remain, whose insignificance is indicated by the name that it was contemptuously called, the Rump.

The blindness that they display in their fiscal policy is also displayed in their military policy, and both are based on the assumption on their part, which our Government have done a great deal to encourage, that one can eat one's cake and have it too, that in some unexplained manner we will defend the country and hold it in subjection—to them—while they pursue a policy, the only intelligible principle of which is to injure us in every way possible.

Great as is the blindness of Hindu politicians, it is not merely fostered but surpassed by that of our own. In "The Times" of October 23rd, I find the following in a speech of Lord Londonderry, Secretary of State for Air, under the heading, "British Rule in India," which appears to be something of a misnomer, as the whole argument is in favour of the relinquishment of British rule:—

"The policy of the Government had been of a progressive nature, and had taken into consideration the developments which had taken place throughout the British Empire all over the world. That policy had followed the

line of placing on communities themselves the responsibility of self-government, and no one could deny that the vitality and the prosperity of the British Empire has been the result of the trust and confidence which British policy had placed in its component parts.

"Why should we make so great an exception in the case of India, by seeking to maintain an old-fashioned method of Government and giving as our reason that we were fearful that the numerous communities in India were incapable of exercising those powers of self-government which had proved so beneficial to all other portions of the Empire?"

As an example of begging the question this would be hard to beat. The speaker not merely assumes that all the changes that have taken place in the constitutional arrangements of the British Empire recently have been for the better, but that there is no important difference between the conditions of India and that of the Overseas Dominions, ignoring completely the questions of colour, race and religion. In this he shows himself not merely superficial, but carries modesty to a point that rather reminds one of Philippe Egalité, Duke of Orléans, who in the French Revolution wore a cap of liberty, the then equivalent of the Gandhi cap, and was as democratic as any of the revolutionaries; all of which did not save his head. By the irony of fate, on the same page I find an account of the unveiling of a tablet in Durham Cathedral to the late Marquess in which it was stated by the Dean that:—

"The late Marquess of Londonderry was a distinguished public servant in Ireland, where for three years he was Lord Lieutenant, while in England he was an important member of the Government."

Who is the present Lord Lieutenant, or Governor-General of Ireland, or whatever it is now called, so as to keep pace with constitutional changes? The post has become so unimportant that it is possible to live in that country for months without knowing, but I was told that it is a person called Buckley, who before his elevation to his present position was a publican in a provincial town. When the appointment was announced, his fellow-townsmen found it difficult to believe the news, and the following is the substance of the dialogue that is said to have taken place between two of them. After one of them had expressed his incredulity, and been at last convinced by the statement that it was in the newspaper, he compared the appointment to keeping bedroom utensils in a prominent place in the kitchen. Even if the story is an invention, it serves to show

the complete contempt into which the office has been reduced. Appointments of Governors-General have now to be made in consultation with the Governments concerned. Mr. de Valera considers the office superfluous, and took care to nominate a person who would not merely be a nonentity, but would make the position ridiculous.

Is Lord Londonderry really of opinion that Mr. Buckley is a more suitable person to be appointed Lord Lieutenant than his own father was? Even if he is, he might pause to consider the implications of his argument, which is that India is to be treated in the same way as the other Dominions, and to be placed on the same footing. They are allowed to select, or have a voice in the selection of their Governors-General. The Indian politicians will have a grievance, and will never stop agitating till they are allowed the same privilege. So the position will be that the Viceroy, by the exercise of his emergency powers, is to control the Indian politicians, and the Indian politicians will, for all practical purposes, nominate the Viceroy. There being no limit to their demands, they may even insist on having applied to him the principle of recall, which it is proposed to apply to the representatives of the Indian States who do not obey the orders of the persons by whom they are appointed.

The Secretary of State for Air might have been less enthusiastic if he had read, or remembered, the speech on "Terrorism in India," by Sir Charles Tegart, C.S.I., C.I.E., M.V.O., Member, Council of the Secretary of State for India, formerly Commissioner of Police, Calcutta, delivered before the Royal Empire Society on November 1st, 1932, from which the following is an extract:—

"One of the earliest acts of Mr. C. R. Das, when elected Mayor of the Calcutta Corporation, was to call for applications for appointments from those who had suffered in the country's cause. The result has been that for years this civic body has provided terrorists and their relatives with jobs, largely in the capacity of teachers."

What Mr. C. R. Das did, almost every Indian to whom we transfer power will do, which is to fill the public service either with his relatives or his creatures, and we shall be driven out, if not by force, simply because we shall have nobody left to serve us.

It is interesting to find that at the very time that the Government are making such efforts to force Federation on India, Western Australia is sending a delegation to London to petition the King and Parliament for leave to secede and form a separate Dominion. The newspaper comment on this is that the only way in which this could

be done would to amend the Constitution Act of 1900, and that this would conflict with the Statute of Westminster.

It was stated some time ago that the predominantly Mohammedan Provinces of India were considering the idea of forming a Federation of their own, and if they are forced into the one now proposed, even without the example of Western Australia to guide us, it is not difficult to foresee what is bound to happen. The reasons given for the desire of Western Australia to secede apply with still greater force to the Mohammedan Provinces of India, quite apart from the differences of religion. These are, in the main, that she is the victim of fiscal policies which exclusively benefit other parts of the country, that she contributes financially into the pool more than she receives out of it, and that in various ways her welfare is habitually neglected.

Indian politics are largely dominated by vested interests in Bombay and Bengal. The price of cloth, the principal item of expenditure of the cultivating classes, and of the poor all over India, has been greatly enhanced for the benefit of the Bombay mill-owner, and incidentally of the Congress funds. Bengal and Bihar have the most fertile soil and a large proportion of the most highly cultivated land in India, but the State obtains no benefit from this, owing to the Permanent Settlement of Lord Cornwallis, and the influence of the landlords is so powerful that they have succeeded up till now in escaping Income Tax, Death Duties, and all the various taxes which have been imposed on the landowning classes in Britain. In the Punjab and other provinces which were subsequently conquered, the settlements are temporary, and there are few landlords of importance. There is thus a clear conflict of interests between the Provinces in which the Land Revenue is permanently settled, and those in which it is temporarily settled, and between the Bombay Presidency, in which most of the cotton mills are situated, and the rest of India, the inhabitants of which use cotton cloth, but do not manufacture it. For an analogy of what is likely to happen, we have only to turn to the United States of America, where a conflict of interests and ideas between the agricultural and slave-owning South and the manufacturing North, led the former to secede, though both were of the same race and religion. Should the Mohammedan Provinces of India follow the example of the Southern States of America, all except perhaps Bengal will inevitably, through geographical considerations and the force of circumstances, be drawn into the orbit of the Mohammedan Powers, and if they are not absorbed by them will lean on them rather than on us, unless they all combine to overrun the rest of

India, which would be much more practical politics than the White Paper scheme is ever likely to be.

It was pointed out by Major-General Sir John Megaw Director General of the Indian Medical Service, in his comments on the last Census Report that India has reached the limit of population which it can support, and we have only to look at the number of our own unemployed to arrive at a similar conclusion in regard to Britain. India is particularly subject to famine, and Britain has to obtain the greater part of its food supplies from abroad. In the event of anarchy and civil war, which under the proposed Indian Constitution are sure either to lead to or to follow invasion, India will be unable to support its own population, still less to have a surplus for export, with which to purchase British goods in so far as she is still allowed to do so, and thereby enable Britain to obtain food supplies from abroad. By going out of their way to bring about the ruin of what used to be our best customer, our rulers are doing their utmost to produce the results aimed at in the German submarine campaign, which brought us within sight of starvation. If their efforts are successful they will bring us still nearer it than the Germans did, and it will not be a mere temporary crisis, but a permanent state of things, which will involve a lowering of the standard of living through the loss of a large part of our foreign trade, and a consequent reduction in the national income.

We have seen something of the attitude of the Indian religions towards each other and towards us; now let us see something of the religions themselves, and of the leading characteristics of their adherents, with special reference to Hinduism, which will be predominant under the system of Government that it is proposed to set up. An excellent sketch of the chief Indian religions is given in the pamphlet already referred to, "India and Reconciliation," by Brig.-General H. D. Frost, M.C., C.B.E. It is as follows:—

"What is Hindu Culture.

"It is a superstitious idolatrous religion in which caste intolerance reigns supreme. India has been enslaved to it for 4,000 years. Because of it she has never been free from foreign domination.

"About 2000 B.C. the original Brahmins came to India from the North. They were a fair race with a simple monotheistic religion, far superior in intellect and stature to the original inhabitants. They rapidly overcame all the surrounding tribes, and all who refused to submit to them and accept their religion became outcastes or untouchables. Later on the Brahmins began to compromise with the

existing religions of the country, and fell into idolatry, and began to invent new doctrines to suit themselves and the country, with the result that instead of retaining their separate nationality they became the priestly caste of the people of India. To-day they form the most exclusive of all priestly systems in the world. The ignorant masses fear them far more than they do the Government. The religion is so complicated to-day that only the Brahmin priests understand it, and new doctrines and gods are often added to it.

The Doctrine of Hinduism is transmigration of souls, or reincarnation of the soul after death into some other body, which may be prince or slave, a tiger or a frog, an ape, a serpent, or any kind of animal or reptile. This transmigration is supposed to continue in unbroken succession for millions of years, the real aim of life being to discover how to get release from the burden of existence.

Appalling penances and self-torture are inflicted in the hope of accelerating the day of extermination.

This religion cannot be described here in detail, but it enforced Brahmin widows to be burnt alive on their husband's funeral pyres, and has many awful and disgusting rites. It does all those things mentioned in Deut. 18. 9-13, which caused God to allow Israel to drive out the original inhabitants of Palestine. Hindu culture cannot uplift India.

INDIAN RELIGIOUS REFORMERS.

There have been many reformers trying to free their country from the appalling superstition and idolatry.

Buddha, an Indian Prince of one of the ruling military castes, of Persian origin, about 500 B.C., tried to retain Hindu culture and doctrine, the transmigration of souls without idolatry and caste. His religion has spread to Burma, but has had little effect on India, and is now just as idolatrous as Hinduism. Buddha himself has become deified.

Kabir, whose date is uncertain, rejected caste and condemned idolatry, tried to unite Hinduism with Islam. There are only about 35,000 of his followers to-day, with their headquarters at Benares.

Guru Nanak (1469), the founder of the famous fighting race of the Sikhs. Their religion is a sort of compromise between Hinduism and Islam. Caste has not been eliminated. There are about 4,000,000 in India to-day.

The Brahmo-Samaghist are trying to unite all religions in India to-day, and abolish caste and superstition. They are good people, but their efforts are doomed to failure, because there is only one remedy for India's troubles.

The Arya-Samaghists are very largely a political body of Reformed Hindus, who are anti-British and anti-Christian.

The Mohammedan conquerors under the Great Moghuls were not of Indian origin. They converted many Hindus to Islam by the persuasion of the sword, while others saw a brotherhood in Islam which has never existed in Hindu culture. The Mohammedan religion accepts the whole of the Old Testament, but eliminates the cross and the Resurrection of Christ in the New Testament. It acknowledges the Lord Jesus Christ as born of a virgin, as the only Sinless One Who ever lived, that He was taken to Heaven without dying, and is coming again very soon to rule the world. This is our point of contact with Mohammedans. If only a few more missionaries would realise it, a great work would be done.

"God allowed the Mohammedans to overrun India, because He hated idolatry."

The place of honour in regard to Hinduism must naturally be given to our present Prime Minister, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald. Unfortunately the book from which I quote was written before he attained his present position, and the author, not foreseeing his future greatness, instead of giving him a paragraph to himself, has bracketed his views with those of another whose opinion is less favourable. I find the following passage in "The Call of India," by Rev. Edgar W. Thompson, M.A., formerly a missionary in India, and now Senior Secretary of the Methodist Missionary Society, published by that Society in 1912:—

"One of our latest visitors to India says of the common people: 'Their ignorance and their superstition and many of their habits are as barbarous as anything to be found amongst the most savage heathen . . . These rural millions are as illiterate and superstitious, however charming in manner, as any savages in the remotest darkness of Africa; while one of our Parliamentary leaders has declared that before the inscrutable Hindu an Englishman feels like a decent-minded prize-fighter in the presence of a saint.'"

Footnotes give the names of the persons who expressed these opinions—as Mr. Harold Begbie and Mr. Ramsay Macdonald respectively.

