Towards Home Rule

Part III

"We are convinced that there is only one form of government, whatever it may be called, namely, where the ultimate control is in the hands of the people."—*A. J. Balfour.*

EDITED AND PARTLY WRITTEN

BY

Ramánanda Chatterjee, M.A.,

Editor of "*The Prabasi*" and "*The Modern Review.*"

Calcutta

Modern Review Office

1917

Rupee One.

CALCUTTA :
Printed by A. C. Sarkar, at B. M. Press,
211, Cornwallis Street ;
Published by R. Chatterjee,
210-3-1, Cornwallis Street.

Contents

THE DAY IS COME

Thy call has sped over all countries of the world
and men have gathered around thy seat.
The day is come.
But where is India ?
Does she still remain hidden, lagging behind ?
Let her take up her burden and march with all.
Send her, mighty God, thy message of victory,
O Lord ever awake !

Those who defied suffering
have crossed the wilderness of death
and have shattered their prison of illusions.
The day is come.
But where is India ?
Her listless arms are idle and ashamed
and futile her days and nights, lacking in joy of life
Touch her with thy living breath,
O Lord ever awake !

The morning sun of the new age has risen.
Thy temple hall is filled with pilgrims.
The day is come.
But where is India ?
She lies on the dust in dishonour,
deprived of her seat.
Remove her shame,
and give her a place in thy House of Man,
O Lord ever awake !

The world's highroads are crowded,
resounding with the roar of thy chariot wheels.
The sky is trembling with travellers' songs.
The day is come.
But where is India ?
Doors are shut in her house age-worn,
feeble is her hope, her heart sunk in silence.
Send thy voice to her children who are dumb,
O Lord ever awake !

Peoples there are who have felt thy strength
in their own hearts and sinews
and have earned life's fulfilment,
conquering fear.
The day is come.
But where is India ?
Strike thy blow at her self-suspicion and despair !
Save her from the dread of her own
pursuing shadow,
O Lord ever awake !

RABINDRANATH TAGORE.

THE RIGHT TO BE ONE'S OWN MASTER

BY RABINDRANATH TAGORE.

With the least sign of monsoon conditions, our lane, and Chitpore Road into which it leads, are

flooded. And as I have watched this happening year after year till my head has grown grey, I have often felt that we, the residents of this lane, are hardly better fitted than amphibians for the race of life.

Thus nearly sixty years have passed. In the mean-time things have been moving. Steam, which was the steed of the *Kali Yuga*, is now laughed at by the lightning which is superseding it. The atom, which had merely attained invisibility, has now become unthinkable. Man, like the ant on the eve of death, has sprouted wings, and the legal profession is lying in wait for the good times when disputes for the possession of air space will be brought into the law courts. In one single night all China cut off its pigtail, and Japan has taken so prodigious a leap that the space of 500 years has been covered in 50. But the inability of Chitpore Road to cope with its rainfall has remained as bad as ever. And the burden of our national song is as mournful, now that Home Rule is about to ripen, as it was when the National Congress was not even thought of.

Accustomed as we have been to all this from our early years, it has ceased to be a matter of surprise ; and what does not surprise breeds no anxiety. But after the water-logged discomfort of our road has been underlined and emphasised by tram tracks to which the repairs never seem to come to an end, the jolts which these give to my carriage wheels have brought me out of my absent-minded toleration to a more acute perception of the struggle

between the stream of wayfarers and the stream of water, the splashes of which besprinkle me as I pass. I have latterly begun to ask myself: "Why do we bear it?"

That it is possible not to bear it, that one gets on ever so much better for refusing to bear it, becomes evident as soon as one passes out into the European quarter of Chowringhee. If Chowringhee had been more than three-quarter tram-line, to which perennial repairs went on and on with the leisurely gait of a drowsy elephant, the tramway authorities, I am sure, would not have been permitted to enjoy either their food or sleep. The spirit of docility, however, which is incarnate in us, will not allow us to believe that things can be made to be better than they are. Hence these tears which flood our cheeks and the rain water which floods our streets.

This is not a trivial matter. We have never been allowed to realise, anywhere, in any little particular, that we are our own masters. I have heard tell of the gold fish which continually knocked their heads against the side of their bowl, thinking the glass to be water; and when they were put into a larger piece of water they restricted themselves to the same small circle, thinking the water to be glass. Such-like fear of getting our heads knocked has been driven into our very bones.

Like Abhimanyu in the Mahabharata, who had learnt the art of breaking through the enemy's formation, but not of coming out again, and consequently had to bear the brunt of all the enemy's

warriors, we, who are taught from our birth the art of getting ourselves tied up, but not the method of undoing the knots, are compelled to suffer the assaults of all the adverse forces of the world, big and small, down to the pettiest infantry.

So accustomed have we become to obey men, books, suggestions, barriers, imaginary lines,—generation after generation.—that the fact that we can do something for ourselves, in any sphere of activity whatsoever, escapes our notice, though it may stare us in the face,—even when we have our European spectacles on !

The right to be one's own master is the right of rights for man. And the country in which this great right has been systematically suppressed by book maxims, by current sayings, by rites and observances, has naturally become the greatest of slave factories ;—the country in which, lest reason should err, dogmatism and ritual have been allowed to bind the people hand and foot, where paths have been destroyed so that footsteps may not stray, where in the name of religion man has been taught to humiliate and debase man.

Our present bureaucratic masters have now taken to offering us the same counsel : "You will make mistakes, you are unfit, the right to think and act for yourselves cannot be placed in your hands."

This refrain from Manu and Parashar sounds strangely discordant when voiced by Englishmen. We are, therefore, roused to reply to them in a tune more consonant with their own spirit. "The mak-

ing of mistakes," say we, "is not such a great disaster as the deprivation of the right of being one's own master. We can only arrive at the truth if we are left free to err."

We have yet more to say. We can remind our rulers that though they may now be proudly driving the automobile of democracy, the creaking of the old Parliamentary cart, when it first started on its journey in the night, as it jerked its way from the rut of one precedent to another, did not sound exactly like the music of a triumphal progress. It had not always the benefit of a steam-roller smoothed road. How it used to sway from this interest to that, now of the king, now of the church, now of the landlord, now of the brewer, through faction, corruption, brawling and ineptitude! Was there not even a time when the attendance of its members had to be secured under threat of penalty?

And talking of mistakes, what a dismal tale could be unfolded of the mistakes the mother of Parliaments has made, beginning from the time of her old relations with Ireland and America, down to her recent actions in the Dardenelles and Mesopotamia, to say nothing of the not inconsiderable list which might be compiled for India alone. The depredations of the minions of mammon in American politics are hardly of minor importance. The Dreyfus case exposed the horrors of Militarism in France. And yet, in spite of all these, no one has the least doubt in his mind that the living flow of self-government is itself the best corrective which will dislodge one

error by another till it lifts itself out of each pitfall with the same impetus which led it to fall in.

But we have still a greater thing to urge. Self-government not only leads to efficiency and a sense of responsibility, but it makes for an uplift of the human spirit. Those who are confined within the parochial limits of village or community,—it is only when they are given the opportunity of thinking and acting imperially that they will be able to realise humanity in its larger sense. For want of this opportunity every person in this country remains a lesser man. All his thoughts, his powers, his hopes and his strivings remain petty. And this enforced pettiness of soul is for him a greater calamity than loss of life itself.

So in spite of all risk of error or mischance we must have self-government. Let us stumble and struggle on our way, but for God's sake, don't keep your eyes fixed on our stumblings alone to the neglect of our progress ;—this is our reply—the only true reply.

If some obstinate person keeps on worrying the authorities with this reply, he may be interned by the Government, but he gets the applause of his countrymen. When, however, he turns with this same reply to his own social authorities and protests : "You tell us that this is the *Kali Yuga* in which the intellect of man is feeble and liable to make mistakes if left free, so that we had better bow our head to shastric injunctions rather than work the brain inside it ;—but we refuse to submit

to this insulting proposal;" then do the eyes of the heads of the Hindu community become red and the order for social internment is passed forthwith. Those who are flapping their wings to soar into the sky of politics, would fain shackle our legs on the social perch.

The fact is that the same helm serves to steer to the right and to the left. There is a fundamental principle which must be grasped before man can become true, socially or politically. Allegiance to this principle makes all the difference between Chowringhee and Chitpore. Chitpore has made up its mind that everything is in the hands of superior authority, with the result that its own hands are always joined in supplication. "If things are not in our own hands, what are our hands for?" says Chowringhee; and has brought the whole world into its own hand because it believes that this is in direct connection with the hand of Providence. Chitpore has lost the world because it has lost this belief; and with half-closed eyes seeks in despair the narcotic consolations of quietism.

It is indeed necessary to shut our eyes if we have to keep up a belief in our paltry home-made rules of life. For, with eyes open, we cannot but catch glimpses of the universal law which rules the world. Power and wealth and freedom from suffering are all the rewards of mastery over this universal law, for the mass as well as for the individual. This is the axiom on which modern European civilisation is firmly based, and faith in this has given it its immense freedom.

For us, however, it still remains a case of wringing our hands and awaiting our master's voice. And in the worship of that master, be he the elder at home, the police *Daroga*, temple tout, priest, or pandit, Sitala, Manasa, Ola, or any one of the host of such demoniac deities, we have shattered into a thousand fragments and scattered to the four winds our power of independent thought and action.

The college student will object. "We no longer believe in all that," he will say. "Do we not get ourselves vaccinated for small pox and take saline injection for cholera? Have we not recognised mosquito-borne malaria to be a microscopic germ and refused to accord it a place in our pantheon?"

It is, however, not a question of what particular beliefs are professed. The fact remains that the attitude of blindly hanging on to some outside authority has sapped the very fount of our endeavour. This mental cowardice is born of an all-pervading fear, which dominates us and overpowers our own intelligence and conscience, because we cannot put our faith in the immutable universal law expressing itself throughout the world. For it is of the very nature of fear to doubt and hesitate: "Anything may happen! why take any risk?"

The same phenomenon is noticeable among our rulers whenever, through any loophole in their administration, fear gains an entrance, making them forget their most cherished traditions and impelling them to lay the axe at the root of the fundamental principle on which their power rests so firmly. Then

do right and justice retire in favour of prestige, and, in defiance of the Divine law, they think that acrid fumes will become soothing if only the tears can be hidden away in the solitude of the Andamans. This is but an instance of how the obsession with one's own particular panacea makes for a denial of the universal law. At bottom there is either petty fear, petty self-interest, or an attempt at evading the straight road by petty trickery.

So does blind fear cause us to overlook the claims of humanity, while in a frantic flutter of trepidation we make our obeisances at the shrine of every conceivable authority. And howsoever successfully we may pass examinations in physical or political science, we cannot get rid of our ingrained habit of waiting to be dictated to. Even where we have followed the modern fashion by founding democratic institutions, they constantly tend to be dominated by some one master, for the simple reason that the rank and file are so accustomed to doing everything to order, from waking and sleeping, eating and drinking, to getting married and mounting the funeral pyre.

If I say that the water in the pail of the Brahmin carrier is in a filthy state, unfit to drink, but that the one brought by the "untouchable" person straight from the filter is pure and wholesome, I shall be rebuked for talking mere paltry reason, for such doctrine has not the master's sanction. If I venture to question : "What of that ?", I am promptly boycotted. They cease to invite me to dinner. They

will even refuse to attend my funeral! The wonder is that those who welcome such cruel tyranny in every detail of life, as beneficial to Society, feel no compunction in asking for the most absolute political freedom!

And yet there was a day in India when the *Upanishad* declared of the Divine law,

Yathātathyatōrthān vyadadhāt shāshwatībhyaḥ samābhyaḥ,

that it is immutable and adaptable to each and every circumstance. It is for all time and not dependent on the whim of the moment. Therefore is it possible for us to know it with our intellects and use it in our work. And the more we can make it our own the less shall obstacles be able to obstruct our path. The knowledge of this law is science, and it is because of this science that Europe to-day can say with superb assurance: "Malaria shall be driven off the face of the earth. Lack of food and lack of knowledge shall not be allowed in the homes of men. And in politics the common weal shall harmonise with the rights of the individual."

India had also realised that in ignorance is bondage, in knowledge freedom, and that in gaining the truth lies salvation. What was meant by untruth? —The looking upon oneself as separate. To know oneself in one's spiritual relations to the universe is to know truly. To-day it is difficult even to conceive how such an immense truth came to be grasped. Then the age of the Rishis—the livers of the simple

life in their forest households—passed away, and the age of the Buddhist monks took its place. And this great realisation of India was relegated to a place apart from its every-day life, when salvation was declared to be in world renunciation.

Thus came about a compromise between truth and untruth, and a partition wall was erected between the two. So to-day from the side of truth there comes no protest, whatsoever degree of narrowness, grossness or folly may invade the practices and observances of social life. Nay, they are condoned. The ascetic under the tree proclaims: "He who has realised the universe in himself and himself in the universe has known the truth." Whereupon the householder, profoundly moved, fills the ascetic's bowl with his best. On the other hand when the householder in his chamber rules that the fellow who cannot keep the universal law at a respectable distance must not have access to barber or washerman, the ascetic in turn beams approval and bestows on him the dust of his feet and his blessing: "May you live for ever, my son!" That is how the decadence of our social life has come about, for there was none to raise a protest in the name of Truth. That is why for hundreds of years we have had to bear insult after insult, and weep.

In Europe it is not so. The truth there is not confined to the intellect, but finds a place in practice. Any fault that may come to light in society or the state has to face public examination and rectification in the search-light of truth. And the power and

freedom thus gained becomes available to all and gives them hope and courage. The expression of this truth is not hidden in a mist of esoteric incantation, but grows in the open, in full view of all, assisting them to grow with it.

The insults which we allowed ourselves to suffer for hundreds of years finally took shape as subjection to foreign dominion. And as the hand always seeks the painful spot, so has the whole of our attention become rivetted on the political system of our Western rulers. Forgetful of all else we clamour: —"Let our Government have some reference to our own will, let not all rules and regulations be showered upon us from above, whether we like them or not. Put not the full weight of power on our shoulders as a burden, let there be some sort of contrivance on wheels which we can also assist in pushing along."

From every part of the world, to-day, rises the prayer for deliverance from the rule of irresponsible outsiders. It is well that, stirred by the spirit of the times, we have added our voice to this prayer. It would have been to our undying shame had we not done so,—had we still clung to our accustomed acquiescence in the dictates of governmental authority. It shows that there is at least some chink left through which a ray of truth has been able to penetrate our being.

It is because what we have seen is a glimpse of the truth that I confidently hail the self-respect which impels us forward as a good thing, and as confidently cry shame on the vain self-glorification which would

keep us tied to the stake of immobility like an animal destined for sacrifice. Curiously enough it is the same feeling of pride which when it looks ahead says, "Give us a place in your councils of Empire", and which when it turns homewards says, "Beware lest in religious or social observances or even in your individual concerns you depart even by one step from the path prescribed by the master."—And this we call the renascence of Hinduism ! Our Hindu leaders, it appears, would prescribe for us the impossible commandment to sleep with one eye and keep the other awake !

When the cane of God's wrath fell on our backs, our wounded patriotism cried out : "Cut down the cane jungles !" forgetting that the bamboo thickets would still be there ! The fault is not in cane or bamboo, but within ourselves, and it is this : that we prefer authority to truth and have more respect for the blinkers than for the eyes. Till we can grow out of this disposition of ours some rod will be left in some wood or other for our punishment.

In Europe also there was a time when the authority of the Church was paramount in all departments of life, and it was only when they had succeeded in cutting through its all-enveloping meshes that the European peoples could begin to step out on the path of self-government. The insularity of England was England's opportunity and it was comparatively easier for her to elude the full might of a church, the centre of which was at Rome. Not that England is yet completely free from all traces of

church domination, but her church, like an old dowager, is now only tolerated where once she was all-powerful.

But though England was thus able to shake off the Old Woman, Spain was not. There was a day when Spain had the wind full in her sails. Why was she unable to maintain the start this gave her? Because the Old Woman was at the helm.

When Philip of Spain waged war against England it was discovered that her naval tactics were as rigidly ruled as her religious beliefs. So that while the navy of England, under the command of her most skilful sailors, was as mobile and adaptable to the free-blowing winds, as the waves on which it floated, the Spanish naval command went by caste, and was unable to extricate itself from the iron grip of immoveable custom. So in Europe only those peoples have been able to raise their heads who have succeeded in loosening the shackles of blind obedience to an organised church and learnt to respect themselves. And Russia, which failed to do so, remains bristling with a very forest of authorities, and her manhood is wasted in bending the knee, alike to the meanest modern government official and the pettiest ancient scriptural injuction.

It should be remembered that religion and a church, or religious organisation, are not the same. They are to one another as the fire is to its ashes. When religion has to make way for religious organisation, it is like the river being dominated by its sand bed,—the current stagnates and its aspect

becomes desert-like. And when men begin to take pride in this circumstance, then are they indeed in a bad way.

Religion tells us that if man is despitefully used, it is bad both for him who commits and him who suffers the outrage. But religious organisation tells us: "If you do not carry out without compunction each and every one of the elaborate rules and injunctions which oppress and insult man, you will be excommunicated." Religion tells us that he who needlessly gives pain to a living creature hurts his own soul. But religious organisation tells us that parents who offer water to their fasting widowed daughter on a particular day of the moon commit mortal sin. Religion tells us that repentance and good works alone may serve to wash away sin; religious organisation tells us that to take an immersion in a particular piece of water during an eclipse washes away not only one's own sins but those of fourteen generations of one's forebears. Religion tells us to fare forth over mountain and sea and enjoy the beautiful world, for that will enlarge our minds; religious organisation tells us that he who overpasses the sea shall have to roll in the dust in expiation. Religion tells us that the true man in whatever household he may have been born is worthy of homage; religious organisation tells us that he who is born a Brahmin may be the veriest scoundrel, yet is he fit to shower on others' heads the dust of his feet. In a word, religion preaches freedom, religious organisation chants of slavery.

Faith, even if blind, has its aspect of external beauty. This beauty the foreign traveller passing through India sometimes loves to dwell on, like an artist who enjoys the picturesque possibilities of a ruined house, but gives no thought to its tenantable qualities. During the bathing festival I have seen pilgrims in their thousands, mostly women, coming from Barisal to Calcutta. The suffering and insult, which they had to put up with at each changing station from steamer to train and train to steamer, was unending. Their pathetic resignation had no doubt a kind of beauty, but the God of their worship has not accepted that beauty. He has not rewarded, but punished them. Their sorrows are ever-increasing. The children they rear amidst their futile rites and observances have to cringe to all the material things of this world and tremble at all the shadows of the next; their sole function in life being to go on raising barriers at each bend of the path which they will have to tread; and all they know of growth is in making these barriers tower higher and higher.

The reason for this punishment is that they have misspent the greatest of God's gifts to man,—the power of self-sacrifice. When called upon to render their account, they can only show a heavy debit balance. I have seen, elsewhere, a stream of hundreds of thousands of men and women hurrying along to some place of pilgrimage to acquire religious merit, but a dying man, lying by their road-side, had none to tend him *because his caste was not*

known. What a terrible insolvency of humanity has come upon these spendthrift seekers after merit, whose blind faith appears so beautiful! The same blindness which impels them to rush to bathe in a particular stream, renders them indifferent to the sufferings of their unknown fellow-men. God does not appreciate this wrong use of his most precious gift.

In Gaya I have seen women pouring out their wealth at the feet of some temple priest who had neither learning, piety, nor character. Has this generous self-privation led them a step nearer to pity or to truth? It may be said in reply: "They gave of their substance for the sake of what they believed to be the holiness of the Priest. Had they not this belief they would either not have parted with the money at all, or spent it on themselves." Be it so. But in that case they would at least have had the benefit of the money, and, what is more, they would not have deluded themselves into believing that in spending on themselves they were doing a pious act. They would have remained free from this slavery to a delusion. He who has trained himself to die in docile obedience to his master's bidding finds it impossible, when he becomes his own master, manfully to give up his life for the right.

Thus it happens that in our villages foodstuffs, health, education and the joy of life are all on the ebb. Feeling that the only hope for the villagers was in rousing them to a sense of their own powers, I once made the attempt in a certain village. There

was a part of the village where not a drop of water was to be had. A fire had broken out and all that the neighbours could do was to join in the lamentation while the flames were raging. Said I to them : "If you will give your labour to dig a well, I will pay for the masonry work." They admired my cunning in attempting to acquire merit partly at their cost, but declined to be taken in by it ! That well never got made, the water scarcity there remains as bad as ever, and fires are perennial.

This shows that the main reason for our village distresses is that nothing gets done except with the idea of acquiring religious merit. So that every want must await providence, or some casual visitor in search of merit, for its fulfilment. If the latter is not forthcoming, the village will remain thirsty rather than dig its own well. I do not blame the villagers, for the Old Woman keeps them half asleep with her opium. But I am struck speechless when I see educated young men singing the Old Woman's praises. "What a splendid nurse," say they. "What a proud sight to see our country in her arms ! From that high seat her feet never even touch the ground. How pretty it would look if our country held in her hands the sceptre of self-government, while still perched in her old nurse's arms."

Privation, pestilence and famine obtrude themselves only too patently. But just as the government refuses us a license for arms to withstand the attacking tiger or dacoit, so also does the Hindu social leader deny us the means of de-

fending ourselves against these calamities. "But surely," the latter will protest in reply, "you are allowed to acquire the means of defending yourself. Nobody prevents your learning and applying science for self-protection." True, it would be an exaggeration to say that we are deprived of weapons of defence. But every precaution is taken to prevent our learning how to use them. So incapable have we become by the constant fear of transgression of the multitudinous rules with which we are hedged in both on the side of our country as well as on that of the government, that we are more likely to get hurt by the gun, if we have it, than by the dacoits!

Now let us examine the contention that it is foreign domination which is responsible for keeping us in this distressful state. The fundamental principle of British politics is the participation of the people in their own government. This principle has always hurled its shafts against the irresponsible domination of any outsider and this fact has not been hidden from us. We openly read of it in government schools and memorise it for our examinations. They have no means now of taking back this knowledge.

Our congresses and leagues are all based on this principle. And as it is the very nature of European science to be available to all, so also is it of the essence of the British political creed to offer itself for acceptance to the people of India. One, or ten, or five hundred Englishmen may be found to say that it is not expedient to allow the Indian student

access to European science, but that same science itself will shame these Englishmen by calling upon *all*, irrespective of birth-place or colour, to come to it, and partake of its boons. So also, if five hundred, or even five thousand Englishmen preach from platform or press that obstacles should be placed in the way of the attainment of self-government by the Indian people, these words of these thousands of Englishmen will be put to shame by the British political creed itself, which thunders out its call to all peoples, irrespective of birth-place or colour, to become its votaries.

I know that we are open to the rude retort that British principles do not take into account the likes of us, just as the Brahmin of old had decreed in his day that the highest knowledge and the larger life were not for the Sudra. But the Brahmin had taken the precaution to consolidate his position. Of those whom he sought to cripple externally he also crippled the mind. The roots of knowledge having been cut off from the Sudra, all chance of his blossoming out into independent action withered away, and no further trouble had to be taken to ensure the Sudra's head being kept bowed to the dust of the Brahmin's feet. But our British rulers have not completely closed the door of knowledge—the door that leads to freedom. Doubtless the bureaucracy are repentant and are fumbling about in a belated endeavour to close this window and that—but for all that, even they are unable to forget altogether that to sacrifice principle at the

altar of expediency is only a step towards moral suicide.

If we can only grasp with all our strength this message of hope that our rights lie latent in the deeper psychology of the British people, then it will become easier for us to bear sorrow and make sacrifices for its realisation. If we allow our habitual weakness to overcome us under the baleful influence of the article of our creed—"Thou Shalt Obey," then indeed will our lot be that black despair of which we have seen two opposite forms of expression—the violent methods of secret societies, and the inane discussions of our chamber politicians as to the merits or demerits of this viceroy or that, and whether a John Morely at the India Office will bring about any improvement in our conditions or will not rather the domestic cat, when it takes to the jungles, become as wild as the wild cat.

Nevertheless we must not mistrust humanity. Let us aver with conviction that its power is not the only thing great in the British Empire, but that the principles on which it is broad-based are even greater. Doubtless we shall see this contradicted at every turn. We shall see selfish considerations and the lust of power, anger, fear and pride at work. But these enemies of humanity can only defeat us where they find their like within us, where they find us afraid of petty fears, lusting after petty desires, full of jealousy, mistrust and hatred of each other. Where we are brave, where we are self-denying, devoted and reverential, there we shall find ourselves

in touch with the best in our rulers. There we shall be victorious in spite of all enemy assaults,—not always externally, it may be, but assuredly in the depths of our being.

If we are petty and cowardly, we shall bring down to our level the great principles of our rulers and help their evil passions to triumph. Where there are two necessary parties, the strength of each must contribute to their common elevation, the weakness of each to their common down-fall. When the Sudra joined his palms in submission to the Brahminical decree of inferiority, on that very day was dug the pit for the fall of the Brahmin. The weak can be as great an enemy of the strong as the strong of the weak.

A high Government official once asked me: "You always complain of the oppressions of the police. Personally I am not inclined to disbelieve in it. But why not confront us with facts and figures?" True, there should be at least some in our country who have courage enough to dare to expose all wrongs, to repeatedly proclaim them to the world. This should be so, although we know that the meanest constable is not an individual but the representative of a terrible power, which will spend thousands upon thousands from public funds to shield him from obloquy,—a power which, therefore, practically tells us that if we are oppressed it will be healthier for us to continue to be oppressed in silence,—for is not prestige, at stake? Prestige! That familiar old bogey of ours, the unseen master who has eternal

hold of our ears, the *Manasa* of the Behula epic, the *Chandi* of Kavikankan, to whose worship we must hasten, trampling over right, justice and all else, or be mercilessly crushed! So to Prestige be our salutations:

Yā dēvī rājyashāsanē
Prestige-*rūpēna samsthitā!*
Namastasyai namastasyai
Namastasyai namōnamah!!

This however, is nothing but *Avidya*, *Maya*. We must not believe in it for all that it appears before our material eyes. The real truth is always behind it, that we are the most vitally concerned in our own government. This truth is greater than the government itself. It is this truth which gives its strength to the British Empire. In this truth, also, lies our strength. If we are cowards, if we cannot bravely put our trust in British ideals, then the police needs must go on oppressing, and the magistrate be powerless to protect us. The goddess of Prestige will continue to claim her human victims and British rule to give the lie to British tradition.

To this I shall be told in reply that it is all very well from an idealistic standpoint to talk of principle being greater than might, but in practical life an adherence to this belief will get us into trouble.

"We may get into trouble," say I, "but still we must act as we truly believe."

"But your countrymen will be bribed or intimidated to bear witness against the truth."

"Be it so. But still we must profess what we believe to be the truth."

"But your own people will be lured by the hope of praise or reward to hit you on the head from behind."

"That may be. But still we must trust in the truth."

"Can you hope for so much ?"

"Just so much must we hope for, not one jot less will do."

If we ask our rulers for great things, we must also ask for greater things from our countrymen ; else the first request will not be fruitful. I know that all men are not courageous and that many are weak. But in all countries, and at all times, there are born men who are the natural representatives of their race, and who must take up all the sufferings of their country on themselves ; who must cut a way through all opposition for the rest to follow through ; who can keep up their faith in humanity in the face of all apparent contradictions, and watchfully await the dawn through the blackest night of despair ; who scoff at the fears of the timid with the words :

Swalpamapyasyā dharmasya trāyatē mahatō bhayāt— the least bit of right in the centre will vanquish a multitude of terrors at the circumference. If there be any the least righteous principle in politics, to that shall we bow the head,not to fear, not to fear.

Suppose my child is ill. I have sent for a European specialist at great cost. He comes and begins to make passes and mutter incantations in the manner of our witch-doctors. Must I not speak out and tell

him: "Look here, I called you in to treat the patient, not for this kind of thing?" If he waxes indignant and says: "What do you know? I am a doctor, whatever I choose to do is the proper treatment!" Must I not nevertheless persist in my objection and tell him that his medical science is greater than himself,—*that* is what I have paid for and insist on having? He may knock me down and depart with my money in his pocket, but when he is alone in his carriage he will be ashamed. So I say that if I do not acquiesce in the dicta of the British bureaucracy but hold on to the ideals of the British people, I may bring trouble on myself to-day, but to-morrow I shall win my way through.

Just fancy that after a hundred and fifty years of British rule we hear to-day the extraordinary doctrine that Bengal has not even the right to sigh over the distress of her sister province of Madras. We so long thought that the fact that under the unifying influence of British rule, Bombay, Madras, Bengal and the Panjab were growing into internal and external uniformity, was accounted one of the brightest jewels of the British Crown. When in the West the news is abroad that Great Britain bleeds for the troubles of Belgium and France, and has faced death for their sake, is it to be proclaimed in the same breath in the East that Bengal must not bother her head about the joys or sorrows of Madras? Are we going to obey such a command? Do we not know for certain, despite the vehemence of its utterance, of the load of shame which lurks behind it?

We must bring about a compromise between this secret shame of the bureaucracy and our open defiance. England is bound to India by her pledged word. England came here as the responsible representative of European civilisation. The message of that civilisation is the word she has plighted. This, her only title to Empire, shall be glorified by us. We shall never let her forget that she has not crossed the seas to slice up India into fragments.

Any people which have gained the wealth of a great realisation have been permitted to do so that they may impart it to the world at large. Should they turn miserly, they will only deprive themselves. The great realisations of Europe have been—Science and Rights of Man. With this wealth as her gift to India the divine mandate sent England to these shores. The duty has also been cast upon us to hold her to her mission. And unless each party does its duty, forgetfulness and downfall will be inevitable.

The Englishman may point to his history and tell us: "This great prize of self-government have I earned only after many a struggle and with infinite toil and trouble." I admit it. Each pioneer race has arrived at some particular truth through much sorrow and error and sacrifice. But those who follow after have not to tread the same long path of tribulation. In America I have seen Bengali youths becoming experts in the manufacture of machinery without having to retrace all the historical stages of the Steam Engine beginning from the boiling kettle. What it took ages of shower and

sunshine for Europe to mature, Japan was able to transplant in no time, roots and all, to her own soil. So if in our character the qualities necessary for successful self-government appear to be in defect, it is all the more reason that practice in that art should be the sooner commenced. If we begin by the assumption that there is nothing in a man, we can never discover anything in him. No worse crime can be committed against us than to allow a contempt for our people to close the door to the development of their better nature and thereby compel them to remain for ever contemptible in the eyes of the world.

When morning dawns in history, the light does not gradually creep up from the East but at once floods all the four quarters. If the peoples of the world had to acquire greatness inch by inch then nothing short of eternity would have served for its attainment. Had it been true that men must first deserve and then desire, then no people in the world would ever have attained freedom.

The West boasts of democracy to-day. I have no wish to stir up the repulsive mire which is still so plentiful beneath the surface glamour of the Western peoples. Had there been some paramount power to rule that while such a state of things prevailed no democracy was to step into its rights, then not only would the foulness have remained where it is, but all hope of its ever being cleansed away would have vanished.

So in our social life and our individual outlook

there are no doubt blemishes. I could not hide them even if I would. But still we must be our own masters. Because the lamp in one corner is dim, that is no reason why we should not light another lamp in another corner. The great festival of Man is in progress, but in no country are all its lamps ablaze; nevertheless the festivity proceeds apace. If our lamp has gone out for some little while, what harm if we light its wick at Britain's flame? To wax indignant and disdainful at such a request cannot be accounted to the good, for while it would not diminish Britain's lustre, it would add to the world's illumination.

The god of the festival calls us to-day. Shall the priest be allowed to deny us admittance,—the priest who has all his bows and smiles for the wealthy, who hastens up to the railway station at the bare news of the arrival of Australia or Canada? This difference of treatment will not be permitted, for the god of the festival is not blind. If conscience does not manifest itself from within as shame, it will do so as wrath from without.

Our hope lies both in the British people and in ourselves. I have great faith in my people. I am sure our youths will not consent to peer for ever through the borrowed mask of age. We know of great English souls who are willing to suffer insult from their own countrymen so that the fruit of England's history may become available to India. We also want men of India, real men, who will dare to face the frowns of the foreigner and the sneers of

their countrymen, who will be ready to take all risks of failure, in their eagerness truly to express themselves as men.

The wakeful, ageless God of India calls to-day on our soul,—the soul that is measureless, the soul that is undefeated, the soul that is destined to immortality, and yet the soul which lies to-day in the dust, humbled by external authority, in the fetters of blind observances. With blow upon below, pang upon pang, does He call upon it "*Ātmānam Viddhi*: know thyself!"

O self-mistrusting coward, worn out with premature old age, bowed down with a foolish burden of blind belief! this is not the time for petty quarrels with your own people, for mean hates and jealousies. The time has passed for squabbling like beggars over trivial doles and petty favours. Let us not, either, console ourselves with that false pride, which can only flourish in the darkness of our secluded corners, but which will be shamed on facing the vast assemblies of the world. Let us not indulge in the cheap consolation of the impotent, of casting the blame on another. Our sins, accumulating through the ages, have crushed our manhood under their load and paralysed our conscience. The time has come to make a supreme effort to rid ourselves of their dead weight. Behind us lies the greatest obstruction to our forward progress. Our past overcomes our future with its hypnotic influence, its dust and dead leaves obscure the rising sun of the new age, and befog the activities of our awakening youthfulness. We must

ruthlessly relieve our backs of this clinging obstruction, if we would save ourselves from the shame of utter futility, if we would keep pace with the stream of ever-progressing humanity—the ever-vigilant, ever-exploring humanity which is victorious over death ; which is the right hand of the Great Architect of the universe ; and of which, as it ceaselessly journeys along the knowledge-lighted road to truth, the triumphal progress from epoch to epoch is hailed with acclamations which resound throughout the world.

