

विभाग मंत्रालय
DEPARTMENT/MINISTRY
शाखा
Political - BRANCH A

मंत्रणा संग्रह
Consultation/Collection July 1910

संख्या
No. 55

दिनांक
Date

विषय
Subject

पूर्व निर्देश
Previous reference

18

बाद का निर्देश
Later reference

CALCUTTA RECORDS.

4

1910.

**GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.
HOME DEPARTMENT.**

POLITICAL—A.

Proceedings, July 1910, No. 55.

Prevention of the importation into India of seditious and inflammatory pamphlets and newspapers published in England.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Progs. no	Letters, etc., and subjects.	Page
	Notes	1—4
55	Despatch to the Secretary of State no. 3, dated the 14th July 1910, regarding the above	5—16

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.

- Poll. A., August 1909, nos. 36—39.
- A., June 1909, no. 36.
- A., March 1909, nos. 148—150.

LATER REFERENCES.

NOTES.

POLITICAL A.—JULY 1910.

No. 55.

PREVENTION OF THE IMPORTATION INTO INDIA OF SEDITIOUS AND INFLAMMATORY PAMPHLETS AND NEWSPAPERS PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND.

Extract from Director, Criminal Intelligence's note, dated the 24th May 1910.

• “ 2. The *India* of 29th April 1910 is also put up. At page 192 it republishes the offending article of Arabindo. It is too late to proscribe this issue. The republication is a cheap defiance of the Government of Bengal. If we had a friend at court, he might have wired that the article was to be found in this issue and the Government of India would have had time to take effective action if it desired to do so. If thought fit I can easily arrange to have certain London publications watched with a view to telegraphic warning being sent in good time, but it looks to me as if the India Office had the prior duty in the matter.”

C. R. CLEVELAND,—24-5-10.

Extract from India, London, dated the 13th May 1910.

Submitted. This is another objectionable letter published in the *India* newspaper. B.C. Pal who several times escaped prosecution for sedition while in India seems to have committed the same offence by publishing this letter.

A. L.,—4-6-10.

Yes, but we can do nothing unless the Secretary of State consents to move in the matter.

H. C. WOODMAN,—4-6-10.

I have requested Mr. Woodman to collect material in order to see if we could move the Secretary of State in the matter of *India*, or should consult him as regards proscribing it here.

A. EARLE,—6-6-10.

Please make a collection of the various extracts from *India* (Mr. Cotton's paper) which have been noticed as offending against the provisions of the Press Act.

H. C. WOODMAN,—6-6-10.

The extracts from *India* which have been noticed as offending against the Press Act are :—

- (1) Extract from *India*, dated the 22nd April 1910 (Regarding an Egyptian student).
- (2) Article in *India*, dated the 29th April 1910. “ What is sedition ”
- (3) Extract from *India*, dated the 13th May 1910. “ The Indian situation ”.
- (4) Extract from *India*, dated the 29th April 1910.
- (5) Extract from *India* dated the 29th April 1910.

A bundle of extracts from *India*—all more or less of an objectionable nature—from 1st January 1910 to date, are placed at the bottom of the file.

A. L.,—9-6-10.

I venture to suggest that it would be better to deal with this question on more general lines, and to represent the desirability of equal treatment under the Press Law of journals and pamphlets published in England. We could use certain articles published in *India* as an example, and could make the case strong by putting Mackarness's pamphlet in the fore front of the battle. The case of the latter has shown the necessity, which the Secretary of State admitted, of consistency in the treatment both of English and Indian publications, and has also indicated the need (to which Director, Criminal Intelligence refers) for timely warning of the issue of articles and pamphlets which offend against the provisions of the Press Act.

S 632 HD

7

1

2. In our despatches of the 4th* March and 27th† May 1909 we referred to the issue in London of revolutionary literature, and with the Secretary of State's approval we took action against one of the worst of this type of journalism—Hyndman's *Justice*. We now however propose to deal with a

more reputable type of journalism, less openly offensive but probably exercising a considerably greater influence in India than literature of a professedly revolutionary nature.

3. I put up a rough draft of a despatch on the lines of which the subject may perhaps be approached. Possibly Director, Criminal Intelligence could give us, if necessary, some more

Yes, please ask him.
A. EARLE,—13-6-10.
objectionable articles from *India*.