Another visitor to India who arrived at a very different conclusion regarding Hindus and Hinduism from those of Mr. Ramsay Macdonald was the late Rev. R. F. Horton, M.A., D.D., one of the leading Nonconformist ministers in England, who has held the positions of Chairman of the Congregational Union, and President of the Free Church Council. He wrote a book recording his impressions

which was published by Messrs. Cassell & Company, Ltd., in 1913, under the title "Three Months in India." One of the places he visited that impressed him most strongly was Kalighat, the chief Hindu temple of Calcutta. As a matter of fact, it is not in Calcutta itself, but in the suburb of Bhawanipore, and where Dr. Horton refers to women of the city, he means what in Europe would be called women of the streets—that is prostitutes. The chapter is headed "The Horrors of Kalighat," and the following are some extracts from it:—

"If the reader is tempted to entertain any sentimental optimism about the Hindu religion, if he has any cheap philosophy about Christianity being the best religion for the Western, and Hinduism for the Hindu, the simplest cure is for him to pay a visit to Kalighat, the temple of Kali."

* * * * *

"I had heard that Kalighat was terrible, though until I had actually seen and heard, it was impossible for me to imagine the scene."

* * * * *

"Goats are sacrificed in the worship of the goddess. Our guide took us to the place where a kind of shambles is prepared, and the heads of the goats are struck off. I shall never forget the expression of that man's face when I said to him: "Would you sacrifice a cow?" He looked dumbfounded—the awful sacrilege of sacrificing a cow! If I had said a woman he would merely have replied in the negative."

* * * * *

"The steps of the temple were crowded with little girls. The Brahmin himself explained they were kept here until they lost their virginity. At the bathing ghat the women of the city were bathing; this is their resort. We were taken into a great colonnade, a kind of picture-gallery representing the gods. One was a picture of the latest incarnation of Kali representing her carrying her head under her arm. Another was a picture of Vishnu riding on an elephant made of women. Before these pictures there were men beating drums in a kind of fowl ecstasy. A fakir close by came forward; he was the most degraded-looking human being I ever saw. The dirt, the noise, and the fetid atmosphere were insufferable. I felt it almost impossible to mention the name of Christ in this building. It seemed as if the very stones would cry out"

* * * * *

"You say 'surely Kalighat is maintained only by

ignorant and base Hindus,' But alas! it is maintained by the cultivated, educated, English-speaking Hindus, by men who, when the proposal was made a short time ago to drain the river and cleanse the precincts as a sanitary precaution, raised their protest and prevented it from being done—it would be an interference with religion. Kalighat is the centre of the vice of the city, the scene of what we should call debauchery. It is impossible to imagine what it is like. There is one text which describes the whole thing. It is St. Paul's terrific saying: 'The things that they sacrifice they sacrifice to devils.'

"We in the happy light of Christendom, trained in the Christian morality and permeated with Christian ideas, cannot conceive that religion can take this form. We know that vice exists in our own cities; but that it should be connected with a place of religion, and even practised as a form of worship, is so remote from our dreams that we never really grasp what these heathen cults mean."

* * * * *

A view similar to that of Dr. Horton is taken by the author of a book called "The Land of the Lingam." Linga and Lingam are different forms of the same word, which English delicacy prevents from being literally translated and is usually rendered by its equivalent of the Greek phallos, and emblems of it are to be found all over India where Hinduism prevails. The following is an extract from the review of it in "The Irish Times." The heading is "Religion and Caste":—

"India can never be a nation till Hinduism, with its superstitions and beastly rites, is wiped out."

"With this warning note ever before his readers, either by suggestion, implication, or direct illustration, Mr. Arthur Miles has written a most damnatory attack upon the religious system of India proper, and particularly upon the Brahmins. Hinduism, as he sees it, is a conglomeration of superstitions, myths and revolting practices. Sex is the keynote of the Hindu's life from cradle almost to deathbed, and many of the rites and ceremonies of their religion have either a sexual significance or are practised in a definitely orgiastic manner. Besides this sex-hysteria, there is a welter of revolting self-torture, blood sacrifices, magic and superstition, utterly confusing to the Western mind."

* * * * *

What the Mohammedans think of the Hindus and Hinduism may be seen from the following extract from a letter from a Mohammedan correspondent describing the Hindu mythology. One used to think the Greek and Roman

mythology pretty bad, and some even of the Greeks and Romans recognised the fact themselves, as one of the Greek poets says that the gods did among themselves all that was bane and shame among men. In comparison with the Hindu mythology, however, a handbook of Greek and Roman mythology would almost do for a Sunday-school prize.

My correspondent has condensed into less than a page a mass of material to be found at greater length in such books as Dr. Murray Mitchell's "Hinduism Past and Present," and Sir W. Hunter's "Indian Empire." I am only able to give a part of what he writes, as some of the doings of one of the Hindu gods, Siva, or Shib, were so grossly indecent that they excited the anger of another Hindu god, Vishnu, himself anything but puritanical, judging from his amorous adventures with the three thousand milkmaids. The result was that he cut off an important part of Siva with a sort of celestial mowing-machine, and the thousand pieces of this which fell from the sky in different parts of India, are, according to my correspondent, adored by the Hindus as Shib-Linga, while the Mohammedans regard them as nothing but clumsy pieces of stone. The details are so foul that I have had to omit most of those relating to this deity, and content myself with the above paraphrase of them. The portions of the account of the Hindu deities which, though far from delicate, it is possible to print in English, except in a medical book, are as follows:—

"You have understood that damned religion Hinduism in its true colours. In our (Moslim) opinion it is not a religion at all, being only devil worship. Mahadeb or Shib being called Bhut or Bhutraaj, king of devils), Kali (a demoness), worship of Brahma (the creator) who ravished both his mother and daughter according to Hindu mythology) Ram, (that effeminate prince of Oudh), who most unchivalrously and treacherously left his wife Sita in a wilderness when she was in a family way. Besides, they have been worshipping even up till this enlightened age, trees (as Tulsi, Peepul, etc.), serpents (Nag, etc.) men of any fame (or notoriety). Indecency is the essence of their religion (?) if Hinduism may be called a religion at all. Impurity (e.g. cow-dung, etc.) uncleanness (e.g. smearing body with ashes by sadhus, of the Tantric persuasion, etc.) immorality (e.g. Indra's ravishing Ahalya, wife of Sage Gautan, when the latter was away to take his bath in the Ganges), indecency (e.g. Shiva's assaulting his mother-in-law, (Dakshan's wife), obscenity (of which there are thousands of anecdotes in the Mahab-

harat (epic) and Paranas, ribaldry and lust (of gods) debauchery, seduction, concubinage, adultery, intrigue (of Krishna, etc.), harlotry (of goddess Ganga (Ganges) etc.): and a thousand and one misdeeds of like nature and regarded as meritorious acts and justified without the least shame by even otherwise well-educated Hindu gentlemen of position, as did your Deputy Magistrate mentioned on page 61 of your book. For these we Musulmans specially and all sane people generally will be loth to call Hinduism a religion. To put Muslims under such a grossly immoral and unjust people, as is contemplated in the White Paper as it stands now, would be an act of anything but political prudence."

The passage from other book referred to is as follows:—

"What appears on this subject in the works of Buckingham and Hunter is bad enough, but I have heard worse from one of my Indian Deputy Magistrates, a Brahmin. I gathered that one way of acquiring religious merit in this sect is for a man to adopt a girl as a child, bring her up as a daughter until she attains maturity, then to outrage her and, after doing so, to cut her throat. I naturally took the view that such conduct was fiendish, but the Brahmin, though highly educated and living in the European style, found some excuse for it and regarded it, not as sadism gone mad, but as a kind of mental training to teach a man to overcome his natural feelings."

Another Hindu method of acquiring religious merit is indiscriminate sexual intercourse. I shall come to the institution of temple prostitutes later, which we in all our years in India have not been able to abolish, as every time an attempt is made to do so, a howl is raised by the orthodox Hindus that we are interfering with their religion. As an example of this I have heard from the same source of a certain non-resident landlord, who used to make a tour of his estate, and spend a month at a certain part of it, during which he was only to be seen in the day-time, as his nights were spent in Puja, that is worship. The Puja consisted in getting hold of the daughters of his tenants, and ravishing them with the most elaborate religious ceremonial. Of this full details are given, but these are as unprintable as would be a description of the statuary of the temple of Kananak, or that of the Nepali temple at Benares. The former is a perfect museum of sexual pathology. The latter mostly depicts more or less normal sex relations, except that these are sometimes combined with gymnastic displays, such as high kicking or bending backwards till the palms of the hand touch the

ground. Another peculiarity is that there is generally a third deity present, sometimes a god, sometimes a goddess, who regard the proceedings with such rapt attention as to suggest that after a time they expect the parts of the performer and spectator to be interchanged. The expression of intense lust on the faces of the statues at Kanarak is here replaced, at least in the case of the principals, by one of smug satisfaction, but both expressions are very far removed from anything that Christians, Mohammedans, or Jews would associate with the idea of divinity. Benares is the chief centre of Hinduism, and the seat of the Hindu University.

The person who described the incident to me concluded with the remark:—

“Thus is spent the thirty and one nights of the zamendar in a holy (?) way. Is not this Zamindar, Sir, a pocket edition of the hundreds of Indian Rajas of one of whom (the perpetrator of the Bombay murder) you mention in your book? Are innocent raiyats—especially the Moslems, to be placed under such Rajas by the White Paper? I shudder to think of the black old days that the White Paper may introduce.”

Raiyats, it should be explained, are Indian cultivators who, as a class, possess all the virtues of a peasantry who have a hard struggle to live. We have done something to free them from their oppressors, but when such things happen even under our rule, what will happen when we abdicate, and those oppressors control the Government?

Another false assumption on the part of the British public noticed by the other Indian correspondent quoted, he describes as follows:—

“Moreover, they do not understand the strength of Saivite worship (Kali, etc.) and its connection with crimes of violence against the State, and the public, much as was Thuggee a century ago.”

We have already seen something of the worship of Kali; let us now see something of what Thuggee was. For the benefit of those who do not know India, or whose knowledge of it is slight as that of Mr. Ramsay Macdonald would appear to be, I shall now supply some information about Thuggee, to which my correspondent also refers.

The following account of it is given in Low and Pulling's Dictionary of English History, published by Cassell & Co., Ltd., 1889:—

“Thugs were an Indian fraternity of travelling assassins, who subsisted on the plunder of the victims they strangled. They generally attached themselves, as if by accident, to the travellers whom they met, and then at a

convenient spot, strangled them and buried the bodies in a pit hastily dug with a pickaxe which had been consecrated by religious ceremonies. They were bound to secrecy by oath, and had peculiar signs for recognising each other and a slang language of their own. They considered themselves the especial favourites of the goddess Doorga, the goddess of thieves and murderers, and celebrated her rites with the most scrupulous piety. The gang was recruited by children kidnapped for the purpose, and cautiously initiated into the arcana of their society. Their victims were counted by thousands annually, and no district was free from their ravages. Lord William Bentinck determined to suppress them in 1850, and organised a regular department presided over by Major Sleeman The confederacy was effectually broken up, and travelling in India ceased to be dangerous."

Doorga is another name for the goddess, or as one of my Mohammedan correspondents describes her, the demoness Kali, a description which is more in accordance with her attributes. If the Hindus in 1909 were exhorted to sacrifice white goats to Kali, in other words to kill Europeans at sight, they were only doing to Europeans what they did to each other a hundred years ago, and would be doing still if we had not put a stop to it, since not merely the pickaxe, but the use to which it was put, were consecrated by religion.

The quotations that I have given are sufficient to show to any unprejudiced mind that Mr. Ramsay Macdonald has been completely misled about Hindus and Hinduism, at least the class of Hindus in whose favour it is his intention that we should abdicate. With regard to the masses, except when their religious fanaticism is aroused, my feelings are the same as those expressed by Major General Sir Hamilton Bower, K.C.B., in an article in the "Indian Empire Review" for November, 1933, from which I quote the following passage:—

"I cannot understand the attitude of the Labour Party. When the question of changes in the Government of India come under discussion, one would expect that they would show some consideration for the welfare of their opposite numbers and say, 'We are not concerned with the interests of politicians and lawyers et hoc genus omne. All we want to know is what is the best for the mass of hardworking peasants.' That would appear logically to fit in with their profession of helping the under-dog, and that they do not do so can only be ascribed to ignorance of the facts.