Deeply stained as we are by the repeated showers of insult and sorrow that have been unceasingly poured on us from outside, we must today undergo purification—the purification of the *homa* of self-sought travail, voluntarily borne. In the sacred flame of that sacrificial fire our sins will be burnt away, the fumes of our folly dissipated, and our inertness reduced to ashes. O Great God ! thou art not the God of the poor in spirit ! That in us which is not mean and miserable, that which is indestructible, masterful, god-like, of that art thou the Over-Lord,—that dost thou call up to the right hand of thy kingly throne. Let our weakness be scorned, our folly censured, our servility punished, till they depart from us for ever.

Translated by
SURENDRANATH TAGORE.

MR. MONTAGU'S VISIT AND OUR DUTY

Mr. Montagu is coming out to India to confabulate with (1) the Government, (2) representative bodies, and (3) others. The Government of India is a thoroughly organised body, with infinite ramifications, and has at its command expert knowledge and all the materials for making out a case. The public bodies of India, headed by the Indian National Congress and the Moslem League, are not so efficiently organised, and suffer from the great disadvantage that the political leaders, unlike the members of the Government of India, work for love, do not meet often, and cannot devote their whole time to the business. The 'others' probably include representative men of different communities, and they, as we know, are an uncertain body, whose views are not always based on sound political knowledge, and many of them are likely to be in a peculiar degree susceptible to the influence of the powers that be in framing their opinions for Mr. Montagu's consumption. It is therefore necessary that we should try to settle our plan of campaign at this critical juncture.

The vast mass of evidence recently collected by the Public Services Commission, and the use which has been made of it in the Commission's report, clearly proves, if any proof were needed, that a

heterogeneous collection of opinions, representing conflicting interests, seldom serves any useful purpose ; for it can be turned to any use and cited in support of any set of preconceived theories. Three lessons are to be derived from a careful perusal of the Commission's report which it is most important for us to remember and profit by. They are : (1) the absolute necessity, on the part of the popular leaders, to speak out the truth, and nothing but the truth, if they want to make an impression ; (2) the bureaucracy is firmly determined to hold fast to all the advantages they possess, and to clamour for more ; (3) the immense waste of energy, and the proportionate meagreness of achievement, which results, in our case, from an inadequate coordination of aims and methods. We shall examine these three points *seriatim* with a view to indicate our duty at the present moment.

As to the first point : Plain, naked, honest truth, with no mental reservations actuated by the desire to be fair to your adversary or to gain a reputation for moderation and sobriety, is what is wanted, and what counts. Any faltering, any giving away of your case from a spirit of compromise, is bound to introduce a fatal weakness in your chain of arguments, of which the utmost advantage will be taken by your opponents, for which the whole country will have to repent at leisure. This, no doubt, is the consideration which induced Mr. Justice Rahim to write a separate minority report instead of recording a mere dissentient minute, as was done by

some other members of the Commission, and the result is that his report has a moral value all its own, and will always be consulted by Indians and foreigners alike as the true exposition of the Indian point of view. To put your case at the highest, morally speaking, that you are capable of, in others words, honesty in politics as elsewhere, is always the best policy. It prevents those in whose hands the decision lies from judging your case from any mere makeshift standpoint of expediency, and compels them to examine the validity of your first principles ; and if these be right, the authorities cannot, for very shame, bring the discusion down to a lower plane on vague and uncertain grounds of policy without betraying their hand. The type of men who are needed as our spokesmen before Mr. Montagu are not those professed politicians who are above all votaries of expediency and who are anxious to win certificates from official and non-official Anglo-Indians for so-called "moderation," "reasonableness," "sanity" and "impartiality" ; they must be sober thinkers who weigh their words and yet think it contemptible to make compromises with their conscience. It is men of this stamp who, we hope, are meant by 'others' in Mr. Montagu's pronouncement, for it is only opinion emanating from such persons that is really worth having. That pronouncement, in the opinion of the Viceroy, "is a landmark in the constitutional history of India," as "it points to a goal ahead." Whether it is a landmark or not will depend very much on the steps which may

now be taken for "the progressive realiasation of responsible government in India." With a view to determine what these steps are to be, the Viceroy has invited the Indian leaders to examine the problems which confront us "from the standpoint of what is judicious, what is practicable, and *above all, what is right*" (the italics are ours). Since Mr. Montagu has declared that "the British Government and the Government of India on whom the responsibility lies for the welfare and advancement of the Indian peoples must be the judges of the time and the measure of each advance," the sole duty, in the official view, of "that great unofficial India, now stirring into fuller political consciousness" (to quote the Viceroy again), "at this great epoch of our national evolution," is to examine the problems from the stand-point of what is right, and from that stand-point alone. As for what is judicious and what is practicable, it is for the British Government and the Government of India, who reserve to themselves the right to judge the time and measure of each advance, to come to their own conclusions ; the people having been by official declaration excluded from participation in that decision, questions of policy or practical difficulty need not deter them from giving full expression to what they think to be right. Perhaps it will be found that in a long view what is right is after all the most judicious and the most expedient, so that the Government of India and the British Government will have the best assistance from the Indian leaders, for whose co-

operation the Viceroy earnestly appeals, if they confine themselves exclusively to what is right, instead of making uncalled-for excursions into those forbidden regions formally reserved for the practical administrators of the Executive Government. We do not mean to say that we ought not to express any opinion on "the time and the measure of each advance",—our comments on this point will be found in the article on "Mr. Montagu's Announcement"—; what we mean is that our demands must not be made less than what they logically and in justice ought to be, from any apprehension or consideration that so much may not be granted early or at once. Government may or may not wish to concede what we want, in the immediate future, but that need not deter us from making known the full measure of our immediate demands. The Indian members of the Executive Councils, as part of the Government, will, of course, have their say on the practical and the judicious aspects of the changes proposed by the public, but having regard to the fact that too lively a consciousness of those aspects has always in the past been allowed to override the just claims of the people, it will be their duty to try to curb the propensity of their civilian colleagues to make too much of them. The Viceroy's speech shows that he places the justice of our demands above all considerations of expediency, and he would not want any cooperation not based on an absolutely unfettered regard for what is right.

As to the second point: The Congress and the

Moslem League have formulated their views, and the memorandum of the nineteen members of the Imperial Council, of which the Congress-cum-League scheme is an elaboration, is also before the Secretary of State. It is needless to go over the same ground, nor is it possible to do so within the space at our command. But the suggestions made by them are divisible into two parts, namely, rights which we must have, and changes in the machinery of government necessary to secure us in the enjoyment of those rights. We shall try to fix the attention of our readers on one or two points under the second of these heads which have been dealt with in the above schemes, and which seem to us to be all-important. A careful and prolonged study of Indian political problems has convinced us that so long as the State and the Civil Service in India remain synonymous as they are now, all reforms are bound to prove in the end as empty of substance as Dead-sea apples. The poison-tooth of the bureaucracy must be drawn, as advocated long ago by Sir Henry Cotton, and this must be laid down as the *sine qua non* of all other reforms. To do this, three things are immediately required : (1) The India Council, the headquarters of sun-dried bureaucrats, must be abolished, for, in the words of Mr. Montagu himself, "the whole system of the India Office is designed to prevent control by the House of Commons for fear that there might be too advanced a Secretary of State." (2) The English members of the Executive Councils must not be drawn from the ranks of the Civil Service, but from

among men trained in the public life of England. In other words, as in all other civilised countries, the permanent officials must not be allowed to dictate the policy of the Government as well as carry it into execution. (3) The Secretaries to the various Governments, who are invariably members of the Civil Service, should not have the large anomalous powers now vested in them of approaching the Executive Head of the Government direct over the heads of the members of the Council or of pressing their own views before the full Council when opposed to those of their official chiefs. These little-known but very important powers give them a control over the policy of the Government, even though nominally they are outside it, and tend very materially to curb the independence of the members of the Government. Unless and until these three *adjective* reforms are introduced, all *substantive* reforms which we are trying for will prove almost futile, and the domination of the bureaucracy, of the forces of darkness and reaction, of powerful vested interests, of organised opposition to liberal principles, of the spirit of centralised departmentalism, absorbed in the contemplation of its own perfection and determined to fight tooth and nail the encroachment of progressive ideas and the influx of new light, will continue to frustrate the best-laid plans of Mr. Montagu, as they have frustrated those of Lords Ripon and Morley. As Sir William Wedderburn says: "The complaint is not against the men, but against the system, which has placed them in a false position, making

them masters where they should be servants. An *Imperium in Imperio* has thus been created at Simla; so that the permanent Civil Service, a privileged foreign body, with professional interests adverse to Indian aspirations, dominates the administration, and intervenes, as a non-conducting medium, between the good will of the British democracy and the reasonable claims of the Indian people." The bureaucracy have now learnt their part well, and are profuse in giving utterance to liberal maxims. They know that this much, by way of concession, is demanded by the Time-Spirit. But the bureaucracy cannot forget their vested interests, and so they are ever apt to devise new ways and means to prevent those maxims from being practically effective—witness the Islington Commission, which, originally intended to widen the field of Indian employment in the higher branches of the administration, ended, first and foremost, by making further liberal provisions for the Civil Service.

As to the third point: What splits and ruptures and divisions in the camp may do, is already becoming manifest. We refer to the meetings which are reported to have been held in various parts of India, Southern India especially, by some men belonging to the "non-Brahman" castes, to the depressed communities, and some Indian Christians, Zemindars, Mahomedans, and and the like. All these sectional agitations, however they may have originated, seem to have only one object in view—to decry the movement in favour of

Home Rule. Even Mr. Gokhale's incomplete and hastily drawn up political testament has been resurrected from the limbo of oblivion with a view to draw a red herring across the track of the country's political progress. The forces of reaction are evidently at work, and are being employed to turn back the inrushing tide for mere temporary and questionable sectional gains. Our political history during the last few decades is replete with instances of failure courted by ourselves in the effort to promote sectional advancement—failure not only of the larger interests of the country, but also of those very communal interests for the sake of which we were so ready to sacrifice the greater good of the nation. Yet we have not learnt our lesson, or having learnt it, are ready to forget it at the first touch of outside pressure. It is easy to understand who stands to gain by these suicidal moves which trade on our narrow selfishness and render us blind to the national welfare. There is no truth more self-evident than this, that if the country as a whole gains self-government the beneficent influence of such a radical transformation will infuse a new vitality into every pore of the body-politic, and the nation as a whole will be uplifted on to a plane where all our thoughts and activities will be governed solely by the desire of national well-being, which includes the well-being of every part of it. It behoves us therefore sternly to repress all such dissipation of energy as is involved in mere sectional movements, and to combine to present a bold and united front. 'United

we stand, divided we fall.' Our thinkers and public men should lose no time in laying their heads together, and devising the best means of presenting our united demands before Mr. Montagu, and of formulating them in as closely-reasoned a form as possible, supporting the whole scheme by statistics, figures and extracts from blue-books and other reliable documents, and by arguments drawn from the constitutional history of nations, so that our presentation of the case may not suffer in comparison with those of our adversaries and may, in every way, be worthy of a great and united nation, which knows its mind and is capable of giving the fullest expression to it. Special sessions and committee meetings should be held. At the same time those representatives of the landed aristocracy and other special interests who are likely to be consulted by Mr. Montagu should be patriotic enough not to play into the hands of our enemies by repeating things which they know will please the bureaucracy, for in this momentous epoch of our country's history they should remember the sacred trust reposed in them by their mother-land, whose call they should honour even if they be not chosen representatives.

One word more, and we have done. The Viceroy has said that Indians will be employed in larger numbers in the higher branches of the public service in order to give them training in administration. Mr. Montagu has laid down the policy of "increasing the association of Indians in every branch of the administration". If this be their object, the recom-

mendations of the Public Services Commission must be completely ignored and they must make a fresh start. We all know how essential it is to employ Indians in the higher branches of district administration, if the nation's character is to be built up from the foundations. Fawning, flattery, grovelling obsequiousness, is the prevailing atmosphere in the districts in intercourse between the English officials and Indians. The fact that everywhere Indians are as a rule 'subordinates' is humiliating enough ; but when the consciousness that the official superior is also a member of a close corporation and belongs to the ruling race is added to the sense of subordination, the divinity that hedges in the high district official becomes almost intolerable, and the consequence is that even the best men of the district can scarcely hold up their heads before him as man to man. Again, being a foreigner, the English official is more liable to be influenced by interested self-seekers, whose characters they are unable to judge. This introduces an element of uncertainty in his dealings with the educated men of his district which precludes all effective co-operation. The result is that while the European official goes on drawing his fat salary and inditing long-winded reports, and the educated and self-respecting Indian sulks in his tent, the public life of the country suffers an irreparable loss—all of which could be avoided by the appointment of Indians in district charges.

Mr. Montagu in his Mesopotamian Debate speech said : "I see the great self-governing Dominions and

Provinces of India organised and coordinated with the great Principalities—the existing principalities and perhaps new ones—not one great Home Rule country, but a series of self-governing provinces and principalities, federated into one central Government." We shall not quarrel over words, and shall, for the nonce, accept Mr. Montagu's ideal of a federated and self-governing India. But let us not forget that in the coming reconstruction of self-governing principalities, all Bengali-speaking peoples should be united under one provincial government. The partition of Bengal has been annulled, but all Bengal has not been united. In Bihar and Chota Nagpur on the west, and in Assam on the east, there are extensive tracts where the population is mostly Bengali. These outlying tracts should be brought into the fold and the new province formed on a linguistic basis. In cases of doubt, a plebiscite may be taken, and the views of the people of the affected tracts ascertained. The same will perhaps be demanded by the Oriyas, Mahrattas and others whose homogeneity has been artificially sundered by their being placed under different provincial governments. All such claims of racial reunion should be sympathetically considered when the provinces are thrown into the crucible to emerge into self-governing states under a central federal Government, as outlined by Mr. Montagu. He will not need to be reminded that one of the main objects of Italy joining in the present war is to reunite *Italia Irredenta*—unredeemed Italy. Here, as on the broader question of self-

government, we cannot fight for one set of principles in Europe and apply another set of principles in India.

X.

"INDISPENSABLE CONDITIONS" OF SELF-GOVERNMENT.

In his famous speech delivered in September, 1917, in the Indian Legislative Council, Sir Michael O'Dwyer enumerated the conditions of self-government in the following passage :

But I would remind those who press for it that the ideal can only be realised when the three indispensable conditions laid down, not by any bureaucrat eager to retain power, but by so high an authority and so great a champion of popular rights as Mill, are fulfilled. These are : (1) That the great majority of the people shall desire it, (2) that they shall be capable of exercising it, (3) that they shall be able and willing to undertake the responsibilities, i. e. external and internal defence, which it entails.

We are sorry to find that the speaker did not quote Mill correctly. The three conditions laid down by him occur in his "*Representative Government*" in more than one place. They occur in the first chapter of the book in the following form :—

"This implies three conditions. The people for whom the form of government is intended must be willing to accept it ; or at least not so unwilling as to oppose an insurmountable obstacle to its establishment. They must be willing and able to do what

it requires of them to enable it to fulfil its purposes. The word "do" is to be understood as including forbearances as well as acts. They must be capable of fulfilling the conditions of action, and the conditions of self-restraint, which are necessary either for keeping the established polity in existence, or for enabling it to achieve the ends, its conduciveness to which forms its recommendation."

They are repeated in the fourth chapter in the following abridged form :

"These were—1. That the people should be willing to receive it. 2. That they should be willing and able to do what is necessary for its preservation. 3. That they should be willing and able to fulfil the duties and discharge the functions which it imposes on them."

Let the reader compare the three conditions as they are described by Mill and as they have been quoted by the Panjab Satrap, and they will find out the difference, which is very material as regards the first condition. This is laid down by Mill in the following words : "The people for whom the form of government is intended must be willing to accept it ; or *at least not so unwilling as to oppose an insurmountable obstacle to its establishment.*" (The italics are ours). The italicised words bring out the exact intention of Mill, which is very different from what Sir Michael would make it out to be, namely, "that the great majority of the people shall desire it." "*To desire it,*" and "*not to be so unwilling to accept it as to oppose an insurmountable obstacle to its establishment*" certainly represent quite different attitudes. Certainly we fulfil the first condition as laid down by Mill.

As regards the two other conditions, it should be borne in mind that self-government has its measures and degrees. The people to whom a certain measure or degree of self-rule is to be given "should be willing and able to do what is necessary for its preservation" to the extent that that amount of self-rule may make it incumbent on them to do it. Similarly when it is said that "they should be willing and able to fulfil the duties and discharge the functions which it imposes on them," the degree or measure of self-rule enjoyed by or conferred on a people must be borne in mind. A people who demand *only a very qualified form of internal autonomy* must not be called upon to show all at once that they are able to undertake, unaided, "the responsibilities of external and internal defence" (Sir Michael's words), which are undertaken unaided *only* by *independent* nations. In the present world war, however, even the strongest independent nations have not been able to discharge this function *unaided*. Before the war not a single self-governing British Dominion was able to undertake external defence, and even now after three years of war they are unfit to undertake that responsibility unaided, because they have no navies, and have inadequate armies. Like the Dominions we are able partially to do the work of defence. That India has no navy is neither her fault nor is it a disqualification for Home Rule. Ireland has no navy, nor has any Dominion. India's ship-building industry was destroyed during the East India Company's regime. As regards the Indian army, when was the attempt

made to make it a sufficiently large, well-equipped and well-trained, self-contained and independent *national* army ? Is it being made even now ? Still we are firmly of the opinion that we are able to fulfil Mill's second and third conditions to the extent that the measure of self-government we demand makes it incumbent on us to do so. We are surprised to find that though the Panjab has so readily supplied such large numbers of soldiers, yet in Sir Michael's opinion "those conditions are not likely to be fulfilled for many a long day" in that province.

It should be noted that in the scheme of post-war reforms prepared and adopted by the Congress and the Moslem League, it is laid down that "no resolution of the Imperial Legislative Council shall be binding on the Governor-General in Council in respect of military charges for the defence of the country." This limitation of the power of the Council correspondingly limits the military responsibility of those who in the last resort send representatives to the Council, *i.e.*, the people of India.

It may be easy to misquote Mill when it serves one's purpose to do so, but it is equitable and necessary to bear in mind and follow what Mill says even when it may not be convenient for one to do so. For instance, we present to the bureaucracy some passages from the first chapter of Mill's *Representative Government* :

"People are more easily induced to do, and do more easily what they are already used to ; but people also learn to do things new to them. Familiarity is a great help ; but much dwelling on

an idea will make it familiar, even when strange at first. There are abundant instances in which a whole people have been eager for untried things. The amount of capacity which a people possess for doing new things, and adapting themselves to new circumstances, is itself one of the elements of the question. It is a quality in which different nations, and different stages of civilisation, differ much from one another."

Mill then observes that "*the capability of any given people for fulfilling the conditions of a given form of government cannot be pronounced on by any sweeping rule.* Knowledge of the particular people, and general practical judgment and sagacity, must be the guides." This is followed by a passage to which we wish to draw particular attention. It runs as follows:

"There is also another consideration not to be lost sight of. A people may be unprepared for good institutions; *but to kindle a desire for them is a necessary part of the preparation.* To recommend and advocate a particular institution or form of government, and set its advantages in the strongest light, is one of the modes, *often the only mode within reach*, of educating the mind of the nation not only for accepting or claiming, but also for working the institution. What means had Italian patriots, during the last and present generation, of preparing the Italian people for freedom in unity, but by inciting them to demand it?"

Far from undertaking this "necessary part of the preparation" the bureaucracy have discouraged and repressed our efforts in that direction by various direct and indirect means, and even tried to kill all

hope of self-rule by gubernatorial pronouncements. All readers of newspapers know the measures and speeches to which we refer. It is only very recently, owing to circumstances on which we need not dwell, that the two or three highest official pronouncements have been marked by a somewhat altered tone. But even after that, followed Sir Michael's speech, for which he has expressed a sort of regret, but has not withdrawn a single statement or remark made therein, which fact has necessitated our comments on it. Non-official European counterblasts have not also been wanting. Sir Hugh Bray's speech is the most noteworthy among them and non-official Europeans are making preparations for a tremendous agitation against giving any appreciable power of control to the people of India over the affairs of their country.

So the "necessary part of the preparation" must be undertaken by ourselves alone, against heavy odds. But God and his world-forces are with us. So, courage, sisters and brethren !

"DEMAND" OR "DESIRE" AND SELF-RULE

We have shown above that Mill does not lay down that "demand" or "desire" is a necessary condition for the grant of self-rule. It is not a universally accepted principle that representative government should not or cannot advantageously be granted to a people without a demand for it on their part. The Japanese got it from their monarch when there was no demand for it on their part. Regarding

Japan Lala Lajpat Rai wrote in the *Modern Review* (Nov., 1915, p. 552).

> She is an object lesson to those who deprecate the granting of constitutions by sovereigns without agitation, without pressure from the people. She is an example and a successful example of how a Government can educate a people in democratic methods by the grant of democratic institutions.

It cannot also, in fact, be shown from the history of England that before each forward step in self-rule which she has taken from time to time "the great majority of the people desired it." Even in the case of British India, the earliest civic rights were conferred on her people without any demand or desire for them on the part of any of them. For instance, we did not agitate for Clause 87 of the Charter Act of 1833, which declared,

> "That no native of the said territories nor any natural born subject of His Majesty resident therein, shall, by reason only of his religion, place of birth, descent, colour, or any of them, be disabled from holding any place, office, or employment under the Company."

The despatch of the Court of Directors which accompanied the Act of 1833 when it was forwarded to the East India Company, stated that "the meaning of the enactment we take to be that there shall be no governing caste in British India; that whatever other tests of qualification may be adopted, distinctions of race or religion shall not be of the number."

Self-rule should be understood to be to the body politic what food and medicine are to the human body; because, without self-rule the body politic

cannot remain healthy and attain its greatest possible strength and development, and because, without the remedy of self-rule, many maladies which beset and weaken a state cannot be cured. In a healthy condition the human body craves food ; but when in a diseased condition the craving is very weak or is non-existent, it has to be strengthened or roused by proper treatment. So, it cannot be said under all circumstances that food ought not to be given unless there is a demand ; you must sometimes create the demand. As regards medicine, there are many patients who not only do not ask for medicine but are very unwilling to take it. Still medicine has to be given for their benefit. It can be shown from history that self-rule is a medicine for the body politic. We shall give only one example. Referring to the decline of public spirit in the middle of the eighteenth century in England, Lecky says :

"The fault of the time was not so much the amount of vice as the defect of virtue, the general depression of motives, the unusual absence of unselfish and disinterested action."

The story of this decline of public spirit in England is quoted at length in part I. of "Towards Home Rule" (pp. 79-80). The remedy which Henry Fox proposed was, giving more power to the people, and when given, it proved a good cure. The grant of self-rule to Canada at Lord Durham's recommendation cured that colony of the political malady of repeated rebellions. We expect that in India self-rule will prove the most effective remedy for chronic malnutrition and physical degeneracy,

epidemics, famines, illiteracy and ignorance, and discontent and revolutionary tendencies.

It can never be a universal rule that unless there be a demand for a good thing, it should not be given. Do children demand to be educated and agitate for it before it is given to them? In all countries where compulsory free education has been introduced, was there everywhere a demand for it on the part of the people?

Of course, where there is a demand or a desire for a thing, the case for the necessity of supplying it becomes very much stronger. There is a demand and a desire for self-rule in India. But we have to make it so conspicuous and unmistakable, that its existence may not be ignored. One way to do it is to prepare a petition embodying our demands, and obtain the largest possible number of signatures to it, after explaining it to the intending signatories, as Mr. M. K. Gandhi has been doing in Gujarat.

SOME CONDITIONS OF SELF-RULE

We have persistently and earnestly maintained that we ought to have self-rule, Home Rule, or national autonomy *now*, though socially, morally, educationally, economically and physically we are not what we ought to be. We have advocated self-rule even in our present unsatisfactory condition, because self-rule is a primary human right, is natural,

and because there is no other means of national advancement. But for obtaining Home Rule we must make the most strenuous endeavour. We must be prepared to make the utmost sacrifices for it. And in order that we may be able to do so, we must not for a moment forget that we must have character.

Should our national character not be what it ought to be, even independence would not be of any use to us. For power would be grasped by designing, self-seeking persons, and the body politic would suffer in consequence. An independent country ruled by an autocrat or by a close oligarchy or bureaucracy, is not really a self-ruling country, though, no doubt, an indigenous oligarchy or bureancracy is better than a foreign one. True self-rule is synonymous with democraey. It can be beneficial and the best results can be obtained from it only if a people possess character and be public-spirited. Moreover, a characterless people can never remain self-ruling for any considerable period of time. Character, then, goes before self-rule, and must be its constant concomitant in order that it may be maintained and be beneficial. We do not say or suggest that our people have no virtues. What we mean is that we must develop to a far higher degree than we have yet done the qualities which enable men to make sacrifices for civic rights, to prefer honour to honours, not to stoop to flattery, to give up selfish ease for the public welfare and to keep to the path of integrity, rectitude and truth

inspite of temptations and apprehension of loss of wealth, liberty and life itself.

John Stuart Mill says in his *Representative Government*,

"A people may prefer a free government, but if, from indolence, or carelessness, or cowardice, or want of public spirit, they are unequal to the exertions necessary for preserving it ; if they will not fight for it when it is directly attacked ; if they can be deluded by the artifices used to cheat them out of it ; if by momentary discouragement, or temporary panic, or a fit of enthusiasm for for an individual, they can be induced to lay their liberties at the feet even of a great man, or trust him with powers which enable him to subvert their institutions ; in all these cases they are more or less unfit for liberty : and, though it may be for their good to have had it even for a short time, they are unlikely long to enjoy it."

Another condition for the maintenance of self-rule and the continuous increase of the capacity for managing our own affairs, is that we must be truly democratic in our social relations, too. We tell the British rulers of India that they cannot advocate and apply one set of principles in Europe and another in India. Must we not similarly say to ourselves that we ought not to profess one set of principles in politics without sincerely and earnestly advocating their application in the sphere of our social relations, too ? An upholder of hereditary social inequality, social exclusiveness and touch-me-not-ism is not and can never be a true Home Ruler. The door of opportunity should be equally open to all in everything. That and that alone is true democracy.

PARTY STRIFE AND SELF-RULE.

Some objections against Indian self-government have been based on the existence of party strife in our midst. These have no great validity, as there is no self-ruling country without political parties and more violent party strife than we have here. In our present condition, however, we dislike and condemn party dissensions, because they stand in the way of a united effort to win civic rights.

One particular objection of our opponents we wish to meet. It has been said that as, on the whole, the Indian members of the legislative councils form a standing opposition, if Government be defeated by them, who will carry on the work of administration? This objection presupposes that things are to remain just as they are now even when India obtains complete self-government. But that is not the case. In a self-ruling India, the position of the Viceroy and the Governors would probably be like that of similar functionaries in the self-ruling Dominions. And there is enough of political capacity in India and sufficient difference of opinion on many matters of detail to make it practicable for one party to form a government when another has gone out of power. So the existence of parties among us is really in one sense one of our qualifications for self-government. The system of party government has

its faults, and they are great. Partisanship and factiousness are maladies from which parties suffer. But there may be healthy party activity free from the taint of partisanship and factiousness. All nations which wish to advance should have in their midst, as Mill says, "the antagonism of influences which is the only security for progress."

PROGRESS AND FREEDOM ALL ROUND

We want freedom and progress in all directions, religious, social, political, educational, industrial, &c. We want freedom and autonomy for the human soul in all spheres of human thought and activity. Those who would defer our attainment of political freedom till we have achieved social, economic or any other kind of freedom, have to show, *first*, how political dependence can create a more favourable environment for social or other kind of freedom than political self-rule, *secondly*, how political self-rule would be more detrimental to the cause of social or other kind of freedom than political tutelage, and *thirdly*, how without political power it would be easy to make educational, social, economic, or any other kind of progress. This our opponents have not done, and, we think, cannot do. Any kind of freedom or progress makes for every other kind of progress or freedom.

WOULD HOME RULE INCREASE SOCIAL TYRANNY ?

Some persons argue that Home Rule would increase social tyranny over the "depressed" castes. We do not think it would. Whatever it may mean in some particular areas, taking India as a whole, Home Rule would not mean the rule of any particular tyrannical caste, but that of the elect of the Hindus, Musalmans, Christians, Sikhs, Buddhists, Parsis, Jainas, &c., and a majority of such men, many of them belonging to sects favouring social democracy, would not be likely to favour or connive at any kind of tyranny, social or of any other description. Those who profess to admire Anglo-Indian dominance cannot deny that various kinds of social tyranny exist inspite of this dominance, because it is beyond its power to check, and that there are many kinds of suppression and highhandedness which are directly or indirectly due to this dominance. Moreover, as Home Rule does not mean independence, it would not mean the disappearance of the influence of British rule, British traditions, and British literature in so far as they tend to curb and destroy social tyranny.

Examples from Indian States.

There is a passage in Mr. V. P. Madhava Rao's presidential address at the Madras Provincial

Conference, 1917, which has its lesson for those who say that in India under Home Rule political power and office would be a monopoly of the Brahmins or any other section of the Indian community. It is quoted in "Towards Home Rule," part I, page 141. It shows that in Travancore, the most caste-ridden State in India, an appreciable number of "untouchable" men has been elected members of the Popular Assembly. There is no reason to suppose that British India under Home Rule would be under worse social conditions than any Indian State.

In British India nothing remarkable has been done specially for the benefit of the depressed or untouchable classes. But in some Indian States, Baroda, for example, special attention has been paid to their needs. In that State the *Antyaja* or depressed classes number 1,74,289. In 1915-16 there were 252 separate schools for *Antyaja* children. Of these 247 were for boys and 5 for girls. The told number of children attending these schools was 11,224 (10,872 boys and 352 girls). Besides these, 7,131 children of the *Antyaja* classes were receiving their education in other primary schools. Thus the total number of *Antyaja* children at school was 18,335, or more than 10 per cent. of their population. Can British India show anything like this ? School requisites and books are given free by the Baroda Government to these children (and, of course, they do not have to pay any tuition fee), and scholarships of an aggregate amount of Rs. 122 per mensem were awarded in the principal *Antyaja* schools

to students in higher standards. Eight scholarships of Rs. 5 each were given to students studying in the 4th, 5th and 6tn Standard classes of the Baroda High School. In the Training College, along with high class Hindus, 15 *Antyaja* scholars received training as a preparation for teachership in *Antyaja* schools. The *Antyajas* Hostel at Baroda accommodated 42 children (34 boys ahd 8 girls), while the one at Pattan had 27. There are, besides, special boarding schools for forest tribes. The Garoda School is a unique institution, founded with a view to teaching Sanskrit to the sons of the Garoda or priestly class of the *Antyajas* and initiate them into the proper performance of religious rites and ceremonies.

We learn from the address of the Dewan to the Mysore Representative Assembly, delivered on the 26th October, 1917, that in Mysore "a sum of one lakh of rupees has been sanctioned for the grant of scholarships to pupils belonging to backward and depressed communities, chiefly to encourage them to take to higher education." How much, if anything, is spent in the British provinces for this purpose ?

Some people think or pretend to think that under Home Rule conditions, Musalmans would suffer in provinces or areas with a preponderating Hindu population. A home-ruled British province is not likely to be worse governed than the advanced Native States. Let us, therefore, see how Musalmans fare as regards education, for instance, in Mysore of which over 92 percent of the population

is Hindu. In the Dewan's latest address, we find the following paragraph :—

"The number of institutions for Mahomedans increased from 530 in 1915-16 to 701 in 1916-17. *Higher rates of pay were sanctioned for teachers in Mahomedan schools* at an extra cost of Rs. 6,740 per annum, in order to attract qualified members of the Mahomedan community to the teaching profession. A training school for mistresses of Hindustani schools has been opened at Mysore."

It is stated in the latest Report on the Administration of Travancore, a Hindu State, for the year 1915-16 A. D., that there was an appreciable increase in the number of pupils of all the backward classes except Marakkans and Chakkalas. "During the last 5 years the number of these backward classes attending schools rose from 8,468 to 29,295, or *has nearly quadrupled itself during the past quinquennium.* The chief classes that have contributed to the increase are the Pulayas [an "untouchable" caste], the Parayas [another "untouchable" caste] and the Mahomedans." Have the British bureaucrats in British India done greater things for the backward classes ? The latest address of the Dewan of Travancore to the Sri Mulam Popular Assembly states :

Mahomedan education continued to receive special attention. As a result of the representations made in this Assembly, the Government have approved on principle the suggestion that the Mahomedans should not be grouped with the depressed classes in regard to the establishment of special schools, all that is necessary being the appointment of Arabic Munshis in the schools

largely attended by Mahomedans. Government, nevertheless, will have no objection to open special schools, if they are found to be absolutely necessary in specific localities. Government have also promised the appointment of a separate Mahomedan Inspector. It is proposed to open a secondary school for this community at Alleppey. The policy of throwing open schools to depressed classes was vigorously pursued, with the result that the children of these classes now receive instruction in as many as 250 elementary schools for boys. The number of Malayala Brahmins under instruction rose from 1,145 to 1,384. Since the close of the year, half-fee concession under the Code has been extended to Jews and Kuravas.