H. C. WOODMAN,—13-6-10.

We may be able to improve the despatch when we hear from Director, Criminal Intelligence. I have made some modifications towards the close of the draft.

A. EARLE,—13-6-10.

Director, Criminal Intelligence.

My Office file of *India* is so cut up by extracting for individual files that I have been unable to make a thorough examination of the whole series. The case against *India* in so far as it stands on individual articles, seems to me overwhelmingly strong on the extracts already attached to the draft despatch.

We have no recent information as to the circulation of *India*. In 1905 a canvasser for *India* said that if *India* would subscribe for 10,000 copies the financial difficulties of the paper would disappear but as a matter of fact only about 4,000 copies were in circulation in the whole country of which Bombay subscribed for more than 2,000 copies.

It is difficult to say what the real aims of *India* are : as a commercial venture it is quite clear that it endeavours to increase its circulation by representing extremism as well as moderatism. Hence its support of Arabindo and B. C. Pal. The Home Government may not yet have realised that it has most serious responsibilities as regards checking seditious and revolutionary propaganda which the measures hitherto taken do not nearly fulfil. One of our officers writes most pessimistically about the wholesale demoralisation to which the large body of Indian students in England are exposed. I think the despatch under consideration should succeed in enlisting a preliminary and much needed instalment of cooperation from the Home Government. I do not wish to suggest any alterations in it.

C. R. CLEVELAND,—20-6-10.

Home Department.

Submitted.

A. L.,—20-6-10.

The printer of the *Karmayogin* has just been convicted, which strengthens the case against the *India*.

The despatch may now be resubmitted to Honourable Member and His Excellency.

H. C. WOODMAN,—20-6-10.

On reconsideration I have amended paragraph 4 of the draft. The republication of the *Karmayogin* article with the obvious intention of exciting disaffection renders the editor liable to the same penalties as the original offender.

H. C. WOODMAN,—21-6-10.

Add as enclosure 4 the letter about the Egyptian student.

A. EARLE,—21-6-10.

The letter about the Egyptian students has been added as enclosure 4.

There is one important point to be noticed about the article from the *Karmayogin* which was republished in *India*. In republishing the article *India* left out some of the most virulent passages. These passages are shown within brackets in a copy of the article. Perhaps this point should be brought to the notice of the Secretary of State.

A. L.,—23-6-10.

This should certainly be brought to notice for the passages omitted are most significant and some of them were noticed in the Chief Presidency Magistrate's judgment* convicting the printer. The fact of their omission is a discreditable instance of dishonest journalism. I have added a few words to the draft and propose to reprint the whole article as an enclosure showing the words omitted in brackets.

*Vide unprinted papers.

H. C. WOODMAN,—27-6-10.

A. EARLE,—28-6-10.

I think we are fully entitled to make this representation to the Secretary of State. It can do no harm and may do some good.

J. L. J[ENKINS],—28-6-10.

The draft puts the case very clearly. Please circulate.

M[INTO],—1-7-10.

G. F. W[ILSON],—2-7-10.

I agree that it is desirable to obtain *early* information of objectionable literature exported from England, so as to enable the Government of India to exercise the powers conferred under the Press Act. But I am unable to agree that the 2 extracts from *India* (the *Karmayogin* article, and the *Labour Leader* article) are suitable specimens to select as instances of such literature. As regards the former, the matter, I believe, is under appeal to the High Court. It would in my opinion be better to wait for the decision of the High Court. If it happened to reverse the judgment of the Police Magistrate, it might prove awkward.

S. P. S[INHA],—2-7-10.

The publication by *India* of the *Karmayogin* article appears to me most mischievous but I agree with the Hon'ble Mr. Sinha that it would be desirable to await the decision of the High Court before addressing the Secretary of State.

R. W. C[ARLYLE],—4-7-10.

O'M. C[REACH],—4-7-10.