"A very great deal of the time of our civil affairs is taken up in protecting the peasantry from the very class

to whom it is proposed to hand them over. A greater cruelty to a simple, likeable people it is difficult to conceive."

How can we account for such terrible mistakes on the part of one within whose power the accident of circumstances has placed it to impose his will on Parliament and the people? Not content with this, in order that there may be no place for repentance, he is endeavouring to make the act irrevocable, by conferring on India Dominion Status, so that no matter how far the Hindu majority which it is proposed to place in a dominant position may fall short of saintliness, or even should their actions turn out to be as diabolical as those of their co-religionists were at Cawnpore in 1857 and 1931, we shall have no power to interfere.

An incident that happened to myself may throw some light on the subject. The Hindu is a born intriguer, and when a new officer comes, a clerk who is dissatisfied often tries to get him to reverse the orders of his predecessor, though the proper course is to appeal against it, and there is no power of revision. In one district I succeeded an officer of the Statutory Civil Service, the first attempt at Indianisation, who was what is called in Hindustani a great bahadur. The phrase is almost untranslatable in English, except negatively,

It is the antithesis of democratic, and means a person who is very lordly in his ways and ideas. Some promotions among the clerks had been made shortly before, and within a few days of taking over charge, I received a petition which ran somewhat as follows:—

"Far be it from me to say anything which might be construed as a reflection on a person holding the high position of Magistrate and Collector of a District. At the same time, for the purpose of my case, it is absolutely essential that I should point out to your Honour that Mr. A., Your Honour's predecessor, was extremely susceptible to flattery."

Mutatis mutandis, I feel in the position of that clerk. Not realising the position that he would attain, it was a source of mingled amusement and indignation to watch the progress of Mr. Ramsay Macdonald through India. From the moment of his arrival to that of his departure, he was surrounded by a crowd of Congress politicians, all expert flatterers when they get hold of a British journalist or politician ready to listen to them. They set numerous traps for him, into which he walked with that complete assurance which is one of his most marked characteristics, and got him to act in a manner which excited considerable astonishment in India at the time. He was then supposed

to be a Socialist, and it was not realised that his Socialism was only skin-deep, or the result of environment, and that his real affinities were with Rajas, Maharajas, successful lawyers, and other high-caste Hindus.

His Congress friends took him to be the guest of a very rich and high-handed nobleman in a Bengal district. This landlord maintained a large staff of lathials to fight his battles, take forcible possession of any land that he claimed or coveted, and in all probability to dragoon his tenants. An Indian barrister, whom I met in England before I came to India, used sometimes to come to one of my districts, to conduct cases in the Court of the Sessions Judge. In the evenings he would come over to my bungalow to see me, and have a talk. I remember his telling me that the easiest and best paid work that he ever had, was when he was employed by this Maharaja to follow up behind the lathials, and prepare the defence as soon as the riot was over.

In India, except in the case of a few estates which have been declared to be impartible, landed property follows the ordinary law of succession, so that there may be one owner of an estate, or two, or several hundred, and each of these shares is transferable. The general Hindustani and Bengali word for an office building, whether the Court of a Magistrate, or the house in which the rent of a landowner is collected, is kachahri. A big landlord, who I believe was this nobleman, and a co-sharer, who was quite a small man in comparison, had a joint kachahri in a very remote part of the district. Settlement operations, that is a record of all the interests in land, were going on in the locality. One day the Assistant Settlement Officer was approached by the local agent of the smaller landowner, and asked if he would like to see a fight. He asked what it was about. The agent replied that the big landlord had determined to dispossess the smaller one, and with that object had collected four hundred lathials, and the smaller one had collected two hundred. The Assistant Settlement Officer naturally asked what chance had two hundred men against four hundred? The agent replied that the smaller man had been able to borrow a fighting elephant from one of his friends, and it was hoped that this would turn the scale. The Assistant Settlement Officer, would greatly have liked to see such a unique spectacle, but he suddenly remembered that he was also a Magistrate, and was reluctantly obliged, as he put it, to forbid the banns.

Mr. Macdonald is no doubt under the impression that he has seen a great deal of India, but some things I feel fairly confident he did not see, the Nepali temple at Benares,

the temple of Kanarak, and a fighting elephant in action.

A possible explanation of the attitude of Mr. Ramsay Macdonald towards India may perhaps be found in the following passage which a writer to another newspaper quotes from the "Edinburgh Evening News":—

"One of the pleasures of his Premiership has been the strong bond of sympathy on this subject that has developed between him and Mr. Baldwin. For him the Indian Reforms are a matter of profound principle. As is well known, he has even considered the possibility of a personal assumption of responsibility for the Indian Empire, if that should be desired by the King."

There have been rumours that his ambition takes the form of aspiring to be the first Viceroy of the new India. While the ambition of the Aga Khan will be satisfied if he has an Indian State created for him, so that he may become a temporal as well as a spiritual ruler, that of Mr. Macdonald soars higher, and nothing less than Empire will satisfy him. To this end it must be given Dominion status, so that it will be for all practical purposes independent of Britain, and he can choose as Ministers his Hindu friends, unless Mr. Gandhi, or whoever is the popular leader for the time being, should follow in the footsteps of Mr. de Valera, and relegate Mr. Ramsay Macdonald to the position of Mr. Buckley, which will be quite within the bounds not only of possibility but of probability.

His present position is one of rather unstable equilibrium. He has practically no following of his own, and depends for the maintenance of his power, and the retention of his position, on being able to impose his will on Mr. Baldwin, and on Mr. Baldwin's being able to impose what he supposes to be his will, but is really that of Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, on the Conservative Party. How far the process has gone can be seen from the following extract from another letter to the same newspaper:—

"In September, 1929, Mr. Baldwin was on holiday at Aix-les-Bains in France. On his return journey he stayed at Bourge, where a communication awaited him from Mr. Macdonald, who was then Prime Minister of the Socialist Government, asking him to give his adherence to granting Home Rule and Dominion Status to the people of India.

"Truly a momentous question for any statesman to decide, seeing that it involved the destinies of India's 350,000,000, the staple industry of Lancashire, and British investments totalling £700,000,000.

"Without consulting any of his colleagues, Mr. Baldwin agreed: hence the present trouble and the prospect

of the Party being divided, as was seen at Bristol recently."

Mr. Baldwin hates the trouble of thinking, and is never so happy as when he is in a position to play the part of saying "ditto to Mr. Burke." His doing so to Mr. Andrew Mellon, Secretary of the United States Treasury, has cost the country dear, and if he is not checked in time, his saying ditto to Mr. Ramsay Macdonald will involve both India and Britain in complete ruin.

Let us now see the views of a French savant, M. André Chevrillon, from whose book, "Romantic India," a short extract is given in the Preface. As he was an unknown foreigner, or if not unknown in his own country, one whose reputation had not reached India, and he had not given out that he was going to write a book about it, the Congress politicians, instead of buzzing around him like bees round a honey-pot, as they do with those British writers and politicians who will listen to them, left him alone, and he was allowed to observe things for himself. That he did so to some purpose will appear from the following extracts from his book:—

"At two miles distance from Pondichéry we come to the pagoda of Villanur; and we no longer think of Greece. Above the village—twenty wretched hovels of dried mud, twenty huts of savages, within whose shade black figures with bestial heads are drowsing—rises an indescribable something, a bluish heap of swarming figures, a confused pyramid of porcelain monsters, grimacing, innumerable, in serried ranks, one above another. It is hideous and insane, this pagoda roof; it is an imagination of a diseased brain, which, crushed, perverted by the torrid sun, raves in grotesque and horrible visions. And in this heap of shapeless figures, of twisted limbs that writhe about each other, there is not merely the lack of sanity, but there is also a something savage, disturbing, incomprehensible, like the Polynesian idols or the ancient sanguinary Mexican divinities—something that speaks of the old indigenous races which the Aryan conquerors met everywhere in India: mysterious black races that still people this southern part of the peninsula, sending out wandering tribes through the forests of the interior. This character is noticeable in all the architecture of Southern India. Next door to Pondichéry, at Madura and Trichinopoli, it attains its utmost extravagance and strangeness, displaying itself in granite pagodas as large as cities, covering the earth with pillars, heaping up, in gigantic pyramids, gods and goddesses, demons, heroes, monkeys, horses, elephants—a whole world of human and animal forms, which are massed

together in most astonishing confusion."

"A crowd of black-skinned priests and worshippers came yelping about us, and a hundred hands were greedily stretched out. Some random blows with a stick from my guide, and sadness settled upon their faces, outcries changed to wailing, and the begging hands were extended, clasped in supplication. Quick, some little silver coins to restore joy in this poor black world; and the piteous faces of the Brahmans are overspread with broad smiles of infantile delight! At once they send the crowd away, and consult, with an air of mystery. Two minutes' conference, and then two of the older priests slip away, they vanish into the sanctuary, and return triumphantly, their faces radiant at the surprise they are preparing for us, leading out a troop of bayadères in full costume. Clad in silks, their noses, ears, arms, and ankles loaded with rings, with languid, alluring gestures, and shiverings of the body and of the finger-tips, they execute an erotic pantomime. Not very seductive, these bayadères, with their brutish fat faces and thick lips which mark the inferior race. Their look is vacant and almost idiotic, the mouth open in a stupid smile. Evidently the soul is lacking; these black women are too near the animal.

"Behind them is the entrance to the sanctuary; we are not allowed to go in; but in the darkness I can discover vague figures of gilded divinities, and an extremely ugly idol in a tabernacle. Idols, bayadères, pyramids of monsters heaped upon each other, black-skinned worshippers, savage, begging priests, we leave them all with little delay, somewhat confused, not very well comprehending what we have seen."

The Babylonians had a custom which shocked Herodotus, a Greek traveller who lived nearly 2,500 years ago, but in comparison with that of the modern Hindus, who keep Devadasis attached to some of their temples, the Babylonian custom is almost Puritanical. His description is as follows:—

"The most disgraceful of the Babylonian customs is the following: Every native woman is obliged, once in her life, to sit in the temple of Venus and have intercourse with some stranger. And many disdain to mix with the rest, being proud on account of their wealth, come in covered carriages, and take up their station at the temple with a numerous train of servants attending them. But the far greater part do thus: Many sit down in the temple of Venus, wearing a crown of cord round their heads; some are continually coming in, and others are going out. Passages marked out in a straight line lead in every

direction to the women, along which strangers pass and make their choice. When a woman has once seated herself, she must not return home till some stranger has thrown a piece of silver into her lap, and lain with her outside the temple. He who throws the silver says thus: 'I beseech the goddess Mylitta to favour thee'; for the Assyrians call Venus Mylitta. The silver may be ever so small, for she will not reject it, inasmuch as it is not lawful for her to do so, for such silver is accounted sacred. The woman follows the first man that throws, and refuses no one. But when she has had intercourse and has absolved herself from her obligation to the goddess, she returns home; and after that time, however great a sum you may give her you will not gain possession of her. In some parts of Cyprus there is a custom very similar."

* * * * *

M. Chevrillon visited Benares, and this is his description of one of the temples there:—

"In the walls, above the doors, niches shelter shapeless divinities, monstrous gods with heads of elephants and bodies encircled with serpents. Here and there, wells, from which ascends a fetid odour of decayed flowers, are inhabited by gods, and around them the crowd is dense. Upon the walls blue paintings narrate the Hindu mythology; the temples are girt with a garland of obscene divinities, and in the midst of the streets, as if the temples were not numerous enough to contain all the idols, small altars make a pedestal for the fat Ganesa or the shapeless Kali. One's foot slips in the heaps of decaying flowers, there is a strange mud of ordures and sacred jasmine putrefying in this Ganges water with which all the altars are sprinkled; and from the glutinous soil rises a strange, nauseating odour. In the midst of the human multitude monkeys gambol and chatter, clinging to the roofs, and cows wander freely and eat the flowers."

* * * * *

"All our mental habits are set at naught. Imagine yourself to have landed in a country where the inhabitants walk on their heads. This race thinks, and feels and lives in a fashion contrary to our own; and one's first idea on arriving in Benares is that insanity is normal here."