Some men who are or profess to be social reformers are opposed to the Home Rule or self-rule movement. They have no doubt noted that Indore has a Civil Marriage Act which is in some respects superior to Act III of 1872 of British India : also that the Baroda Caste Usages Bill, directed against social tyranny, cannot be matched in British India. Orthodox Hindus do not like such social legislation ; but those of them who oppose Home Rule do not do so on the alleged ground that it would favour social tyranny. Of course, all Indian States are not like Baroda, Mysore, Travancore, or Indore ; but our illustrations are meant only to show that British India under Home Rule *may be* like some advanced Indian States, and, therefore, it need not necessarily be a social hell for the backward or other classes.

Facts in support of our position may be cited even from some States which are small and not much known. For instance, the junior Dewas State in Central India has a population of only 63,015.

In the Report of the working of the Panchayats in this state for the year 1914-15 we find it stated that the total number of village panchayats was 73 and that of the *Panchas* or village elders, 531. Of these men 186 were Rajputs, 45 Mahajans, 19 Jats, 7 Kumawats, 3 Kalas, 1 Blacksmith, 3 Sonars, 1 Teli, 42 Kulmis, 8 Nandwanas, 4 Malis, 1 Dhobi, 3 Gowlis, 24 Musalmans, 32 Khatis, 12 Rawats, 4 Bohoras, 8 Anjanas, 3 Purbhias, 2 Bhats, 1 Kumar, 1 Kosta, 48 Brahmins, 44 Gujars, 1 Kir, 4 Minas, 3 Naiks, 1 Pinjara, 7 Gadris, 3 Sutars, 3 Kaseras and 2 Balais. "It will thus be apparent that men from all castes [including "untouchables"] and classes have secured a place on the Panchayat Board."

The following comments of the *Indian Social Reformer* on the subject of caste under British rule are apposite :

The weakening of caste under British rule is the result, not of the direct action of Government, but of the greater political freedom which the people enjoy under that rule. So far as the direct action of the British Government is concerned, its effect, as Sir Henry Maine pointed out many years ago, was rather to strengthen and extend Brahmanical influence in the country. He refers to the curious circumstance that the influence of Brahmanical theories upon law had been rather increased than otherwise by the British dominion. He points out how the Judges of the Sudder Courts who were first set to administer Indian Law "acted as if they believed in it more than did the native inhabitants." And he says, "there is in truth but little doubt that, until education began to cause the natives of India to absorb Western ideas for themselves, the influence of the English rather retarded than hastened the mental development of the race," He further adds that "the English dominion of India at first placed

the natives of the country under a less advanced regimen of law than if they had been left to themselves." These passages and others of the same tenour occur in the first two lectures in Maine's "Village Communities of the East and West."

SOME OF LORD SYDENHAM'S DICTA

Lord Sydenham says, widespread alarm has been caused among thoughtful Indians by demands of Indian Maximalists involving assumption of all political power by a little oligarchy. The problem for us is firstly to break up the most highly centralised system of Government that ever existed. Secondly, to ensure that the real not sectional opinion shall have full expression and that we shall not be deprived of the counsels of Indians who are working to build up the country and promote social changes which alone can make nationhood possible. The weakening of the British in India would lead to most disastrous anarchy. We cannot divest ourselves of our duty or responsibility towards the vast masses of India whose welfare must be our only object. If the realities of the situation are ignored or misunderstood dangers are certain.—*Reuter.*

Who are these "thoughtful Indians" of Lord Sydenham? Does this old fogey mean to say that Dadabhai Naoroji, who originated the idea of Indian Home Rule and was a staunch Home Ruler to his dying day, was not a thoughtful Indian? It would be sheer impudence even to suggest this. Let Lord Sydenham name his "thoughtful Indians", and we undertake to name a far larger number of far more thoughtful Indians who are in favour of Indian self-

rule, including some men who are known and respected throughout the civilised world for their worth and work. We do not say that those Indians who are not in favour of self-rule are not thoughtful. They may be, and many of them are. What we contend is that they are not the only thoughtful men in the country; nor are they the most thoughtful, or the majority of thoughtful Indians. The lord calls us Maximalists! As if abuse were any argument. He speaks of the assumption of *all* political power by a little oligarchy. As Home Rule is not independence, the winning of Home Rule would not mean the assumption of *all* political power by Indians. Nor is it true that Home Rule would mean the monopoly of power by a small exclusive group of men; it would mean the management of the affairs of the country by capable men drawn from the different races, sects and castes inhabiting India. And with the progress of education (which Home Rule is sure to accelerate and ensure) even the most backward communities must come to participate in the control of affairs. This gradual equalising of the distribution of power is still in progress even in England. But supposing what the lord says is a true prophecy let us examine the present state of things and compare it with Lord Sydenham's forecast. At present the Anglo-Indian (old style) bureaucracy are a real, close and exclusive oligarchy. Entrance into this charmed circle does not depend on character and capacity, but on race and complexion. And this

oligarchy consists of foreign birds of passage whose main interest in life lies in a distant country, to which they retire with their hoards and their experience. If this oligarchy were replaced by an Indian oligarchy, the latter would not be a close preserve for any particular race, sect or caste. Men belonging to any Indian community would be able to become members of this oligarchy by their capacity, character and public spirit. And the economic and moral gain would be immense. Salaries and pensions would for the most part remain and fructify in the country ; and the knowledge of affairs, mature judgment and experience of our public servants would still be of use to us after their retirement from public service. All this gain would accrue even on the supposition that Indian Home Rule would mean an Indian oligarchy, which would be preferable to the present foreign oligarchy. But, as we have said and shown above, it would not mean an oligarchy. The Indian oligarchy may possibly bungle ; but their bungling would not create a worse hell than that produced in Mesopotamia by the foreign officials. Lord Sydenham tries to frighten his countrymen and possibly gullible Indians also with the prospect of an Indian oligarchy ; but it does not frighten us. Does he not know that sagacious patriots in all countries, if offered a choice between a foreign and an indigenous oligarchy, would at once choose the latter ? Why, if they were told to choose even between foreign despotism and indigenous despotism, they would vote for the latter. Lord

Sydenham perhaps knows the poem in which Byron's feelings find expression in some such words as "their tyrants then were their own countrymen." The reason for this preference does not lie in the greater sweetness or bearability of native despotism. It lies in the fact that indigenous despotism is an obstacle to progress easier to "negotiate" than foreign despotism. Look at the history of Japan, China and Russia for proof. It is certain that if Japan, China and Russia were under a foreign Western despotism, they would not have had constitutional government so early as they have.

What is the "real" opinion as opposed to the "sectional," and how does Lord Sydenham propose to get it? In a preponderatingly illiterate country without the franchise the opinion of the majority of educated men must be considered the real opinion; and even in countries which are almost universally literate and enjoy the franchise, the opinion of the party in power is at best a sectional opinion. Something like the real opinion might be attempted to be obtained if there were universal suffrage. Let Lord Sydenham work for universal suffrage in India and then talk of the real opinion. Under present circumstances to try to disparage the opinion of the majority of articulate educated men as being sectional and not real is merely to play with words. It is humbuggism and quackery, not statesmanship.

Lord Sydenham insinuates that *all* or *most* advocates of "social changes which alone can make nationhood possible" or, in other words, social re-

formers, are not in favour of the measure of reform demanded in the joint note prepared by the Congress and the Moslem League. That is not so. Among the adherents and workers of the Congress and the Moslem League there is a large number of earnest and practical social reformers. There is no opposition or incompatibility between political and social freedom and progress, rather the two are interdependent. If any social reformer thinks there is such opposition. his intelligence and knowledge of social dynamics and development cannot be praised.

"The weakening of the British in India would lead to most disastrous anarchy." Is there disastrous anarchy in the Indian States ? A self-ruling India within the British Empire cannot be in a worse condition than these States. And should there be such disastrous anarchy, Britishers need not pity us: we must be prepared to take the risk. No "earthly providence" can or ought for ever to ward off disaster from the heads of the incapable. They ought to be prepared to be wiped off the face of the earth. In reality it is not pity for us which keeps the British autocrats and exploiters here, but self-interest.

British bureaucrats always talk as if they alone were responsible for the welfare of the masses. The real fact is, it is the people of India who are mainly responsible for their own welfare. True, the educated *classes* are not the whole of the people, but they are at least a part of the people, which the British birds of passage in India are not. Official and non-official Britishers have, there-

fore, no right to prevent even a part of the people from assuming responsibility for the welfare of the entire mass of the population of India; rather is it the duty of England to bring home to us this responsibility and call upon us to shoulder it. This talk of responsibility on the part of the bureaucrats is merely a mask for keeping intact the monopoly of power and pelf. The welfare of the masses of India has never been the only or even the main object of the officials. If it were, there would not have been the appalling mass of ignorance, disease and starvation or semi-starvation that there is in India. As, however, Lord Sydenham says that it "must be our only object", may we expect his official and non-official countrymen here to take the hint?

MR. MONTAGU'S ANNOUNCEMENT.

A *Gazette of India* Extraordinary issued at Simla on August 20, published the following notification :—

The following announcement is being made this day by the Secretary of State for India in the House of Commons and is published for general information :—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

The policy of His Majesty's Government with which the Government of India are in complete accord is that of increasing

the association of Indians in every branch of administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible Government in India as an integral part of the British Empire. They have decided that substantial steps in this direction should be taken as soon as possible, and that it is of the highest importance as a preliminary to considering what these steps should be, that there should be a free and informal exchange of opinion between those in authority at home and in India. His Majesty's Government have accordingly decided with His Majesty's approval that I should accept the Viceroy's invitation to proceed to India to discuss these matters with the Viceroy and the Government of India, to consider with the Viceroy the views of Local Governments and to receive with him the suggestions of representative bodies and others. I would add that progress in this policy can only be achieved by successive stages. The British Government and the Government of India on whom the responsibility lies for the welfare and the advancement of the Indian peoples must be the judges of the time and the measure of each advance and they must be guided by the co-operation received from those upon whom now the opportunities of service will thus be conferred, and by the extent to which it is found that confidence could be reposed in their sense of responsibility. Ample opportunity will be afforded for the public discussion of the proposals which will be submitted in due course to the Parliament.

(Sd.) J. H. DUBOULAY,
Secretary to the Government of India.

This announcement has made us neither optimistic nor pessimistic. We have never indulged in prophecy, never based any hopes on official proclamations, promises or pronouncements, and we do not see any reason to depart from our usual practice on the present occasion.

The announcement has the usual ring of bureaucratic pronouncements in India. "Increasing the

association of Indians in every branch of administration;" "the gradual development of self-governing institutions;" "progress.....by successive stages;" "the responsibility.....for the welfare.....of the Indian peoples" lying on the British Government and the Government of India, that is, on the bureaucracy; these are all old familiar phrases in a new setting. They are beautifully vague; they may mean much or mean little. Increasing the association of Indians in every branch of administration may mean only a few more high posts conferred on Indians. But we do not want merely offices or influence, we want, above all, political power to control public affairs and shape our own destiny. The gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible Government, may mean such development in the course of a year, five years, a decade, fifteen years, a generation, a century, five centuries, or a millenium. It is, therefore, risky to criticise these words. For if one objects to gradual progress, the reply may be, "Surely you don't want Home Rule in a second." The Filipinos have got responsible government within less than two decades of the American occupation; after a century and a half of British rule we are treated to vague phrases like gradual progress, progress by stages, &c. If the present war had not taken place now, but two centuries hence, and if the present form of government had lasted till then, these very phrases, we are sure, would have done duty in that remote future.

Poland has been subjected to foreign rule (German, Austrian and Russian), not so enlightened, Englishmen have told us, as their own in India, and therefore, it is the duty of all loyal Indians to believe that the Poles have had less training in self-government than the Indian subjects of his British Majesty; yet British statesmen have declared that an independent Poland is included in the peace terms of the Allies. Independence at once after the war for Poland; for us gradual progress by undefined stages, and that, too, to depend on our good behaviour *at every stage*, to be judged by those to whom self-rule for India must mean loss of power, prestige and pelf.

The reader will note that the sentiment embodied in the sentence which says that the reponsibility for the welfare of the Indian people lies with the British Government and the Government of India is in substance the same with that expressed by Lord Sydenham, on which we have commented before. For, so far as India is concerned, the British Government means neither the Crown nor Parliament, but the Secretary of State and his Council, the latter consisting of retired sun-dried Anglo-Indian bureaucrats, and the Government of India means practically the bureaucrats of the Civil Service. In theory the Secretary of State is responsible to Parliament, but that is merely in theory; even the farce of an Indian Budget Debate has not been acted for three years in the House of Commons!

It is not Poland alone which is to have independence or at least autonomy, immediately after the

war, but Ireland is to have Home Rule, during the war, *not* as soon as the British Government and the Government of Ireland decide that they should have it, but as soon as the *people* of Ireland have agreed upon the form which Home Rule should take in their country.

On the occasion of receiving the freedom of the city of Glasgow Mr. Lloyd George, the Premier, in the course of his speech, referring to the fate of the German colonies, said that "*their peoples' desires and wishes must be the dominant factor.*" Is it necessary for a people or peoples to be natives or inhabitants of quondam German colonies in order that their desires and wishes may be the dominant factor in the determination of their fate? We had always been taught to believe that British subjects, even of a dark complexion and living in a dependency, had greater rights than the subjects of any other Western power.

In the course of his great speech before the American Luncheon Club in London Mr. Lloyd George said;

"There are times in history when this world spins so leisurely along its destined course that it seems for centuries to be at a standstill. There are also times when it rushes along at a giddy pace covering the track of centuries in a year. These are such times. Six weeks ago Russia was an autocracy. She is now one of the most advanced democracies in the world." (Cheers).

It seems, however, that so far as India is concerned, the world must spin leisurely along even in these exceptional times.

It is said that Government "have decided that

substantial steps in this direction [viz., the progressive realization of responsible Government in India] should be taken as soon as possible, and that it is of the highest importance as a preliminary to considering what these steps should be that their should be a free and informal exchange of opinion between those in authority at home and in India." Let us wait and see what these "substantial steps" are going to be and when they are to be taken.

But it must not be mere waiting. We too have our duty to perform, and we must do it.

Our Duty.

Our duty is to determine what minimum measure of self-rule we want as a first step towards full responsible government, and when this first step should be taken. The scheme prepared jointly by the National Congress and the Moslem League embodies a minimum measure of self-rule, and they have decided that the first step should be taken immediately after the war.

We must firmly stick to at least this much, and we must ask Government to definitely fix the date on which India is to have responsible government. A great world-war like the present one (with its Mesopotamia muddle, too,) ought not to be expected to break out at each stage fixed by the bureaucracy to force their hands.

"Purna-Bhandis" (पूर्णभाण्डी).

There is a class of Sannyasis in Benares known as "Purna-Bhandis" or "Full-Bowlers" whose

method of collecting alms differs from the usual one. They do not fill their alms-bowls by accepting handfuls of flour or grain from many houses successively. They go about the lanes and streets, saying, वही लेंगे, वहीलेंगे, *Wahi lenge, Wahi lenge*, "I will take only that," "I will take only that," meaning that they will accept not less than a bowlful. And when some house-holder has filled the bowl, the Purna-Bhandi departs saying, वही लिया, *Wahi liya*, "I have taken not less than that."

This is not the place to discuss the term "political mendicancy." We may or may not be beggars. But we must be Purna-bhandis. Our two most representative bodies, the National Congress and the Moslem League, have determined the size and capacity of our bowls. That it is not a big vessel, is a sufficient compromise. We must not suggest or think of any further compromise, though variations in details may be suggested; those who are constantly thinking of compromises and of reducing even their moderate demands, have no faith in the justice of their cause. Our cry must be, *Wahi lenge*, *Wahi lenge*, and when our demands have been met, we shall say, *Wahi liya*.

Our motto then is

WAHI LENGE.

"IMMODERATE" AND "MODERATE."

There are some people who think that if our demands appeared immoderate to the bureaucracy, they would give us nothing. It is an extremely

foolish idea. Have the Irish "moderated" their demands a jot ? Let us satisfy *ourselves* as to what is just and moderate, and then stick to it. It is a sign of a slavish mind to seek to determine the measure of one's demands according to the conjectured size of the crumb which the officials may be disposed to throw at us. We must have the courage to believe what is really true, viz., that what we are asking for is much less than what we deserve.

BRITISH CAPITAL AND THE "BRITISH CHARACTER" OF THE ADMINISTRATION.

At a recent sitting of the Imperial Council,

Proceeding to discuss the points that should be remembered when considering the number of Indians who should be taken into the Civil Service, Sir William Vincent said the British character of the administration should be maintained. This factor need not play the determining part but could not be lost sight of so long as India was an integral part of the Empire. British interests had to be secured. He did not in the least suggest that the presence of a large number of Indians would necessarily prejudice them, but what he submitted was that unlike in countries like Japan and China British capital had been sunk in India on the distinct understanding that administration in India would be British in character, though not in personnel.

Europeans contend that "the British character of the Administration" should be maintained in India.

We contend that the character of the administration is now *un-British*; it should be first made British, and then that character may be maintained. Dadabhai Naoroji spoke long ago of *Un-British Rule in India*. Let us have the *British* thing first, and then the question of its preservation may be raised. In the United Kingdom, the people's representatives are supreme and control the salaried officials, who are servants of the public. Here the people have no proper representation, no control over public affairs, and the salaried officials are the masters of the public. Therefore, the system here is *un*-British; it ought to be made *British*.

When Sir William Vincent said that "administration in India would be British in character though not in personnel," did he mean to imply that "the British character of the administration" could be maintained even by good and able Indian public servants? Why then insist on a practically permanent minimum of British officers, which is really a very big maximum? Why not strictly adhere to the righteous declaration made long ago that there is to be no governing caste in India?

What is meant by the British character of the administration? The democratic constitution, methods and procedure which obtain in Great Britain have not yet been followed in India; the people are not supreme here in India as they are in Great Britain. Therefore, "the British character of the administration" in India does not mean a democratised administration as in the British Isles;

it can mean only one of two things : (1) that the administration is to be carried on mainly by British officials, or, in other words, that the personnel, at least in the higher controlling offices, is to be mainly and preponderantly British ; (2) that the administration is to be as progressive, just and efficient as it is in the British Isles. Sir William Vincent admits that the British character of the administration is not synonymous with the employment of British agency. Therefore, it can and ought to mean only a progressive, just and efficient administration. Now, as administrations of this character exist in other countries besides England, and as those countries do not employ British officers, it must be admitted that men who are not of British descent have made and can make good and successful administrators. There have been and are many progressive, just and efficient Indian administrators.

We will mention a few facts here. During the Swadeshi agitation, among the most tranquil districts in Bengal were those which were under Indian Magistrates. During the Muharrum celebrations in October, 1917, Bhagalpur was the only district in Behar and Orissa which was under an Indian Magistrate (Mr. B. C. Sen), and there the greatest cordiality prevailed between Hindus and Musalmans. In Patna District the two highest police officers in charge, on the same occasion, were Indians (Mssrs. A. K. Sinha and S. Khuda Bukhsh), and cordial relations prevailed there between Musalmans and and Hindus. In Chittagong, on

the same occasion, imminent disturbances were prevented by tactful and firm handling by the Commissioner Mr. K. C. De. Before the late Mr. R. C. Dutt took charge of Backarganj, it was known as a notoriously criminal district; but during his administration there was a great decrease in crime. We say these things only to show that Indians also make capable officers, *not* to show that Europeans cannot, when they like, show similar tact. The Police and Criminal Justice Reports of the Panjab for 1916 show that there was in that year a noticeable decrease in the recorded crime of the Province and that this decline in the figures has not been reached since 1910. Sir M. O'Dwyer expresses satisfaction at the decline. *The Panjabee* has brought out a significant lesson from the Reports :—

Owing to War conditions—loan of officers to the military authorities, etc.—it would appear that there has been a substantial diminution in the number of European gazetted officers in the department, with the result that the Imperial Police Force is now 31 strong in the Panjab as against the sanctioned strength of 78; and this, in addition to the fact that 36 non-gazetted European officers have also been detained for military service, only strengthens the Indian demand for a real, substantial share in the positions of trust and responsibility in the Public Services —even in the Police Department. Why then should the theory of British "tone" and "efficiency" be dangled before our eyes by Anglo-India and its friends? The Public Services Commissioners, who have been captured by Anglo-India, have been particularly overcautious and retrograde in their recommendations, and have insisted on the theory of "British preponderance," being maintained and practised in this country. We hope the Punjab Report will convey its lessons to all our "friends."—Summarised from the *Panjabee* by "The Commonweal."

There is nothing, therefore, which can weaken our firm conviction that administration can in future be progressive, just and efficient even if the personnel be entirely Indian. The administration in the British Isles has not throughout their recorded history been progressive, uncorrupt and efficient. There is sometimes great inefficiency and corruption even now. The present usually high standard has been reached after effort. There is nothing in the British blood which makes for efficiency; if there were, administration by British men would have been efficient in their own country and in all other lands in all ages. But it has not been so. The high level reached by the Britisher is the result of effort. Many Indians have already reached that standard of efficiency, integrity and progressiveness and more can do so as opportunity offers.

Apart from integrity, progressiveness and efficiency, if the administration in self-ruling India is to have any special racial character, it cannot but be *Indian*. The whole might of the British Empire can not make it otherwise.

Sir William Vincent has said that "British capital had been sunk in India on the distinct understanding that administration in India would be British in character though not in personnel." The saving clause "though not in personnel" is probably his; most Europeans out here would omit it and say that the British character of the administration could not be maintained in India without a majority of British higher officials, and Sir William, too, would

insist on a permanent big proportion of British officials being kept up. Hence it is necessary to enquire who gave "the distinct understanding" to British capitalists "that administration in India would be British in character," and when it was given and by what statute or royal proclamation. Some Member of Council ought to ask these questions. For if any such understanding has really been given, we may be able to gather from the words used what is actually meant by the British character of the administration. We do not know of any such understanding having been given by any person or persons in authority in his or their official capacity.

We believe no Englishman, from the greatest to the least, has any right to enter into any understanding which in the least goes against our interests, directly or indirectly. No such understanding can be valid as against our natural rights.

Sir William Vincent said that "British interests had to be secured." True, but not to the detriment of Indian interests. Indian interests are the first consideration here, as British interests are in England. If for safeguarding our interests those of Englishmen in India have to suffer to some extent, that is inevitable. British interests in India are mainly material, ours are both material and moral. We have not the least desire to injure British interests; we recognise the work done by the British people in India, though they have got ample remuneration for it. We are also convinced that the legitimate interests of British capitalists in India

will not be injured by Home Rule. But in every country, the health, prosperity, and enlightenment of its inhabitants have the first claim on the attention of its government. If in the endeavour to secure these the material interests of Britishers in India could not be fully attended to, nobody would be to blame for it.

SIR HUGH BRAY'S SPEECH

The main position taken up in Sir Hugh Bray's speech in the Imperial Council in connection with Mr. B. N. Sarma's resolution about the recommendations of the Public Services Commission, is not at all new. He said :

We demand then, a continuance of those guarantees, a continuance that means either a retention of such a measure of control by the British Government as will safeguard those interests, or such representation of those interests in any new form of Government as will ensure their protection.

He made his position clearer by saying : "we demand.....that *we* be given satisfactory assurances that the interests we represent will be safeguarded."

Mr. Sastri asked how they could say beforehand whether or not law and order would be maintained when Indians were employed on a large scale.

Sir Hugh Bray : "Our Indian friends mention that they are now fit to assume very much greater responsibility than they

have had up to now and as far as we know they may be, but, with some exceptions, they have not given proof of it. Their natural reply is, how can we prove it without trying ? One cannot learn to swim on dry land. We reply that is so, but as the cost of the experiment if it fails will fall largely on us we must have some guarantees. I can only see two forms of guarantee that could be considered satisfactory, either that a sufficient measure of control be retained by the British Government, or that the very large and important interests of the mercantile community and those who have invested money in this country be given adequate representation in the body or bodies that will have the power."

It is not true that "the cost of the experiment if it fails" will fall more largely on Anglo-Indians (old style) than on Indians, as Sir Hugh Bray suggests but does not say. Taking even the material interests alone of the two parties into consideration, the total wealth of the millions of poor Indians cannot but he reckoned to be greater than the wealth of the hundreds of rich Anglo-Indians. But supposing the material stake in the country of the latter is greater than that of the former, which is, we repeat, not true, is there in the British Empire any form of representative government which gives more votes or more representatives to wealthier men than to the less well-to-do ?

Anglo-Indian capitalists attach great importance only to their capital. But our health, morals, knowledge, life, liberty, these are far more valuable than their material wealth. There is no inevitable or innate antagonism between these two classes of interests. We find that without self-rule we cannot be as healthy and as enlightened as we ought to be ;

we are convinced that self-rule will help us to reduce the death-rate, it will give us more freedom to make progress in all directions, and help us to elevate and strengthen our characters. Should the worst apprehensions of Anglo-Indian capitalists, which we consider entirely unfounded, be realised by "the experiment" of Indian Home Rule failing, it would mean only the loss of part of their wealth and the transfer of the remainder to more promising fields of investment; but to Indians the failure would mean untold misery in all possible directions. If we be prepared to take the far greater risk, why, in the name of justice, freedom and democracy, for which the British people profess to be fighting,—why should not the western capitalists take the smaller risk?

Statesmen can act from two motives, either the sense of justice or considerations of expediency, or both. From the point of view of justice, self-government has been long overdue. Considerations of expediency have been growing more and more urgent day by day, as all students of the European and Asiatic situations know. The motive of expediency may make the sense of justice of British statesmen sufficiently keen to enable them to do their duty by India.

Sir Hugh said :—

We are of the people. Numerically we are, perhaps, weak, but our stake in the country is enormous. We and our predecessors have given ourselves and our money to the land, and without boasting I may claim that we are directly reponsible in no small degree for its development and increasing prosperity. The money and our lives have been given to this land on the under-

standing that law and order will be maintained and that we shall conduct our enterprise under secure and just conditions.

We should have been glad if Sir Hugh and his fellow capitalists were of the people. But they are not. They have not settled here, they do not build their permanent homes here, they do not educate their children here, they do not share the peoples' joys and sorrows, and they leave these shores as soon as they have made their piles. In saying, "we are of the people," Sir Hugh was guilty of the same sort of sophistry and "intellectual dishonesty" of which "Ditcher" in *Capital* accused Mr. Beatson-Bell for attempting to prove that Englishmen out here are not "birds of passage." Their stake in the country may be enormous, but our stake is immeasurably more enormous, even as calculated in rupees, annas and pies. Sir Hugh may have read Lord Acton's Letters. In one of these he says :—

"The men who pay wages ought not to be the political masters of those who earn them, for laws should be adapted to those who have the heaviest stake in the country, for whom misgovernment means not mortified pride or stinted luxury, but want and pain and degradation, and risk to their own lives and to their children's souls."

So it is we, poor Indians, who have the heaviest stake in the country, and we are entirely justified in demanding that laws should be adapted to us, in order that what is good for our lives and souls may come to pass. We are convinced that this will be good for British capitalists also. But if they think otherwise, they ought to try to convince us by reasoning. And in the last resort, they can take

away their capital from India. They should not, they cannot, stand in the way of our obtaining our just rights. We can manage to do without foreign capital until we are able to supply it ourselves, but it is unbearable death-in-life to us to be without the rights of freemen.

If the worst comes to the worst, India must be prepared to purchase all British concerns in India which were started without the consent of Indians and some of which have involved injustice to Indians.

Sir Hugh expressed regret

that our Indian friends should apparently take it for granted that we are opposed to their aims entirely. I must assume such to be the case because they make no reference to us. It does not occur to them to seek our aid. They ignore us entirely in their proposals. I can assure them that they are making a great mistake. We realise that changes are coming, that changes must come, and if we should seem desirous of checking at all the progress of events, it is not because we wish to prevent them but because we foresee the complications, the disaster even, that may arise from their premature birth.

We should indeed be glad to have the help of Sir Hugh and his fellow-capitalists in our endeavours to gain political rights. But we think his complaint was unjust. Has it been the case that he and his fellows have generally sided with us and given us their aid and counsel in our political or economic movements ? They have, on the contrary, generally opposed us. If they change their attitude towards us, we, too, shall change our attitude towards them. We have ignored them because they have all along worse than ignored us. Sir Hugh assured us :

We are ready and anxious to go forward hand in hand with our Indian fellow-subjects. For the advancement of this great country we will pull together either in double harness or in tandem as leader or wheeler, the wagon of India, but what we will not do is to follow hitched to the tail board, with no control over the pace, no power to check a too quick descent, left to pick up what feed we can by the way-side when halted, and called upon only to give an extra pull now and then to get the wagon out of the mire or up an extra steep ascent. That is a position, Sir, which we will not accept.

This desire for co-operation would be a blessing indeed, if it ever led to real co-operation without loss of self-respect on either side. It must be genuine co-operation, but not a subordinate position for us in the home of our ancestors, of ourselves, of our children and of our children's children. In the language of Sir Hugh Bray, "what we will not do is to follow hitched to the tail board;" "that is a position, Sir, which we will not accept." We may be kept in an inferior position by force, but we will never be a consenting party to it. For preventing the disintegration of the British Empire, the willing co-operation of *all* provinces of India would, as time passes, be more and more an urgent necessity. On account of the increasing national self-consciousness of Indians and their growing sense of self-respect, such co-operation would not be possible unless India became a free partner in the Empire.

"WE HAVE COME TO STAY"

In the recent speech made by Mr. Beatson Bell in La Martiniere College, he tried to prove that the English are not birds of passage in India, and that they have come to stay in India. Let us take a passage from his speech.

We are sometimes told that we are birds of passage. We are not. We have come to India and we have come to stay. Whether as individuals or as families or as firms we have come to India to stay and to do our duty by India. When I hear people talk about birds of passage, I generally think of my own children, and I remember that their father, their grandfather and their great grandfather have already between them put in nearly one hundred years of work in India, and I naturally smile when I hear people talk of birds of passage. And when we look round on the tea gardens and jute mills, when we look round upon all the railways and all the steamers, and they are the freight and traffic of the British Empire, and what the British have done in India, we smile when we hear ourselves talked of as birds of passage. But why should we look at the jute mills and the tea gardens ? The real test as to whether we are or are not birds of passage is the fact that we have founded churches and schools. After all the characteristic of a bird of passage is that it does not build nests. But the British came to India and they have built their nests. Just as in olden days the Aryans came to India and founded temples and "tols," just as the Mohamedans came and founded mosques and madrasahs, so the British have come to India and have founded churches and schools and that is the outward and visible sign that the British have come here to stay. That is why I say, whether we are domiciled or whether we are not, we are all in the same boat and we have come to India

for ever. It matters not whether in the last few years of our lives we may go back to England to lay down our bones. The fact remains that India is and always will be our home."

The sophistry and "intellectual dishonesty" of this piece of so-called reasoning is astonishing. "Ditcher," who is an Englishman, has criticised the speech at some length in *Capital*. We select a few passages from it.

We know that in the domain of argumentation there is no fallacy of such frequent occurrence as that of confusing the point at issue in some way or other. In this case Mr. Beatson Bell not only employed a favourite device in supporting a weak case but was also guilty, unwittingly perhaps, of intellectual dishonesty. He was evidently answering the charge brought by Indian politicians against Britons "individually," of being mere birds of passage in India. And he set out deliberately to prove the wrong conclusion. I have never heard it disputed that the British Power has come to stay in India. What I have heard contended with much vehemence is that Britons who work in India and make their money here do not become settlers as in Canada, South Africa and Australia. They are surprisingly indifferent to almost everything native, and are therefore a source of weakness instead of strength in the policy of the country. The average educated Indian readily admits that the English Judge is just, the English Civil Servant is unbribable, faithful and efficient, the English Merchant fair and honest in his dealings ; but all are birds of passage, here today and gone to-morrow. They take no real interest in the political development of the country.

Mr. Beatson Bell did not answer this charge. He mistook the proposition he had to establish and resorted weakly to argumentum ad populum, argumentum ad ignorantiam, argumentum ad verecundiam, to prove, what nobody denied, that the British power has come to stay in India as long as it is let. It is a great pity that a man of his character and influence did not catch the occasion to preach a sermon to his fellow-countrymen on the need, in the present changing times, of departing from an attitude

of aloofness which has been hardened since the opening of the Suez Canal.

India has a long history. To this country came many foreigners as conquerors, including the ancestors of the present-day Aryan-Hindus. Their Powers had come to stay. But where are those Powers now? The Powers have not stayed, but the descendants of the persons who established those powers are still in India, not as a politically predominant governing caste, but merged with the people of the country. Similarly, some people of the United Kingdom may correctly say that they have come to India to stay, *if they settle in India*, as the Indo-Aryans, the Parsis, the Arabs, the Pathans, the Moghuls, &c., did; *not otherw* But as regards the permanence of political power, there is no instance in history of a foreign power,—either ruling from its home-land, as the ancient Roman or the modern German, British, &c., or settled in the conquered country, as the Pathan, Moghul or Manchu, —there is no instance in history, we say, of a foreign power permanently ruling a country. There is a probability of India forming a part of a federated British Empire for ages as a *perfectly equal partner*, but there is not the least probability of our country remaining for long a part of the British Empire *as a mere dependency* with its inhabitants governed as a subject race. *We* may not be sufficiently strong for our political enfranchisement, but world-forces are.