I do not think we should delay this representation to the Secretary of State pending the disposal of the *Karmayogin* case. We wish to obtain from the Secretary of State some indication as to the action which he may be willing to take, and may allow us to take, in respect of seditious matter published in Great Britain and imported into India. This is a general question. The *Karmayogin* article is merely one of the illustrations. And, as the article in respect of which the prosecution was instituted is not the same as that published in *India* the decision of the High Court will not help us in the least.

It is a matter for executive action not for judicial deliberation, and I think we should act upon our own view of the circumstances and not wait upon the decision of the High Court in one particular instance.

J. L. J[ENKINS],—5-7-10.

I cannot but think the Hon'ble Mr. Sinha and the Hon'ble Mr. Carlyle have misunderstood the intention of the despatch. We are not asking the Secretary of State to authorize us to take action against *India* on account of any particular article that has hitherto appeared, but to assist us with information as to the publication of future articles in newspapers which might justify us in forbidding their introduction into India. That being so I hardly think Hon'ble Members would wish to dissent from the despatch which accordingly may issue after they have seen my note.

M[INTO],—6-7-10.

J. L. J[ENKINS],—6-7-10.

In deference to His Excellency's views, I will not dissent. I only want to guard myself against subscribing to the opinion that the two articles selected come under section 124-A of the Indian Penal Code.

S. P. S[INHA],—7-7-10.

I also do not dissent. My point, which I should have brought out more clearly, was that if the High Court held the article, republished in *India* with some omissions, not to be seditious

5

It would weaken the force of our despatch and might divert attention from the real point which is not affected by the question whether any particular article is seditious or not. I have no desire however to press the point.

R. W. C[ARLYLE],—7-7-10.

The despatch may, I think, now issue.

A. EARLE,—7-7-10.

J. L. J[ENKINS],—7-7-10.

Pro. No. 55.

DESPATCH TO SECRETARY OF STATE, NO. 3, DATED THE 14TH JULY 1910.

Director, Criminal Intelligence.

Seen and returned with thanks.

C. R. CLEVELAND,—19-7-10,
Director, Criminal Intelligence.

Home Department.

6

SECRET.

5

No. 3 of 1910.

No. 557

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

HOME DEPARTMENT.

POLITICAL.

To

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE VISCOUNT MORLEY OF BLACKBURN, O.M.,
His Majesty's Secretary of State for India.

Simla, the 14th July 1910.

MY LORD,

In our secret despatch no. 3 (Political) of the 4th March 1909, we drew *Per A handog*
Your Lordship's attention to the gravity of the danger arising from the wide *14B-150*
and increasing distribution in India of seditious and inflammatory pamphlets and
newspapers emanating largely from London and we invited your assistance in
repressing this danger. We have from time to time, with your approval, on
receipt of information that papers of this nature were in circulation, issued orders
to prevent their importation into the country, and our action in this respect
has been facilitated by the more extended powers which have recently been con-
ferred upon local Governments by the Press Act.

2. It is obvious that any steps which may be taken to prevent the importation
of seditious literature into India by vigilance on the part of our customs or postal
officials must depend for their success upon the receipt of timely warning of their
probable despatch from England. In the case of pamphlets of a purely
revolutionary nature, this is done so far as possible by means of the agents of
our Criminal Intelligence Department; but there are other publications, increas-
ing steadily in number, which treat either habitually or occasionally of Indian
subjects, and not infrequently in a manner which is highly prejudicial to good
administration in this country. It is no part of the duty of police agents to
examine these publications, nor do we think it advisable to entrust to them
the task of sifting the utterances of publicists amongst whom may be included
reputable journalists and politicians.

3. A recent instance of the difficulties which confront us may be cited. From
comments in the press in India we learned that a pamphlet had been published by
Mr. F. C. Mackarness which professed to give details, culled from official sources,
of the methods of torture employed by the police in India. We instituted
enquiries and ascertained that the pamphlet was a compilation of judicial
and departmental pronouncements on selected cases of police oppression or abuses

7

interspersed with unfair and even malicious comments conveying the imputation that such scandals were common and were connived at by the Government of India and its responsible officers. The whole tone and tendency of the pamphlet were such that, if published in India, it would have called for suppression under the provisions of the Press Act, and we considered ourselves fully justified in exercising our powers to prevent its circulation in India. We accordingly prohibited its entry into the country by a notification under section 19 of the Sea Customs Act, No. VIII of 1878, and we suggested to local Governments the desirability of taking action under sections 12, 13 and 15 of the Press Act, I of 1910, with the object of suppressing it wherever found. It transpired, however, that the pamphlet had been in circulation for some time, and that several copies had already reached India before it attracted our attention. Our orders were, therefore, in a large measure too late.