After a long description of the ceremonies that have to be performed by a Brahman of Benares, M. Chevrillon proceeds as follows:—

"It is estimated that between daybreak and noon he has scarcely an hour of rest from the performance of these rites. After the great powers of nature, the Ganges, the Dawn, and the Sun, he goes to worship, in their temples, the representations of divinity, the sacred trees, finally, the cows, to whom

he offers flowers. In his own dwelling other divinities await him: five black stones, representing Siva, Ganesa, Surya, Devi, and Vishnu, arranged according to the cardinal points; one toward the north, a second to the south-east, a third to the south-west, a fourth to the north-west, and one in the centre, this order changing according as the worshipper regards one god or another as most important; then there is a shell, a bell—to which, kneeling, he offers flowers—and lastly, a vase, whose mouth contains Vishnu, the neck Rudra, the paunch Brahma, while at the bottom repose the three divine mothers, the Ganges, the Indus, and the Jumna.

* * * * *

“This is the daily cult of the Brahman of Benares, and on holidays it is still further complicated. Since the great epoch of Brahmanism it has remained the same. Some details may alter, but as a whole it has always been thus tyrannical and thus extravagant. As far back as the Upanishads appears the same faith in the power of articulate speech, the same imperative and innumerable prescriptions, the same singular formulas, the same enumeration of grotesque gestures. Every day, for more than twenty-five hundred years, since Buddhism was a protest against the tyranny and absurdity of rites, has this race mechanically passed through this machinery, resulting in what mental malformations, what habitual attitudes of mind and will, the race is now too different from ourselves for us to be able to conceive. A negro, a Tierra del Fuegan savage, resembles us more than do these people. The negro is more simple than we, nearer to the life of the animals; but, if we divest ourselves of the unstable acquirements of our civilisation, we discover, concealed, yet alive, in the depths of our souls nearly all of his instincts. On the contrary, the Hindu soul is as completely developed as our own; its vegetation is no less rich, but is entirely different. It is stupefying to see the crowd of ideas, according to us incoherent and absurd, that form the substance of their minds. Each man belongs to a caste, in which, like his ancestors, he is inexorably shut up. At bottom, the idea of caste is as the idea of species among animals. The distinction between a dog and a bull is of the same nature as that between a Sudra and a Brahman. Hence the horror attaching to the idea of marriage between the persons of different castes. Notice that to-day the castes are as numerous as the trades and professions. Each Hindu is born a priest, or a doctor, a scribe or a potter, a blacksmith or an engraver; and he believes himself lost if a man of lower caste touches his food or eats at his side. If he quits India, if he crosses

the sea, he becomes a pariah: that is to say, he loses his relatives and friends, and can neither buy nor sell, eat, drink, nor live, with any person whatever. He is polluted, and nothing can efface this pollution but the *supreme purification*, the purification "by the cow." Having given large sums of money to the Brahmans, and called together the men of his caste, he swallows the four products of this most sacred of animals, a paste made of the milk and butter and the solid and liquid excrement of the cow. For this animal is one of the high incarnations of divinity, inferior to the Brahman, but superior to almost all the rest of humanity.

* * * * *

"Our Hindu has his ethics. An inner voice dictates to him certain actions, which it is meritorious to perform and criminal to neglect. But his code and ours have no similarity whatever. Every society rests upon a certain number of sentiments common to all its members, which check or direct the selfish instincts that would tend to the undue development of the individual at the expense of his neighbours and of the harmonious life of the whole group. It cannot be denied that these sentiments vary; and as they vary, the form and structure, the power, and the cohesive strength of the society, differ. They may be very simple, as in the ancient cities; they may be very complex, as in our modern communities, where, slowly, through the ages, extremely diverse circumstances have superposed upon the ancient instincts a great variety of delicate sentiments. But, simple or complicated, they are a condition without which social life is impossible. With the Hindus ethics have a different origin, it seems, and a different character. They are not a code of duties toward one's neighbours; they are nothing but a series of prescriptions regulating the external life, actions, food, and dress."

* * * * *

"It is not forbidden him to lie; it is not forbidden him to steal: before the English rule, certain sects commanded assassination, or honoured Siva by an organised violation of women. But if the Hindu sees meat eaten, if he swallows a cow's hair in a cup of insufficiently filtered milk, he is lost, condemned to the worst transmigrations—to the hells of blood, of boiling oil, of reptiles, of molten copper: more than that, he has a horror of himself, for these commands and these prohibitions are not addressed to the outer man only; there are sentiments corresponding to them, deep-rooted by an observance of twenty-five centuries—organic, traditional sentiments, which form the very substance of the moral nature, enduring through life, entirely independent of changing circumstances or ideas, real categorical imperatives like those which, with us, forbid murder and

theft. Intelligent babus, well informed as to our ideas, our sciences, European in philosophy and ethics, have been seen to faint dead away with horror at having by accident tasted bouillon."

* * * * *

"If we look at certain general customs, they manifest no less clearly the strangeness, the contradictions, in the habitual sentiments of this people. Here on every side, in the streets, are birds living unmolested in the midst of the human crowd; here are blue peacocks, that wander through the city at will. Observe the hospitals for sick animals, where are tenderly cared for all sorts of living creatures, dogs, gazelles, eagles. Is it not a sign of the gentle character, the radical goodness of these Hindus? But in 1857 they outbid in cruelty the aborigines of America; and though public human sacrifices have disappeared under the English rule, there is sometimes seen a child's dead body upon an altar of the hideous Kali. Love is unknown in India. Children are married to each other when they are nine years old, then strictly separated till the age of maturity. After that time, the woman is immured."

* * * * *

"As a widow she becomes a pariah, an object of evil omen, whom all avoid with disgust. The married man is not held to fidelity, or even the merest external decency. Those offences against morality that we surround with so much reserve and secrecy are here paraded in the open day, no religious law requires their concealment. More than this, there is a recognised caste of prostitutes; their trade is a sacred duty; and in the south of India every temple has its troop of bayaderes. A sect of Saktists, worshippers of 'the energy of Siva,' 'the force that develops the world,' on their feast-days are even released from all distinctions of castes and ties of relationship. Men and women assume a mystic character; they are no longer individuals, but direct incarnations of Siva and Kali. 'All men are myself,' says the god to the goddess. After drinking wine and intoxicating liquors, eating fish and meat and rice, the union of Kali and Siva is celebrated with inconceivable orgies, and the worshippers feel the limits of personality disappear; they become absorbed in Siva, identified with 'the soul of the world.'"

* * * * *

"This cult is 'the path leading to the highest form of salvation'; absorption, that is to say, in the Supreme Existence. He who follows it is called *Shidad*, the perfect one; he who knows it not is a *pasu*, a beast, an impure being. 'For,' says one of the texts, 'there is salvation in the use of intoxicating liquors and animal food, and in union with women.' It is true this is only a sect amongst the

Hindus; but the point to be noted is that these ideas, which to us appear inconceivable and incredible, dwell familiarly in their minds; that the Hindu does not possess those fundamental sentiments and ideas which, with us, would oppose to notions like these an insurmountable barrier and throw them outside the regular action of the mind; that, moreover, certain kindred notions enter into the daily cult of them all; in short, that, between the Saktist and the ordinary Hindu, the difference is one of degree and not of kind, and that in all the race there exist those germs of mental and moral maladies which, in certain sects, are seen in chronic form and of intentional development."

* * * * *

M. Chevillon has some very pointed remarks about one of the principal villains, and some of the greatest heroes of the Mutiny. This is what he writes about Nana Sahib, who ordered the massacre of the British prisoners, including women and children, after they had surrendered on a promise of their lives being spared:—

"Exterior resemblances to our modes of being do not reveal to us what passes in the interior of these souls. What effort of intelligence or of sympathy, for instance, could make us understand the fact I am about to mention? On the 15th of July 1857, Nana Sahib gave orders to massacre the English prisoners. The men having been shot in the open air, the women and children, crowded in a bungalow, were destroyed by repeated firing through the windows. At the end of an hour, the cries within having ceased, Nana caused the dead and dying to be brought out, and to be thrown into a deep well. That evening the Sahib ordered a nautch, and reposing upon a sofa, he passed the night satiating his eyes with the sinuous and serpentine movements of four dancing-girls."

One of the regiments which took part in the relief of Lucknow was the 42nd Highlanders. At that time we did not understand Indian climatic conditions, and instead of wearing pith helmets, as almost every European in India does now, they had to wear an absurd headdress the shape of a bearskin, and covered with feathers. The odds were so great that the Commander-in-Chief, Sir Colin Campbell, thought it necessary to give them some extra encouragement, so before the attack commenced he told them that if they succeeded, he would ask the Queen to give them the blue bonnet. Sir Ian Hamilton, in one of his books, describes how grandly they advanced to the attack, and draws the inference that although the human race throws up occasional freaks, and some men can justifiably be described as old women, the average man is essentially a fighting animal.

This is what the Frenchman writes about the men who defended Lucknow:—

“There is the same tranquil beauty, the same happy blossoming of flowers, in the cemetery of Lucknow where lie the dead of 1857. The Residence, which Sir Henry Lawrence with his handful of soldiers so long defended, is a heap of ruins, blackened by fire, torn by cannon-shot, all covered now with the green of climbing plants, where flame great drooping clusters of yellow flowers.”

“I have been re-reading the story of the siege. What impresses one in this narrative is the sentiment that supported the defenders. There was something besides courage and love of country or desire of glory; I mean, first, a certain grave pride and tenacity; and then, a religious sentiment very serious and very lofty. Every morning the officers and soldiers, with the women and children who had been brought into the Residence for shelter, sang psalms—those which their persecuted Puritan ancestors had sung to strengthen their courage and support them; and the grand Biblical verses gave them that grave and silent enthusiasm, that fervour, which makes men able calmly and coolly to sacrifice their lives. ‘Here lies Henry Lawrence, who tried to do his duty. May the Lord have mercy upon his soul’ says a slab in the little fragrant cemetery.”

“To-day, in Cawnpore, I have seen the well into which Nana Sahib flung the palpitating bodies of the women and children massacred at his command. All around it is now the silence of a great park, and the calm of flowers. A marble angel with folded wings stands on the edge of the well, which has been surrounded with a Gothic balustrade. The downcast eyes have a divine serenity, the clasped hands droop with a gesture of forgiveness.”

How the defenders of Lucknow must turn in their graves, now that their work is being undone by men whose only weapon is their tongue, and that persons of their own race and possibly some of their own descendants are going to be made over to the tender mercies of persons like Nana Sahib, or rather still worse, since he merely murdered, while the modern Hindu patriots have added to their programme torture and rape.

From what has been said, it will be seen that to reconcile Hinduism, with its usually reactionary tenets and its often bestial rites, to the European conception of democracy requires nothing short of a feat of mental gymnastics. But the difficulties do not end here and the Mohammedans, who as fighting-men are in most cases vastly superior to the Hindus, will brook no dictation from them.

The "Daily Mail Blue Book" summarises the situation:—

"222 different languages are spoken in India, nearly all mutually unintelligible. Hindustani is the most widespread. English is the official language, and the one used by educated Indians of different tongues to communicate with each other.

"2,500,000 natives of India can read and write English—16 per thousand males, 2 per thousand females.

"India is a land of infinite diversity. Two-thirds of its population are Hindus of various grades. This religion claims about one-half the people of the British Empire, and one-eighth the population of the world if out-castes are included.

"Hindus worship an immense number of gods. Their outlook on life is entirely different to that of Europeans. Their religion is highly formalist, and prescribes rules for every detail of daily life. The foundation of the Hindu social system is caste.

No man can get out of the caste in which he is born; he must marry within it. Generally, some particular occupation is followed by each caste.

"There are about 2,300 castes. Their chief are:—

The Brahmans—priests and teachers.

The Kshatryas—warriors.

The Voishyas—traders and peasants.

Below the elaborate gradation of castes come the Untouchables, who form 30 per cent. of the Hindu religion. They are supposed to be the descendants of a forgotten conquered race. 'For all other Hindus they cause pollution by touch, and defile food or water.' (Simon Report). In the villages they live in separate quarters, and eat food which no other section of the community would accept.

"Cruel Hindu religious practises like Thuggism (the sacrificial murder of travellers) and Suttee (the burning alive of widows) have been forbidden by our Government in India. Temple prostitution and child-marriage still remain.