Of the English official "Ditcher" says:

He takes credit for his long service and dwells on his hereditary connection with India. Yet we know that he has not the slightest intention of remaining in India after he qualifies for pension or is superannuated, and we also know that he would be insulted if it were suggested that he should have his children trained and educated in the schools which have been established by the State or by Missionary enterprise. The official no more than the merchant becomes racy of the soil. Herein lies the danger to the European community in the political crisis through which we are passing.

"Ditcher" does not entertain a high opinion of the European Association, which has begun to agitate.

We have an European Association which claims to be thoroughly representative. Admitting the claim for the sake of argument, what is its policy ? It has none beyond defence against what it regards as native encroachment. There is not the slightest attempt at co-operation with any section of Indian reformers ; on the contrary, the whole tendency is to exaggerate the isolation of the Briton and crystallize that provincialism which makes him blind to all that is fine in Indian Society. The pity of it ! Instead of proving wrong conclusions, it were infinitely better if Britons in high places, official and non-official, were to look facts squarely in the face, draw the right conclusions, and act accordingly with courage, honesty and sympathy ; else the European community in India will not be able to give that co-operation for which Lord Chelmsford pleaded the other day, nor will it have the right to complain if Indians continue to regard it as a collection of birds of passage, foreign and predatory.

The Indian Daily News also writes :

The Ilbert Bill alienated the European and Indian communities for ever and dug a deep gulf between them. The bureaucracy has exploited that gulf for forty years for all it is worth, and are exploiting it to-day. The prosperity of European capital is much more likely to be secured by good relations with Indians than by bad ones. And that is why we have deprecated the recent agitations and recriminations.

Regarding the "nests" and schools and colleges referred to in the speech, "Ditcher" observes :—

The thoughtful Anglo-Indian who listened to or read Mr. Beatson Bell's speech at La Martiniere Commemoration must have smiled bitterly at the allusion to the nests the official Englishman helps to build in India but declines to allow his own offspring to inhabit. There is not a school or college for the Domiciled which the Covenanted Englishman deems good enough for his sons or daughters, no matter how efficiently the institution is staffed. The young of the bird of passage, if they have the misfortune to be born in India, must be sent to England as soon as possible to escape physical and spiritual deterioration. But the implied inferiority of schools in India does not stop here. It has further been decreed by the Bureaucracy that the higher grades of the public service shall be closed to boys educated in this country unless they go to England for extra training and finish. The non-official European community adopts in a large measure the same exclusiveness. To compare the schools established by the British in India with the "tols" of the Aryans and the Madrassahs of the Mahomedans is cool even for a bureaucrat.

MILL'S WORD OF CAUTION TO AGITATORS FOR SELF-RULE

We have said in a previous note that according to Mill, "to kindle a desire for" good political institutions "is a necessary part of the preparation." He then adds a word of caution :

"Those, however, who undertake such a task, need to be duly

impressed, not solely with the benefits of the institution or polity which they recommend, but also with the capacities, moral, intellectual, and active, required for working it; that they may avoid, if possible, stirring up a desire too much in advance of the capacity."

It is difficult to judge the capacity of a people until it has been put to the test. The leaders of India, however, have not demanded anything like independence, which might be considered too much in advance of our capacity; they have not demanded even complete autonomy now.

CAPITAL AND VOTES

The European community in India want in our future representative bodies much larger representation than their numbers would entitle them to, on the ground that they have made large investments of capital. The question, then, is, do they base their claim to political power on the ground of their investments alone, or do they base it on the ground of race also? If only on the former, would they advocate the principle of granting to wealthy communities a certain number of representatives according to the amount of capital invested by them in trade? "So many representatives per million or crore of rupees invested in trade,"—is that going to be the principle? In that case, consistency would

require that a millionaire should have many more votes than the man who owns only a few thousand rupees, and a multimillionaire very many more. Should the principle of excessive representation being given to investers of capital be accepted, what representation would be given to Parsis, Marwaris, Bhatias, and other wealthy trading communities ? How many votes per lakh or million of capital would the wealthy men of these communities have ? Where would the men with brains and culture come in ? Between a European professor in some College in India who has obtained the highest academic distinctions and has made scientific discoveries and a European trader who has inherited wealth but has not had much education, how would votes be apportioned ? Should English traders, however, want a disproportionately large representation on the ground of race, we should continue to be subjected to the political domination of both European officials and non-officials, as hitherto we have been. That would be quite in keeping with the principles of justice, freedom and democracy for which England is professedly fighting.

RACTICAL EUROPEAN MONOPOLY OF THE INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE

Why do Europeans want a practical monopoly of the I. C. S. ? Either because they want lucrative

careers for British lads, or because they think that it is indispensably necessary for the maintenance of law and order. Perhaps both these reasons influence them. They also probably think that with a majority of European officials, the non-official Europeans can have better facilities for exploitation. As for careers for lads, our sons' claims are superior, because we are the people of the country. The maintenance of law and order is more necessary for us than for the Europeans. Anarchy and disorder would mean utter ruin and death to us, for we have no other country to go to and live in than India. To them it would mean only some pecuniary loss and the transfer of their capital to some other part of the British Empire. All the world is open to them to live in. Under the circumstances, if we be prepared to allow our affairs to be managed by as great a proportion of Indian public servants as is possible to obtain, and thus be prepared to run greater risk than the Europeans, why should they raise such a hue and cry ? Surely, it is absurd for them to profess greater solicitude for the welfare of India and her "*dumb millions*" than ourselves who are their kith and kin ! By the by, these *dumb* millions *speak* regularly to Lord Sydenham, Sir Michael O'Dwyer, Sir Archie Birkmyre, Sir Hugh Bray and other intimate friends. The *dumb* millions never open their hearts to us who speak and understand their language. They speak to their foreign friends in some mysterious universal tongue which we do not understand.

Regarding trade and manufacturing facilities, it is to our interest to develop the resources of the country. In this we do not object to have the assistance of foreign capital on fair terms. But we can not agree to India being used merely as a milch-cow. We who belong to the soil, and will spend our earnings here, have the first claim to trade and manufacturing facilities, and have a just right to secure such a personnel of the administration as would ensure proper facilities *and encouragement* being given to us.

The I. C. S. is a costly service. It ought to be abolished, and men obtained by advertising in the open market. The next best thing is to keep it and hold a competitive examination only in India. The third best is simultaneous examination in India and England. The present method of recruitment is bad and unjust and the recommendations of the Public Services Commission would make it worse.

If Burma and the N. W. F. Province do not want and will not obey Indian civilians, as has been alleged by the Anglo-Indians but of which there is no proof forthcoming from unbiassed and untainted sources, let them, as now, continue to be ruled by Englishmen, military and civil; but why should they stand in the way of our getting indigenous administrators ?

"INDIA'S PROSPERITY DUE TO FOREIGN CAPITAL"

Most of the claims made by the speakers at the recent meeting of the European Association in Calcutta have been discussed above directly or incidentally. One contention is that India's prosperity is due to investment of foreign capital, and, therefore, the capitalists ought to have political power. But whose prosperity mainly is it ? Prosperity of the permanent dwellers in the land or of the sojourners ?

The foreign capitalists earn ample dividents. They want political power into the bargain ! Why should they have this twofold remuneration ?

We do not here discuss whether the investment of foreign capital has been an unmixed blessing to India or how much of this capital is really foreign. It can be shown that it is in great part derived from India in the last resort. Both in India and in England the British Government accommodate the exploiters with loans from Indian revenues at easy rates of interest through banks and in other ways. Indian merchants and industrialists do not generally receive such help and encouragement from Government.

THE BISHOP OF BOMBAY ON DEMOCRACY FOR INDIA

While the greatest of British and American statesmen have been telling the world that the present war is for the establishment of democracy throughout the world, while Mr. Lloyd George, the Premier, has declared that Indians are entitled to ask that they should be treated not as a subject race but as partners in the British Empire, the Bishop of Bombay has been trying to throw ice-cold water on the growing democratic aspirations of educated Indians. And in this attempt he was driven to such sore straits, that he was compelled to hold up to our admiration the example of Prussia. We refer to his recent lecture before the Deccan Sabha. "With all its faults the Government of Prussia for the last 150 years have proved how most effective a Government could be." And yet British statesmen have still been repeating for the thousandth time that the aim of the war is to destroy Prussianism! If Prussianism be so good a thing as the Bishop would make it out to be, why should it be destroyed? But if it be an accursed thing, why should an Anglican Bishop whose salary is paid by the Indian subjects of the British Government, be allowed to praise it publicly? What would have been the fate of an Indian speaker if he had praised Prussianism?

The Bishop said, "We must not expect to find it [democracy] a complete ideal." But is there any political ideal which is entirely free from defects ? This world is imperfect and its ideals, too, are imperfect. And among these imperfect ideals of government, "the ideally best form of government," in the opinion of Mill, "is representative government." Mr. A. J. Balfour has said : "We are convinced that there is only one form of government, whatever it may be called, namely, where the ultimate control is in the hands of the people."

Speaking about the desirability or otherwise of this ideal for India the lecturer asked two questions to Indians : (1) Are Indians by temperament or by conviction democratic and (2) is the democratic ideal suitable to India at this juncture ? Answering the first he said, the answer must be given by Indians, but so far as he had observed, it was not an accident that India had shown in the past no tendency towards democracy.

Can the Bishop prove that in all countries where now democracy prevails the people were all along democratic "by temperament and conviction "? If he knows history well, which we doubt, he will find that in every one of the countries where at present there are either constitutional monarchies or republics, there was at some period of their history or other absolute monarchy. The Bishop will find it stated even in a popular work of reference like *Chambers's Encyclopaedia* that "democracies have grown up in large states in which absolutism formerly prevailed." (Article "Democracy.") So even if we were not or are not democratic by temperament and conviction,

there is nothing to prevent us from being democratic in future.

As to whether it is really true, as the lecturer says, that "India had shown in the past *no* tendency towards democracy," we think it would not be proper for us to repeat here all the historical and other proofs and arguments which we have been printing for years past. The most important of these proofs and arguments are to be found in *Towards Home Rule*, parts I and II. Some time ago we presented the Bishop of Bombay with a copy each of the two parts of this book. If he has not thrown them away, we should ask him to read the following articles: part I—India and Democracy, Self-rule in Oriental Countries, the Popular Assembly in Ancient India, Notes on Self-rule in the East; part II, Public Administration in Ancient India, Municipal Institutions in Ancient India, Ancient Village Government in Southern India.

Speaking under correction as an outsider he suggested that the political counterpart of Mohamedanism was autocracy and that of Hinduism monarchy resting on oligarchy.

Instead of speaking under correction, the Bishop ought to have first acquired knowledge and then spoken. He would not have had to go to recondite sources of information. So far as Islam is concerned pages 128, 133, 134 of *Towards Home Rule*, part I, would have told him to what extent Muhammadanism is democratic even in politics. As regards Hindus, the articles named above would have given him useful information. We are not referring him to *our*

opinions, but to the opinions expressed and historical evidence collected by well-known orientalists. Europeans should first know our case before discouraging or opposing our aspirations. They have power in their hands now ; but they ought to know that this power depends partly on their moral and intellectual "prestige." But how long can this prestige last, if they speak and write like ignoramuses ?

Should anybody after reading the articles suggested by us say that after all the Hindus, Buddhists, Musalmans, and Sikhs had not developed perfectly democratic political institutions, we would ask him to bear in mind what the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (article "Democracy") says even with regard to ancient Greece and Rome, which are popularly believed to have been models of democracy : "Democracy in modern times is a very different thing from what it was in its best days in Greece and Rome."

Referring to the second question his lordship remarked, the democratic ideal implied that the whole people was capable of being interested in the questions of government. So far as the speaker could tell, the mass of the people in India were not interested and did not wish to be interested in political questions. They wished to be governed and not to govern, but they wished to be governed impartially, justly and consistently. They wished to have an equal chance in the law courts. They wished to be secured against petty oppression and fraud. A government which secured all these things to them would have their consent. In fact it would not be necessary to ask of them to give their consent in words.

In the democratic countries of the world, includ-

ing England, were the whole people capable of being interested in the questions of government when rudimentary democratic institutions (such as we are now demanding) were first established there? Are the whole people capable of being so interested even now? Even in modern England have not many voters to be directly and indirectly bribed in order to be induced to simply exercise the right of voting? In Australia, which is a democratic continent, have not electors sometimes to be punished in order to encourage them to exercise the franchise? The Bishop may satisfy himself on the point by reading the following extract from the *Christian Life* of London;—

> Forty electors in Australia have just been fined one shilling each and costs (with the option of three days' imprisonment) for neglecting to get their names on the Federal electoral roll. Those who cannot pay the fine must therefore go to jail for refusing to be politically enfranchised. It is queer that in a country boasting of its freedom the man who simply allows people who know more about the business than he does, to make its laws, should be punished as a criminal. Yet numbers of people are constantly being brought up for this offence.

How does the lecturer know that "the mass of the people in India were not interested and did not wish to be interested in political questions"? Has he ascertained this by a plebiscite? If not, why does he indulge in such a sweeping statement? The "dumb millions" of India are dumb, it would seem, only when their educated countrymen require their support; but they are not dumb when their voice has to be requisitioned by

their Anglo-Indian (old-style) friends to oppose the political claims or propaganda of their educated countrymen.

Let us take it for granted that "the mass of the people in India were not interested and did not wish to be interested in political questions." But should not an attempt be made to rouse their interest in political questions ? Suppose some one said to the prelate, "The mass of the people are not interested and did not wish to be interested in religious questions and in Christianity," would he allow the matter to rest there ? Would it not be his duty to rouse the people to take interest in religion, in Christianity ? It is our duty and our aim to make people interested in political questions. Mill says : "A people may be unprepared for good institutions ; but to kindle a desire for them is a necessary part of the preparation." (*Representative Government*, Chapter I.) It is our duty to kindle a desire for good political institutions.

"A government which secured all these things to them would have their consent." How does he know ? By telepathy ? By a plebiscite ? By talking *in their vernaculars* with at least one million of the illiterates in each province out of the hundreds of millions of Indians ?

The prelate shows that he has a very low ideal of human welfare, when he says with tacit approval that the people of India "wished to be governed, and not to govern," and that "it would not be necessary to ask of them to give their consent in words"

to the kind of government which agrees with his ideal. The highest human good does not consist simply in being secured by others against oppression and fraud or even in having plenty of good food, good clothing, good houses, &c., but it includes the power to secure oneself from fraud and oppression, it includes moral and mental welfare, the power of self-direction, &c. That form of government is the best under which every one can have the opportunity to rise to his full moral and intellectual stature and to develop the power of self-help and self-direction.

Two heads, as they said in England, were better than one, but it was equally true that one will was better than twenty. The British Government in India had slipped into a rough approximation to the rational system of government.

But what if that one will were perverse and should go wrong, as despots frequently do ? Is it not more probable that out of twenty wills, a majority should be more generally right, than that the one will should be generally right ? Mill observes : "For one despot who now and then reforms an abuse, there are ninety-nine who do nothing but create them." We are sorry we have no space to quote here the calm discussion of the despotic and bureaucratic forms of government in Chapter III of Mills' *Representative Government*, leading that eminent thinker to declare :

"There is no difficulty in showing that the ideally best form of government is that in which the sovereignty, or supreme controlling power in the last resort, is vested in the entire aggregate of the community ; every citizen not only having a voice n

the exercise of that ultimate sovereignty, but being, at least occasionally, called on to take an actual part in the government, by the personal discharge of some public function, local or general."

The extract given above will furnish a reply to the lecturer's opinion that the vesting of the supreme power of democratic states in an assembly, was by no means clearly "the best method of obtaining wisdom in legislation or in executive action."

Under despotic and bureaucratic governments, says Mill,

"The nation as a whole, and every individual composing it, are without any potential voice in their own destiny. They exercise no will in respect to their collective interests. All is decided for them by a will not their own, which it is legally a crime for them to disobey. What sort of human beings can be formed under such a regime? What development can either their thinking or their active faculties attain under it?.....Nor is it only in their intelligence that they suffer. Their moral capacities are equally stunted. Wherever the sphere of action of human beings is artificially circumscribed their sentiments are narrowed and dwarfed in the same proportion. The food of feeling is action: even domestic affection lives upon voluntary good offices. Let a person have nothing to do for his country, and he will not care for it. It has been said of old, that in a despotism there is at most but one patriot, the despot himself: and the saying rests on a just appreciation of the effects of absolute subjection, even to a good and wise master. Religion remains: and here at least, it may be thought, is an agency that may be relied on for lifting men's eyes and minds above the dust at their feet. But religion, even supposing it to escape perversion for the purposes of despotism, ceases in these circumstances to be a social concern, and narrows into a personal affair between an individual and his maker, in which the issue at stake is but his private salvation. Religion in this shape is quite consistent with the most selfish and contracted

egoism, and identifies the votary as little in feeling with the rest of his kind as sensuality itself." Mill's *Representative Government.*

If, as the lecturer said, "the British Government in India had slipped into a rough approximation to the rational system of government," why is India the poorest, unhealthiest, and most illiterate large country in the world ruled by a civilised nation? Why of all countries in the world ruled by civilised people, in India alone there has been plague for more than a decade, and why India alone among such countries is frequently visited by famines? Of course, Government alone are not to blame, we are also to blame. Why, again, if our Government is so rational, has there been such a strong condemnation of it by the Mesopotamia Commission?

In reply to the prelate's second question, namely, is the democratic ideal suitable to India at this juncture? we would ask him to read *Self-government for India under the British Flag*, by Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri (Servants of India Society, Allahabad), and the following articles in *Towards Home Ruie*, Part I: Home Rule for India, Contemporary India and America on the Eve of Separation from England, and Is Parliamentary Government Suited to India?

The lecturer has "appealed to the people of India to abhor imitations." His meaning is quite clear. He wishes us not to imitate but to abhor the democratic ideals, methods and institutions of the West. Is his appeal confined to the sphere of politics, or does it extend to the sphere of religious beliefs and

socio-religious matters as well ? Does he, a Christian clergyman, appeal to us to abhor the imitation of the religious ideals, methods, customs, rites, and institutions of the Christians of Western countries ? If he does, his profession becomes a puzzle. His occupation must be gone ; he should cease to be a minister of the Christian religion, and become merely a plain Anglo-Indian (old-style) politician. If he does not appeal to us to abhor the imitation of Western Christian ideals, &c., we have a question or two to ask. (1) Why is imitation to be abhorred in politics and not in religion ? (2) He has said that "the political counterpart of Mohamedanism was autocracy and that of Hinduism monarchy resting on oligarchy," which suggests that Christianity, too, has a political counterpart. If so, what is the political counterpart of Christianity ? If it is not democracy, why does not the Bishop return to England to preach to his Christian countrymen that they must give up democracy and cease to fight for "the establishment of democracy throughout the world," as their foremost men have declared they are doing ? But if the political counterpart of Christianity be democracy, then by trying to Christianise India, the Bishop is trying indirectly to democratise Indians. Or does he wish and hope that the Indian Christians are to be *twi-natured*, European in religion and Indian (as understood by him) in political instincts ? If that be so, let his spiritual lordship settle their spiritual and political ideals with Indian Christians.

DO NOT THE MINORITY RULE IN ENGLAND ?

Opponents of Indian Home Rule say that if Home Rule be granted to India at this stage of her development, the country will be ruled by an oligarchy, that is to say, by the representatives of a small minority. But that has been the case in the past in England, too. How far that is the case even now, will appear from an extract made by the *Indian Daily News* from *Reynold's Newspaper*. Says our Anglo-Indian (old-style) contemporary :

The announcement that the Labour Party will start 300 candidates at the next general election shows how little real representation of the people has existed in England in the past. *Reynold's* writes this week : "The working classes form the great bulk of the nation ; in the House of Commons it is very evident that the vast majority of the members have neither the knowledge nor the qualifications to represent the workers. And yet politicians talk glibly of the House of Commons being a microcosm of the nation ! As if any statement could well be more absurd ! The great task of Labour, and especially of the Trade Union Congress, which is its largest and most potential organisation, is to alter this. Or else, depend upon it, Congress may pass resolutions till it is blue in the face, and it will find its efforts stultified at every turn by bureaucrats and politicians whose aims are not those of Labour at all. We want, then, Education, Agitation, Organisation. There is no time to waste. The amount of thought and work to be done is immense. But that thought and work must come from Labour itself, for it will come from nobody else."

Which all means that the governance of England is going to shift to the less wealthy classes and probably to those who have higher ideals.

The Indian Daily News has also made some rather pertinent comments on the speech of Mr. Jones, editor of the *Statesman*, at the Dalhousie Institute meeting of the European Association. Our contemporary calls him the logician of the meeting, and observes :

Another argument put up by the logician that a small minority of semi-educated people cannot represent the mass of ignorant Indian humanity, has often been answered. Read English history. How long have the masses been represented ? People will tell you that they are not represented yet and that is to a large extent true. Certainly they are not represented like the population of France or America, where there is manhood suffrage. But one has only to read Pickwick and the description of the Eatenswill Election to see that the world went somehow on in 1830, with the smallest possible representation of the people through a few ignorant and disreputable voters. That was the case for a century before the Reform Act, and some people think that the property and residential qualifications on voting which still prevail in England, totally prevent the representation of the masses. At all events the fact remains that England was for a century before Waterloo represented by a small set of voters who were mainly rascals. Yet England had a fairly respectable political history in that century. The real fact is that in England the "dumb millions" have never been satisfactorily represented and we are only just coming to it. As to whether the British officials or the Indian axe-grinders most properly represent the dumb millions is at least a very arguable proposition—and we cannot pretend to judge between Codlin and Short. But to say that a country is not fit for self-government beeause its voters are few and of no character, and do not represent the people, is to fly in the face of facts of English political history.

NON-BRAHMIN MOVEMENT

DETRIMENTAL TO NATIONAL INTERESTS.

Mr. C. V. Narasimha Raju, who presided at the special sessions of the Andhra Conference, at Bezwada, in the course of his presidential address, referring to the non-Brahmin movement, said :

A non-Brahmin movement has been newly started in our province and carefully engineered. According to the view of some non-Brahmin leaders, they want separate representatives for the various castes according to their importance in the various localities, but this cannot be accepted. No workable scheme can be put forward on this basis and it is detrimental to the national movement and to national unity. Even the principle of separate representation for Mahomedans is detrimental in the national interests. When the Government called for the views of various gentlemen in 1907 on this question, the most prominent non-Brahmin leaders, such as the Maharaja of Bobbili, the Raja of Pithapuram, the Raja of Kollengode, Mr. Rajaratnam Moodeliar and many others, disapproved of the idea of representation by castes. The Board of Revenue and the Madras Government came to the same conclusion on that occasion. The number of non-Brahmin representatives in the local Council is always satisfactory.—"Associated Press."

OUR FITNESS FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT

BY THE HON'BLE PANDIT JAGAT NARAIN.

Is it in India's own interest, we are asked, that the reins of government should be transferred into

her hands ? Is she fit to bear the responsibility of governing herself ? Are Indians fitted by previous experience to discharge the duties associated with responsible government or even to manage representative institutions ? Has education made sufficient progress among them so that they may be expected to choose their best men as their leaders ? And will they place national above communal interests or will sectarian rivalries draw them farther away from each other as soon as the bond of common obedience to their present rulers is dissolved ? I hope to answer these questions by appealing to the history of the British Empire, but I cannot help remarking that the recital of our shortcomings reflects little credit on British rule itself. "Never let a prince", says Machiavelli, "complain of the faults of the people under his rule, for they are due either to his negligence or else to his own example." England will do well to bear the saying in mind when it is tempted to justify its autocratic rule in India on the score of our unfitness.

In considering the objections advanced against India's demand for greater freedom I am led to ask myself if Great Britain itself possessed all the qualifications which are now supposed to be the essential pre-requisites of self-government, when it was ruling not merely over itself but had extended its sway over a large part of the human race. I find that even so late as the beginning of the 19th century its masses were steeped in ignorance and political power was concentrated in the hands of

a few. Ireland was unquiet, religious bigotry had by no means died out and modern ideas of social duty had not made much headway among the upper classes. But the ignorance of the masses did not deter statesmen from putting more power into their hands and in view of the glorious success which has crowned their policy, who will say that they should have waited until the people had attained to ideal perfection ?

It may be said, however, that England has had a long experience in the art of government and that she has arrived at the present stage after a slow process of evolution extending over several centuries. But this could not have been said of the colonies when responsible government was conceded to them. I shall begin with Canada as being the first in order of time and importance. The right of Canada to control its internal affairs received statutory recognition in 1840 and responsible government was conceded a few years later. But the history of the colony during the few years preceding the grant of representative government concerns us more nearly than the events which followed it. Upper Canada was inhabited almost entirely by Englishmen. Lower Canada too contained men of British origin, but the vast majority of the inhabitants were of French extraction. The relations of the two races were far from friendly. The difference of race led to quarrels between the French and the British and between Lower Canada and Upper Canada and seriously interfered with the government of the

provinces. At last things became so serious that the Imperial Government was forced to intervene and to pass laws in order to safe-guard the interests of Upper Canada. The interference of the British Government was fiercely denounced by the French politicians and a rebellion broke out in Lower Canada in 1837, which however was soon put down. The ostensible cause of the rebellion was political, but the real cause lay deeper. Political strife was the outcome only of racial bitterness and was accentuated in proportion as the latter increased. The report of Lord Durham, who was sent to Canada by the Imperial authorities in order to bring peace to the troubled provinces, gives startling illustrations of the extent to which the alienation between the two races had proceeded. The French hated the British and aspired to establish a government in which the British would occupy a very inferior place. They looked upon the British as their commercial rivals and regarded their increasing trade and prosperity with dislike and jealousy. In consequence of this state of things, says Sir John Bourinot, "trade languished, internal development ceased, landed property decreased in value, the revenue showed a diminution, roads and all classes of local improvements were neglected, agricultural industry was stagnant, wheat had to be imported for the consumption of the people and immigration fell off." Juries were permeated with political prejudices. In purely political trials it was almost impossible to obtain justice. As to social inter-

course between the two races, none of course existed. "French and British", writes Lord Durham, "combined for no public objects or improvements, and could not harmonise even in associations of charity."

The year 1838 witnessed another rebellion. This time the infection spread to Upper Canada as well. The policy pursued by the Government in Upper Canada had given rise to a great deal of dissatisfaction and there were loud complaints against the dominant influence of the official class. The colonists demanded that the legislature should be wholly elected and that the executive be made responsible to the legislature. The Imperial Government, however, showed no sign of complying with their demands, while the local Government practically made no secret of its hostility to the movement. The discontent consequently went on increasing and culminated in a rebellion.

Faced with such a serious situation, what did the British Government do ? Did it decline to make any concessions ? Did it forge repressive measures to put down disloyalty with a stern hand ? No ; on the contrary, be it said to its credit that it set itself resolutely to the task of removing discontent by removing the matter of it. Lord Durham's report was published about this time. This memorable document, which may be said to have laid the foundation of modern British Colonial policy, awakened British statesmen to the gravity of the issues they were called upon to settle. Conceived in a spirit of far-sighted statesmanship,

it proposed that England should withdraw from the direct government of the colonies and by conferring freedom on them in regard to their internal affairs, bind them to itself by the strongest of all ties, the tie of self-interest. "The colonists", wrote Lord Durham, "may not always know what laws are best for them or which of their countrymen are the fittest for conducting their affairs, but, at least, they have a greater interest in coming to a right judgment on these points, and will take greater pains to do so than those whose welfare is very remotely and slightly affected by the good or bad legislation of these portions of the Empire. If the colonists make bad laws, and select improper persons to conduct their affairs, they will generally be the only, always the greatest, sufferers; and like the people of other countries, they must bear the ills which they bring on themselves, until they choose to apply the remedy." Lord Durham's advice found ready acceptance with the Imperial authorities. An Act was accordingly passed in 1840 which effected the legislative union of Upper and Lower Canada and made the colonists masters in their own house. All discontent immediately subsided as if by magic. New interests were created, which provided healthy channels into which the energy of the people began to flow. Race was no longer the dividing line between different parties. Men grouped themselves not according to their origin but according to the view that they took of political, social and economic questions relating to their country.

I have mentioned above that at the time self-government was conferred on Canada it was distracted by civil dissensions which had their origin in racial antagonism. Thus it was sadly wanting in one of the three qualifications without which, it is alleged, self-government can never be a success. It remains to be seen how far the people of Upper and Lower Canada were possessed of previous experience in the management of their institutions and what progress education had made amongst them. We find that Government disregarded the wishes of the popular assemblies and thought themselves bound to obtain the instructions of the Imperial authorities in difficult or doubtful cases. The executive officials were all appointed by the Crown and were not responsible to the legislature. "Their influence", says Sir John Bourinot, "permeated all branches of Government—the Executive, the Legislative Council, and even the assembly where for years there sat several members holding offices of emoluments under the Crown." The judiciary was more or less under their influence. The judges held office during the pleasure of the Crown and were nominated as members of the Executive and Legislative Councils. Even local self-government, which is said to be the cradle of political freedom, had not made much progress in Lower Canada at least. As for public instruction "popular education was at the lowest possible ebb, In 1837 there were in all the private and public schools of the provinces only one-fifteenth of the total population," which did not

exceed one million. In Lower Canada not even one-tenth could write. Children repeated the catechism by rote, but as a rule were unable to read. The record of Upper Canada was no better. It may be added that the means of communication were lamentably deficient. The roads were in a wretched condition and at times were impassable. Partly for this reason and partly because of the paucity of the police the administration of criminal justice was very unsatisfactory. Thus, it is apparent that judged by the high standard insisted on in the case of India, Canada did not possess the qualifications needed for self-government. Disunion flourished among the people. More than half the population belonged to a race which was a stranger to responsible government in its own country, and there was no antecedent guarantee that they would be able to fulfil the responsibilities which their newly gained freedom imposed on them. In education, undoubtedly, India lags behind Canada as it was in 1840, though percentages are hardly fair standards of comparison where the difference of population is so vast. But we are now in advance of England as it was three-quarters of a century ago. And in any case the main point to be determined is the attitude of the people towards education. The enthusiasm which greeted Mr. Gokhale's Education Bill, which was rejected by those who taunt us with our educational backwardness, and the progressive increase in the number of pupils, in spite of the restrictive policy followed by Govern-

ment, furnish unmistakable proofs of the recognition of the importance of education by the people. If they are still backward, it is not because of apathy, but because of the absence of proper facilities. Thus, practically speaking, every argument used to advocate self-government for Canada can be applied with equal force to India. The statesmen of Lord Durham's day recognized that responsibility could be acquired only when adequate scope was given for its exercise. They believed that liberty would make the colonists wise and exercise a far greater educative influence on them than the irksome restraints of a distant Parliament. Events have fully justified their confidence. The progress and prosperity of Canada are a tribute to the wisdom of their policy. There is no reason why English liberties and privileges should not produce a like result in India. Indians have proved their fitness wherever and whenever they have been tried in responsible positions and if the past is a guide to the future they may be safely entrusted with the direction and management of the affairs of their country to a much larger extent than hitherto. They may make mistakes in the beginning but they will be all the better for them in the end.

I shall now deal briefly with the case of Australia. It does not seem to me that its earlier history makes a very inspiring or profitable reading. The attention of the Imperial authorities was not turned towards it until it became a matter of urgent necessity to find some place to which criminals could be

transported. Some means had to be devised for disposing of the convicts who could no longer be sent to the American colonies, and Australia offered a satisfactory solution of the difficulty. During the earlier years of its history it was thus a land of convicts and it continued as a penal settlement, roughly speaking, till the forties of the last century. Systematic efforts were made to introduce free immigrants in the twenties into New South Wales to which the earliest colonising efforts were directed, and although this had an appreciable effect in promoting the welfare of the colony and raising the moral tone of the settlement, it cannot be claimed that all the new settlers were of a desirable kind, or that any serious efforts were made to grapple with the moral evils which were rampant in the colony. Through carelessness or inefficiency women sent out to the settlement were for the most part such as to make the task of reforming the people more difficult. "New South Wales", writes a historian, "was, in fact, made the dumping ground for all the convicted as well as the unconvicted criminals of the United Kingdom." Drunkenness and immorality prevailed there to an alarming extent, and even so late as 1835 the moral condition of the colony gave cause for serious anxiety. As for education I cannot say how far it had progressed, but till 1848 it was entirely denominational. The state maintained no schools of its own. The economic condition of the colony, however, was much better than its social condition. Land was being steadily brought under the plough,

great progress was being made in cattle-rearing, and trade and commerce were undergoing rapid expansion. But even when these hopeful features are taken into consideration, I must say that the impression left on one's mind by a perusal of the early history of New South Wales is not particularly pleasant.

It is not necessary for me to go into the history of the other Australian colonies. Their development was not in every respect similar to that of New South Wales, but if I am not mistaken, it does not present any markedly dissimilar features.