4. Instances may be multiplied of the need for early intimation of the contents of journals published in England. The paper entitled *India* has, on more than one occasion, come within reach of action under the Press Act. We append copies of an extract headed "What is sedition" and of an editorial comment on the same subject, which appeared in the issue of this paper of the 29th April 1910. The former repeats—omitting however, it is significant to observe, some of the most virulent passages—an article from the *Karmayogin* in respect of which a warrant was issued against the printer of the paper and the author of the article, and for the printing of which the former has since been convicted, the author (Arabindo Ghose) having absconded. The comments preceding that article and also those in the editorial columns are both obvious attempts to prejudice a case which is *sub judice*, and the republication of the article in a manner which is plainly intended to be an act of defiance of the Government of India not only brings the editor of *India* within the scope of the Press Act, but would render him liable, if the article had been republished in this country, to a prosecution for a substantive offence under section 124-A, Indian Penal Code. On the same footing is an article by Bepin Chandra Pal reproduced from the *Labour Leader* in the issue of *India* of the 13th May 1910, of which a copy is annexed. This article expatiates on an alleged change of attitude on the part of Government, by which it is said to be losing its hold on the trust of the people, and insinuates that it encouraged lawlessness on the part of Muhammadans in Eastern Bengal and Assam in order to bring Hindus within the clutches of the law: it appears to us to be a malicious attempt to bring the Government into contempt and to foster class hatred. Even more significant of the attitude of this paper is a letter which appeared in its issue of the 22nd April 1910, asserting that pressure was brought by the Government of India to bear on an Egyptian student in order to drive him from the Aligarh College. The alleged facts were found on enquiry to be wholly untrue, and the insertion of this letter without any attempt to verify its contents is only another instance of the avidity with which this paper seizes upon any circumstances which may serve to discredit our administration.

5. We are averse from taking action to prohibit the circulation in India of the papers above referred to, or of others of a similar tendency, but we cannot consistently allow articles of the nature above indicated, which, if published in India, would render the publishers, printers and authors liable to punishment, to be imported into this country without protest. We do not fear criticism, but we are, we submit, entitled to complain of baseless misrepresentations, which, although probably accepted at their face value at home, when read in India are bound to

convey a false impression. We would ask Your Lordship, therefore, to consider whether it would be possible for you to convey to those responsible for the management of *India* and the *Labour Leader* a warning as to the powers which we possess to prohibit the importation and to order the forfeiture of newspapers which offend against our Press law. As already intimated, we are strongly averse from enforcing our powers against any reputable journal published in England, and it is possible that, if Your Lordship could assist us in the manner indicated, action in this country would be rendered unnecessary. We would also ask Your Lordship whether arrangements could be made whereby journals of the nature above referred to, published in England, should be examined at the India Office, and telegraphic intimation, in sufficient detail to admit of identification, should be sent to us of the publication of pamphlets or newspaper articles which clearly offend against the provisions of section 4 of the Indian Press Act. Such intimation would enable us to take prompt action to prevent the importation into, and the circulation in, India of offending pamphlets and newspapers, and would render our action far more effective than is possible under existing conditions.

We have the honour to be,

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's most obedient and humble Servants,

(Signed) MINTO.

O'M. CREAGH.

S. P. SINHA.

„ G. FLEETWOOD WILSON.

B. ROBERTSON.

„ J. L. JENKINS.

R. W. CARLYLE.

List of enclosures.

1. Extract from *India*, London, dated the 29th April 1910.
2. Extract from *India*, London, dated the 29th April 1910.
3. Extract from *India*, London, dated the 13th May 1910.
4. Extract from *India*, London, dated the 22nd April 1910.

No.

1910.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
HOME DEPARTMENT.

POLITICAL.

No. 3, DATED SIMLA, THE 14TH JULY 1910.

(Copy.)