Scattered about everywhere among the Hindus, and equal to about one-third of their number, are the Indian Moslems, descendants or converts of Mohammedan invaders from the North-West. Their religion is much closer to Christianity than Hinduism. For Moslems there is only one God, and Mahomet is His prophet. Moslems are in the majority in Bengal, the Punjab, the North-West Frontier Provinces, and Baluchistan.

"Between Hindus and Moslems exists a fierce hostility. Their religions clash on many points. The Hindus have the advantages of numbers; the Moslems that of fighting capacity. From 1923 to 1927 there were 450 reported killed and 5,000 injured in Hindu-Moslem fights. The real

casualties were doubtless many more. On March 24, 1931, a terrible massacre of Moslems by Hindus broke out in Cawnpore; at least 1,000 are believed to have perished."

Jews, Mohammedans, and Christians are on common ground in accepting the whole of the Old Testament, while the Mohammedans accept most of the New Testament, but the Jews do not. There is a chapter in the Old Testament, which is worthy of the attention of all three religions: the 18th Chapter of the First Book of Kings. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald would do well to ask himself if he is likely to succeed where Ahab and Jezebel failed, and to take warning from their fate, which was terrible. Yet there is a good deal to be said in extenuation of their attitude. Jezebel merely tried to establish in the land of her adoption the religion of that of her birth; Ahab was a weak-minded king, who allowed himself to be unduly influenced by his wife, but in doing so he merely acted:—

"Like that uxorious king, whose heart though large,
Beguiled by fair idolatress fell to idols foul."

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald has not even this excuse, and was beguiled by designing Hindu politicians, who cleverly played on his prejudices against his own countrymen.

The other great protagonist of Hinduism, Lord Reading, would do well to remember how nearly his own race came to being overwhelmed by idolatry.

Mr. Macdonald thinks that he can reconcile the irreconcilable by conferences and discussions, which have proved as interminable and as fruitless as those of the lost angels in the first book of Paradise Lost, which "found no end, in wandering mazes lost." Perhaps it is unfair to his intelligence to put things in this way, and what in all probability he is really trying to do is to find a formula which, while in no way deluding the parties concerned, will appeal to British sentiment, and enable him, under the appearance of conferring liberty, to throw power into the hands of his Hindu friends. What the Mohammedans think may be gathered from the following extract from an article entitled "Is it Self-Government?" by the Nawabzada Mohammed Azim Khan of Toru, in the November number of "The Indian Empire Review":—

"For two hundred years, England has given of her best to India. Her sons have laboured to build a mighty bridge on which India might travel to peace and prosperity. Is the keystone to be dropped so carelessly into position?"

"What the White Paper proposals mean for us, is that we are exchanging English rule for Hindu rule. Under two hundred years of English rule we have enjoyed the benefits of wise and impartial administration, protected from enemies within and without. Suddenly we are to be handed over to a government by men of the most

intolerant race on earth. We ask that Provincial autonomy as recommended in the Simon Report should be given a long trial, and until it has proved successful no federal government should be established."

"There is little hope that as soon as English rule is withdrawn, Hindoo and Muslim will extend the hand of brotherhood. On the contrary, a Hindoo leader recently said to me: 'When the English have gone, we will settle with you.' The remark is typical of the attitude of the Nationalists, an attitude which will inevitably lead to bloodshed and strife, compelling the resumption of English rule or the intervention of one or more of the other great Powers."

The author is diplomatic enough to say "the other great powers," but he probably means the Mohammedan powers, whose intervention would be quite sufficient. The Mohammedans know from their experiences in Shahabad and Cawnpore what to expect under Hindu rule, and if they are driven to, or determine to throw it off, there is a compact body of Mohammedan States, extending from the borders of India up to and beyond the Bosphorus, all with fairly efficient Governments, and fairly up-to-date and well-equipped armies, not merely whose interest but whose religious duty it would be to assist them. And in the background there is always Russia, which has altered its Government but not its policy; while we appear to have completely reversed ours.

I quote again from the "Daily Mail Blue Book on the Indian Crisis":—

"The Indian sub-Continent has never been a nation nor been self-governing. It was always, prior to British rule, at the mercy of the invader. The aboriginal Dravidian and Mongoloid inhabitants were 3000 years ago driven into the mountains or the south by ruthless Aryan invaders (from whom the present Caste Hindus claim descent) who under the inhuman religious and social code framed by their Brahman leaders condemned the conquered to be hereditary outcastes, or Untouchables.

"To-day these number 75,000,000, and such alleviation of their miserable lot as is possible, is due to the British Raj which treats them as equal before the law, and the Christian missionaries who regard them as God's children. Gandhi now warns us that under Swaraj the British and other Christian Missions will be expelled. There are also 10,000,000 Bhuddists, chiefly in Burma, 6,000,000 Indian Christians, mainly converts from the Outcastes, 4,000,000 Sikhs and half-a-million Europeans, Anglo-Indians and Parsis."

* * * * *

"To call this Indian agitation 'nationalist' is a ludicrous

rous misuse of words. How can the Hindus claim to speak for the imaginary 'nation' of India when 60,000,000 of its people are regarded by them as creatures less than human? For that is the fate of the 'Untouchables,' a body of outcasts, scattered throughout the length and breadth of the land who, until the British came, were the slaves of their Hindu masters. They are still kept in deliberate degradation by the very men who are claiming to be made the masters of India. Can British trade unionists feel genuine sympathy for caste-ridden Hindus who treat most of their poorest class of manual workers worse than a British working-man would treat a mongrel dog?

"These 'Untouchables' are denied education by their Hindu brethren. They may not possess or read the Hindu scriptures, or ever enter a temple, or send their children to school. The 'Untouchables' may not draw water from public wells, so that their sufferings in time of drought are dreadful. They may not even set foot in a court presided over by a Hindu judge. If they want justice they must wait outside and state their case through an intermediary.

"They dare not seek shelter at an inn, or use a dispensary, or enter a shop, or even walk along the public roads. They are allowed to work only as scavengers and removers of night-soil. They are supposed to exude 'distant pollution' from their outcaste bodies. The high-class Hindu would not only throw away food across which the shadow of an 'Untouchable' had fallen, but he would have no scruple in killing the man or woman, if he could do without punishment under the British law, for the religious crime of approaching him."

"Are we to hand over these oppressed wretches to the fanatic cruelty of their fellow-natives? The Prince of Wales expressed the natural feelings of every decent Briton in this matter when, on his visit to India, hearing that a crowd of 'Untouchables' was watching him from afar, he deliberately went over and mingled with them, to the horror and fury of the Hindu Nationalists around."

* * * * *

The 'Untouchables' would not be handed over, if they had their own representation, and our rulers were not obsessed with the British system of voting at elections, which is found in no other country but those that have copied our institutions, the United States and the Dominions. Had they been allowed to elect their own representatives, as was at first intended till Mr. Gandhi, by one of his theatrical fasts took advantage of Hindu superstition to intimidate them, and of the weakness of our Government to intimidate us, the 'Untouchables' would have joined with the Mohammedans and the Indian Christians, in forming a party friendly to

us, and though they would have been in a slight minority as compared with the caste Hindus, the extra amount of voting power that we have promised the Mohammedans, if we had not neutralised it by bringing in the Rulers of the Indian States, most of whom are Hindus, would have turned the scale, and India, even if given a considerable measure of self-government would have been ruled by people friendly to us instead of bitterly hostile. We have been deceived and they have been deceived by that arch-humbug, Mr. Gandhi, about whom the following opinions by an Irish Nationalist and by Indian Mohammedans are quoted in "The Daily Mail Blue Book":—

"At Delhi 11 years ago an Irish Nationalist who had come to India with a great admiration for Gandhi, after a fortnight's close intercourse with him said to the writer: 'That man is the biggest imposter that ever fooled a credulous people or frightened a cowardly Government.' The British Government is still frightened of Gandhi. But the Moslems have at last seen through this astute charlatan, with his ascetic pose. Their Conference, in replying to Gandhi ("Times," April 9), declares:—

'Mahatma Gandhi sowed the seed of defiance of the law in April, 1930. In due course the crop is ready in the shape of rioting, massacring and inhuman atrocities. Instead of repenting and exerting himself to undo the mischief he had done, he takes shelter in mystic murmurs of pursuing the path of justice while the country is being deluged with the blood of the innocent.' "

He promised the Untouchables admission to the Hindu temples in return for giving up their separate electorate. He had as much or as little authority to do this as I have to allot them Canons' Stalls in Canterbury Cathedral, and the persons in charge of the temples have simply ignored the promise made on their behalf by one who had no authority to make it.

* * * * *

For the benefit of those who think differently on many subjects from the "Daily Mail," I shall quote the other opinions from entirely independent sources, free from all suspicion of any but the purest motives, though in this particular matter I think that the motives of the writers in the "Daily Mail" are far more pure than those of our rulers, who while nominally Jews or Christians themselves, are attempting to rush the nation into establishing Hinduism without realising what it is doing, and making it impossible for us to retrace our steps by granting India Dominion status. Lord Irwin has the reputation of being a very good Christian, but by holding out the hope, without apparently realising the consequences, he has however unintentionally, proved a greater enemy of

Christianity than anyone since the days of Julian the Apostate. The absolute freedom conferred by the Statute of Westminster would enable the Indian Chamber to reconstruct their constitution at will, and by introducing some literary or technical qualification such as was designed to disfranchise the negroes in some of the southern States of the U.S.A., it would be possible for the high-caste Hindus to deprive the depressed classes of their rights, and thereby to relegate them to the outer darkness from which we have been endeavouring to rescue them. The complete change that the pursuit of this political will of the wisp has effected in our policy, and the results it is likely to produce in the lives of helpless people, numbering many more than the inhabitants of these islands, can be readily appreciated without having recourse to the realms of the imagination.

* * * * *

The following is from an article in the Jersey "Evening Post," headed "Peeps at India," by Lieut.-Col. G. A. Beazeley, D.S.O., who has had many years service in the Survey of India, which involves living in tents about six months in the year, and brings the officers of it into intimate contact with the people, even in the most remote villages. He appears not merely to have devoted a considerable amount of his time to research, but to have been very observant. In a newspaper article he had to confine himself to the less revolting and objectionable features of Hinduism, but even so his description is sufficiently startling. It is as follows:—

"The word 'Hindu' comes from the Persian and originally meant an inhabitant of India. It gradually became the general term for the Aryan races, who originally brought the cult of Hinduism into India, and now only applies to those who subscribe to the Hindu form of religion.

"They kept themselves distinct in the early days: this is evident from their writings, as well as their dislike of "Colour" or *Varna*; they deemed the original inhabitants as inferior to themselves and only fit to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for them. Even in those early days there was a 'colour bar.'

"To this day in the south of the Peninsula of India they stand out a distinct race in the villages, in contrast to the dark Dravidian and aborigine.

"As the Aryan tribes settled in India they gradually became divided into four classes or *Castes*. First came the *Kshatriyas* or nobles, who claimed descent from the early leaders, then came the *Brahmans*, or priests. After these came the *Vaisyas*, or the peasantry and husbandmen, and last of all the *Sudras*, the hewers of wood and drawers of water and scavengers; there were numerous guilds,

workers in metal, wood, stone, ivory and leather; potters, weavers, dyers, fishermen, butchers, cooks, barbers, etc.

"The general enervation of the Hindus, due mostly to the climate and security of tenure, affected the once virile and sturdy Kshatriya class; these took to residing in splendid courts and lived a life of luxury, relegating matters of religion to the Brahman class. The latter took advantage of this and usurped the privileges of the once supreme Kshatriya, who was too indolent to dispute the pretensions of the former. The consequence was that the Brahman became the supreme caste as well as legislative and secular rulers, relegating the nobles and warriors to the second place in the State, and have remained supreme ever since. Later on, wearied with the unmeaning rituals and ceremonies prescribed by the priests, the Kshatriyas tried to shake off the galling yoke, but all in vain. The Brahmans remained supreme and the Hindus are shackled by the galling yoke to the present day."

* * * * *

"To attempt to describe the Hindu caste system would fill up a big volume, so complicated is it with its ramifications. For a person of an inferior caste to touch a high class Brahman means defilement to the latter; in other cases if an inferior's shadow passes over the food the Brahman is eating, it becomes unclean and must be thrown away.