As for the political condition of New South Wales, which is the chief object of our concern, a representative element was introduced into its government with the advent of free-settlers in 1823. A further step was taken in 1842 when the popular element was increased. Finally, full responsible government was conceded in 1853. It was also conceded to Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania at about the same time. If the facts I have stated above are correct, it does not appear to me that New South Wales or the other colonies satisfed the tests that are nowadays applied to India. A large proportion of the colonists could not be said to have attained to a high social or ethical standard, and no systematic efforts had been made to educate them. And yet the Imperial Government showed itself ready, says Dr. Keith, to grant responsible government because of "the discoveries of gold and the influx of population". Besides, the principle had been established

by the example of Canada, and its acceptance there made its recognition inevitable in the case of other colonies. If there is any substance in the objections advanced against the widening of Indian liberties, the conditions under which Australia was started on a career of full-fledged self-government were not very hopeful; but its progress during the regime of freedom exposes the utter hollowness of the contentions of our critics.

South Africa is the latest example within the British Empire of the benefits of self-government. Undeterred by opposition in Parliament and the wailings of "the men on the spot," the Government of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman conferred full responsible government in 1906 and 1907, respectively, on the Transvaal and the Orange River State, which less than six years before were engaged in a bloody struggle with England. While the events of the war were still fresh in the public mind, the Dutch were not merely placed on a footing of equality with the English but granted liberties which they had not enjoyed under their own rule. The rivalries of race and language, instead of finding free play, have as a consequence become less prominent than they were a decade ago, and the Dutch, so far from rising against England at the first favourable opportunity that offered itself, have been so completely won over by the magnanimous policy followed by her that they are to-day fighting side by side with her sons for the maintenance of her Empire.

The three examples of Canada, Australia and

South Africa which I have just quoted, bear convincing testimony to the potency of self-government as an instrument for the advancement of both national and Imperial interests. In all of them it has been found to be a healing and cementing principle, although according to the exacting standard set up by our critics not one of them could have made good its claim to self-government when it was granted to them. And where they have succeeded, why should India fail ?

[The above is an extract from the speech of the Hon'ble Pandit Jagat Narain, Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Indian National Congress held at Lucknow in 1916.]

WHO CAN REPRESENT THE MASSES ?

Paragraph 18 of the Report of Lord Islington's Commission on the Public Services of India is headed "Extent to which the western educated classes represent the masses of the people" and runs as follows :

"How far the western educated classes reflect the views or represent the interests of the many scores of millions in India who are still untouched by western influences is a question upon which opinions differ. Even amongst the educated the conflicting traditions of Hindus and Muhammadans are still constantly reflected in their attitudes towards social and political questions of the first order, whilst, in addition to this main line of religious cleavage, there are other important communities, such as Sikhs,

Parsis, Buddhists (chiefly in Burma) and Indian Christians, who are all more or less widely separated from the bulk of the population, either Hindu or Muhammadan. Nor does religion constitute the only line of cleavage. Geographical and climatic as well as social conditions have also helped to preserve down to our own times differences originally imported into India by successive waves of conquest and migration. Of all these considerations it would be unwise not to take cognisance. But it would be equally unwise to ignore that growing body of western educated opinion which is gradually creating a new atmostphere all over India. Even those who most strongly deprecate some of its manifestations realise that it has contributed largely to the great social and religious movements which are aiming at giving a new direction to old beliefs and at harmonising ancient doctrines with the teachings of science. It is reflected in that new sense of unity which is displacing the idea of ordered separation hitherto prevalent in Indian society."

The following is Mr. Justice Abdur Rahim's criticism of the above paragraph.

"In para 18 of the majority report, allusion is made to the allegation that the western educated Indians do not reflect the views or represent the interests of the many scores of millions in India. So far as the views of the latter on any of the matters in dispute, or of an allied character, are concerned, it is impossible to imagine what opinions they are in a position to form so long as they are allowed to remain, as at present, in their illiterate and appallingly ignorant condition.* As for the representation of

* Elsewhere, Mr. Justice Rahim, reverting to this subject, says: "In paragraph 18 of the majority report allusion is made to the opinion of those who allege that the western educated classes do not represent the interests of the many scores of millions of India. The fact, however, is that for some time they have been making most earnest endeavours in this direction. If Mr. Gokhale's bill for popular education, supported as it was by the entire educated opinion of the country, has not been placed on the Indian statute book the blame cannot be laid at their door."

their interests, if the claim be that they are better represented by European officials than by educated Indian officials or non-officials, it is difficult to conceive how such a reckless claim has come to be urged. The inability of English officials to master the spoken languages of India and their different religions, habits of life and modes of thought so completely divide them from the general Indian population that only an extremely limited few possessed of extraordinary powers of intuitional insight have ever been able to surmount the barriers. As for the sacred books and classics of the Indian peoples, Hindu and Muhammadan, whose study is indispensable to a foreigner wishing to understand the people's national genius, it would be difficult to name more than two or three Englishmen among the thousands that during a period of more than 100 years of British connection with India have been employed in the service of Government whose attainments could be mentioned with a show of respect. Such knowledge of the people and of the classical literatures as passes current among the European officials is compiled almost entirely from the data furnished to them by the western-educated Indians ; and the idea of the European officials having to deal with the people of India without the medium of the western-educated Indian is too wild for serious contemplation. It would be no exaggeration to say that without their cooperation the administration could not be carried on for a single day.

"With the educated Indians, on the other hand, this knowledge is instinctive, and the ties of religion and custom, so strong in the east, inevitably make their knowledge and sympathy far more intimate than is to be seen in countries dominated by materialistic conceptions. It is from a wrong and deceptive perspective that we are asked to look at the system of castes among the Hindus more as a dividing force than as a powerful binding factor ; and the unifying spirit of Islam, so far as it affects the Muhammadans, does not stand in need of being explained ; while in all communities the new national movement has received considerable accession of impulse from the lessons of such arguments as are hinted at in the majority report. The evidence is remarkably significant in this connection. His Highness the Aga

Khan joined his weighty voice with that of the leaders of the Congress in demanding simultaneous examinations for the Indian Civil Service ; and the representatives of the Sikh Khalsa and the Pathans of the Punjab, the Moslem League along with the spokesmen of the communities more advanced in western education, were unanimous in entering their emphatic protest against the suggestion that the presence of Indians in the higher official ranks would be distasteful to the Indians themselves, and specially in a province or a community other than that of the Indian official."

The criticism of the Hon'ble Mr. Chaubal is no less instructive, and is quoted below.

"The two views on this question are fairly stated in this paragraph.* But in view of the wide belief in high circles in the first of these views a closer examination of the question so far as it is material to the services concerned, and to the employment of Indians in them, is necessary. In the first place, it may be pointed out that in relation to the public services under government there is no such class as *eastern educated classes*, as distinguished or distinguishable from "the western educated classes." For such eastern education as exists now there is absolutely no scope for employment in any of the departments we have considered. If any Indians have to be employed in the higher service at all, they must be from the western educated classes, whether they *represent* the masses of the people or not. Assuming that they do not, the next step implied in the argument is that the ability or capacity to *represent* the masses must be present in any one who claims to be entitled to enter the higher service under Government. Therefore, it is not desirable to employ a larger number of these western educated classes in the higher service, and consequently, it is impossible with safety and in the interests of these masses to narrow the field of employ-

* Paragraph 18 of the Report. The views of Messrs. Rahim and Chaubal are quoted from their dissentient minutes, which are to be found at the end of the same volume (vol I).

ment for Europeans and Anglo-Indians in the higher posts under government. To employ the educated Indian in larger numbers is, in the words of the late Sir Charles Crosthwaite, "to give a disproportionate degree of authority in the government of the masses and the aristocracy into the hands of a few thousand men whose heads have been turned by an education they have not assimilated."

If this argument is analysed one cannot help being struck with the assumption that this capacity to *represent* the masses is taken for granted in the European and the Anglo-Indian. It is difficult to understand exactly what is intended to be conveyed by the word "represent." If it implies a knowledge of the condition of life of these masses, their habits, their ways of living and thinking, their wants and grievances, the ability to enter into their thoughts, and appreciate what is necessary to educate them, to give them higher ideas of life, and make them realise their duties towards all about them, there ought to be no doubt that the educated Indian has all these in a far higher degree than any European or Anglo-Indian can claim to have. The charge really is that the educated Indian has a class-bias, a sort of clannishness, a tendency to favour his own caste or community in the discharge of his official duties which detract from his usefulness in the higher service and, therefore, the presence of the European in large numbers is necessary to hold the scales evenly between these few educated thousands and the dumb and ignorant millions, who would otherwise be oppressed by them.

This is rather a shallow pretence—this attempt to take shelter behind the masses ; and I think it only fair to state that the class of educated Indians from which only the higher posts can be filled is singularly free from this narrow-mindedness and class or caste-bias, e.g., no instances of complaint on this score as against any of the Indian members of the Indian Civil Service would be available, and I have no hesitation in endorsing the opinion of Sir Narayan Chandavarkar, in his recent contribution on village life in his tour through southern India, that the interests of the masses are likely to be far better understood and taken care of by the educated Indian than by the foreigner. As a matter

of fact all the measures proposed for the regeneration of the lower and depressed classes have emanated from the educated Indians of the higher castes. The scheme for the free and compulsory education of these masses was proposed by an educated Indian of a high caste and supported mainly by the western educated classes. High-souled and self-sacrificing men are every day coming forward from this class to work whole-heartedly in improving the condition of the masses.

Perhaps the truth, however unpalatable, is that there are still a number of the average English officials in India who have a distrust and suspicion about the educated Indian. The explanation of this is probably that given by Sir P. M. Mehta in his evidence—that the English Official does not like the independence, the self-assertion, and the self-respect which come naturally in the wake of education. As Dr. Wordsworth stated in his evidence before the last commission, "deferential ignorance, conciliatory manners, and a plentiful absence of originality and independence are now, and will always be, at a premium." It is high time that this shibboleth was exploded. It is indeed hardly consistent that while on the one hand Government should foster and encourage the growth of opportunities for educated Indians for participation in public life, in the municipalities and district boards, and in the provincial and imperial legislative councils, they should, on the other, so jealously guard the entrance of educated indigenous agency into the higher and better remunerated posts in the state."

Speaking of the memorandum of the nineteen non-official Indian members of the Imperial Legislative Council and the scheme of constitutional reform adopted by the Indian National Congress and the All-India Moslem League, Sir Narayan Chandavarkar says in his foreward to Mr. G. A. Natesan's "What India Wants :"

The memorandum and the scheme have been condemned in some quarters as being revolutionary on the main ground that

their proposals transfer power from the Indian Civil Service, who (it is said) are best fitted to represent the masses in India, to the Indian educated classes, who (it is maintained) are not the true representatives of the masses. We may, without fear of the result in favour of the Indian educated classes, invite one test, which is a sure test, on this question. If we take the history of the administration from 1858 down to now, with special reference to the amelioration of the condition of the Indian agriculturists, who form seventy-five per cent. of the people in India, we shall incontestably find that measures advocated in their interests by the educated Indians through their newspapers and public associations and at public meetings had been strenuously opposed as chimerical by the British officials in India for a long time and were ultimately more or less adopted under the stress of circumstances. It is the view of the Indian educated classes regarding the ryot's lot which, generally speaking, has after more or less painful experience to some extent won ; and the official view has yielded in the end.

The latest series of events which can help us to answer the question, "Who can represent the masses best, the official and non-official Europeans, or the educated Indians ?" took place in Bihar. It was a "high caste" educated Hindu from Gujarat, Mr. M. K. Gandhi, who has been instrumental in redressing the grievances of the illiterate Bihar ryots against the European Indigo-planters, not the official and non-official European birds of passage Bihar.

STATESMEN ON JUSTICE, FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY.

"FRIENDSHIP," "LIBERATION," "UNITY ON AN EQUAL BASIS," AND "ORDERED FREEDOM AND FRATERNITY."

An interview of the London Correspondent of the Australian United Cable Service with Mr. Lloyd George concluded thus :—

Question :—Then you are sanguine about the future of the Empire ?

Reply :—If we see the war through, I certainly am. You do not suppose the great combination of peoples who make up the Empire can have stood steadfastly together with their Allies in order to discredit and overthrow the most brutal and inhuman machine for the destruction of human liberties ever seen, and not have discovered new ground for friendship. We stand at this moment on the verge of the greatest liberation the world has seen since the French revolution. Do you tell me that peoples who have stood together and staked literally everything in order to bring about that liberation are not going to find some way of perpetuating that unity afterwards on an equal basis ? I am certain that they will. Further, there will be much for them to do. The peace terms will be only a beginning. After they are satisfactorily arranged we shall have to set to work to build up that ordered freedom and fraternity which is the only security for human peace and progress and which militarism has destroyed. And is it not certain that the nations which have borne the heat and burden of the day in overthrowing that militarism will take a leading share in building that new earth which they have made possibe by their sacrifice ? No ! If we endure to the end I have

small fears for the future, and not the least important of the foundations for the work we shall have to do together in that future will be this War Council of the British peoples.

Mr. Lloyd George thinks that the combination of peoples who make up the Empire have discovered new ground for friendship. But it should be borne in mind that there cannot be genuine *friendship* between subjects and citizens, between those who exclude and those who are excluded, etc. Friendship requires reciprocity. The Premier uses the expression "the greatest liberation the world has seen since the French revolution." Yes, we want to make his words perfectly and truly significant, and in order that they may not be mere hollow sounds empty of meaning we want that India also should be liberated and her sons also should have self-government. "The greatest liberation" will not be a liberation at all within the British Empire itself, if the most numerous nationality forming a component part of it be not given an effective control over their own affairs. "The unity on an equal basis" spoken of does not at present exist in the British Empire. But it can be easily brought about by making India a partner in the Empire instead of a mere dependant—by giving us self-rule, so that instead of being mere subjects we may be citizens. "Ordered freedom and fraternity," too, require that freedom should exist in all parts of the Empire. There cannot be any fraternity between those who rule and those who are merely governed.

No doubt, it is not always quite easy to practise

what one preaches. But in the matter upon which we are writing, it is not difficult to do so. If it be necessary to stand on a high pedestal and sermonise, as it certainly is at present, good care ought to be taken to see that there is not *cheragh ke niche andhera*, "darkness beneath the lamp," and if there be, it is not at all impossible to dispel that darkness. Many British statesmen have already declared that in course of time India will be a sister nation in the Empire. That is good so far as it goes. What we object to is the plea of "*not yet.*" This phrase is not being uttered by the Allies in the case of European peoples whom it is their declared object to enfranchise. They are going to make these peoples independent. Our present demand is much less ; we simply want internal autonomy. And a mere glance at the Joint Note of the Moslem League and the Indian National Congress will show that the immediate demand is not even *complete* internal autonomy. We trust this Joint Note will be considered, in order that, to use Mr. Lloyd George's words, "it may afford some insight into the form" which post-war problems like "the constitutional reconstruction" of the Empire may take.

WHAT IS MEANT BY A FREE PEOPLE.

Speaking in the House of Commons on the Russian Revolution, Mr. Lloyd George, the British Premier, said :—

> A free people were the best defenders of their own honour.

It seems necessary to ask Mr. Lloyd George and

other British rulers of India to bear in mind the dictum that *a free people were the best defenders of their own honour*, in connection with India, too. We would ask all British statesmen also to bear in mind in all that they would do in relation to India the declaration that the British people along with their Allies were fighting "in the cause of human freedom." The British rulers of India cannot be reminded too often of the declared "principles for which" they "entered the war."

We do not make a wrong use of words when we use the words "liberation" and "liberated" in connection with India, as some Anglo-Indians seem to think. We can cite the use of the words "a free people" by the Premier to describe the Russians after the Revolution, in support of our use. When he described the Russian people after the revolution as free, he clearly meant to imply that before the revolution they were not free. Yet, before the revolution, Russia was an independent country, and the Russian people had their Duma, which was a parliamentary institution, though not as powerful and as fully representative of the many peoples inhabiting the Russian empire as the British Parliament is of Great Britain and Ireland. If a people inhabiting an independent country and having a parliamentary assembly with somewhat restricted representation and powers, required to be "free" in order to be the defenders of their own honour, and if this attainment of "freedom" by them, can be spoken of as "the first great triumph of the principles for which" the

British people "entered the War," surely it would be right to speak of India as "liberated," if she, a dependent country without any parliament of any description, were given Home Rule ; and it would, of course, not be proper to speak of India as free until she got Home Rule and had a parliament. Lest some might think our provincial and impertial councils were parliamentary institutions in embryo, we would remind them that Lord Morley, who gave us these enlarged councils, vehemently protested that in doing so he was not introducing the thin end of the parliamentary wedge.

We hope we have established the two propositions that India is not free, and that in order to be consistent the British people should give us free political institutions. Otherwise their declaration that they were fighting in the cause of human freedom would not be correct. It may, of course, be contended that the Allies were fighting for *human* freedom, and that as Indians were not human beings, they need not have freedom. But no British man or woman has laid down such a cynical proposition. We do not therefore feel called upon to refute it. It may be and has been contended that Indians are not fit for even the qualified freedom which Home Rule implies. For such freedom we have proved our fitness repeatedly, and some of the arguments in proof of our fitness have been brought together in our pamphlet "Towards Home Rule." So we need not repeat these arguments. We will only observe that it would be a rather curious circumstance if all peoples should

prove to be fit for self-rule except only those whom it may be to the interest of some British administrators and British exploiters to keep in a state of dependence. Ws would ask all intelligent, honest and patriotic British men and women to consider whether the advocacy, by any of them, of liberation and freedom for all races and peoples except those subject to them might not appear to non-British people as something like a consummate, though transparent, piece of hyprocrisy. Of course, in saying this, we do not and can not suggest a sweeping indictment of the British people as a whole : for many of them have advocated the grant of Home Rule to India at the time of the reconstruction of the British Empire after the War.

"THE RIGHTS OF NATIONS, HOWEVER SMALL."

Statesmen of several European nations have occasionally declared with earnestness that the rights of nations, *however small*, are as sacred as the rights of the biggest empire. We think they should solemnly lay down another principle also, namely, that the rights of countries, *however big*, are as sacred as the rights of the smallest country.

"THE HERALDS OF DAWN."

The magnificent speech of Mr. Lloyd George delivered on April 12th before the American Luncheon Club in London concludes with the following eloquent peroration :

"Those gallant men who won that victory on Monday,—men from Canada, from Australia and from this old country—these

men attacked with the dawn,—fit work for the dawn to drive out from forty miles of French soil those miscreants who had defiled it for three years. They attacked with the dawn. It is a significant phrase. The breaking up of the dark rule in Turkey, which for centuries has clouded the sunniest land in the world ; the freeing of Russia from oppression which for so long has covered it like a shroud ; the great declaration of President Wilson, coming with the might of the great nation he represents into the struggle for liberty,—these are the heralds of Dawn. They attacked with the dawn, and those men are marching forward in the full radiance of that dawn and soon, Frenchmen, Americans, British, Italians, Russians, yes, and Serbians, Belgians, Montenegrins and Rumanians, will emerge into the full light of perfect day."

As it is claimed that the British angle of vision as regards India has changed for the better and as British officials and the British people in Great Britain are now said to be undoubtedly inclined to be more courteous towards India than before, we may be permitted to remind Mr. Lloyd George and other British statesmen and the British people in general that India, too, has not yet emerged "into the full light of perfect day." May we, therefore, urge that they will take such steps as will enable Indians, along with Frenchmen, Russians, Serbians, Belgians, to "emerge into the full light of perfect day" ?

Mr. Lloyd George on Democracy and Freedom.

In the course of the same great speech from which we have quoted above, Mr. Lloyd George said :—

"This is the straightest struggle for liberty America ever embarked upon (Cheers). Most great wars of the past were waged for domestic aggrandisement and conquest. The fact that the

United States has made up its mind finally makes it abundantly clear to the world that this is no such struggle but a great fight for human liberty" (Cheers).

"There are two great facts which clinch the argument that this is a great struggle for freedom. The first is the fact that America has joined. She would not have done so otherwise. The second is the Russian Revolution (Loud Cheers). When France in the eighteenth century sent her soldiers to America to fight for the freedom and independence of that land, France was also an autocracy, but once the Frenchmen were in America, their aim was freedom, their atmosphere was freedom, and they took it home, and France became free. That is the story of Russia engaged in this great War for the freedom of Serbia, Montenegro and Bulgaria. They were fighting for the freedom of Europe and they wanted to make their own country free and have done with it (Cheers). The Russian Revolution is not merely the outcome of a struggle for freedom, it is a proof of the great struggle for liberty and if the Russian people realise this, as there is every evidence that they are doing, that national discipline is not incompatible with national freedom, nay, that national discipline is essential to the security of national freedom (Cheers), they indeed will become a free people."

As it is a great fight for human liberty, may it not be hoped that the British people will bear this fact in mind in their dealings with India now and after peace has been concluded? Thousands of Indians, like the Russians, have been "fighting for the freedom of Europe"; we hope, that Mr. Lloyd George will admit that according to his logic it would not be unnatural if Indians too "wanted to make their own country free."

India does not now demand "independence," nor is there any general desire "to revolt against the beneficence" of white men; there is at present only a

desire for internal autonomy. A contemporary historian should, therefore, be able to say that the following extract from Sir John Kaye's History of the Sepoy Mutiny, vol. I. (Longmans, Green & Co., 1898), page 262, (in which he speaks of the views of the new school of Anglo-Indian politicians as reflected in the Anglo-Indian Press of 1856, the year before the Mutiny,) no longer represents the attitude of the British people at "home" and so-journing in India :—

"To suggest that in an Asiatic race there might be a spirit of independence and a love of country, the manifestations of which were honourable in themselves, however inconvenient to us, was commonly to evoke, as the very mildest result, the imputation of being "anti-British," whilst sometimes the "true British feeling" asserted itself in a less refined choice of epithets, and those who ventured to sympathise in any way with the people of the East were at once denounced as "white niggers.". Yet among these very men, so intolerant of anything approaching the assertion of a spirit of liberty by an Asiatic people, there were some who could well appreciate and sympathise with the aspirations of European bondsmen, and could regard with admiration the struggles of the Italian, the Switzer, or the Pole to liberate himself, by a sanguinary contest, from the yoke of the usurper. *But the sight of the dark skin sealed up their sympathies.* They contended not merely that the love of country, that the spirit of liberty as cherished by European races, is in India wholly unknown, but that Asiatic nations, and especially the nations of India, have no right to judge what is best for themselves, have no right to revolt against the beneficence of a more civilised race of white men, who would think and act for them, and deprive them, for their own good, of all their most cherished rights and their most valued possessions."

We are sure there are some Englishmen now who

would be ashamed to give expression to such sentiments.

We have already drawn attention to and commented upon the Premier's declarations to the effect that the present war was a fight for human liberty and that the world stood on the verge of the greatest liberation that has been seen since the French Revolution. On the 6th April he dictated to the American Press Representative the following message to the American people, on behalf of the War Cabinet :—

"America at one bound has become a world power in a sense she never was before. She waited until she found the cause was worthy of her traditions, and the American people held back until they were fully convinced that the fight was not a sordid scrimmage for power or possessions, but an unselfish struggle to overthrow a sinister conspiracy against human liberty and human right. Once that conviction was reached the great republic of the west leapt into the arena and she stands now side by side with the European democracies, who, bruised and bleeding after three years of grim conflict, are still fighting most savagely for the ever-menaced freedom of the world. The glowing phrases of the President's noble deliverance illumine the horizon and make clearer than ever the goal we are striving to reach. There are three phrases which will stand out for evermore in the story of this crusade. The first is : The world must be safe for democracy. The next is : The menace to the power of freedom lies in the existence of autocratic Governments, backed by organised force which is controlled by their will and not by the will of their people. The crowning phrase is that in which the President declares : A steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partuership of democratic nations. These words represent the faith which inspires and sustains our people in the tremendous sacrifices they have made and are still making. They

also believe that the unity and peace of mankind can only rest upon democracy, upon the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own Government, upon respect for the rights and liberties of nations both great and small, and upon the universal dominion of public right. To all these Prussian military autocracy is an implacable foe. The Imperial War Cabinet, representative of all the peoples of the British Empire, wish me on their behalf to recognise the chivalry and courage which calls the people of the United States to dedicate their whole resources to the service of the greatest cause which ever engaged human endeavour.

We are in the heartiest agreement with the political ideal which has found expression in the Premier's message. We only hope that the principles of democracy will not to be confined in their application only to the white and the occidental population of the earth and to Japan, but that the other races inhabiting the vast countries of Asia and Africa will have the advantage of democratic ideals. Mr. Llyod George is quite right in holding that "the unity and peace of mankind can only rest upon democracy, upon the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their government, upon respect for the rights and liberties of nations, both great and small, and upon the universal dominion of public right." But unless the peoples of Asia and Africa are governed according to these democratic principles, there cannot be "peace and unity of mankind." There can be no unity between bondsmen and their masters. And if Asia and Africa continue to be considered the happy hunting ground of the strongest nations of the earth, there will always be

quarrels about the portions to be possessed and exploited by them. But if democratic principles are given effect to everywhere, there cannot be any such quarrels. Moreover, as under such conditions the protected backward peoples cannot but be sincerely attached to their protectors, there will be less temptation for robber nations to wage war in the expectation of rebellions breaking out among the subject peoples.

That democracy means lasting peace was emphasized by Mr. Lloyd George in his speech before the American Luncheon Club also. He said :

When this War began, two-thirds of Europe was under the sway of autoctatic rule. It is the other way about now, and democracy means peace. (Cheers).

The democracy of France did not want war. The democracy of Italy hesitated long before entering the war and the democracy of Britain shrank from it and shuddered and would never have entered the cauldron, but for the invasion of Belgium, Democracy sought peace and strove for peace and if Prussia had been a democracy, there would have been no war. (Cheers).

This is true. But Europe should give up the habit of thinking that the white races and Japan constitute the whole of mankind. The other people of Asia and Africa are also men. Great Britain and her allies have repeatedly declared that the present war is due to Germany's unrighteous ambition. And what was that ambition ? To monopolise the major portion of the world's commerce, by having more extensive possessions in Asia and Africa than she had, and by other means. For that reason she wanted to have the sea-ports of Belgium by con-

quering that country. Thus, whatever might have been the immediate motive for Germany's declaration of war, the ultimate cause is the firm belief that some continents and races exist only for being industrially exploited and politically kept in subjection. This root cause must be destroyed, if wars are to cease. The ideal of democracy as enunciated by Mr. Lloyd George can alone eradicate it. He, no doubt, observed :

> The world is an old world, it never had peace. It has been rocking and swaying like the ocean, and Europe, poor Europe, always lived under the sword.

But he forgot that there are other places besides "poor Europe" which "always lived under the sword" ; Europe has by no means been the worst sufferer. Hence he spoke of democracy only in connection with Europe. It is possible that in the subconscious regions of his mind there was a belief that democracy is, like the air we breathe, for all mankind. If so, we are only trying to make explicit what was implied.

There was, no doubt, always a possibility, though not a probability, of all the strong nations of the earth coming to an agreement among themselves that all other peoples were to be politically and industrially exploited, and of the unorganised peoples being assigned to particular ruling nations in pursuance of that agreement. But the repeated declarations of British and other statesmen in favour of democracy should be able to avert such a gigantic crime and calamity, the most heinous im-

aginable in human history. The entrance of America—America who is doing her best to liberate her dependency in Asia, into the war strengthens this hope. Mr. Lloyd George may have had some such thought in his mind when he said :

We know America will wage a strong, successful War and ensure a beneficent peace. I rejoice that America is going to win the right to be at the Peace Conference, which will settle the destiny of nations and the course of human life for God knows how many ages. It would have been a tragedy for mankind if America had not been there. I can see a peace, not a peace to be the beginning of another war, but a real peace.

America may be expected not to be a party to the continuance of the enslaved condition of peoples as part of the peace terms, not at any rate to the enslavement of people who were free before the war.

British Appreciation of America's Entry.

On the 18th of April last, the following resolution was unanimously adopted by the House of Lords and the House of Commons :

"This House desires to express to the Government and the people of the United States its profound appreciation of the action of the Government in joining the Allies, thus defending the high cause of freedom and the rights of humanity against the gravest menace by which they have ever been imperilled."

Mr. Asquith in the course of his speech expressed a doubt whether even now the world realised the full significance of the step taken by the United States.

I do not use the language of flattery or exaggeration when I say that it is one of the most disinterested acts in history (Cheers).

Mr. Asquith proceeded to show that the war was not doing appreciable harm to the United States nor was America's independence or liberty directly imperilled. She did not want territory. What then had brought her in was nothing but the constraining force of conscience and humanity growing in compulsive authority month by month with a gradual unfolding of the real character of the aims of Germany (Cheers).

America saw the whole future of the civilised government, and intercourse, particularly of the fortunes of faith in Democracy, imperilled. In such a situation aloofness was not only a blunder but a crime. To stand aside with stopped ear, folded arms and averted gaze when you have the power to intervene is to become not a mere spectator but an accomplice (Cheers). But none of us feared how America would finally decide (Cheers).

We hope when statesmen use the expression "rights of humanity" in connection with the war, they mean the rights of all mankind, not merely the rights of whitemanity.

Mr. Bonar Law said in part :

He welcomed the adhesion of America also because it morally justified our own action (cheers). America like Britain had entered into the war because she could do no other. The entry of America was a fitting pendant to the revolution which brought Russia into the circle of freed nations. He had read with deep admiration and profound agreement the speech worthy of Lincoln in which President Wilson announced the entry of America (cheers). A German newspaper the other day had declared that America was going to war for nothing from the German point of view. That was true. America, like the British Empire, was not animated by love of conquest, greed of territory, or selfish ends. The aims and ideals which President Wilson had so nobly expressed were ours.

What lover of humanity is there who will not wish from the bottom of his heart that no nation

may in future depart from the great ideals embodied in these assertions ?

WHAT SOME AMERICANS THINK.

On America Day in London the American Bishop of the Philippines preached at St. Paul's an eloquent sermon on righteousness. He said the allies were fighting for the great commonwealth of mankind.

In his speech before the Pilgrim Society in London Mr. Page, the American Ambassador, said :

> One of the most important results of the war, next to the removal of the German menace to the free Governments of the world, would be the closer sympathy between Britain and the United States. This would be important not merely to the United States and Britain but to all the free nations. We shall get out of this war in an indissoluble companionship and mutual duties to mankind. I doubt if there could be another international event comparable in its consequences and value to this closer association. I regard it as the supreme political event of all history. There is good hope that it will assure the co-operation of a majority of the organised human race to prevent intermittent devastations of the world. Such a union of purpose would be much less sure of success if either great branch of the English-speaking world were lacking.

We cordially hope "intermittent devastations of the world" will be prevented.

Mr. Page mentions free Governments, free nations, and the organised human race. Neither he nor any other statesman has yet explained the difference which the war will make in the fortunes and status of nations who are not free and of that portion of the human race which is not organised. As the unorganised peoples form the majority of

mankind, those who profess to be fighting for human freedom and human rights ought to foreshadow the future of this majority of the human race.

Some colonial statesmen on Equality and Freedom.

In his speech at the banquet given by the House of Commons on April 2 to the representatives of the Dominions, General Smuts observed :—

"After all, the Empire is founded on the principles of equality and freedom, unlike Germany who stands for might is right."

"After all we built on freedom, and no one outside a lunatic asylum wants to use force with the Nations in the Empire."

At the great assembly in Edinburgh where the Freedom of that City was conferred upon Sir Robert Borden, General Smuts and H. H. the Maharaja of Bikanir, Sir Robert, representative of Canada, observed in the course of his speech :—

The fact that his and General Smuts's conception regarding future constitutional relations were substantially the same, in spite of the widely differing conditions of upbringing, was an evidence of the broad foundation of liberty, justice, autonomy and unity on which the British Empire stood secure.

It is unquestionable that the British Empire ought to be and may in future be established in all its parts on the broad foundation of equality, liberty, justice, autonomy and unity. But to claim that it at present stands on that foundation everywhere is slightly premature. We in India do not enjoy civic freedom to the extent to which the people of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the self-governing Dominions do. India is not auto-

nomous, nor are certain other parts of the Empire. The Asiatic *subjects* of the British Empire do not possess the freedom of migration to and movement in all parts of the Empire which the white *citizens* possess. The non-white peoples, numbering 370 millions out of the total population of 430 millions of the British Empire, labour under many other galling inequalities, which are too well-known to need repetition. The Public Services Commission Report has in effect recommended the accentuation and perpetuation of many distinctions based on race.