DESPATCH TO HIS MAJESTY'S SECRETARY OF
STATE FOR INDIA.

SUBJECT:

Prevention of the importation into India of
seditious and inflammatory pamphlets and news-
papers published in England.

Enclosure no. 1.

Extract from India, London, dated the 29th April 1910.

WHAT IS ' SEDITION ' ?

THE OFFENDING ARTICLE OF MR. ARABINDO GHOSE.

[It will be remembered that a Calcutta cable on 5th April brought the news that a warrant had been issued for the arrest of Mr. Arabindo Ghose on a charge of "active sedition." The correspondent of the *Times* telegraphed at the time an extract from the offending article which was published on 25th December of last year in Mr. Ghose's newspaper, the *Karmayogin*. In order that our English readers may appreciate the lengths to which the doctrine of "sedition" is now being pushed in India, we give below the full text of the article. It is not necessary to agree with every sentiment contained therein in order to fall in with the view that there is very little, if anything, that is actively 'seditious' to be found in it from beginning to end.—ED., *India*.]

To my Countrymen.

Two decisive incidents have happened which make it compulsory on the Nationalist party to abandon their attitude of reserve and expectancy and once more assume their legitimate place in the struggle for Indian liberties. The reforms, so long trumpeted as the beginning of a new era of constitutional progress in India, have been thoroughly revealed to the public intelligence by the publication of the Councils Regulations and the results of the elections, showing the inevitable nature and composition of the new Councils. The negotiations for the union of Moderates and Nationalists in an United Congress have failed owing to the insistence of the former on the Nationalists subscribing to a Moderate profession of faith.

The survival of Moderate politics in India depended on two factors, the genuineness and success of the promised reforms and the use made by the Conventionalists of the opportunity given them by the practical suppression of Nationalist public activity. The field was clear for them to establish the effectiveness of the Moderate policy and the living force of the Moderate party. Had the reforms been a genuine initiation of constitutional progress, the Moderate tactics might have received some justification from events. Or had the Moderates given proof of the power of carrying on a robust and vigorous agitation for popular rights, their strength and vitality as a political force might have been established, even if their effectiveness had been disproved. The reforms have shown that nothing can be expected from persistence in Moderate politics except retrogression, disappointment, and humiliation. The experience of the last year has shown that, without the Nationalists at their back, the Moderates are impotent for opposition and robust agitation. The political life of India in their hands has languished and fallen silent.

By the incontrovertible logic of events it has appeared that the success and vigour of the great movement inaugurated in 1905 was due to the union of Moderate and Nationalist on the platform of self-help and passive resistance. It was in order to provide an opportunity for the re-establishment of this union, broken at Surat, that the Nationalists gathered in force at Hughly in order to secure some basis and means of negotiation which might lead to united effort. The hand which we held out has been rejected. The policy of Lord Morley has been to rally the Moderates and coerce the Nationalists; the policy of the Moderate party, led by Mr. Gokhale and Sir Pherozshah Mehta, has been to play into the hands of that policy and give it free course and a chance of success. This alliance has failed of its object; the beggarly reward the Moderates have received has been confined to the smallest and least popular elements in their party. But the rejection of the alliance with their own countrymen by the insistence on creed and constitution shows that the Moderates mean to persist in their course even when all motive and political justification for

S-391 H.D.

12

it have disappeared. Discomfited and humiliated by the Government, they can still find no way to retrieve their position, nor any clear and rational course to suggest to the Indian people whom they misled into a misunderstanding of the very limited promises held out by Lord Morley.

Separated from the great volume of Nationalist feeling in the country, wilfully shutting its doors to popularity and strength by the formation of electorates as close and limited as those of the Reformed Councils, self-doomed to persistence in a policy which has led to signal disaster, the Convention is destined to perish of inanition and popular indifference, dislike, and opposition. **[If the Nationalists stand back any longer, either the national movement will disappear or the void created will be filled by a sinister and violent activity. Neither result can be tolerated by men desirous of their country's development and freedom. The period of waiting is over.]* We have two things made clear to us, first, that the future of the nation is in our hands; and secondly, that from the Moderate party we can expect no cordial co-operation in building it. Whatever we do, we must do ourselves, in our own strength and courage. Let us then take up the work God has given us, like courageous, steadfast, and patriotic men, willing to sacrifice greatly and venture greatly because the mission also is great. If there are any unnerved by the fear of repression, let them stand aside. **[If there are any who think that by flattering Anglo-India or coquetting with English Liberalism they can dispense with the need of effort and the inevitability of peril, let them stand aside.]* If there are any who are ready to be satisfied with mean gains or unsubstantial concessions, let them stand aside. But all who deserve the name of Nationalists must now come forward and take up their burden.