"Some castes are not allowed to use the village wells; they must live outside the village in their own quarter. They must leave the road on the approach of a high caste man and call out to give warning of their approach. These form the 'untouchable' class, whose welfare has always been a matter of considerable concern and solicitude to the British Government, and for whom provision has been made under the new constitution it is proposed to grant to India. They are to be allowed to elect their own members to act for them and see that they are justly treated in the new Indian Parliament. It is this provision which is so upsetting for Gandhi and for which he has been undergoing his theatrical fast. For although Gandhi has a tender spot in his heart for the depressed classes, Gandhi the Hindu cannot stomach the 'Untouchables' having members of their own class to represent them. This provision for that class has been the main stumbling block in the provision of a new constitution for India. The great majority of the Indians are Hindus, and should they gain the upper hand the outlook for the depressed classes would be very black indeed."

* * * * *

"The original idea of child marriages was to provide her with a protector in the shape of a husband and so preserve the inviolability of the maiden at the earliest

possible age. The actual nuptials do not take place till the girl has reached the age of about 13, when she then lives with her husband; before that she lived with her parents. Her husband may be of any age older than herself, and she may be married to quite an old man.

"The wife must look on her husband as a semi-god, consider herself inferior to him and be submissive and obedient. She has to prepare his food herself and may not eat with him. Should he die the fault lies with her and she is considered unclean and outcast and has to lead the life of drudgery and misery. She cannot remarry. Some of the more progressive Hindus of the present day agree to widow remarriage, and try to alleviate the sufferings of the poor unfortunate widows in every way they can, but they are in a hopeless minority at present.

"If a Hindu dies without a son he is accursed, for he then has no son to perform his funeral rites, and he must go to the Hindu equivalent of hell; here again the wife is blamed for the lack of a son and she is scorned by all her fellow women. In some cases a daughter is allowed to perform the funeral rites for lack of a son."

* * * * *

"As a Hindu lives so he reaps in his re-incarnation. If he lived a wholly good life from the Hindu point of view he goes to the Hindu heaven. If not he must be re-born again in human or animal form, according to the enormity of his sinfulness in his last incarnation. It is this which makes the Hindu so averse to killing any animal for fear it should be a fellow Hindu, and so commit a deadly sin. The breaking of caste rules is sin in the code of the Hindu; in fact sin once committed can only be expiated by a blameless life in the next re-incarnation.

"Each trade has its own caste; each child must follow up the same calling and marry into the same caste as a rule."

* * * * *

The Rev. Edgar W. Thompson writes of the Untouchables as follows:—

"It is not possible in this chapter to describe all the varieties of the outcastes. They are known by many names, and indeed the same class may be found to have a different name in each language area. For example, the people who are called Pariahs or Paraiyans in the Tamil country, are known as Holeyas in the Kanarese country, and as Malas in the Telugu country. There is a term, however, used to denote all the outcastes, which is commonly employed by caste Hindus, and also has the sanction of Government reports. This is the name—"Panchamas," or "Fifth-Class" people. We have seen already in our chapters on Hinduism that the caste system distinguishes four main divisions of human society. These are the priests, springing from the head, the warriors from the shoulders, the merchants from

the thighs, and the workers from the feet of the Primæval Male or Creator. The Sudras, or working classes, form the lowest rank of decent respectable folk; but far beneath them is a great mass of unclean peoples, who have been described as the "untouchables." Though they are herded together under the common heading of "Panchamas," or fifth rate people, there are many divisions among them and varying degrees of uncleanness.

"In an orthodox State, such as that of Mysore or Travancore, while caste organisation was strong and rigid, and the influence of Brahmans was supreme, the Panchama was dealt with very harshly in the old days. His very shadow was pollution, and he had to keep at a prescribed distance—in some cases amounting to 72 feet—and cover his mouth with a cloth when addressing a man of the highest caste. If he observed a Brahman walking along the public highway, he had to leap aside across the ditch, or through the hedge, and remain aloof until his holiness had passed by. The Panchama might not wear a cloth below his knees, or walk with his sandals on through the streets of the caste quarter. These are some of the refinements of insult from which the Panchama suffered; but they are passing away under the pressure of modern civilisation with its railway trains and government thoroughfares for the use of all classes alike.

"Yet still everywhere to-day the Panchamas inhabit quarters of their own, separate from the town or village in which the caste people live. They are not allowed to draw water from the public well, and their touch is considered polluting. They are not granted admittance into Hindu temples, save on rare occasions, and as a matter of special divine favour. They must not read the sacred books, and the scriptures pronounce the most frightful penalties of mutilation against the low-caste man who shall have the misfortune to overhear a 'mantram,' when it is being recited, or shall presume to chant a holy verse with his lips.

"The Panchamas of South India are probably the remains of ancient Dravidian tribes which succumbed to more powerful invaders or more civilised neighbours, and became their serfs. The Pariahs still fill the offices of village watchman, water-bailiff, and sweeper, and are recognised as the hereditary custodians of village boundaries. Whenever a dispute arises, their evidence is taken as representing the oldest tradition. Some of the Panchamas have small holdings of their own and cultivate their land directly under Government, like the caste people; but a very large number of them are mere day labourers, working on the fields of Sudra or higher caste proprietors; and some of them are the bondsmen of their masters. Slavery was

abolished nominally in India seventy years ago, but a system still prevails which is scarcely distinguishable from slavery. A Panchama father will sell his son to a caste cultivator for a few rupees, or give him up as security against his debt; and the boy will live thenceforward in his master's service, receiving as a wage his daily food, a white cloth and coarse blanket at the end of the year, and perhaps a present of a rupee or two. Thousands of pariahs, Holeyas, and Malas are found by our missionaries to be in this condition, which creates one of the problems of work among the outcastes. It often happens that the caste master is a bitter enemy of Christianity and denies his servant any religious liberty; the missionary has then to decide whether he shall simply counsel patience and fortitude, or shall seek also to redeem the bondservant by the payment of the debt."

* * * * *

We are going to substitute the one type for the other, in the name of humanity and self-government, with the most beautiful sentiments on our lips. And Mr. Ghandi, the Mentor of our rulers, with whom they have held almost innumerable conferences, and to whom Lord Reading was prepared to surrender India in 1921-22, if he had condescended to accept it, instead of expressing any regret at the horrible communal outrage of which some particulars have been given, calmly announces that:

after his Swaraj is established these disturbances "may perhaps end in the exhaustion or destruction of one community or the other."

The comment of the writer in "The Daily Mail Blue-Book" is as follows:—

"Yet this is the man with whom Lord Irwin negotiated on equal terms and to whom the Government here have humiliated themselves to secure his coming to London as India's plenipotentiary and an Apostle of Peace!"

* * * * *

That we should attempt to govern by means of Round Table Conferences with persons some of whom deny our authority, and are doing their best to oust us and make our government impossible, whilst others are making a very hard bargain for agreeing to replace us, is totally incomprehensible to Indian mentality, and must be rather puzzling to that of other European nations, none of which so far as I have observed, have developed the habit. This is not the manner in which the former rulers of India were accustomed to deal with rebellious subjects who attempted to upset their authority. In glancing through Sir William Hunter's book I have come across the instance of the Emperor Ala-ud-din who put out the eyes of his insurgent nephews, and then had them beheaded, and of Muhammad

Tughlak, who caused his nephew to be flayed alive. Aurangzeb in comparatively recent times kept his father in prison till he died, and caused his brother to be executed. This was in 1661. What happened still later, not much more than a generation before the Battle of Plassey, may be seen from the following passage on page 314 of Sir William Hunter's book.

"The Sikh sect in the Punjab, driven by oppression into revolt, had been mercilessly crushed in 1710-16. The indelible memory of the cruelties then inflicted by the Mughal troops nerved the Sikh nation with the hatred to Delhi which served the British cause so well in 1857. In 1716, the Sikh leader, Banda, was carried about by the insulting Mughals in an iron cage, tricked out in the mockery of imperial robes, with scarlet turban and cloth of gold. His son's heart was torn out before his eyes, and thrown in his face. He himself was then pulled to pieces with red-hot pincers, and the Sikhs were exterminated like mad dogs (1716)."

* * * * *

In order to gain some idea of what is likely to happen again should our rule be withdrawn, or seriously weakened, I shall give another quotation from Sir William Hunter's book in regard to what happened between 1739 and 1761, by the latter of which years we had begun to establish our supremacy in Northern India:—

"While the Mohammedan governors and Hindu subjects of the Empire were thus asserting their independence, two new sets of external enemies appeared. The first of these consisted of invasions from the north-west. In 1739, Nadir Shah, the Persian, swept down with his destroying host, and, after a massacre in the streets of Delhi and a fifty-eight days' sack, went off with a booty estimated at thirty-two millions sterling. Six times the Afghans burst through the passes under Ahmad Shah Durani, plundering, slaughtering, and then scornfully retiring to their homes with the plunder of the Empire. In 1738, Kabul, the last Afghan Province of the Mughals, had been severed from Delhi; and in 1752, Ahmad Shah the Afghan obtained the cession of the Punjab. The cruelties inflicted upon Delhi and Northern India during these six invasions form an appalling tale of bloodshed and wanton cruelty. The miserable capital opened her gates. Yet on one occasion it suffered for six weeks every enormity which a barbarian army can inflict upon a prostrate foe. Meanwhile the Afghan cavalry were scouring the country, slaying, burning, and mutilating in the meanest hamlet as in the greatest town. They took especial delight in sacking the holy places of the Hindus, and murdering the defenceless votaries at the shrines."

"A horde of 25,000 Afghan horsemen swooped down upon the sacred city of Muttra during a festival, while it was thronged with peaceful Hindu pilgrims engaged in their devotions. 'They burned the houses,' says the Tyrolese Jesuit, Tieffenthaler, who was in India at that time, 'together with their inmates,' slaughtering others with the sword and the lance; hauling off into captivity maidens and youths, men and women. In the temples they slaughtered cows' the sacred animal of the Hindus, 'and smeared the images and pavement with the blood.' The border-land between Afghanistan and India lay silent and waste; indeed, districts far within the frontier, which had once been densely inhabited, and which are now again thickly peopled, were swept bare of inhabitants."

* * * * *

What the condition of India was in the days, not much more than a hundred years ago, when our rule was growing up, can be seen from the following extracts from the "Autobiography of Lutfullah," who was born in the Indian State of Malwah in 1802, and wrote his book about 1854. My edition of it was published by Messrs. Smith, Elder & Co. in 1863.

"In those days, lawless turbulence found a much larger field for display than it did a few years afterwards, when the power of the British Government was exerted for its suppression. Two or three times a year accounts would reach us of the approach of large bodies of Pindarees, who had been committing havoc in the surrounding districts; or of an intended attack by some neighbouring potentate, for the purpose of levying contributions on the city. Then the hearts of the inhabitants were filled with terror and dismay; and forthwith jewels, money, and articles of value were buried in the earth, or otherwise secreted. When the attack did take place, the situation of the inhabitants was truly pitiable. They were then literally 'between two fires' from both of which they suffered nearly equal injury, the cannon balls from the citadel, instead of reaching the enemy for whose special destruction they were intended, generally falling short of their mark, and causing fearful loss of life and property within the walls of the city. This, of itself, was dreadful enough, even when the enemy failed in their object; when victory declared on their side, such of the citizens as had survived the onslaught became the victims of the most refined cruelty, in order to discover the places where their treasure was concealed. Numerous modes of torture were had recourse to for this purpose, amongst which the three following generally proved the most effectual. First, the victim was pinioned and exposed bare-headed to the burning rays of the sun, whilst his ears were pounded or pinched between the lock of a gun; secondly,

after being pinioned, as above, he was made to stand in the sun, with a stone of enormous weight on his head, first inserting a gravel stone of the size and shape of a small grape, which gradually forced its way through the skull to the brain; thirdly, a horse's grain-bag, half-filled with ashes and red pepper in powder, was tied over the sufferer's face, so as to include his mouth and nose, the consequence of which was, at first, a most violent fit of sneezing, and, if protracted to a quarter of an hour, a horrible death by suffocation. But though these, and some other modes of extracting confessions were in general attended with success, there were not wanting instances in which a love of gold prevailed over a love of life; and I have heard of many persons who submitted in resolute and sullen silence to the most agonizing tortures, till death released them from their sufferings, and restored them to that mother-earth, wherein their loved treasure lay interred."