In the Union of South Africa itself, which General Smuts represents, the aborigines are in a majority in every province. Out of a total population of 5,973,394, only 1,276,242 are Europeans. The Senate of the Union consists of forty members, eight being nominated by the Governor-General in Council, and thirty-two elected. Out of the eight nominated members, four are "selected for their acquaintance with the reasonable wants and wishes of the coloured races." But even these four are Europeans, as "each senator must be a British subject of European descent." The House of Assembly consists of 130 members, each of whom "must be a British subject of European descent." "As population increases the total number of members may be raised to 150. The seats allotted to each province are *determined by its number of European male adults* as ascertained by a quinquennial census," *thus no regard being paid to the number or existence of the "natives,"*

though they form an overwhelming majority of the population. The qualifications of parliamentary voters are also worthy of note. "In the Transvaal and Orange Free State provinces the franchise is restricted to white adult male British subjects." In Natal "coloured persons are not by name debarred from the franchise but they are in practice excluded." In the Cape province no colour bar exists *only as regards voters*. Here the number of registered electors in 1907 was 152,135, of whom over 20,000 were non-Europeans. It should, however, be remembered that there are 2,564,965 inhabitants in Cape Colony, of whom only 582,377 are Europeans. Another fact to be specially noted is that even the right to vote enjoyed only by some "natives" in this province is grudged, as the following passage from the *Encyclopædia Britannica* will show :—

"In January 1905 an inter-colonial native affairs commission reported on the native question as it affected South Africa as a whole, proposals being made for an alteration of the laws in Cape Colony respecting the franchise exercised by the natives. In the opinion of the Commission the possession of the franchise by the Cape natives under existing conditions was sure to create in time an intolerable situation, and was an unwise and dangerous thing. The Commission proposed separate voting by natives only for a fixed number of members of the legislature—the plan adopted in New Zealand with the Maori voters. The privileged position of the Cape native was seen to be an obstacle to the federation of South Africa. The discussion which followed, based partly on the reports that the ministry contemplated disfranchising the natives, led, however, to no immediate results."

In South Africa a land law has been enacted whose inevitable effect must be to make the native

a legal serf in his own land. Though there are some six black men to every white man, the whites already control fourteen-fifteenths of the soil. Colonial statesmen should, therefore, revise their notions of equality, freedom, force, and lunatic asylums.

We do not in the least desire to measure the possibilities of the future by the actuallities of the past or the present. If we mention unpleasant facts, it is only because we want all British and colonial statesmen to face them with a view to bringing about a greater approximation between the ideal and the real.

Mr. Chamberlain on India's Present and Future Position.

In the course of a speech delivered in London on the 3rd April, Mr. Austen Chamberlain observed that India "would be the great storehouse of the Empire, but she must not remain a mere hewer of wood and drawer of water." May the Secretary of State for India prove a true prophet, and may India be raised from her present position of Cinderella to the Empire, not in industries alone, but in politics, too.

"The Preservation of Human Liberty."

At the great banquet given by the Americans to the British and French Missions at Waldorf Astoria Hotel, Mr. Balfour aroused great enthusiasm when he declared that a crisis had been reached when the whole of civilisation must rise up and voice its

appeal for the preservation of human liberty. "Unless all who love liberty unite," he said, "we shall be destroyed piecemeal."

Hitherto when white men have spoken of human liberty they have used the phrase in the sense of the liberty of the white peoples and, latterly, of the Japanese also. It is to be hoped Mr. Balfour's range of vision is wider. In any case, where he speaks of "the preservation of human liberty", we would ask the statesmen of all free nations to use the expression "the extension and preservation of human liberty." For we believe, we, too, are human beings, and before we can be called upon to unite for *preserving* human liberty it is necessary for us to feel that we enjoy liberty in the same sense as do the free peoples with whom we are to unite.

"FORMULAS FRAMED BEFORE THE FLOOD."

In the course of the great speech delivered by Mr. Lloyd George on the occasion of the presentation of the Freedom of London to him, he observed :

We are a thousand years older and wiser since the war. The experience of generations has been crowded into just a few winters, and we should be unworthy of the great destiny to which Providence has called this generation if we threw away all that for the sake of formulas framed before the flood. (Hear, hear).

Was the Premier thinking of Lord Chelmsford's famous formula that, whatever the velocity of progress in other countries may be, "catastrophic changes" must not take place in India,—she must advance by slow and imperceptible steps ?

The Viceroy has told us that rapid changes are repugnant to the British temperament and constitution. Mr. Lloyd George's observations do not seem to support this dictum of His Excellency. It is possible that under the changed conditions produced by the war, the British temperament may have been undergoing some change, making it possible also to change the British constitution somewhat rapidly.

"TRADITIONS OF FREEDOM AND SELF-GOVERNMENT."

At a banquet given to General Smuts by the Houses of Lords and Commons, General Smuts said in part that "he hoped that when the time for settlement came we should remember not merely central Europe but the whole British Empire." He added :

We were not fighting for material gain, nor for territory, but for future security. But, the difficult question of future constitutional relations and readjustment within the Empire remained. We were not an Empire in the German sense, but a system of nations almost sovereign, almost independent, rather a commonwealth than an Empire, and its future government was an entirely new problem. The system in the United States would not work and we did not want to standardize the nations of the Empire. The only solution was supplied by our traditions of freedom and self-government.

India is more than three times as populous as the rest of the British Empire ; but she is not included in the "system of nations almost sovereign, almost independent." Hence General Smuts's claim that the British Empire was rather a commonwealth than an Empire is unfounded. Even in the Union of South Africa which he represented in the Imperial Conference, the vast majority of the population do

not enjoy the franchise, because being non-European in origin, they are held to be unfit for it. As General Smuts says that at the time of the after-war settlement the whole of the British Empire should be remembered ; as India is the most extensive, populous and important part of this Empire ; and as the only solution of the difficult question of future constitutional relations and readjustment within the Empire was supplied by "our traditions of freedom and self-government" ; India ought, therefore, to be given freedom and self-government within the Empire after the war.

GENERAL SMUTS ON EMPIRES & FREEDOM.

In the course of his speech on the Empire of the Future, in the Royal Gallery of the House of Lords, on May 15 last, General Smuts said :—

What I feel in regard to all the empires of the past, and even in regard to the United States, is that the effort has always been towards forming one nation—always one nation. All the empires we have known in the past and that exist to-day are founded on the idea of assimilation, of trying to force human material into one mould. Your whole idea and basis is entirely different (Cheers). You do not want to standardize the nations of the British Empire ; you want to develope them towards a greater nationality. These coommunities, the offspring of the Mother Country, or territories like my own, which have been annexed after the vicissitudes of war, must not be moulded in any one pattern. You want them to develope on the principle of self-government, and therefore your whole idea is different from anything that has ever existed before. That is the fundamental fact we have to bear in mind—that this British Commonwealth of nations does not stand for standardization or conventionalization, but for the fuller, richer, and more various life of all the nations comprised in it.

Does the British Empire in reality stand "for the fuller, richer, and more various life" of the people of India ?

The General went on to observe :—

Even the nations which have fought against it, like my own, must feel that their interests, their language, their religion, are as safe and as secure under the British flag as those of the children of your own households and your own blood. It is only in proportion as this is realized that you will fulfil the true mission which is yours. (Cheers.) Therefore, it seems to me that there is only one solution, and that is a solution supplied by our past traditions—the traditions of freedom, self-government, and of the fullest development.

There is no question that the General has hit upon the right solution. Englishmen sojourning in India may ask themselves whether they are trying to "fulfil the true mission which is" theirs, by following "the traditions of freedom, self-government, and of the fullest development." In his peroration General Smuts further expatiated on this mission.

You talk of an Imperial mission. I think the British Empire has only one mission, and that is a mission for liberty and a mission for greater self-development. You represent the only system in history in which a large number of nations has been living in unity. You talk about a league of nations. You are the only league of nations that has ever existed. If the lines I am sketching here are correct, you are going to be even more a great league of nations in the future ; and if you are true to your old traditions of self-government and freedom and are true to those views of your future, you must exercise far greater and a far more beneficial influence on the history of mankind than you have ever done before.

That is a very big IF.

President Wilson's Flag Day Speech.

In the course of his "Flag Day" address in Washington Monument grounds, President Wilson, referring to the intrigues and other sinister endeavours of the Germans, said :—

Their present particular aim is to deceive all those who throughout the world stand for rights of peoples and self-government of nations, for they see what immense strength the forces of justice and liberalism are gathering out of this war. They are employing the Liberals in their enterprises, but let them once succeed and these men, now their tools, will be ground to powder beneath the weight of a great military Empire.

It would be good to have a list of all those nations who "stand for rights of peoples and self-government of nations" "*throughout the world*," both in profession *and in practice.*

President Wilson concluded by declaring :—

We shall make good with our lives and fortunes the great faith to which we were born and a new glory shall shine in the face of our people.

We wish Americans godspeed in their noble resolve. But will they please remember that the world cannot be free until India possesses civic freedom ?

American Labour on Democracy for all the World.

Mr. Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labour, has cabled to Mr. Duncan, the Labour delegate in the American mission to Russia, advising him to attend, if invited, the conference in Petrograd to consider the advisability of calling a

world congress of Socialists and Trade Unionists. Mr. Gompers continues: "Of course you will insist on the acceptance of the fundamental principles of democracy for every country and also on the necessity for all people of each country living their own lives and working out their own destinies. America entered the war in order to safeguard these principles and American labour will fight for the destruction of autocracy and the victorious establishment and maintenance of democracy."

Remember that India *is* a country and its inhabitants *are* a people.

If the unity of India and of her people be denied, let the principles of democracy be accepted at least for Sind, Punjab, Oudh, Bengal, Bihar, Maharastra, Andhra, Gujarat, &c., separately; for these at least are countries.

British Note to Russia on Allied War Aims.

His Majesty's Government's reply to the Russian Note regarding the Allied war aims states that they heartily concur in the sentiment of the proclamation to the Russian people which declared that free Russia did not propose to dominate other peoples or deprive them of their national patrimony or forcibly to acquire foreign territory. The reply proceeds:

Great Britain did not enter the war as a war of conquest, and are not continuing it for any such objects. Their purpose was at the outset to protect their existence and enforce respect for international engagements. Another object has now been added, namely, liberation of the populations oppressed by alien tyranny. The Government heartily rejoices at free Russia's

intention of the liberation of Poland—not only Poland which old Russian autocracy ruled but equally that within the Germanic Empire. British democracy wish Russia God-speed in this enterprise. Beyond everything we must seek a settlement which will secure the happiness and contentment of peoples and take away all legitimate causes for future wars.

We understand the meanings of words, and, in case of need, have several English dictionaries at hand.

President Wilson's Message to the Russian People.

We print below the coucluding paragraphs of President Wilson's noble and hope-inspiring message to the Russian people.

We are fighting again for the Liberty of Selfg-overnment and the undictated development of all Peoples ; and every feature of the settlement that conlcudes this War must be conceived and executed for the purpose. Wrongs must first be righted and then adequate safeguards must be created to prevent their being recommitted. We ought not to consider any remedies merely because they have a pleasing, sonorous sound : practical questions can be settled only by practical means.

Phrases will not accomplish this result. Effective readjustments will, and whatever readjustments are necessary must be made ; but they must follow a principle and that principle is plain. No people must be forced under a sovereignty under which it does not wish to live ; no territory must change hands except for the purpose of securing to those who inhabit it a fair chance of life and liberty ; no indemnities must be insisted on except those that constitute payment for manifest wrongs done ; no readjustments of power must be made except such as will tend to secure the future peace of the world and the future welfare and happiness of its peoples and then the Free Peoples of the World must draw together in a common covenant,

some genuine practical co-operation that will in effect combine their force to secure peace and justice in the dealings of Nations with one another. Brotherhood of mankind must no longer be a fair but empty phrase. It must be given a structure of force and reality. Nations must realise their common life and effect a workable partnership to secure that life against the aggressions of an autocratic self-pleasing power. For these things we can afford to pour out blood and treasure, for these are things we have always professed to desire and unless we pour out blood and treasure now and succeed, we may never be able to unite or show a conquering force again in the great cause of Human Liberty. The day has come to conquer or submit. If force and autocracy can divide us they will overcome us. If we stand together, victory is certain and the Liberty which victory will secure. We can afford then to be generous but cannot afford then or now to be weak or omit any single guarantee of justice and security.—(Reu.)

Has America any message for India ?

"THE PRESENT CRISIS"

BY JAMES RUSSEL LOWELL.

"For mankind are one in spirit, and an instinct bears along,
Round the earth's electric circle, the swift flash of right or wrong ;
Whether conscious or unconscious, yet Humanity's vast frame,
Through its ocean-sundered fibres feels the gush of joy or shame ;—
In the gain or loss of one race all the rest have equal claim."

NOT "SUBJECT RACES," BUT "PARTNER NATIONS."

In the fairly long summary of the Premier's Guildhall speech which Reuter cabled out to India, there was a very significant omission. Towards the close of his speech Mr. Lloyd George said that he had only two more points and that one was about Ireland. Reuter gave a summary of Mr. George's plea for Ireland, but did not transmit a word of his observations on "the other matter", namely, India. Here is the passage.

The other matter is India. Germany's greatest disappointment in this war has been India. (Cheers). She has had many disappointments; she has had no worse than India. She expected sedition, distraction, disaffection, disloyalty; she expected the forces of Britain to be absorbed upon the task of subduing and suppressing. What did she find? Eager, enthusiastic, loyal help to the Empire from India. (Cheers). I think they are entitled to ask that those loyal myriads should feel not that they were subject races of the Empire, but partner nations. Both these questions require bold statesmanship. Timidity, timorousness, faintheartedness, abborrent in peace or war, in war is fatal. (Cheers). Britain, which has faced the problems of war with a courage that has amazed the world, must face the problems of peace in the same great strength.

We do not know who made this omission, and why. It was a perfectly unnecessary piece of foolishness. For it is well-known that the words of British statesmen, and even of British sovereigns, need not be understood and given effect to in their ordinary sense east of Suez. Meanwhile we note that the Premier's declaration that Indians should not be treated as subject races has caused rejoicing in France. But will France or any other of the Allies keep watch how Mr. Lloyd George's implied promise is kept? Should he fail to keep it, Germany is sure to try to make capital out of the failure.

"THERE IS ONLY ONE FORM OF GOVERNMENT."

Mr. Balfour had a magnificent reception when he addressed both the Houses of Parliament in Canada on May 29, 1917. We quote one passage from his speech and italicise one sentence. He said:

"Wherever you find free democracy and the spirit

of liberty abroad, that great spirit of self-development on national lines, there you find the friends of the Allies and enemies of the Central Powers. *We are convinced that there is only one form of government, whatever it may be called, namely, where the ultimate control is in the hands of the people.* We have staked our last dollar on this and if democracy fails us we are bankrupt indeed. But we know that democracy will not fail us." (Cheers.)

As in Mr. Balfour's opinion there is only one form of government, namely, where the ultimate control is in the hands of the people, and as in India there is no such control, is there any government in India, or is there not? Will democracy fail the British people in their dealings with India or will it not?

There is one sentence in Balfour's address to which we desire to draw the attention of *our people*. It is: "*Patriotism overcomes all difficulties.*" We need to remember, however, that patriotism consists, not in getting angry and shouting, but in love, sacrifice and service.

WHY THE BOERS ARE FIGHTING.

Speaking at the Empire Day celebration at Stepney, General Smuts said :—

"I am a barbarian from the Veldt, a Boer who fought for three years against you when you were very wrong indeed. However, we have helped to convert you and win you back to the right road of freedom and liberty, and on that road you are now making the biggest struggle in your whole history. I am fighting with you and not I alone but thousands of my old

companions of the Boer war. What has brought these men into the struggle ? I don't think it is love of the British Empire. It is that they feel what you all feel that the greatest, the most precious and most spiritual forces of the human race are at stake. Either we are going into the future under the drill sergeant of Prussian lines or we shall move forward as free men and women. It is not a battle of the British Islands or of the British Empire. It is a battle of the world and when success is achieved I hope we may all be happy, and know we fought for a lasting peace for mankind and that for centuries war will not be heard of again on earth."

Who are meant by "we" and "mankind" and what kind of "peace" will "subject races" *enjoy ?*

"The Anglo-Saxon Creed."

In the course of his address at the dinner given to him at the London Savoy Hotel by the Pilgrims' Club, Dr. Page, the American ambassador, said :

We are come to save our own honour and to uphold our ideals—come on provocation done directly to us. ("Hear, hear.") But we are come also for the preservation, the deepening, and the extension of free government. Our creed is the simple and immortal creed of democracy, which means government set up by the governed ; for this alone can prevent physical or intellectual or moral enslavment. This is the ideal towards which the whole world is now moving along bloody paths. It is a colossal upheaval which will turn the world into a better home for free men.

Does this "Anglo-Saxon creed" hold good in India ?

Mr. Barnes on British Principles.

The Right Honourable Mr. G. N. Barnes made his first speech as a member of the war cabinet on June 21st, 1917. It gives some idea of British politi-

cal principles as they are professed and understood in England. He said : "We stood for the principle of each nation living its own life in its own way. The Central Powers stood for letting each nation live as *they* ordered."

As many official and non-offiicial Europeans in India insist that we should live as they order, are they subjects of the Cen tral Powers ?

Mr. Barnes also said : "We were not out to fight the German people, but we were out for the liberation of all peoples." This is indeed a very noble object, especially if it can be accomplished, both within and without the British Empire. Englishmen ought to be convinced that India is not a free country, but that it stands in need of liberation. For when Russia overthrew the tsardom, Mr. Llyod George, the British Premier, described the Russians as a "free people," meaning that they were not free before. Yet they were independent and had their parliament called the Duma. Dependent India without any kind of parliament certainly, then, requires at least home rule, in order that "the liberation of all peoples" may be an accomplished fact.

Russian Mission to America.

M. Baehvetieff, head of the Russian Mission, in a statement to the American people, avowed Russia's consecration to war with the German autocracy to the end. "Only through victory could stable world peace and the fruits of the Russian revolution be secured. The Russian people thoroughly understood

and were fully convinced that it was absolutely necessary to root out the autocratic principles which underlay German militarism that threatened the peace, freedom and happiness of the world."

There is no doubt that the Germans are greatly to blame. But is it certain that autocratic principles and militarism are exclusively German ? On his first public appearance in England since his return from America, Mr. Balfour also said :

President Wilson's latest speech formed a complete justification of the great alliance of nations loving liberty, against monstrous tyranny and coercion of the civilised world which was promised, if we submitted to an inconclusive and ineffectual peace,

This is true. But we do not think that monstrous tyranny and coercion of the civilised world will disappear from the face of the earth with the crushing of Germany. That devoutly wished for consummation can not be brought about without a change of heart throughout the "civilised" world, as General Smuts observed in effect on a recent occasion.

Poland in the House of Commons.

The following question and answer which took place in the House of Commons on April 26, 1917, should be found interesting :—

Mr. H. Samuel (L—Cleveland), for Mr. Asquith, asked whether His Majesty's Government was now in a position to make any statement in regard to Poland.

Mr. Bonar Law : As the House is aware, one of the first acts of the Russian Provisional Government was to issue a proclamation to the Poles recognising their right to decide their own destinies, and stating that the creation of an independent Polish State would be a sure guarantee of durable peace in Europe.

(Cheers). I am confident I rightly interpret the feeling of this House when I say we welcome the declaration, and look forward to the time when, thanks to the liberal and statesmanlike action of the Provisional Russian Government—(cheers)—Poland will appear again in international life, and take her share with other Nations in working for the common good of civilisation. (Cheers). Our efforts in the War will be directed towards helping Poland to realise her unity on the lines described in the Russian proclamation, that is to say, under conditions which will make her strong and independent. We hope that after the War Great Britain will remain united to Poland in bonds of close friendship. (Cheers).

Poland has been, on the whole, under German, Austrian and Russian despotism for a longer period than India has been under the benevolent rule of the British people. We have learned from many British authors and journalists that the oppressors of Poland never made any efforts to fit her for self-rule. On the other hand, our rulers claim that they have been continually giving us a training in the art of self-government. And the achievements of the Poles in any sphere of human endeavour, including the art of government, can not be said to surpass those of the Indians. Nor have they won their freedom by a war of independence. British statesmen acknowledge with enthusiasm that Poland is fit for immediate independent existence. But in India they have interned people apparently for demanding a qualified home rule after the war. What is the explanation ?

America and Ireland.

The London *New Statesman* makes an impassioned appeal to the British Government to apply Home

Rule to Ireland in order to secure the unqualified moral support of America in the war :

In Australia, with its very large Irish population, the issue has almost as much importance as in the United States. We can never attain a harmony of the English-speaking peoples with the Irish left out. But when once the Irish sore is healed, the path is straight before us. Great Britain can fight the war to its end, with no further aspersions on her role as the champion of freedom. The United States.....can then give us an unqualified moral support.

But what about India ?

"A UNITED STATES OF THE WORLD."

Current Opinion of New York expresses the opinion that a United States of the World may grow out of this war. It says that the ultimate results of the participation of America in the war can only be predicted intelligently in the light of what President Wilson regards as America's objects in entering the war. On January 22, in an address to Congress, he stated these objects substantially as follows :

(*a*) A League of Nations to insure peace and justice in place of 'Balance of Power' ;

(*b*) Equality of rights among nations ;

(*c*) Democracy : government by the consent of the governed :

(*d*) Independence and autonomy for subject nations, *e. g.*, Poland ;

(*e*) Guarantee of security of life, of worship and of industrial and social development to all peoples :

(*f*) Freedom of the seas and free access to the great highway of the sea for all nations :

(*g*) International limitation of armaments.

The first item on this program may be regarded as already near to realization. The nations of Europe now allied with the

nations of North and South America in warfare against Germany constitute a League of Nations that is likely, after the war, to be fully competent to insure peace and justice throughout the world. And the common principle which more and more clearly underlies their common action is the principle of democracy. "Democratic world federation" and "the United States of the World" are phrases that we find in newspaper editorials. "It is the hour of the federation of the world, of the parliament of man," according to the *Christian Science Monitor* (Boston).

India is not mentioned by name. But we should rejoice to see other dependent nations liberated, though our own liberation may be delayed. Our day also must come.

"UNION OF NATIONS."

About the middle of May last, the following cablegram was sent from Boston, U. S. A. : "Minister Viviani of France, in an address delivered in this city last evening, stated that he hoped to see a union of nations of the world to prevent a mad 'autocrat' from imperilling the welfare of the entire universe." Whereupon the *Philippine Review* rightly comments as follows :—

Exactly what was actually meant by Minister Viviani by "a union of nations" we hesitate to construe. If it is a step towards avoidance by all nations in interest of further international outrages or the prevention of 'a mad autocrat' from jeopardizing the welfare of the whole world, it should prove beneficial to all mankind and the idea can never be over-praised. But if it is confined to Europe alone, to the exclusion of Africa, the Near and Far East, and, generally speaking, of all other still non-independent or smaller or weaker countries, the materialization of this union would greatly change neither the present world status nor the danger which the powers concerned are confronted with. The

principle, open or underlying, which, in their own interest and for the balance of power in Europe, has prompted France, England and Russia together to fight Germany can hardly warrant this union. America's principle as enunciated by Wilson would more properly be the one to prompt it. The union as proposed cannot operate in behalf of a certain portion only of the universe. It should operate in behalf and for the good of the whole of mankind. For the latter's welfare does not admit of any division whatsoever. It is high time now for all the countries of the universe to enjoy the same rights and stay together on the same plane of living. The birth of this ideal is but the sequel of the successful efforts made by the French Revolution for the recognition of the equal rights of all men. Minister Viviani's ideas as to the union of nations can only be true if it would bring all countries of the world to the same higher plane of common life and life relations. If men have the right to be equal, countries should also have that same right to be equal. We cannot conceive of any union of nations if it is only to mean union of nations to quell any very strong nation or the better to subjugate the weaker ones. One of the blessings of the present war is the definition of the attitude, more or less sincere, of world powers as to nations' respective rights to exist as free states, be they small or great. Belgium is impersonating in the present War the small countries of the world. If her merciless invasion by Germany has aroused the sincere indignation of the greater powers because she was weaker, and if such step really was taken as a reliable indication of their readiness at any time to safeguard the rights of smaller countries, just as they claim to be defending those of Belgium, then the purpose is good. But if the attitude of the powers towards Belgium, England's supporting of Belgium, is simply because her own country may have been imperilled by the invasion and occupation of Belgium by Germany, then the hope of small countries lies on a sandy and slippery basis and its chance for materialisation can be but a conditional one. We therefore trust that Minister Viviani, in alluding to this hoped for union of nations, has sincerely meant the promotion of the welfare of the WHOLE UNIVERSE and that this welfare comprises also

that of the smaller and still dependent countries. In this sense, the step would be one towards the equalization of peoples, similar to the equaiization of men as proclaimed and attained by the French Revolution. May this forward move be a better future for the WHOLE OF MANKIND and may this be a chance for all countries and peoples of the world to be happy and independent, and for the designs of the stronger for the subjugation of the weaker to cease at once and forever, for "the welfare of the entire universe." Fortunately, the presence of America in this possible union of nations is an assurance for us smaller countries.

RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF LIBERTY THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.

Speaking at the Belgian Independence Day Feast at Queen's Hall in London Mr. Lloyd George gave a caustic reply to Dr. Michælis, the then German Chancellor. In the course of his speech the Premier said :—

"I don't want Germans to harbour delusions, that they are going to put us out of this fight till liberty has been re-established throughout the world."

We hope liberty will be re-established throughout the world, *including India.*

INTERNATIONAL RIGHT AND JUSTICE IN THE WORLD.

Mr. Lloyd George is reported to have concluded his recent Queen's Hall speech as follows :—

Every British, American and Portuguese soldier knows that he is fighting side by side with others for international right and justice in the world, and it is that growing conviction more than the knowledge of our vast unexhausted resources, which gives them and us heart to go on fighting to the end knowing that the future of mankind is our trust to maintain and defend (loud cheers).

May it be hoped that "every British, American and Portuguese soldier" and citizen will insist on the ideal and standard of "international right and justice in the world" being the same in India as elsewhere? May it be hoped that the allied nations will actively remember that the people of India form part of mankind and that the future of mankind includes the future of India?

Mr. Lloyd George on Human Liberty.

In the course of the speech which he made on the occasion of receiving the Freedom of the City of Glasgow on June 29th last, Mr. Lloyd George said:—

> But for our great efforts, a catastrophe would have overtaken the democracies of the world. "The strength of Britain flung into the breach has once more saved Europe and human liberty." (Cheers).

We hope "human liberty" includes the liberty of Indians.

Peoples' Wishes the Dominant Factor.

> Referring to the fate of the German colonies, the Premier said their peoples' desires and wishes must be the dominant factor. The untutored peoples would probably want gentler hands than Germans' to rule them. (Hear, hear).

As the people of India are somewhat more tutored than the people of the German Colonies in Africa, the desires and wishes of the people of India ought to be a more dominant factor in determining their future, though the present temper of the bureaucracy in India does not encourage the hope that any such equitable principle is going to be followed. As untutored peoples want gentle hands to rule them,

we hope it has not been or will not be concluded that tutored peoples want ungentle hands to rule them.

"NATIONS MUST CONTROL THEIR DESTINIES."

Mr. Lloyd George also said :

The Austrian Premier has repudiated the principle that nations must control their own destinies, but unless this principle is effected, not only will there be no peace, but if you had peace there would be no guarantee of its continuance. Peace framed on an equitable basis would not be broken by nations and abiding peace will be guaranteed by the destruction of Prussian military power.

It is well-known that in their press laws and rules regarding communal representation the Government of India borrowed some ideas from the Austro-Hungarian Empire. But we do hope, none of our rulers have had any Austrian training in statecraft. The reason for this apprehension is that some of them seem to repudiate in practice the sound democratic principle laid down by the Premier "that nations must control their own destinies."

"EMANCIPATION OF MANKIND."

The Premier concluded: "Europe is again drenched in the blood of its bravest and best, but do not forget the great succession of hallowed causes. They are stations of the Cross on the road to the emancipation of mankind. I appeal to the people of this country and beyond, that they continue to fight for the great goal of international rights and international justice, so that never again shall brute force sit on the throne of justice nor barbaric strength wield the sceptre of liberty." (Loud cheers.)

When British and other Allied statesmen speak of human liberty or the emancipation of mankind, there

is no positive reason to suppose that they speak light-heartedly or hypocritically. But we can not help thinking that their words, if taken literally, would seem to raise greater hopes than they have power to fulfil. Do these statesmen possess the power, or even the serious and firm determination, to bring about or work for the emancipation of all mankind ? We shall indeed be glad to be convinced that they are not in their excitement and enthusiasm indulging in big talk.

The Ideals of Justice and Liberty.

On May 10 last, the anniversary of the expanding of the first Russian Duma, the President of the Duma, M. Rodzianko made a speech, in the course of which he said :—

The innumerable sacrifices which we have laid on the altar of this war demand that the peace should correspond with the immensity of our efforts, and that the aim for which we are struggling should be assured to us, namely, the triumph of the ideals of justice and liberty. The Germans oppose to these splendid ideals their own programme, which is totally different, namely the hegemony of the world and the enslavement of nations.

A struggle of principles so mutually contradictory cannot terminate in a draw, but only by the decisive victory of one or other of the adversaries. Only the complete defeat of German militarism will assure the happiness of the world. The gulf separating the Germans, the devastators and destroyers of civilisation, from the Ailies is too deep for the war to cease without the realization of the ideals which I have mentioned.

Prince Lvoff, the Prime Minister, said :—

It is not the wonderful and almost fairy-like character of the Russian Revolution, it is not its power and rapidity which have

astonished the world, but the ideal which directed it, and which embrace not only the interests of the Russian people, but those of all nations

'THE WAR OF IDEAS.'

In an article with the above heading, contributed to the London *Daily News*, Mr. A. G, Gardiner writes that German or Prussian militarism is not confined to Germany or Prussia, so that the mere material defeat of Germany will not do ; the idea for which that militarism stands must be uprooted from every country, including England.

The victory over Napoleon was a material victory, but a spiritual defeat for Europe. The victory had to be won because Napoleon had betrayed and trampled on all the grand ideals of the French revolution. He used the power generated by the ideals of the revolution to overthrow the old gods of despotism and having overthrown them impudently erected a shoddy fabric of Imperialism on the ruins. The fabric collapsed and the old Gods came back for the plunder. The liberties of Europe were lost in the struggles of rival despots.

A SPIRITUAL VICTORY.

If we are not to have a repitition of that experience, if this war is not to be a mere overture to another and a greater war, a material victory must not satisfy us. We must have a spiritual victory. It is not enough to defeat Prussian militarism. We have got to defeat in all the world the spirit of which Prussian militarism is the present embodiment. And in this matter it is necessary to remind ourselves that ideas have no geographical limit. They are indifferent to all belligerents. You will find as venomous a hatred of liberty in this country as anywhere. Turn to any number of the *National Review* or any issue of the *Morning Post*. Turn on that infamous article in Blackwoods' this month in which insults are poured on President Wilson and the United States, sneers levelled at the Russian revolution and silly

gibes directed at all our free Allies and in which the 'trumpery of democracy' is denounced as a vile thing for which we are not fighting.

What Then?

Aren't we? Then pray what are we fighting for? If we are not fighting for freedom, then we are fighting for its opposite. And its opposite is Prussian militarism. The man who writes thus is not fighting against Prussian militarism. He is fighting to impose Prussian militarism on us. And do not let us suppose he is simply a voice crying in the wilderness. There are many to read him and echo his virulent animosities. You will hear plenty of scoffing at America, find plenty of sympathisers with the Tsar, discover the clubs full of people who are bewildered by the turn of events and are not quite sure whether they hate the Prussian despotism or the Russian revolution the more. In the war of ideas the revolution is a defeat for them and the intervention of America is a defeat for them, for these events make for the doom of Prussianism, and they are not fighting Prussianism. They are only fignting Prussia for the possession of her idol. The difference between England and Prussia is not that one has been wholly Liberal and the other wholly Militarist. The difference is that in our case liberalism has been in the saddle, in the case of the other, despotism has been in the saddle. And the gentleman in 'Blackwood' wants to win the war in order that the position may be reversed. He wants to win the war to defeat Liberalism in England.

To our Countrymen.

British and Colonial statesmen ought to be able to perceive that in every part of the world in which they have a predominant influence they should establish and maintain inviolate the human rights for which, they have repeatedly declared, they have been fighting. They should be able to show that democracy, human freedom, justice, equality and

unity, for which, according to their own solemn declarations, they are fighting, are good for all men, and good, therefore, for the peoples who are for the time being subject to them. Justice, humanity, consistency and sincerity demand that they should behave in this way. Many a time have Indians been disillusioned owing to the non-fulfilment of promises made to them. It is to be hoped that there is no fresh disillusionment in store for them after the conclusion of peace, as such disillusionment would make it very difficult for honest and self-respecting Indians to co-operate with Government officials.

British statesmen and the statesmen of allied countries should be convinced that a lasting peace is possible only if human rights are recognised in the case of both organised and unorganised races. There should be left as little temptation and opportunity as possible for the gratification of the predatory instincts of savage man persisting in his civilised descendant. Should land-grabbing and commerce-grabbing and the desire for the possession of human cattle persist, a fresh war among those having such desires would be inevitable, civilisation would prove a sham and a mockery ;—nay, it would be a curse : and it must die of its own excesses.

Our countrymen, too, have a duty in the matter. In many things, we think we have done our duty when we have merely criticised, exhorted, advised, or prayed to Government or the British public. But that is not our whole duty ; in fact, that is the least part of our duty. The British nation and their allies

have declared through their spokesmen that they are fighting for human rights, human freedom, justice, equality and the establishment of democracy. British and colonial statesmen have laid special emphasis on the fact that their Empire stands secure on the foundations of justice, equality, freedom and unity. The Secretary of State for India has declared that after the war India is not to remain a mere hewer of wood and drawer of water. Our urgent duty is to secure the recognition and observance in India of the declared principles and ideals of the major portion of the civilised world. We must see that human rights are recognised in India. We must not submit to any infringement of these rights. The principles of democracy, to which the most progressive races of the world have declared their adhesion, must be followed in our country. All who reside here, of whatever caste, creed, race or country, rich or poor, literate or illiterate, should be placed in a position to understand and appreciate these principles. Human equality and human freedom must no longer remain mere abstractions in any part of the world.