The fear of the law is for those who break the law. Our aims are great and honourable, free from stain or reproach, our methods are peaceful, though resolute and strenuous. We shall not break the law and, therefore, we need not fear the law. **[But if a corrupt police, unscrupulous officials or a partial judiciary make use of the honourable publicity of our political methods to harass the men who stand in front by illegal ukases, suborned and perjured evidence or unjust decisions, shall we shrink from the toll that we have to pay on our march to freedom? Shall we cower behind a petty secrecy or a dishonourable inactivity? We must have our associations, our organizations, our means of propaganda, and, if these are suppressed by arbitrary proclamations, we shall have done our duty by our Motherland and not on us will rest any responsibility for the madness which crushes down open and lawful political activity in order to give a desperate and sullen nation into the hands of those fiercely enthusiastic and unscrupulous forces that have arisen among us inside and outside India.]* So long as any loophole is left for peaceful effort we will not renounce the struggle. If the conditions are made difficult and almost impossible, can they be worse than those our countrymen have to contend against in the Transvaal? Or shall we, the flower of Indian culture and education, show less capacity and self-devotion than the coolies and shopkeepers who are there rejoicing to suffer for the honour of their nation and the welfare of their community?

What is it for which we strive? The perfect self-fulfilment of India and the independence which is the condition of self-fulfilment are our ultimate goal. In the meanwhile such imperfect self-development and such incomplete self-government as are possible in less favourable circumstances must be attained as a preliminary to the more distant realisation. What we seek is to evolve self-government either through our own institutions or through those provided for us by the law of the land. No such evolution is possible by the latter means without some measure of administrative control. We demand, therefore, not the **[monstrous and mis-begotten]* scheme which has just been brought into being, but a measure of reform based upon those democratic principles which are ignored in Lord Morley's reforms—a literate electorate without distinction of creed, nationality, or caste, freedom of election unhampered by exclusory clauses,

* Note.—The passages enclosed in brackets are omitted from the republication of this article in *India*.

23

an effective voice in legislation and finance, and some check upon an arbitrary executive. We demand also the gradual devolution of executive government out of the hands of the bureaucracy into those of the people. Until these demands are granted, we shall use the pressure of that refusal of co-operation which is termed passive resistance. We shall exercise that pressure within the limits allowed us by the law, but apart from that limitation the extent to which we shall use it depends on expediency and the amount of resistance we have to overcome.

On our own side we have great and pressing problems to solve. National education languishes for want of moral stimulus, financial support, and emancipated brains keen and bold enough to grapple with the difficulties that hamper its organisation and progress. The movement of arbitration, successful in its inception, has been dropped as a result of repression. The Swadeshi boycott movement still moves by its own impetus, but its forward march has no longer the rapidity and organised irresistibility of forceful purpose which once swept it forward. Social problems are pressing upon us which we can no longer ignore. We must take up the organisation of knowledge in our country, neglected throughout the last century. We must free our social and economic development from the incubus of the litigious resort to the ruinously expensive British Courts. We must once more seek to push forward the movement towards economic self-sufficiency, industrial independence.

These are the objects for which we have to organise the national strength of India. On us fall the burden, in us alone there is the moral ardour, faith, and readiness for sacrifice which can attempt and go far to accomplish the task. But the first requisite is the organisation of the Nationalist party. I invite that party in all the great centres of the country to take up the work and assist the leaders who will shortly meet to consider steps for the initiation of Nationalist activity. It is desirable to establish a Nationalist Council and hold a meeting of the body in March or April of the next year. It is necessary also to establish Nationalist associations throughout the country. When we have done this, we shall be able to formulate our programme and assume our proper place in the political life of India.