* * * * *

"The morning of good luck, however, now began to dawn upon the people of our district, for in those days they were not molested by the outlaws, the Pindarees being engaged with their enemies. But the hill Bheels still infested the roads, and occasionally paid their nocturnal visits to the town, to rob at the risk of their life. They were sometimes apprehended, and then rarely escaped, and that only by bribing the ministers and giving large presents to the Raja himself; and if not, they used to be punished and executed in most cruel fashion; such as by being tied to the foot of an elephant to be dragged through the town, or being split by one of those huge animals. In the latter case, the elephant, directed by the mahawat, puts one of the legs of the poor victim under his foot, and, seizing the other with his trunk, splits him in a second by a pull, when the leg pulled comes off with the covering of the stomach and very nearly half the skin of the body. The next mode is breaking the head: this horrid punishment is inflicted by putting the man horizontally on one side with his head on a flat stone; a ball of stone is then put on his upper temple, and the executioner, asking permission of the officer three times, inflicts a fatal blow with a large wooden hammer on the small ball, which smashes the head at once, and the brain is dashed out. Other modes are throwing down from the high wall of a castle; beheading with a sword; and, lastly, blowing from the mouth of a cannon. I have often been an eye-witness to these horrid executions, and beg my reader to avoid them to the best of his power."

* * * * *

"One morning, as I was sitting with Lieutenant E. M.

Earle, of the 24th Regiment N.I., who studied Persian with me (after having passed in Hindustani and Marathi), we were informed that a sati (suttee) was going to be performed that forenoon at the village of Maholi, near the river side. The news startled my young friend as well as myself. We could not believe that such an outrage could be committed with impunity whilst a British Resident remained near the capital. We had hardly finished our conversation on the subject, when we descried the ominous procession, attended with native music passing from the town, along the high road close to the Resident's gate. Upon this, we ran to our horses and rode to the place of execution, which we reached in about half an hour in the heat of the sun.

* * * * *

"After waiting about a quarter of an hour under an umbrageous pipal-tree on the bank of the river, the procession arrived, and the Brahman carriers placed the bier at the brink of the water, so as to keep the feet of the corpse washed by that element. The face and hands of the dead being exposed to view, we found the deceased to have been a strong well-made Brahman, about forty years of age.

"Having examined the dead man, we proceeded to the young lady, who seated herself under another pipal-tree, at a little distance within sight of the corpse, ready to immolate herself on the pile under preparation near the dead body. She was surrounded by her relatives and others, about twenty persons in number. To those she kept on talking and foretelling many things, on being interrogated. She was handsome, about fifteen years of age, and her charming countenance showed no marks of fear or anguish. Lieutenant Earle, being an excellent Marathi scholar, finding an opportunity, entered into conversation with her, and delivered a very eloquent speech, dissuading her most earnestly from this horrid suicide, which he said he viewed in the light of a wilful murder committed by the Brahmans, whose evil advice, contrary to the pure Hindu law, enticed her to a death of torture in both worlds.

* * * * *

Upon her entering the Brahmans began to stop the entrance with heavy pieces of timber.

* * * * *

Immediately the poor woman set fire to the pile, the Brahmans and others surrounding it began shouting out the name of their god, Rama, and ordered the kettle-drums, flageolets, and cymbals that accompanied the procession to be beaten and played, and rent the air with

their cries, in order that no cry of distress might be heard from the victim: and, as soon as the flames issued from all sides, they cut the ropes of the four corners of the platform of the pile with their hatchets, so the enormous weight of the firewood, falling at once upon the delicate girl, crushed her in a moment. In short, in about fifteen minutes' time all the fuel became a heap of ashes, the music and the cries ceased, and the party of the executioners, being tired, seated themselves in calmness under the tree, in expectation of the embers being extinguished, that they might throw the ashes into the river and return home. We then hastened to our own places of rest, sad and dejected from what we had seen."

This took place, as the context shows, shortly before 1840, but there was a similar instance in the Patna District, close to an important railway centre, and within about thirty miles of the capital of the Province in 1923 or 1924. Hindu opinion was so strongly in favour that the Police were unable to prevent the suttee. The abettors received somewhat severe sentences by the High Court, and one of Mr. Gandhi's lieutenants, whose attitude towards me when I was trying him for belonging to an illegal organisation, as well as the message of hope conveyed to him by his friends outside in regard to the negotiations between the Viceroy and Mr. Gandhi, I have already described, got himself into serious trouble over the matter. He wrote a violent newspaper article denouncing the High Court for its interference with the Hindu religion, and got committed for contempt of Court. When I sent him to jail, the Local Government let him out before he had served more than about a quarter of his sentence, but this time he served it in full, and emerged a sadder, and it is to be hoped, a wiser man. If the Chambers under the proposed Indian Constitution do not repeal the legislation of Lord William Bentinck prohibiting suttee, Hindu judges will inflict only nominal sentences on the abettors of it, and it will flourish once more. It has never been completely suppressed, and still exists sporadically.

Such days may return at any moment if authority is released, and sometimes do return even when it is not. When I was a Sub-divisional Officer I had to deal with a gang of dacoits about forty strong, whose methods were not much more gentle than those of the Pandarees, torture being used to force the owners of the houses attached, to disclose their treasures. Rape and even gang rape were not uncommon, and no woman who went outside the village after nightfall was safe.

Once, over quite a trifling dispute about gambling

at a fair, 5,000 people were for nearly a week in a state of what was practically open rebellion; this was during the agitation about the Partition of Bengal, but whilst it was the higher castes who were the agitators, it was the lower castes who rose against them. A high-caste Hindu landowner, whose home was in the affected area, begged for the protection of a single policeman; otherwise he said that his house would be looted, and his women outraged, which is the usual accompaniment of successful rioting. If such things happen, can their consequence be undone? If not, is it right or honest for a political leader to endeavour to make those of his followers who see the danger to which he is blind, vote against their judgment, by saying that he has taken full responsibility, when this is only an empty phrase?

* * * * *

Orthodox Hindus have a short way with widows, and if they do not get them to burn themselves alive with their husbands, make their lives a burden to them, as a widow is held to be in some way responsible for the death of her husband, this being considered due to some sin that she committed in a previous state of existence. They are often driven to suicide, and if they are indiscreet in their love affairs, so as to bring disgrace on the family and do not commit suicide, they are sometimes murdered.

When a murder takes place, if a railway is anywhere near, a favourite device is to place the dead body across the rails, in the hope that when it has been mangled by a few trains passing over it, the assumption will be made that it was that of somebody who was run down and killed. A few miles nearer Calcutta than the station close to which the suttee took place, the European driver of a light engine noticed a woman lying across the line. He thought that it was someone attempting to commit suicide, and the engine having no train behind it, he was able to pull up quickly, and avoid running over her. On going to pick her up, he found that she was dead. What he ought to have done was to put the body on the tender, and bring it to the nearest station, and inform the police. Instead of doing this, he sent for the chaukidar or village watchman, made over the body to his custody, and reported the matter at the next station. When the Police arrived on the scene, there was no trace of the body, and everybody including the chaukidar denied all knowledge of it. It was found impossible to discover even who the woman was, much less how she met her death. I dismissed the chaukidar, but that was all I could do in the face of such a conspiracy of silence. When this is the way in which high caste Hindus govern

their own villages, what sort of results can we expect if we hand over to them the right of governing India? The right we may transfer, the power we cannot. ...

While the higher castes of Hindus are merciless to their own women who go astray, a good many of them have no scruples in their dealings with girls of the lower castes. I have already referred to the Bhumiari Brahmans as having anticipated in one way the establishment of swaraj. According to my information, since the relaxation of authority due to the Reforms, they have commenced to anticipate it in another way also. There has been a great increase in the number of outrages on women in the part of the Province where this caste is numerous and influential, and no low caste girl is now safe. What will happen to European women, of whom there are 45,000 in India, mostly British, when the country is made over to Hindu rule, will largely depend on which form of lust prevails, blood-lust or lust in the ordinary sense of the term. During the Mutiny it assumed one form at Cawnpore and another at Delhi. What happened at Cawnpore we have already seen. In regard to Delhi I would invite attention to the following extract from "Impressions of India," by Sir Henry Craik, K.C.B., M.P., already referred to. He was the head of the Scottish Education Department, a position which requires ability and knowledge, qualities which are now at a discount, when the leader of the party of which he used to be an ornament rather prides himself on his ignorance of history, and sees great merit in the policy of "muddling through":—

"I am certain of my own impression, that the Mutiny is still a living memory there (Delhi). It comes across one at every turn. Each spot has its story of heroism and of tragedy, of rescue and death, or worse. It is not a fancy that leads close observers to mark amongst the outlying Zemindars and in the scattered villages traces of English origin amidst the children of native families. In the early days of the tragedy English girls disappeared. Who can say what their fate may have been, and how their blood survives amidst those who have taken them for their own—to lose, in alien surroundings, the very sense of their own origin?"

The other possible alternative is given in the following recent press telegram:—

"A threat to shoot British women has been made to-day by Bengal terrorists—members of the 'Indian Republican Army.'

"Letters addressed to the leading British newspaper

in Calcutta declare that if proposed anti-terrorist legislation is persisted in, the terrorists will divert their attention from Government officials and concentrate on clubs, restaurants, and hotels.

"The writers add that they will lie in ambush for British women unless British representatives on the Bengal Council immediately withdraw their support for the proposed legislation."

"A declaration is made that these letters are 'a final warning' before the initiation of the campaign.

"The legislation is expected to be passed to-morrow. B.U.P."

These dangers are neither imaginary nor ancient history. Women are not allowed to reside in some of the military stations on the frontier, and where they were so allowed, there have been instances of their being kidnapped and forced to bear unwanted children. European women have been killed, and Indian women have been employed, not merely to kill European officials, but to kill European women; vide the following extract from the speech delivered before the Royal Empire Society on November 1st, 1932, by Sir Charles Tegart, C.S.I., M.V.O., Member of the Council of the Secretary of State for India:—

"You will recollect that two girls murdered Mr. Stevens, Magistrate of Comilla, when they had put him completely off his guard. Another woman graduate made a treacherous attempt on Sir Stanley Jackson. Since then a woman terrorist has taken part in a dacoity and another still more recently led the terrorists in the attack last September on the railway institute at Chittagong. A whist drive was in progress when at 10.30 p.m. the premises were suddenly attacked on three sides by terrorists armed with bombs, revolvers and guns. One Englishwoman was killed and eleven other guests wounded, including four women. The female terrorist was found later dead outside the building, having poisoned herself."

That such actions as those described above are not merely in no way repugnant to the Hindu religion but are a natural outcome of it, will appear from the following description of it by one who knew it well, J. Murray Mitchell, M.A., L.L.D., from whose "Hinduism Past and Present," published by the Religious Tract Society in 1885, the following is an extract:—

"The Puranas, in which the orthodox system is embodied, have exceedingly little merit; they are tasteless and extravagant productions. The faith which they inculcate is an incongruous mixture of pantheism and polytheism. The polytheism often runs to the grossest

fetishism. Each divinity has a history; but, for the most part, it is a history of sin and shame. The fundamental distinction between god and devil is not recognised; that is to say, the character and doings ascribed to the divinities are often diabolical. The worship runs into endless ceremonialism, which in most cases is as childish as it is complex. Religion is thus transformed into magic. Prayer is an incantation.

"True, sects, and what we have called reforming sects, dissatisfied with the orthodox system, have so far modified it. The followers of Siva tend to extreme asceticism and self-torture. The followers of Vishnu have brought forward the doctrine of devotion; but in most cases the devotion is paid to Krishna, whose worship leads necessarily to corruption. Viler practices, as a part of religion, have flourished more among the followers of Vishnu, than among almost any other class of religionists. The Vallabhacharya sect affords a conspicuous example of this.

"Of the worship of the Sakti, as enjoined in the Tantras, we need say nothing more; it is painful even to think of the moral degradation it involves."

* * * * *

"Such, then, is the strange conflict of opinion which we now witness in India. It has often been noticed that there is a remarkable similarity between the state of religious belief in the Roman Empire in the first and second centuries of the Christian era, and what exists in India at the present day. There is doubtless a striking similarity; yet there is also a dissimilarity. The obstacles to the spread of Christianity in India seem decidedly greater than they were in ancient Greece and Rome.

"The population of India is more than double that of the Roman Empire. In Greece and Rome there were no books holding the position which is assigned to the Sastras. In India religion is made to consist of an infinite number of minute observances. Authority and ceremonialism have combined to crush the religious consciousness. Caste is all but omnipotent. The soul is in fetters. There is no individuality in India. Further, foolish and evil as ancient Paganism was, it was found not so wicked nor so childish as modern Hinduism."