One misconception we must get rid of. Justice and equality and freedom and unity are not principles of politics alone. Human nature does not consist of separate air-tight compartments. Political justice, equality, freedom and unity cannot co-exist with social injustice, inequality, slavery and disunion. It is true that in politically free and independent countries, too, there is much social injustice, inequal-

ity, bondage and disunion. But to the extent that such conditions prevail there, those countries are not free ; and their foremost thinkers and workers are striving for justice, equality, freedom and unity in all spheres of human life. The highest freedom and the most essential, is freedom of the mind,—of thought, will and conscience, leading to freedom of action. Without it no other kind of freedom is possible in all its perfection, nor can it secure the highest good to man.

Our position must not be misunderstood. We do not say that because we are not socially free, therefore we must not aspire to be politically free, or that because we are not politically free, we must not strive to be socially free, etc. ; nor do we say, that any one kind of freedom must precede any other kind, being a condition precedent to it. However enslaved a people may be in any department of human life, that does not bar its right to be free in any other direction, particularly as freedom in any sphere may promote freedom in the rest. What we do say is that *Freedom is One*, and freedom in each sphere of human life depends for its perfection on freedom in all other spheres. National effort must embrace all spheres, though, owing to differences in convictions, ability, opportunity, etc., individual efforts may be confined to one or more departments of human life. But every individual should study the interdependence of political, social, religious, educational, economic and other kinds of reform.

We have said above that freedom in any sphere of

life may promote the cause of freedom in the rest. We shall give an example. Nationalism and Swadeshism in Bengal has, no doubt, to some extent revived and strengthened a blind adherence to some time-worn ways and usages, simply because they are "national," and such adherence has been sought to be supported by pseudo-scientific explanations; but it must also be acknowledged that caste restrictions were relaxed, interdining was promoted between men of different castes and creeds, occupations other than ancestral caste callings were resorted to, and social solidarity was sought to be promoted by attempts at ameliorating the condition of "the depressed classes." All these endeavours have not been ephemeral. Many have survived the days of our first enthusiasm and are strengthening our national life.

The golden rule is, do unto others as you would be done by. We do not like to be despised by the ruling caste, we want equality of opportunity with them. So, if we are neither hypocrites nor the slaves of blind bigotry, we must not prescribe social subjection for any class, we must not, either in theory or in practice, despise any class, we must, so far as in us lies, try our best to give equality of opportunity to all classes of our countrymen. Freedom all round, should be our motto. Social opinion has its police value in keeping men in the right path. But the ideal man is not he whom fear of the police or of society keeps straight; self-reverence ought to suffice to make a man what he ought to be. But whatever

may be the value of social opinion, social tyranny is a curse. Like other kinds of tyranny, it dehumanises and makes cowards of its victims.

ALLEGED INSUFFICIENCY OF "RULERS ABLE TO RULE"

It has been said that in India there are not "rulers able to rule" in sufficient numbers. How has that been ascertained ? In what kind of duties, civil or military, have Indians been given a fair chance to prove their capacity, to which they have not proved equal ? It is the misfortune of dependent peoples that the proof of their fitness is made to depend upon the certificate of their foreign rulers, whose occupation would be gone, at any rate to a great extent, if they gave that certificate.

The argument against Indian Home Rule based on our alleged unfitness for it was thus disposed of by the president of the Bihar Provincial Conference, 1917 :—

As a matter of fact, the alleged unfitness of our people has no existence apart from the Anglo-Indian mind which sees what it desires to see. It is idle to attempt to argue into conviction men or classes whose judgments are warped by prejudices incidental to threatened encroachments on their vested interests. To such I can do no better than present the following passage from Macaulay's famous Essay on Milton :—"Many politicians of our time are in the habit of laying it down as a self-evident proposition that no people ought to be free till they are fit to use their freedom. The maxim is worthy of the fool in the old story who

resolved not to go into the water till he had learnt to swim." "If men are to wait for liberty," continues Macaulay, "till they have become good and wise in slavery, they may indeed wait for ever."

The Philippine Review says :—

Dependent peoples are always looked upon by westerners as short of qualifications ; and, whatever their actual merits may be, they (their merits) are lost sight of under cover of such *advisably* prevailing belief that *they* (said people) *are short of qualifications.*

Their failures are magnified, and their successes minimized. Their failures are theirs, and their successes not theirs, and the *latter are necessarily the work of their masters.*

The mistakes of independent peoples are not mistakes to them ; but the same mistakes, if made by dependent peoples even in the *minimum* degree, are considered *mistakes in the maximum degree*, deserving the most spiteful condemnation,—the result of their alleged lack of qualifications, character or what not.

Besides dependent peoples are not in a position to act for themselves ; for others act for them—those who, for one reason or another, in one way or another, have assumed responsibility for this tutelage and are always discriminated against, and subject to the pleasure of their masters whose convenience must obtain.

On the other hand, an independent people are free from outside prejudices, none cares to waste time searching for their virtues and vices, and they are *per se* considered as fully qualified people, particularly if before and behind them big modern guns can deafeningly roar defensively.

AN ASSUMPTION AND A PRETENSION

When we express a desire for self-rule, it is generally assumed that we want to cut off all political connection with England ; though it has been made

clear again and again that, whatever the remote and ultimate *result* of the attainment of self-rule by us may be, the direct and immediate *object* of our political endeavours is a position *within* the British Empire similar to that of the self-governing dominions. This wrong assumption is to be found in two recent publications. Thus it is observed in Mr. Elwyn Bevan's pamphlet "*What should our Attitude as Christians be to Indian Nationalism*" :—

If by our leaving India to-morrow India could start as a self-governing community, we ought to leave India to-morrow. But it is practically certain that if the foreign rule were withdrawn from India at this moment Indian native rule would not have the degree of efficiency necessary to make free India a "going concern" amongst the nations of the world. The more sober-minded even of Indians admit that the first result of the withdrawal of the English would be chaos.

But does not the writer know that we do not want Englishmen "to leave India to-morrow"? As the equivalent of the untold wealth and other advantages which England has been deriving from her connection with India, we want Englishmen to help us to do without them more and more. We do not want to be in tutelage for ever. We want an acceleration of the pace of our political progress.

Mr. Lionel Curtis says in *The Problem of the Commonwealth* :—

"Not one of them [British ministers] would venture to say that either of these countries [India and Egypt] *can be left to shift for itself*, or could even be placed, for the present, in the same position as Canada or Australia. Responsible leaders of the national party in India would scarcely repudiate this view, and any

proposal to deal with India now as the Transvaal and Free State were dealt with in 1907 would strike some if not all of them with dismay. They would say that, whatever the rate of the progress to be made in that direction, the final authority in Indian affairs must remain, for the present, where it now rests." [The italics are ours.]

Here the author has mixed up two different propositions. One is to leave India to shift for herself, and the other is to give her self-rule, similar to, though it may not be identical with, that of the self-governing Dominions. The first is not our demand, and therefore it ought not to be assumed that it is. We can no more *at present* shift for ourselves than the Dominions *in their present condition* can. Can Australia, left to herself, defend herself against a hostile Japan ? Can Canada, left to herself, maintain an independent political existence against an inimical United States ?

The real attitude of Indians to the British Empire is clear to those foreigners who have no axes to grind and who take an unselfish interest in our affairs. For instance, the Rev. J. T. Sunderland of America says :—

"While India wants freedom to shape her own affairs, her wisest minds do not desire separation from England. They recognize many strong ties between the two countries which they would not see broken. While they are determined not much longer to lie prostrate beneath England's feet, they would gladly stand by her side, arm in arm with her, firmly united for great ends of mutual welfare and mutual strength. An Anglo-Indian Empire is one of the splendid possibilities of the future, binding Britain and her colonies and her great Asiatic possession into a powerful world-spanning federation of free peoples. Something

like this is the dream of India's greatest leaders, as it is also the dream of not a few of Britain's most far-seeing minds."

As to the second proposition, *we do think* that India can at present be placed in the same position as Canada and Australia. We do not look forward to it with the least dismay. We should like very much to know the names of the "responsible leaders of the national party in India" who would be dismayed at the prospect.

Mr. Edwyn Bevan observes :—

"It could hardly be right for us to take a course [*i.e.*, withdrawal from India] which would entail distress upon millions for whom we have made ourselves responsible simply because some hundreds of men in the country tell us they would like it."

The underlying suggestion here is that Englishmen rule India and do not want immediately to withdraw from India primarily and chiefly, if not entirely, because they want to save us from the miseries of chaos. Whilst we are by no means blind to the advantages of peace and order, our view is that the presence of Englishmen in India, whatever its advantages to us, is not in pursuit of a philanthropic enterprise. Englishmen are in India primarily and chiefly because it is a paying business to be here. "The White Man's Burden" consists of gold nuggets. The benefits derived by us from his presence are by-products, though like many other by-products some of them may be very valuable.

We do not mean to suggest that not a single Englishman has realised England's mission in India and acted accordingly. It would be contrary to the truth to do so.

THE PACE OF INDIA'S PROGRESS

Regarding the pace of India's political progress Lord Chelmsford has observed :

The growing self-respect and self-consciousness of her people are plants that we ourselves have watered, and if the blossom is not always what we expect, it is not for us to blame the plant. There are doubtless some of you who think our footsteps halting and our progress slow, but I should be dishonest if I held out any hope that progress will be rapid. Neither the British constitution nor the British temperament is fond of catastrophic changes, nor are such changes consistent with developments on sound and healthy lines. Progress should be steady and sure, and in regard to it I believe that my views are in close harmony with those of my predecessor who was so happy as to win the confidence of India, and, using Lord Hardinge's words, I hope some day to see India hold a position of equality amongst the sister nations of which the British Empire is composed.

His Excellency himself, his predecessor, the British constitution and the British temperament are, in his opinion, against rapid progress. The word "rapid," however, does not convey any definite idea of velocity ; it is a relative term. His Excellency said : "I hope some day to see India hold a position of equality amongst the sister nations of which the British Empire is composed." Should this hope be interpreted to mean that he expects its fruition during his own life-time ? It is to be hoped, however, that India will become politically equal to the other parts of the British Empire sooner than His Excellency thinks. In addition to the controllers of India's destiny which His Excellency has mentioned,

there are other forces to be taken into consideration. We are not thinking of Providence in this connection, though we are firm believers in Providence as the final disposer of events; —we are thinking only of mundane forces. And they are pressure of public opinion and public movements in India (if they can be made sufficiently strong), and circumstances, originating in international complications or in events of international importance, like the present war. Forces like these may impel the British people to hasten less slowly in spite of their temperament. It is, moreover, not axiomatic that whatever is not suited to the British temperament is dangerous or wrong. For we find various non-British peoples have made solid progress with un-British rapidity.

"Catastrophic Changes."

The use made by the Viceroy of the phrase "catastrophic changes" reminds us of the rapid changes introduced by the Japanese government in less than the life-time of a generation, changes which have made Japan a formidable first-class power. In the Philippines America has just given the people a government responsible to them, after eighteen years of occupation. Substantial self-government had already been granted to them before within only nine years of American rule. The Americans are largely of British stock. The British temperament itself may, therefore, be considered capable of undergoing such a change as to favour a somewhat more

rapid progress in India than has been to its liking hitherto.

Mr. Srinivasa Sastri has shown in his presidential address at the Bombay Provincial Conference that our legislative councils, constituted in 1853, "worked for eight years before the first Indian found entry into them by nomination."

Thirty years passed before the next step was taken, **a period within which other peoples found it possible to begin and consummate their political evolution.** This step consisted of a slight increase of non-official Indians, some of whom came in by a subsidiary process of election, not recognised in law. Seventeen more years passed before election became a reality and the provincial legislatures had a majority of non-officials, which has proved a delusion and a snare. What is the next step to be, and when will it be taken? Perhaps we should get an elected majority, in two years more, that is, ten years after the last reform. Of course, this majority would be bare and utterly ineffective. To make it decisive, at least one decade would be necessary. Our mentors would then take us in successive decades through such fractions as two-thirds, three-fourths, four-fifths, till in another half a century we might have a wholly elective legislature in the advanced provinces. Of course a longer period would be required for the Indian Legislative Council and the Councils of the backward provinces to reach this level.

Referring to our progress as regards the public services Mr. Sastri has shown that

"Eighty-four years after statutory affirmation of our equality we are still looking forward to getting something between a fourth and a third of the chief administrative posts in our own country. And the whole history is marked by noble sentiments and promises, backsliding, bitter recrimination and paltry and graceless concession. Can a people who have endured this sort of thing be accused of seeking to introduce catastrophic or revolutionary changes or effect a "sudden upheaval' and "startling

transfer of political authority into ignorant and inexperienced hands ?"

"STEP BY STEP."

In the course of his reply to the address presented to the Viceroy in Lahore by the Sikhs, His Excellency said :

I sympathise whole-heartedly with Indian aspirations and I hope it will be my lot, during my period of office, to assist them to find greater scope. But let me repeat here a warning which it is my duty constantly to reiterate in these times of exuberant political activities, when people's minds are disturbed and opinions are unsettled by the conflict and crash of Empires,—let me repeat that the ideal which is best suited for India is not so much rapid progress as steady progress. Do not expect violent changes. If progress is to be sure it must be consolidated step by step.

This is similar to what the Viceroy said in reply to the address of the Indian Association in Calcutta, and which has been quoted above.

What the Viceroy said in the Punjab might have been more appropriate if uttered in Petrograd.

If a man is lying still, it is superfluous to tell him that he must not run too fast. If a man is accustomed to ride, he may be warned not to gallop at a breakneck pace ; but such advice is unnecessary in the case of one who has not got a horse and therefore does not propose to ride.

The Viceroy speaks of "the ideal which is best suited for India" being "not so much rapid grogress as steady progress. Do not expect violent changes. If progress is to be sure it must be consolidated step by step," We do not believe that India is outside

the world. We believe the pace of progress which suits Japan and the Philippines will suit India, too. Has not progress been sure and has it not been consolidated in Japan and the Philippines? The most irrefutable argument in the armoury of our rulers is the peculiarity of India. It is irrefutable, because really there is no other country in the world geographically, politically and racially situated *exactly* and *identically* as India is. All the same, such an argument is entirely unconvincing.

"Rapid," "violent," and "steady" are relative terms. What the rulers of India consider "steady" progress, we consider as almost equivalent to marking time. Progress should certainly be steady and sure, but there is no immutably fixed natural law regulating the length of the steps and the interval between one step and the next.

The British temperament may not be fond of catastrophicc changes ; but nevertheless there have been several revolutions in British history. Of course, we do not want a revolution, but only ordered progress. In fact we do not care so much for the adjectives "rapid," "steady," &c., as for the substantive, "progress." There has been just enough progress in India to prevent the critics of British rule from asserting that there has been no progress. But that is not enough.

The British temperament may dislike rapid progress, particularly in India, but it can appreciate and applaud "catastrophic changes" which take place outside the British Empire ;—a fact which political

psychologists may study. In support of our assertion, we shall quote from the speeches of only one British statesman. Mr. Lloyd George's great speech before the American Luncheon Club contains the following passage :—

There are times in history when this world spins so leisurely along its destined course that it seems for centuries to be at a stand-still. There are also times when it rushes along at a giddy pace covering the track of centuries in a year. These are such times. Six weeks ago Russia was an autocracy. She is now one of the most advanced democracies in the world. (Cheers).

We do think the British rulers have the capacity to make India move along at such a pace as to cover the track of centuries, not in one year, but in a decade or two ; but it seems their overpowering sense of diffidence leads them to entertain an unduly low estimate of their powers. They ought to overcome their modesty and have a better conceit of themselves.

There are times when progress requires a new departure to be made. Then, whether one calls its sudden or violent or not, there must be a break with the past, and progress must be by leaps. Such a time has come in India.

POLITICAL STATUS AND MAN-POWER.

If you want men to come forward to give their lives, you must touch their imaginations. Mere

words cannot touch the imagination. Some Anglo-Indian journalists seem to think that they can deceive us by saying that we ought not to expect rewards for our loyalty or to make political capital out of Government's decision to raise a defence force. But it is foolish to look at the matter in that light. It is really a question of how best to obtain the largest number of soldiers animated by the utmost enthusiasm for the Empire. We want to make our meaning quite plain. Englishmen are fighting for preserving their own free citizenship and for restoring and safeguarding the free citizenship of some other nations. What are we expected to fight for? It is nothing more nor less than preserving our position of dependence on England and all the advantages and disadvantages which it implies. Now, we do not want to malign England, we are not at all interested in representing British rule to be worse than it is. We know its value and the value of British protection. But, taking the best view of British rule in India, we do not think any patriotic and imaginative Englishman can assert that India's position of dependence on England has the same political, economic and moral value for Indians as British citizenship has for the British people. That being so, can a desire for the safeguarding of India's position of dependence on England rouse the same enthusiasm among the people of India as the desire to preserve their perfectly free citizenship does among the British people? We trow not.

Still Indians are fighting and will fight to save

themselves from a worse fate and from the inconveniences, barbarities and oppression incidental to all fresh conquests. But Englishmen must be much more unimaginative than they are reputed to be, if they think that this motive can be as strong, can rouse as much ardour, as the longing to preserve the glorious rights and proud privileges of self-ruling citizens. This is the reason why we want to feel in real fact that we have a political status, a status equal to the citizens of the British Empire. It is the cause that makes the fighter.

It will be understood that in this note we have in view only the voluntary principle of enlistment. Soldiers who fight mainly for pay or for pay as one of the main considerations, may enlist themselves for it, even though they do not possess any political status. But the number which can be obtained in this way is limited. An army truly national in numbers and thoroughly national in spirit can be had on the voluntary principle, only when the inhabitants of a country are free and self-ruling citizens. The other way is the method of conscription. But this, too, implies the possession or concession of the franchise. For conscription cannot work smoothly or secure zealous fighters unless the men are free self-ruling citizens.

Even in independent states history has proved the difference in man-power between a country whose people possessed the franchise in very large numbers and a country where the franchise was confined only to certain sections of the people. Major Cartwright

in his pamphlet *The Commonwealth in Danger* (1795), contrasts England and France as they were during the Revolutionary war. The French Republic, relying on the populace, had more than a million men under arms. Great Britain was "a disarmed, defenceless, unprepared people, scarcely more capable of resisting a torrent of French invaders than the herds and flocks of Smithfield." How, then, could the danger be averted ? "Solely," he replied, "by trusting the people and by reviving the ancient laws which compelled householders to bear arms. But this implied the concession of the franchise." "Be bold," he said ; "make the Kingdom a commonwealth and the nation will be saved.....A million of armed men, supporting the state with their purse, and defending it with their lives, will know that none have so great a stake as themselves in the Government. Arming the people and reforming Parliament are inseparable."

"By the talisman of trust in the people France conjured up those armed hosts which overthrew all Europe...[Instead of] trusting and arming the people, Pitt was fain to plod along in the old paths, and use the nation's wealth, not its manhood." (H. Rose's *William Pitt and the Great War*, pp. 280-281). Hence his failure-

The British Empire, if it is to reman intact for a long time to come, must use the full man-power of India. But it would be impossible to secure the full man-power of India without giving her arms and a parliamentary form of responsible government.

That is the clear verdict of history, Full franchise and full man-power go together.

What we drive at, should not be misunderstood. Our support of the proposal to raise a defence force does not depend on any conditions. We want that it should be a strong and sufficiently numerous body, animated by the highest spirit of devotion. And in order that it may easily be so, we urge that Government should make our people feel that they are "equal subjects of the King" with Englishmen.

VOTES FOR THE INDIAN PEASANT

Indiaman of London, representing Anglo-India among other people, writes :—

India has definitely adopted the principle of political representation, and she is daily learning that the principle will not work without an adequate supply of voters : there is no reason to doubt the political capacity of the Indian peasant, but at present it is latent, and it must be gradually drawn out—in fact, educated. There is not time to wait till the boys now at school grow up, and the great political importance of the co-operative movement is that it is saving time by educating the adults, We do not mean that it is teaching them the three R's, which is what some people understand by education, but that it is insensibly giving them experience which will enable them to make a reasonable use of their votes when they get them. We have insisted on this point before, but repetition is justified by its practical importance. Indian politicians claim to represent the peasant ; other people who know something of the peasant say they do nothing of the kind ; and the only effective way of settling the

controversy is to allow the peasant to speak for himself. For some centuries he has been dumb, and it has become the fashion to think that he will never learn to speak; the co-operative movement is teaching him this lesson, and it is well to remember that when the lesson is learned the world will hear the voice of India, speaking with an authority to which leagues and congresses can lay no claim.

It is extremely funny that foreigners who differ from the Indian peasant in race, complexion, creed, language, dress, appearance, manners, customs, habits and interests, should claim to know the Indian peasant better than any of his educated countrymen. But it does not matter. What is important is the admission made by *Indianman* that "there is no reason to doubt the political capacity of the Indian peasant, but at present it is latent." Let the peasant be allowed to speak for himself. We have no misgiving as to what he will say and demand.

LOYALTY AND BARGAINING

It is well-known that partners in a concern share all the profits and losses. They run risks in common and enjoy and suffer advantages and disadvantages. Dependants, whether called employees, servants, or by any other names, neither get dividends nor bear any losses. They sometimes get bucksheesh; that is all.

India's position in the Empire is not that of a

partner. That is an old grievance, which we need not revive. But as India is bearing losses, running risks, and spending her blood and treasure like a partner, inspite of her not being one, it is but just that the position of a partner, so long unjustly withheld from her, should now be given to her.

Our very shrewd friends, the Anglo-Indian journalists and their customers, have repeatedly preached sermons to us exhorting us not to make political capital out of our loyalty. Loyalty, they have told us, is incompatible with bargaining. Very true indeed. But we are sure we cannot be more loyal than our friends, the white citizens of the self-governing Dominions. We will pay them the sincerest tribute of admiration by imitating them in our own small feeble way. They are co-operating with Great Britain to win victory. We have done and will continue to do the same. They have autonomy in their internal affairs and, when peace is concluded, they want to have the same sort of power in the management of the affairs of the whole empire as Great Britain and Ireland now have. We are, for the present, not so ambitious. We want only internal autonomy, home rule.

We hope our Anglo-Indian journalistic brethren will not misjudge and misunderstand us. Nearly two centuries of intercourse and contact with Westerners has not been able to deprive us entirely of the otherworldliness with which Europeans credit us when it suits their purpose to do so. We are, therefore, not very grasping. We do not want to be too

grasping; we do not want to monopolise all the loyalty ourselves, and leave all the sordid bargaining to our white brethren here and in the Colonies. Let us all be loyal and all drive bargains, as far as we can. That ought to be a fair and satisfactory arrangement all round.

Seriously speaking, there is no incompatibility between loyalty and an endeavour to obtain political rights. To strive for civic rights in legitimate ways is not to be wanting in loyalty. Were it so, England would have been considered very disloyal. Nor is it a right use of words to call our endeavour to obtain political rights bargaining.

UTILITY OF "THE MOON" IN HASTENING POLITICAL PROGRESS

Lord Morley, when he was plain John Morley, was the first British statesman to exhort us not to cry for the moon. As we continue to be children, many other British statesmen have repeated Lord Morley's exhortation in varied phraseology. "The Moon," however, in the shape of a distant, "impracticable" ideal, would seem to have some utility in accelerating the pace of political evolution. Lord Acton observes in his essay on Nationality :—

"The pursuit of a remote and ideal object which captivates the imagination by its splendour and the reason by its simplicity, evokes an energy which would not be inspired by a rational,

possible end, limited by many antagonistic claims, and confined to what is reasonable, practicable and just. One excess or exaggeration is the corrective of the other, and error promotes truth, where the masses are concerned, by counterbalancing a contrary error. The few have not strength to achieve great changes unaided ; the many have not wisdom to be moved by truth unmixed. Where the disease is various, no particular definite remedy can meet the wants of all. Only the attraction of an abstract idea, or of an ideal state, can unite in a common action multitudes who seek a universal cure for many special evils, and a common restorative applicable to many different conditions."

We do not consider Home Rule "a remote and ideal object"; we think it is "a rational, possible end" which is "reasonable, practicable and just." But if our political opponents think that it is "the moon" in politics, we present to them the observations of Lord Acton on the need and utility of such a moon. In our opinion it is only the absolute independence of India which can be described as "a remote and ideal object." Our political opponents are guilty of "excess or exaggeration" when they assert that nothing but personal rule, or nothing but the bureaucratic system of government, can suit India. Both in theory and in practice they persisted in this opinion so long that the "counter-balancing" "excess or exaggeration" made its appearance a decade ago in the desire for absolute independence, which was given the name of extremism : it was obvious that extremism in one direction led to extremism in a contrary direction ; but this our political opponents would not admit. However, as Indian extremism, except among a few revolutionaries, has made room for the "reasonable, practicable and

just" demand for Home Rule, Anglo-Indian extremism should also agree to meet us half way.

Anglo-Indians are probably to a man opposed to Indian Home Rule. Among Indians, too, there are some who are opposed to it. To both these classes of opponents we appeal to name some "remote and ideal object" which would "captivate the imagination by its splendour and the reason by its simplicity," and "evoke an energy" which could not otherwise be evoked. Let them supply that "abstract idea" or "ideal state" whose attraction "can unite in a common action multitudes who seek a universal cure for many special evils, and a common restorative applicable to many different conditions." In our opinion Home Rule is a cure for many special political and economic evils and a restorative applicable to many different conditions.

STAKE IN THE COUNTRY

The Home Rule agitation being at its strongest in the Madras Presidency, it is natural that various sorts of opponents of the desire for self-rule should make their appearance there. Among them are men with a "stake in the country." We do not wish to indulge in the trite pleasantry of asking how many acres make a wiseacre; but we wish to ascertain who are really the men who have the greatest stake in the country. We know, of course, that when

certain animals are kept tied to stakes driven deep into the soil, they cannot move forward. But it would be incorrect to conclude therefrom that the logically true converse proposition would be, that those individuals who are absolutely incapable of progress or are the least capable or desirous of progress have the biggest stakes in the country.

We do not think that big landholders and wealthy capitalists are the only men who have a stake in the country or that their stake is the biggest. We are supported in this opinion by what Lord Acton thought. He felt strongly that the stake-in-the-country argument really applied with the fullest force to the poor, for while political error means mere discomfort to the rich, it means to the poor the loss of all that makes life noble and even of life itself. As he says in one of his published letters :

'The men who pay wages ought not to be the political masters of those who earn them, for laws should be adapted to those who have the heaviest stake in the country, for whom misgovernment means not mortified pride or stinted luxury, but want and pain and degradation, and risk to their own lives and to their children's souls.'

So long as the Indian ryots, artisans and labourers themselves are not sufficiently educated to organise themselves and stand up for their rights like the labouring class in Western countries, their spokesmen and champions can be found chiefly among the educated, independent middle class, and to some extent among educated and capable landholders and capitalists. Government can have no difficulty in recognising this fact. For, owing in-

directly to the pressure of the opinion of the educated middle class, it has passed tenancy legislation to protect the peasantry against those men among the landholding class who are greedy and grasping, and also grandmotherly Court of Wards legislation to protect incapable landholders against themselves.

"PROSPEROUS YET DISCONTENTED"

Some of our Anglo-Indian critics profess to be surprised that, though India has in their opinion progressed and prospered under British rule, we should still criticise bureaucratic rule and want self-rule. We need not here discuss whether there is increasing material prosperity in the country, nor whether progress in other directions has been as great as in other oriental countries during a shorter period than the period of British rule in India. Taking it for granted that we have progressed and prospered adequately, what Mr. Srinivasa Sastri said in his presidential address at the Bombay Provincial Conference, ought to be a convincing reply to our critics.

Only a few days ago, in a debate on the condition of Ireland both Mr. Asquith and Mr. Lloyd George referred to the material prosperity that the Irish enjoyed, but neither of them wondered at the serious discontent of that people. Hear what the Prime Minister said : "I want to show that the discontent of Ireland is not material ; but still there remains one invincible fact after all this great record of beneficial legislation—inspite of the fact that Ireland is more materially prosperous than she has ever been, there remains the one invincible fact to-day that she is no more

reconciled to British rule than she was in the days of Cromwell. It proves that the grievance is not a material one, *it is something which has to do with the pride and self-respect of the people.* I entreat the House of Commons and the British people to get that well into their minds. It is a fact which must be grasped by the House of Commons or by any Government which means to attempt a settlement of this question." On a later occasion Mr. Bonar Law emphasized the same truth. "I know what the views of Nationalist members are and I do not agree with my noble friend that the only thing you have to think of with respect to the government of Ireland is to set up a government that will govern in the best way. I do not think so at all. I think that very often a very bad form of government, if it is with the consent and good-will of the people governed, will work infinitely better than a much better system without that consent and good-will."

We may add that in a letter contributed to the London *Times* of March 26, 1917, Mr. J. G. Swift MacNeill, M.P., quoted Mr. Gladstone's utterance on April 9th, 1886, in the course of which he said : "England tried to pass good laws for the colonies, but the colonists said : 'We do not want your good laws ; we want our own.' We admitted the reasonablenesss of that principle, and it is now coming home to us from across the seas. We have to consider whether it is applicable to the case of Ireland." Is it not also applicable to the case of India ?

In the extract given above, Mr. Bonar Law may or not have meant to imply that a very bad form of government can have the consent and good-will of the people governed ; but such consent and good-will are scarcely possible. Taking everything into consideration, popular self-rule on a representative basis is better than the best forms of other-rule.

IRELAND AND INDIA AND THE OUTSIDE WORLD

At the first of a series of meetings under the auspices of the Canadian Round Table held at London, Ontario, Canada, Mr. Rowell argued that a necessary preparation for closer organisation should be the concession of Home Rule to Ireland. At another meeting, a crowded one, held in the Russel Theatre at Ottawa, Canada, the following resolution was enthusiastically adopted :—

"That with a view to strengthening the hands of the Allies in achieving the recognition of equal rights for small Nations and the principle of Nationality, against the opposite German principle of military domination and Government without the consent of the governed, it is, in the opinion of this meeting of Canadian citizens, essential, without further delay, to confer upon Ireland the free institutions long promised to her."

The following extract will show the trend of American opinion and the pressure it exerted on England.

The Times' New York correspondent had taken some pains to sound American opinion on the subject and he felt "no hesitation in stating, that from President Wilson downwards the people of the country feel that now is the psychological moment to solve the Irish problem in the interest of the Allies and, above all, in the interest of the most effective possible participation of the United States in the war." "Those who are acquainted with the mind of the President," the correspondent added, "know that before the autocratic frightfulness of Germany finally drove him into declaring war for the salvation of democracy he was constantly confronted by two arguments which he found it very difficult to answer. One of these arguments concerned Russia. When he was

asked : 'Do you think the victory of Tsardom will be in the interests of democracy ?' he was reduced to silence. The recent revolution dramatically removed this obstacle to a clear vision of the issue of the war as a struggle between democracy and autocracy. It dissipated the last scruples of the President, but it left Great Britain in the anomalous light of being the only Power in the democratic Entente which was open to the charge of 'oppressing' a small nation."

In his famous Guildhall speech Mr. Lloyd George said :—

"If he appealed for a settlement in Ireland it was because he knew from facts driven into his mind every hour that in America, Australia and every other part, it was regarded as one of the essentials of speedy victory."

We learn from *New India* (June 12,1917) that almost immediately after America's declaration of war, Mr. Medill McCormick introduced the following resolution into the House of Representatives :—

Whereas the United States is now at war with the German Empire, and whereas the other Great Powers at war with the Empire have voiced their purpose to secure the rights of small peoples no less than of great, therefore be it resolved that the House of Representatives send its greetings to the Chambers of Deputies at Rome and at Paris, to the Duma at Petrograd, to the House of Commons at London and Ottawa, to the House of Assembly at Cape Town, and to the House of Representatives at Melbourne and Wellington, and that this House express to the other Chambers the hope that peace shall witness the restoration of Belgium and Serbia and the establishment of a united and self-governing Ireland and Poland.

Resolved further, that the Speaker of the House of Representatives transmit these resolutions to the Presidents and Speakers respectively of the several Chambers herein named.

The same paper quotes the opinions of Mr. J. F.

Fitzgerald, late Mayor of Boston, of Mr. Justice V. J. Dowling, of the Appellate Division of the New York supreme court, of the President of Columbia University, of Colonel Harvey, Editor of the *North American Review*, of the Mayor of New York, and of Archbishop Ireland, all asking that Home Rule shall be given without further delay to Ireland. Colonel Roosevelt, Mr. Taft, Dr. Charles Eliot, President of Harvard University, Cardinal Gibbons —all have appealed to Britain to do her duty to Ireland and to justify her assertion that she is fighting in the cause of liberty. And the *Times'* correspondent at Washington has cabled to his newspaper that Americans

are inclined to attribute the tragedy of our relations with Ireland to the same John Bullish stupidity that produced the American Revolution. Since the Ulster crisis of 1914 they have, indeed, begun to see that there are two sides to the question. But the effect of that realisation has been modified by the War. German assertions that we are insincere in our protestations regarding the freedom of small Nationalities tend to place us n a somewhat illogical light.