* * * * *

"It would be very instructive to compare throughout the legislation of Manu with that of Moses. We can notice only some outstanding points. One of the most prominent the gods will allow you to approach them? They will kill things in Manu is the place assigned to caste. Some men

are held to be essentially, and in virtue of their blood, pure; others are neither pure nor impure; others are essentially and in virtue of their blood, impure. The idea of the dignity of man as man would have been scouted by Manu as utterly ridiculous.

"The frightful extent to which the idea of birth pollution is carried by Brahmanism lately came under our notice in Southern India. Some high-caste men said to the lowest classes: 'We who are men cannot endure the presence of such impure wretches as you. Do you think the gods will allow you to approach them? They will kill you if you do. You had better make the best terms you can with the devils, and worship them.'

"One becomes sick at heart when he thinks of what caste has done and is doing. Even politically it is a curse. It goes on multiplying divisions; men of the same caste, if from different localities, will not eat with one another. Society splits and splits. All feeling of brotherhood is destroyed; and if the Hindus are ever to become a nation, they must first cast off Hinduism."

In Dr. Murray Mitchell's early days in India, suttees were constantly taking place in what were then called the Native States. This is so far from being ancient history that I know a man who knew him personally. Instances of it occasionally took place in British India while I was there, and were reported with covert approval in the Hindu newspapers. One was that of a daughter of a friend of mine, a graduate, a lawyer, a member of all the local bodies, and Vice-Chairman of one of them. She was prevented by her relatives and the law from committing suttee in a formal manner, and she improvised the ceremony in the usual way by pouring kerosene over her clothes and setting fire to them. Needless to say she was burned to death.

The idea of most of our political leaders is to work what is practically a miracle by means of a paper Constitution, one of the many absurdities of which has been pointed out by the Rt. Hon. Josiah C. Wedgewood D.S.O., M.P., when he states, in his evidence before the Joint Select Committee: "There is no precedent on earth for a federation on these lines, where some parties to the federation are completely independent of the administration to which they enter." Since then, yet another absurdity has been added, by putting forward on behalf of the members of it who are independent of the administration, the claim to be at liberty to leave it if they find that it does not suit them. In fact, it is proposed to add to our political system a principle which has never been

applied to the social system, even in the U.S.A., that of trial marriage. In view of the enormous privileges which are being conferred on the Rulers, if the principle is admitted at all, it ought to be the other people who would have the right of leaving at will, which they would be fairly certain to exercise, when they experience the working of the Government that it is proposed to set up.

It is assumed that the miracle can be performed, and that by means of this paper Constitution it will be possible to combine into one nation Hindus, Mohammedans, Sikhs, and Christians, with Hindus as the predominant partner. I have tried to show what the fundamental ideas of Hindus are, that these have not changed in the least, and that such a horrible institution as that of suttee is regarded with general approval, and can find its sturdiest defenders among Hindu politicians who consider themselves advanced.

How different were the views of the late General Bramwell Booth of the Salvation Army, which a writer who calls attention to them describes as heartening! The entry from his journal written in Calcutta and dated January 1923, appears to me to be a simple statement of our national duty, and a concise description of what the leaders of all parties are now trying to do. The passage is as follows:—

“As I look at India to-day, with some knowledge of her history and some considerable knowledge of her present condition and the state of her mind or minds, and with my deep convictions that a definite purpose runs through what we call history, I feel that it may well be that the work that the Anglo-Saxon has done for these peoples, especially the oppressed among them, is a divinely ordered and appointed work. If so, then to abandon that work will be not only a cowardly thing, but a going in the face of what God has planned.”

Although discarded by the Government, the traditional attitude still survives in the Army, and I have seen that in a recent lecture to young soldiers the men were told that the 22nd Field Battery is called the “Residency Battery,” because it was all through the siege of Lucknow, and that the Residency is the only place in the Empire where the British flag flies day and night, in memory of the gallant men and women who lost their lives there. Unless events take a very different course from what they have done in the Irish Free State, all will be changed, when if ever, effect is given to the Government proposals. Lucknow will have been defended in vain, and if any flag flies over the Residency, it will be the swaraj flag, the companion emblem to the Gandhi cap.

After seeing what has happened and is happening in the Irish Free State, do our Politicians seriously expect us to attach any importance to what they choose to describe as safeguards in regard to India? If so, what are their reasons for believing that what has proved delusive in the one case will prove effective in the other? Or that the relaxation or abandonment of our authority will lead to any different results in India from what it has done in the Irish Free State? One of these that I saw with my own eyes at one of the leading music-halls in Dublin was the buffoon with a patch on the seat of his trousers representing a miniature British flag, a turn which brought down the house.

If the supporters of the policy of abandoning India could bring themselves to think, there are a number of questions that they might with advantage ask themselves. Can they alter the nature of people who act in the manner described, by making over the Government to them and their friends, and entrusting to them the maintenance of law and order? Another is, can they bring the dead to life, restore her honour and self-respect to a woman who has been ravished, or prevent the act from having its natural consequences?

If not, let them look facts in the face, and cease to endeavour to silence opposition or criticism by representing that they are prepared to take full responsibility, and if they are not allowed to have their way, something worse will happen. Nothing worse could happen, and they must not be allowed to have their way. They have been very successful hitherto in imposing their will on Parliament and the people, but one thing they have forgotten, which is that referred to by the author whom I have quoted. They cannot impose their will on God.

* * * * *

The foregoing was written some time ago, before the India Bill was introduced, and I had seen the result of the voting on it. Our politicians have not been able to impose their will on God, but they have done the next best thing, and succeeded in imposing it on those who consider themselves, or are considered by a large section of the British people, His representatives on earth, and His authoritative spokesmen, always excepting Mr. Baldwin, whose attitude is more pontifical than that of any Pope. A scathing comment on their attitude in the matter is contained in the following letter to the Jersey "Evening Post," signed Mary Jacomb: —

"Sir,—Having been in touch with India some 75 odd years, I feel it my duty to send these lines of protest to the passing into law of the proposals of the White Paper.

Apart from the consideration as to whether federation is possible, or desirable, or whether India is ripe for it, or even as a whole desires it; whether it is in the interest of England or India that we should surrender power to Congress; there is one vital point of over-riding importance, at present apparently lost sight of, even by the Bench of Bishops, who (save only the Bishop of Exeter) voted unanimously for Mr. Baldwin's scheme. Is it right or wrong for a Christian country to hand over control of nearly 350 millions of primitive and helpless natives to the mercy of those professing and practising religions which include such abominations as suttee, child marriages, and other unmentionable hideous practices?

What will be the future fate of the Eurasians (a vast crowd) and the Untouchables?

Have we the right to wipe out the scores of years of Christian endeavour, and obliterate the teaching of our Saviour Jesus Christ?

These are questions I cannot answer in the affirmative. Can any follower of Christ do so?"

Assuming for the sake of argument that any pledges were given, a speech by Mr. J. H. Morgan, K.C., one of the greatest living authorities on Constitutional Law, shows how greatly the original idea is being expanded, vide the following report in "The Morning Post" of March 9th. The headings are " 'New Pledge' to India. What Dominion Status Means. Mr. J. H. Morgan's Statement. 'Right of Secession' Promised." The account of the speech proceeds:—

"Mr. J. H. Morgan, K.C., the eminent constitutional lawyer, in a speech to the Cambridge University Conservative Association last night, said that he would take as his subject: "The Crisis of Conservatism."

Was there a crisis? Let them turn to Mr. Baldwin's recent speech, in which he said: 'I do not believe that our Party alone could win a clear majority in the United Kingdom to-day.'

Of late, Mr. Morgan said that he found no little difficulty in recognising the Mr. Baldwin who delivered a knock-out blow to Mr. Ramsay MacDonald in 1926 and saved the country from the felon blow of a General Strike.

Could it be that some four years' association with the greatest 'defeatist' English public life had ever known, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, had infected Mr. Baldwin with the 'bug' of defeatism? He sometimes thought that association had already continued a little too long,

Now the worst of a liaison was that the longer it continued the more difficult it was to break off. Mr. Baldwin had now advanced to the position, or been decoyed into it, of declaring that the Conservative Party must go

to the polls at the next election, not as the Conservative Party, but as the paramours of the National Socialists, aided and abetted by a fraction of the Liberal Party.

'I have an impeachable authority for saying,' Mr. Morgan said, 'and 50 years hence the truth will be known—that the two men who saved the country in the crisis of 1931 were the King and Mr. Baldwin. With perhaps more magnanimity than wisdom, Mr. Baldwin waived his indefeasible claim to be Prime Minister.'

Mr. Morgan then referred to the 'pledge' by Sir Samuel Hoare that the Government of India Bill was to be regarded as yet another statement in the direction of the grant of what was called 'Dominion Status.' Even to-day the construction put upon 'Dominion Status' varied among the Dominion^s themselves.

The Irish Free State and the Union of South Africa, who might be regarded as the prime authors of the Statute of Westminster, put one construction upon the term 'Dominion Status,' understanding by it the 'Right of Secession,' while the Australian Commonwealth and the Dominion of New Zealand, who had contracted out of the Statute of Westminster and would indeed have nothing to do with it, put quite another construction upon the term.

It might be said indeed of the Statute of Westminster that instead of settling everything, as was fondly hoped by Mr. Amery, it had unsettled everything.

The extension of Dominion Status to India would be totally destructive of all the 'safeguards,' whether express or implied, contained in the Bill. The term 'Dominion Status' had, as a matter of constitutional development, acquired a new and vastly extended meaning which at the date of the Viceroy's pronouncement in October, 1929, it did not possess.

It was universally admitted that the six Dominions were each and all of them subject, at the time of the Viceroy's 'pledge' of October, 1929, to certain very certain limitations, in law, on their 'sovereignty.'

"To-day the whole of these limitations on the degree of autonomy implied by the term 'Dominion Status,'" Mr. Morgan said, "have disappeared as the result of the Imperial Conference of 1930 and the Statute of Westminster of 1931.

"When, therefore, Sir Samuel Hoare a few weeks ago pledged the Government to grant 'Dominion Status' to 'India' he was not renewing an old pledge. He was making a new one. He was promising 'India' independence. He was promising her the 'Right of Secession.'

"That sort of pledge is the beginning of the end. When I read that momentous declaration of his, looking at the map of India, I was reminded of an historic

utterance: 'Roll up that map. It will not be wanted any more.' "

Mr. Morgan spoke of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's record on India, and recalled that at the British Labour Conference in London in 1928 he said that he hoped that there would be a new dominion added to the Commonwealth of our nations. A year later, within a few weeks of taking office, he instructed the Viceroy to make the fatal pledge."

The excuse put forward by the Government spokesman is that promises must be kept. It has been shown by the Joint Select Committee that no promise whatever has been made. The late Mr. E. S. Montagu tried a political experiment, which has failed, and I am told that he bitterly repented of it before his death. There are at least two instances in the Bible, in which it would have been better if promises had not been kept. One is that of Jephtha's daughter, described in the 11th chapter of the Book of Judges, and the other is that of Herod and John the Baptist, described in the 14th chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew.

A reference to the 18th chapter of the First Book of Kings will show that there is no need to despair. One man single-handed stemmed the torrent of idolatry that threatened to overrun the world at that time, and one Bishop, whose family connections enabled him to know something about India, has remained faithful to his trust, the Bishop of Exeter. The rest have been content to follow the lead of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and Mr. Baldwin, the former of whom has announced his preference for Hinduism, and the other has given a clear indication of his mentality, in the following extract from his message to the official Conservative candidate for Norwood:—

" 'I deplore the fact that you should be handicapped in your fight by the futile intervention of a self-styled Conservative candidate. The man who waves a banner aloft and under its shelter fights against his own side has never been an object of respect or admiration.' "

In other words, nobody can be a Conservative who does not surrender his judgement and his conscience to the party machine controlled by Mr. Baldwin, who appears to have surrendered his own to Mr. Ramsay MacDonald. Such are the ideas which are now being imposed on, and accepted with the utmost docility, by a majority of the Members of the House of Commons. If they continue to submit to this dictatorship, and are not allowed the liberty of conscience and right of private judgement that everyone in Britain is theoretically supposed to possess, India and England are doomed.