And further that

when it is a life and death matter, not only to the British Empire but to the free democratic institutions of the world, that this War should be successfully prosecuted, British reputation for statesmanship and patriotism will suffer badly if such a sacrifice to the common cause is refused. Inversely a settlement will immensely increase our prestige here, will clinch the success of Mr. Balfour's mission, will help the President to weld his countrymen together behind a vigorous prosecution of the War, and will render infinitely smoother Anglo-American relationship. London, Dublin, and Belfast have, in fact, the power to deal the German Trans-Atlantic intrigue a deadly blow.

Why does not any nation exert similar pressure on Great Britain for India, though India's political status is far inferior to that of Ireland ?

Sympathy means fellow-feeling. There have been men like Buddha who have had *fellow*-feeling for the meanest worm ; but such souls are rare. There are men who have formed themselves into societies for the prevention of cruelty to the lower animals, not out of *fellow*-feeling but merely out of pity. Ordinarily men feel only for their fellows. The Irish being Europeans, white men, and Christians, are considered the fellows of peoples of European extraction dwelling in America and the British Colonies. In the days before the abolition of slavery, even many so-called good and pious men did not believe that the Negroes were human beings, and therefore they had no sympathy for them. If we want practical sympathy we must prove that we are human beings and the fellows of other nations. We must be known, not as mere human cattle to be shut out or admitted according to the convenience of "civilised" men, not as mere producers of raw material, but as real civilisers of the race whose co-operation is needed for the progress of the world. What our ancestors did in ancient times connot help us much. We must show in the living present that the world cannot do without our manhood and our spiritual, moral and intellectual services. We must be creators in the sphere of literature and art, seers and discoverers of truth, inventors, and benefactors of mankind. Let us strive to rise and advance, not

as a select class, the upper ten, but as a whole people, and join and help in the forward march of humanity. We ought to have intercourse with the whole world. A hermit-like existence will not do. If we allow the world to forget our existence, if we do not try our best to make our true condition known all over the world, it would be foolish to complain if the world did not exert its influence on our behalf. True, the sympathy of "civilised" men is limited by creed, colour and race. But the remedy does not lie in inveighing againt such narrowness, particularly as we are not ourselves faultless in this respect, but in practically showing to the world that true worth is not the monopoly of any particular creed, colour or race, and in setting an example of a broad sympathy which is no respecter of creed, colour or race.

LANGUAGES IN THE PHILIPPINES

The Present population of the Philippine islands is 9,838,700. The total number of native languages and dialects spoken there is 87. This does not include many unknown dialects. The number of linguistic groups alone is 43. The existence of so many languages and dialects has not,—will Anglo-Indians believe it ?—stood in the way of the Filipinos' obtaining responsible self-government. Of course, English is the lingua franca, which is the case in India

too. According to the census of 1911, in India there are 220 languages and dialects, including 38 minor dialects. The number of the speakers is nearly 313 millions. As the population of India is more than 31 times that of the Philippines, we should not have been disqualified for self-rule even if we had 87 × 31 or 2,697 languages and dialects in our midst, instead of which we have only a paltry 220! The figures for the Philippines are taken from the latest census of that archipelago.

DADABHAI NAOROJI'S "SWARAJ"

Historically the expression Indian Home Rule was, as far as we are aware, first used in India and the demand for "Home Rule" was made in the *Modern Review* in 1907, though it was certainly Mrs. Annie Besant who brought "Home Rule" within the range of practical politics and made it a ringing cry and a living issue. *But the idea* of complete autonomy, self-rule or *Swaraj, was older.* When Mrs. Besant first made the Home Rule cry resound through India, many leading Indian politicians thought that it was too much to ask for Home Rule and that the Indian National Congress could not support such a demand. But it was evidently forgotten that, about a decade before, the greatest President of the Indian National Congress, Dadabhai Naoroji, had in his presidential address formulated

a demand for *Swaraj* which was not less but more than what the present-day Indian Home Rule Leagues ask for. Dadabhai Naoroji's demand was :

"(1) Just as the administration of the United Kingdom in all services, departments and details is in the hands of the people themselves of that country, so should we in India claim that the administration in all services, departments and details should be in the hands of the people themselves of India. The remedy is absolutely necessary for the material, moral, intellectual, political, social, industrial and every possible progress and welfare of the people of India. (2) As in the United Kingdom and the colonies all taxation and legislation and the power of spending the taxes are in the hands of the representatives of the people of those countries, so should also be the rights of the people of India."

It was in the year 1906 that he made this demand. Not the most moderate of Moderates criticised *him* then or afterwards. And "in the last year of his life," as the *Bombay Chronicle* correctly notes, Dadabhai Naoroji "declared with passionate insistence that India was now fit for self-government and gave whole-hearted adhesion to the Home Rule cause." Moreover, Indian Home Rule Leagues are working for the reforms demanded in the joint note prepared by the Congress and the Moslem League. There is, therefore, now no reasonable cause for any congressman to say that the Indian Home Rulers' demands are immoderate. Of course, if any one for any reason considers the use of the words Home Rule inexpedient or unsuitable, he may use any other words he likes.

SECRET OF A NATION'S ABILITY TO STAND ON ITS OWN LEGS

The Indian Home Ruler has generally to answer two questions: (1) Can India stand on her own legs now? (2) Will India ever be able to stand on her own legs? The Filipinos have also to answer similar questions. Their reply can be gathered from the following paragraphs reproduced from the *Philippine Review*:

Quite often, when the question of our final independence is taken up officially and privately, many ask what will become of us when left alone to stand by ourselves. Under the present circumstances we have to admit that the question is not altogether unwarranted. However, sooner or later, the dependent relation of the Philippines to America shall terminate,—delayed perhaps only for such length of time as may be necessary for the establishment of our own government on a safe basis; and alone, on our own feet, we shall stand in the enjoyment of the blessings, as well as all the other *sequelae* of the new political status we have so dearly won.

The Philippines is now practically beginning its international intercourse, and sooner or later will have to face more serious situations of an international and more complicated character. tI undoubtedly has its place of honour in history, hut, like all other countries, it has to earn and keep it, that we may honorably enjoy it. We must, for our part, be determined to earn and keep that place for our dear Philippines, unless we are willing to waive our right to it. It looks now as if the Orient is going to be the field for the settlement of future international complications after the present war, and one way or another the Philippines will be affected by them.

On the other hand, we cannot foretell what our future will be.

Over one hundred years ago, with the exception of the Earl of Aranda, no one believed that the United States would be what she is now. A little over fifty years since, Japan was not what she is today in the concert of world powers. Bulgaria was rather a negligible unit. The Philippines is now very advantageously started out, with the varied and wide experience of nations at her command, on the road of progress; and, no matter how small and weak we may be today, no one can tell that we are not going to stand high, in the Oriental community at least. To our good fortune, the scientific exploits of the present war are teaching us how to practically overcome the main difficulties and odds small island nations used to begin with. We have the latent means and the resources therefor. What we need is self-reliance and the wit to know and acknowledge what we are, with all our weaknesses and shortcomings, as well as our relative position in the Orient; and then the determination, stamina, backbone—*grit—to make good.* Empty speeches, mere party satisfactions are of no avail. We should stick to facts, with complete disregard to self and selfish interests. This would mean concerted action by the individual and the community, that the Philippines may be ready to meet and honor the requirements and consequences of her new life.

Self-confidence is the first requisite for success.

It should be remembered that the people whose organ utters this note of self-confidence number only 9 millions. We are 315 millions. The area of the Philippine Islands is 120,000 square miles. The area of Great Britain and Ireland is 121,633 square miles. That of India is 1,802,629 square miles.

If a people be progressive and have room to grow in numbers, their future must be bright even if they be a small people at present.

SUPERSTITIONS AND DEMOCRACY

There are some people, including Count Okuma, who think that we ought not to have political power until we have got rid of our superstitions, &c., the underlying assumption and suggestion being that free peoples are not superstitious. But that is not really so. For example, Mr. Lowther Peters writes in *Pedagogical Seminary* :—

The difficulty of uprooting old beliefs is so great because they are usually incorporated or adapted by advancing culture. There is a persistency in human thought which is surprising. Many revolutionary movements have taken place, but we have never been able to get rid of our past. A study of 350 girls of good American families, between seventeen and twenty-one years of age, reveals that the following taboos and mental obsessions actually and frequently influence their conduct : (1) A silent wish made in passing a load of hay, or a piebald horse, will come true if you do not meet either one on the same day. (2) To pick up a pin means good luck for the day. (3) To open an umbrella in the house means trouble. (4) To put flowers on bed means a funeral. (5) Never tell a dream or sing a song before breakfast. (6) To spill salt at the table or to leave a pair of scissors open means a quarrel. (7) Give for every pointed gift a penny in return in order to preserve the friendship. (8) Tap on wood when boasting. There is also a widespread and firm belief in the unlucky ; "13," in "lucky" or "unlucky" days, in mascots, in "Fate," "destiny," "Guardian Angels," or in "perfect Jonahs." —*The American Journal of Sociology.*

Of course, we want to uproot all superstitions.

WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?

"Democracy," rightly observes the *Christian Register*, "is something more than the freedom people gain to govern themselves, something more than the levelling of privilege and the breaking down of ancient narrowness of prerogative.

The most impressive and fruitul part of democracy is its human economy. It brings all the resources of all people into what is far more than a melting pot. It utilizes the infinite possibilities of human nature. It enlarges the area of choice. It abolishes human waste. It discovers power which under the best conceivable order of society otherwise would be undiscovered. It develops, creates, what the most careful selection and culture could not bring to fruitage. It is a natural order displacing artificial order and broadening to the full extent of human life. What makes it of such inspiring quality is not that it takes away superiorities and excellencies in abolishing their exclusiveness, but that it opens the door of these superiorities to every human being. **Democracy is universal hnman opportunity.** It does not level downward ; but it does give entrance from every lower level to every higher level, so that the real levels in humanity shall be reached.

It is democracy which enables us to understand what equality means.

This shows what equality really is. It is not the spurious thing which, merely by claiming, people can be credited with having. It is not the impossible thing which in loose discourse it appears to be. **The only equality meant by democracy is every person's equal freedom to make of himself all that is possible.**

It has been often observed that Abraham Lincoln saved the United States of America. That is true. But our American contemporary's interpretation of that historical fact shows great insight.

Lincoln saved this country; rather we should say that the democracy which made it possible for the country to have a Lincoln at its head saved the country. Joffre saved France; rather the democracy which made it possible for a cooper's son to command an army saved France. **Democracy alone makes saviors possible. It is worth every sacrifice.**

ANCIENT AND MODERN DEMOCRACY

There is trustworthy evidence that in ancient India there were oligarchies, aristocratic republics, self-governing city-states and self-governing village communities. Democracy in ancient India was not, however, like modern democracy. But in no country in the ancient world was there democracy in the modern sense. The study of the history and progress of political institutions in ancient India has only begun, and there is still much pioneer work to do. We possess a far larger amount of accurate information regarding the political institutions of ancient Greece and Rome. The Encyclopædia Britannica (article Democracy) tells us that "democracy in modern times is a very different thing from what it was in its best days in Greece and Rome.

The Greek states were what are known as 'city-states,' the characteristic of which was that all the citizens could assemble together in the city at regular intervals for legislative and other purposes..... Of representative government in the modern sense there is practically no trace Athenian history, though certain of the magistrates had a quasi-representative character. Direct democracy is impossible except in small states. In the second

place the qualification for citizenship was rigorous ; thus Pericles restricted citizenship to those who were the sons of an Athenian father, himself a citizen, and an Athenian mother. This system excluded not only all the slaves, who were more numerous than the free population, but also resident aliens, and those Athenians whose descent did not satisfy this criterion. The Athenian democracy, which was typical in ancient Greece, was a highly exclusive form of Government."

We learn from Chambers's Encyclopædia that "the modern democracy differs essentially from the ancient and medieval forms.

The people no longer consist merely of a body of burgesses limited in number, but of millions of men inhabiting extensive countries..... Another important point of difference is the abolition of slavery, serfdom, and the other unfree conditions which formerly prevailed. Freedom of conscience, freedom in the choice of one's residence and profession, have been more or less fully realised. We must also note the progress towards the abolition of all privileged classes, and towards equality before the law."

"As we have seen, the distinctive features of the modern democracy are the widest *personal freedom*, by which each man has the liberty and responsibility of shaping his own career ; *equality* before the law ; and political power in the form of universal suffrage exercised through the representative system."

These "*distinctive features*" seem to have existed neither in ancient India nor in ancient Europe.

The spirit of democracy may exist in a more or less pronounced form under a monarchical form of government. "In Europe all monarchies were, within certain limits, originally elective" (Encyclo. Brit.). Some Indian monarchies in the Vedic and post-Vedic periods were elective in the same way. But this does not probably mean, in the case of either ancient Europe or of ancient India, that after

their election these kings were always effectively restrained in the exercise of their power by the voice of the people or of any representative assembly. Thus Prof. Pasquale Villari writes of the ancient Roman Senate and the ancient Roman kings :—

"It is useless to attempt a precise definition of the prerogatives of the king when once installed in office. Tradition ascribes to him a position and powers closely resembling those of the heroic kings of Greece. He rules for life, and he is the sole ruler, unfettered by written statutes. He is the supreme judge, settling all disputes and punishing wrong-doers even with death. All other officials are appointed by him. He imposes taxes, distributes lands and erects buildings. Senate and assembly meet for little else than to receive communications from him. In war he is absolute leader, and finally he is also the religious head of the community." (Article *Rome* in the Encycl. Brit.)

"By the side of the king stood the senate or council of elders ... On the one hand the senate appears as a representative council of chiefs, with inalienable prerogatives of its own, and claiming to be the ultimate depository of the supreme authority... [It is] consulted in the choice of the new king..... On the other hand they are no longer supreme. They cannot appoint a king but with the consent of the community, and their relation to the king when appointed is one of subordination." (*Ibid.*)

In the opinion of Prof. Villari, "the occasions on which" "the popular assembly of united Rome in its earliest days" "could exercise its power must have been few....., of the passing of laws, in the later sense of the term, there is no trace in the kingly period. [In some respects the Vedic Assemblies appear to have had more power ; as, according to Macdonell and Keith, they *did* legislate to some extent, and performed judicial work, too.] Dionysius' statement that they voted on questions of war

and peace is improbable in itself and unsupported by tradition."

Constitutional monarchy *in the modern sense* is a growth of comparatively recent times, and does not seem to have existed either in the East or in the West in ancient times. This will be clear from the following extract from the article on "Democracy" in Chambers's Encyclopædia :—

"The modern democracy as we now see it, is the result of a gradual process of development continued through centuries amidst the severest struggles. Such struggle will appear to be inevitable, when we consider that democracies have grown up in large states in which absolutism formerly prevailed, and in which the military system prevails even yet. Among the decisive steps in the modern struggles of the people against the old classes and systems should be noted the long contest of the Dutch against Spain, the great English revolutions of 1642 and 1688, the War of American Independence in 1776, the great French Revolution of 1789, and the revolutionary periods of 1830 and 1848. The English revolutions of 1642 and 1688 established parliamentary rule in England, though on a narrow basis. Yet they had the important result of proving the *fitness* of a new type of government, which further became a model for similar institutions in other countries. The greatest event in the evolution of democracy, however, was the French Revolution of 1789 ; though it failed for the time, it shook the old system to its foundations ; it everywhere spread new ideas, and raised questions that could not again be set aside.....

"England has not been the first, however, to bring democratic institutions to their full development. The Reform Bill of 1832 conferred the franchise on the middle classes ; but it was not till the reforms of 1867 and 1885 that she has approximated to universal suffrage."

Even to-day in many countries which have adopted parliamentary institutions, the power of

the people is seriously curtailed. A prominent example is Germany. There the emperor claiming to be of divine right "may be regarded as wielding a power co-ordinate with that of the people, and resting on the army. The position of his Chancellor does not depend on a parliamentary majority—he is the servant of the emperor ; yet while not depending on a parliamentary majority, he finds it expedient and even necessary to have one."

No estimate of the political power of the people in ancient India can be correct which is not based on comparison. But as democracy in the modern sense did not exist in any country in ancient times, the comparison should be, not with the powers of democracy in modern republics and constitutional monarchies, but with what political power was exercised by the people in the West in ancient republics and monarchies.

To prove our fitness for Home Rule it is not necessary to show that in ancient India the people exercised political power ; for "democracies have grown up in large states in which absolutism formerly prevailed." The history of political institutions in ancient India possesses an independent interest of its own. But if it can be proved from incontestable evidence, as we think it can, that absolutism was by no means the only form and kind of government which prevailed in India of the past, that will be an additional argument to prove that the soil of India is not unfit for the growth of democracy in the modern sense.

We have shown above that the ancient and medieval forms of democracy in the West and the East were different from its modern forms. Ancient democracies may be considered primitive and crude. But that is no reason why we should look down upon them, as being inferior in every respect to well-organised autocracies. We should never forget that

"the tendencies in the direction of democratic government do mark progress in social integration, however feeble may be the telic power displayed. Crude and imperfect as such governments may be, they are better than the wisest of autocracies. Stupidity joined with benevolence is better than brilliancy joined with rapacity, and not only is autocracy always rapacious, but democracy is always benevolent." P. 279, *Outlines of Sociology*, by Lester F. Ward: New York, The Macmillan Company.

It has to be observed in this connection that though democracies *as democracies* are benevolent, they may under certain circumstances cease to be so in their treatment of dependent peoples; and then they become more dehumansing than the tyranny of individual despots.

PERSONAL FREEDOM AND SLAVERY IN ANCIENT GREECE AND ANCIENT INDIA

Democracy in ancient Greece took the form of "city-states," the characteristic of which was that all the citizens could assemble together in the city at regular intervals for legislative and other pur-

poses. But the qualification for citizenship was rigorous ; thus Pericles restricted citizenship to those who were the sons of an Athenian father, himself a citizen, and an Athenian mother. "This system excluded not only all the slaves, *who were more numerous than the free population*, but also resident aliens, subject allies, and those Athenians whose descent did not satisfy this criterion."

In ancient India the slaves formed an insignificant fraction of the population. But it was not merely in the small number of slaves that ancient Indian society was superior to ancient Greek society. The status of slaves here was higher and their treatment better than in ancient Greece and Rome and in the plantations of Christian slave-owners.

In his "Buddhist India" Prof. Rhys Davids divides the people into the four social grades of Kshatriyas, Brahmanas, Vaisyas, and Sudras. Below all four, that is below the Sudras, we have mention of other "low tribes" and "low trades"—*hinajatiyo* and *hina-sippani*. "Finally we hear in both Jain and Buddhist books of aboriginal tribes, Chandalas and Pukkusas, who were more despised even than these low tribes and trades." Besides the above, says the author, "*who were all freemen*," there were also slaves : "individuals had been captured in predatory raids and reduced to slavery, or had been deprived of their freedom as a judicial punishment ; or had submitted to slavery of their own accord. Children born to such slaves were also slaves ; and the emancipation of slaves is often referred to. But

we hear nothing of such later developments of slavery as rendered the Greek mines, the Roman *lati-fundia*, or the plantains of Christian slave-owners, scenes of misery and oppression. For the most part the slaves were household servants, and not badly treated ; and their numbers seem to have been insignificant." According to the report of Megasthenes "all the Indians are free," and "not one of them is a slave." On this Prof. Rhys Davids observes that the evidence of Megasthenes "only shows how very little the sort of slavery then existing in India would strike a foreigner accustomed to the sort of slavery then existing in Greece."

In the development of political theory and the practice of citizenship, according to modern ideas, ancient Greece and Rome surpassed ancient India. But a far larger proportion of the people enjoyed natural human freedom in ancient India than in ancient Greece or Rome. The Sanskrit word *Dasa* means a slave and also refers to Sudras in general. This has led many to suppose that the Sudras were an enslaved population. This is far from the fact. Not only Sudras, but the "low tribes" and the followers of "low trades" below them, and the aboriginal tribes, Chandalas and Pukkusas, were all freemen. Whatever the amount of *political* freedom enjoyed by the people of ancient India,—and that was in many ages not inconsiderable, a far greater proportion of them enjoyed *personal* and *economic* freedom than was the case with the people of ancient Greece and Rome.

That our ancestors were free men, proud of their freedom, will also appear from the condition of the village folk in "Buddhist India."

In modern India the rural population is far larger than the urban population. In ancient India the rural character of the population was still more marked. Rhys Davids says that "the peoples of India, then much more even than now, were first and foremost, village folk. In the whole vast territory, from Kandahar nearly to Calcutta, and from the Himalayas southwards to the Run of Kach, we find mentioned barely a score of towns of any considerable size." He goes on to observe that "the mass of the people, the villagers, occupied a social grade quite different from, and far above, our [*i.e.* British] village folk. They held it degradation, to which only dire misfortune would drive them, to work for hire. They were proud of their standing, their family, and their village. And they were governed by headmen of their own class and village, very probably selected by themselves in accordance with their own customs and ideals." But the superiority of our ancestors in some respects should not blind us to their inferiority in certain other respects. They seem never to have attained civic equality. Caste stood in the way of their attainment of social equality, too.

"UTOPIA"S

An English reviewer has spoken of Chanakya's *Arthasastra* as a sort of "Utopia." His reason for holding such an opinion probably was that Chanakya's work gives evidence of a highly organised system of administration, regulating the minutest details of the affairs of the state and of what we now call municipal administration; and it goes against the grain of Britons to believe that the people of India could ever have been highly skilled in administration. Taking it for granted that Chanakya wrote his book as a work of imagination, it must be admitted that he was a very extraordinary man; for he was a great minister of state, and it is not usual to find a combination of such statesmanship and such imagination in the same individual. That, however, is not our point. What we are curious to know is, what stood in the way of such an extraodinary man's reducing to practice a system of administration which he could map out in imagination in such detail? We know the actual always falls short of the ideal. But in the case of men who possess executive and administrative capacity, such as Chanakya possessed, the actual usually does make an approach to the ideal. We are writing on the supposition that Chanakya was really the author of the work which goes by his name. Such an assumption is not, however, absolutely essential for our argument. If a nation can produce a statesman

of the calibre and ability of the historical Chanakya, and also an author or authors gifted with the political and economic imagination which could produce the *Arthasastra*, it is not an impossibility for that nation to follow in practice the highly developed and organised system of administration described in that book. Works of fiction are generally written to give pleasure; some are written with a purpose. The *Arthasastra* is not a story. It cannot possibly give any pleasure to readers of stories. Even if it were a Utopia, it was written with a purpose, and that purpose was that the country where it was written should be governed according to the system laid down in it. There is nothing to show that the country which had the ability to evolve the system did not possess the capacity to reduce it to practice. The conclusion which this line of argument points to is supported by the testimony of Megasthenes. This Greek traveller and ambassador corroborates in many details the account given in the *Arthasastra*. We need not, therefore, hesitate to accept it as a work of historical value.

ANCIENT INDIAN POLITY

In ancient times, like many other countries, India did not probably possess a constitution in the modern Western sense. But it should be considered

whether it is a correct view of our ancient history to say that the royal power was unlimited or that the counsels and rules to be found in our ancient works of polity and law codes were mere pious wishes.

The *Nitis* or works on polity and the Laws of Manu and other similar works which lay down the duties of kings and ministers and rules of statecraft, if they were not embodiments of mere pious wishes, would seem to show that, whatever individual kings might have been, monarchs did not usually possess or wield unlimited power. As Dr. Pramathanath Banerjea says in his work on ancient Indian administration :—

"The system of government may be described as a limited monarchy. There were various checks on the authority of the monarch. The king had to abide by the law as laid down in the Sastras or embodied in the customs of the country. In the practical work of administration he was guided by his ministers, who occupied an important position in society and wielded the real power of the State. Then, there was the influence of the learned Brahmans as a class, who were looked upon by the people as the natural guardians of society. With these checks operating on the governmental system it was very difficult for a king to have his own way in the administration of the country. Occasionally, under a strong and capable ruler like Asoka or Harsha Vardhana, the government might resemble a paternal despotism, but it was very rarely that the power of the King was quite absolute. The Sastras he regarded as embodying a sort of political constitution as well as ethical law, and the ancient system of government may thus be called a constitutional monarchy. It must, however, be remembered that the devices by which the monarch's authority was kept within proper limits were more moral than political. The most suitable term which can be used

to describe the system appears in our opinion to be 'Sachivatantra.'*

"It should, however, be noted," says Dr. Banerjea, "that in the latter part of the Hindu Period of Indian history, the power of the monarch was much greater than in the earlier, and that such increase of power did to some extent receive the sanction of the writers on Law and Politics; but at no time was the royal power, in theory at least, quite absolute. In practice, it is true, some kings acted in an autocratic manner, but this must be regarded as a usurpation and abuse rather than a normal exercise of authority." Dr. Banerjea also gives evidence to show that "the Ministers recognised some responsibility to the people. And they were held responsible not only for their own actions but also for those of the King." The Vedic kingship was probably elective, and responsible to the popular assembly. There is evidence to show that even in later times some kings were elected by the ministers and the people.

But all these and many similar statements rest mainly on the authority of the works on polity, ethics, or canon law. It has to be shown that what they say regarding the rights, duties, functions, etc., of the King, the ministers, and the people, were not pious wishes, before any historical conclusions can

* "The term 'Sachivayatta-tantra,' that is to say, a form of Government in which real power exists in the hands of the Ministers, is found in *Mudra-Rakshasa*. Under favourable conditions, such a Government answered to Aristotle's description of an aristocracy, that is to say, government by the wisest.

be based on them. It is not in our power to prove conclusively that they were not pious wishes. But we may urge some considerations which may be of some slight help in arriving at a conclusion.

After recording in his *Buddhist India* (page 2) the fact that "the earliest Buddhist records reveal the survival, side by side with more or less powerful monarchies, of republics with either complete or modified independence," Professor Rhys Davids writes :—

"It is significant that this important factor in the social condition of India in the sixth and seventh centuries B. C. has remained hitherto unnoticed by scholars either in Europe or in India. They have relied for their information about the Indian peoples too exclusively on the brahmin books. And these, partly because of the natural antipathy felt by the priests towards the free republics, partly because of the later date of most of the extant priestly literature, and especially of the law books, ignore the real facts. They convey the impression that the only recognised, and in fact universally prevalent, form of government was that of kings under the guidance and tutelage of priests." P. 2.

Dr. Rhys Davids also mentions some facts which he thinks "go far to confirm Professor Bhandarkar's recent views as to the wholesale recasting of brahmin literature in the Gupta period."

It is probable, then, that in the composition and recasting of "brahmin literature" the authors and editors had to please the priestly class, and also the kings, whose patronage they stood in need of. These literary men would not, as human nature goes, put down or preserve anything very obnoxious to monarchs. If, therefore, in "brahmin literature," we

find things which are in the nature of checks on kingly power, we may be justified in presuming that the rulers were so accustomed to these restraints and they were such familiar contemporary facts that they were not omitted from the books forming part of "brahmin literature." We make these general observations without any reference to the dates of the different works collectively called "brahmin literature." Some of them may have been composed after the Gupta period, but some were presumably also composed before or during the Gupta period, or edited during this period. And if the general testimony of "brahmin literature" be in favour of the conclusion that the Hindu monarchy was not absolute, the presumption may be ventured that the political injunctions contained in Sanskrit works were not in all cases pious wishes.

There are idealists who show little practical capacity, and there are practical men who show very little power of formulating ideals; there are also some practical idealists. Whatever the case may be with individuals, of peoples as collective entities it may perhaps be said that there has never been a people who have only formed ideals but never reduced them to practice, or who have been very practical but without any idealism. In every country there has been some approximation to the ideals held up by its thinkers. There is no reason to think that India is the only country where the men with brains simply dreamed dreams and wrote utopias without there being anybody with either

the desire or the power to give them concrete shape to some extent.

In all countries, the history of literature shows that each age or epoch is marked by some prevailing tendency favouring the creation of some particular form of literature, as the drama, the novel, the lyric, &c. The Sanskrit books on polity, canon law, etc., which are the sources of our information regarding the political institutions and ideals of ancient India, were not all contemporary works; they did not belong to the same age. We cannot, therefore, say that in one particular age it was the fashion for Sanskrit authors to indulge in pious wishes, as in the Elizabethan age it was the prevailing tendency for English authors to write plays. If, then, in different ages we find Hindu writers laying down rules regarding the duties of kings, ministers, &c., we must hold one of two theories: (1) that the Hindu mind has been particularly fond of and prone to indulging in pious wishes age after age, inspite of their futility; or (2) that these rules were not all pious wishes, but had some correspondence with objective reality.

In the past history of many countries we find that the supreme check on the tyranny of oppressive kings was their expulsion or deposition, or regicide. And generally in the countries where these means were adopted, lesser checks were also sought to be imposed on the monarchs. The history of England exemplifies our remark. In the ancient history of India, there are examples of bad kings being expelled,

deposed or slain by their people. Is it quite unlikely that the people who were capable of putting an end to tyranny in this drastic manner, were also probably accustomed to the imposition of lesser restraints on kingly power ?

Historical evidence corroborating "brahmin literature" is not entirely wanting. For instance, the power of the ministers and the people to elect a king in certain cases, mentioned in some Sanskrit works, finds historical corroboration. "From the poet historian Bana as well as from Hiuen Tsiang we know how a successor was appointed to Rajya-Vardhana, King of Kanauj." "After the treacherous assassination of Rajya-Vardhana by the King of Pundra, the Prime Minister Bhandi, with the concurrence of the Council of Ministers and the approval of the people, placed Harsha Vardhana on the throne."

The island of Ceylon is, as regards the type and origin of its civilisation, a part of India. Any strictly historical proofs relating to the political institutions of Ceylon may, therefore, be presumed to confirm conclusions, regarding the existence of such institutions in ancient India, based on data furnished by Sanskrit works. The council of ministers with considerable powers, is thought to have been such an Indian institution. Now Dr. Banerjea writes in his work :

"From the Ceylon inscriptions we learn that in that island all measures were enacted by the King-in-Council, and all orders were issued by, and under the authority of the Council. In the

Vevala-Katiya Inscription of Mahinda IV*, for instance, we find the following : "... all these lords who sit in the Royal Council, and who have come (together) in accordance with the mandate delivered (by the King-in-Council), have promulgated these regulations." When any grant was made by the State to any individual or body, a Council Warrant of immunity was issued. In the Madirigiriya Pillar inscription of Kassapa V. (980-990) A. D. † we find the following passage: "Whereas it was so decreed by the Supreme Council, we, all of us, Officers-of-State, namely,.....(five names)... have come... by Order and granted this Council warrant of Immunity to the area." Sometimes Pillars of Council Warrant‡ were set up to inform people of the privileges granted to religious or other institutions. The appreciation of the importance of the Council by monarchs is shown by the Slab Inscription of Queen Lilabati where she says : 'By creating a council of wise, brave, and faithful ministers, she has freed her own kingdom from the dangers (arising) from other kingdoms.¶' "

In some Sanskrit works details, such as the constitution and work of village assemblies, is given. Corroborative historical evidence is found in such inscriptions as those quoted by Sir C. Sankaran Nair in his article on village government in southern India, contributed to the March (1914) number of the Modern Review. "Certain long inscriptions of Parantaka I. are of especial interest to the students of village institutions by reason of the full details which they give of the manner in which local affairs were administered by well-organised local committees or panchayats, exercising their extensive administra-

* Epigraphia Zeylanica, Vol. I. No. 21.

† Epigraphia Zeylanica, Vol. II. No. 6.

‡ Vide Pillar-inscription of Dappula V., Ep. 2. Vol. II. No. 8.

¶ Epigraphia Zeylanica, Vol. I. No. 14.

tive and judicial powers under royal sanction." (V. A. Smith.)

In a previous note we have referred to the fact that some details in Chanakya's *Arthasastra* are confirmed by Megasthenes.

When some of the political deductions made from Sanskrit works are thus corroborated by the strictly historical evidence of inscriptions and of the writings of foreign travellers, it may not be improbable that the other deductions, too, are not entirely unwarranted.

It is not contended that the checks on kingly power which existed in ancient India in theory always actually succeeded in preventing the arbitrary exercise of power by kings. In fact, this does not seem to have been the case in any country. Take the case of England. Restraints on the power of the king existed in theory before the Great Charter was wrested from King John, before the civil war in Charles I.'s reign, before the revolution which placed William III. on the throne, and at the time when some of the Georges acted like despotic kings. But the very fact that there have been revolutions in England shows that many British kings did not care much for the constitution. Still, we shall not be justified in describing any provisions of the British constitution as a pious wish. In contemporary India we find there are laws which are in practice treated as non-existent by some persons and classes. But that does not make them pious wishes. Of course, there is much difference between our an-

cient canon laws and *nitis* and modern western statute laws. What we take the liberty to suggest is that even if an injunction or rule was not followed or observed uniformly in every case, it might have been somewhat better than a pious wish; it might have been more binding.

These observations of ours are in no sense meant to be a substitute for a historical discussion. They are rather intended to evoke such discussion. We have a genuine and earnest desire to know our past history. Our past does not, of course, limit our present or our future. But it is good to know our strength in the past, in order that we may be stronger in the present and the future; it is better still to know our failures and weaknesses in the past and the causes thereof, in order that we may apply the proper remedies. We are prepared to face the whole truth in the calm conviction that as we possess souls like other peoples, we shall find nothing impossible of achievement in human affairs.

दिनांक Date	उधारकर्ता की संख्या Borrower's No.	दिनांक Date	उधारकर्ता की संख्या Borrower's No.