Enclosure no. 2.

Extract from India, London, dated the 29th April 1910.

Mr. Krishna Kumar Mitra has, we notice with regret, been subjected to the annoyance of a house-search by the police, because during the period of his deportation Mr. Arabindo Ghose, who is a relation of his, had occasionally resided there, and it was assumed that discovery might be made of copies of the offending number of the *Karmayogin* in respect of which a warrant has been issued against Mr. Ghose. The search as it turned out was perfectly unnecessary, for on demand being made all copies of the paper in question which were in the house were at once produced. We have reproduced the "seditious" article elsewhere, and hope all our English readers will study it. We shall be surprised indeed if they find anything in it which calls for a criminal prosecution.

Enclosure no. 3.

Extract from India, London, dated the 13th May 1910.

THE INDIAN SITUATION.

BY BEPIN CHANDRA PAL.

[FROM THE "LABOUR LEADER."]

All those who really have any care for humanity must regret the indifference with which British publicists and politicians are treating the Indian situation at

19

this critical juncture. Some day, I am afraid, they will all be roused from their present apathy by some misfortune, the magnitude of which it is impossible just now even for the keenest foreign observer to forecast.

Repression has been the parent of revolutions in every country known to European history. As Lord Morley pointed out in one of his speeches on Indian affairs, attempts to govern by pure repression have all failed in Continental Europe. "They may have had, now and again, a spurious semblance of success, but in truth they have all failed." But yet he has been sanctioning, even since he came to office as Secretary of State for India, one after another, a series of repressive measures such as the present generation of Indians, and especially the educated and thinking classes in the community, has been trained to regard as inconceivable in British India.

The Futility of Repression.

This faith of the people in the justice and enlightenment of their British rulers was the real secret of Britain's wonderful hold on India. This is the true explanation of what has frequently been described as the miracle of British rule in India—the government of 300,000,000 of human beings by about 150,000 foreign civilians and soldiers. The British rulers of India at one time fully recognised this fact, and they tried by every possible means to perpetuate and increase this moral hold on the people. Schools were opened, universities were established, freedom of thought and speech were granted, and the organisation of enlightened public life and activities was directly or indirectly encouraged, evidently under the inspiration of this idea. But all is changed to-day. What has really been a willing and ready acquiescence to a superior and enlightened moral power is being interpreted now as submission to mere brute force. Obedience to an alien authority in the pursuit of enlightened self-interest is taken now as due to mere craven selfishness. Even Lord Morley has not been free from this ignorant folly. Repression has universally failed in continental Europe, but why should it fail even in Asia? His Lordship cannot answer the question, and he simply says: "Whether we with our enormous power and resolution should fail, I do not know." I am afraid His Lordship will never know until it is too late.

Universal Discontent.

They did not talk thuswise fifty years ago, during and after the Mutiny. Yet we who know the country from the inside, know that the moral forces that stood behind that rising are as nothing compared to what lies beneath the present unrest. The discontent that led to the Mutiny was sectional, the present discontent is practically universal. That affected the army alone: this has affected the civil population. Even the native army is not altogether unaffected by the present discontent. The thing would be unnatural. The sepoy has his own grievances; he does not harangue at public meetings, he does not edit newspapers, and he does not carry his heart on his sleeve. But all this does not mean that he has neither sense nor sensibilities. The population of a country is like the waters of a great lake or sea, and you cannot disturb one part of it without moving the whole. The sepoy is a part of the civil population. His women-kind and his children-folk all live and move among their neighbours. And through these at least, if not through other channels, the ideas and sentiments running through the general populations of the country percolate to the cantonment and the barrack room. And the sepoy has his own specific grievances also. No responsible Nationalist leader has yet tried to tamper with the loyalty of the sepoy; on the contrary they have always been anxious to avoid mixing up the sepoy with the Nationalist propaganda, for they have never wanted to bring about a physical revolt leading to a physical struggle that would be ruinous to their cause. But in spite of it all the sepoy has caught the contagion of the new spirit in the country. The authorities are already nervous about it. The deportation of Lala Lajpat Rai and Sirdar Ajit Singh in 1907 was admittedly due to this suspicion, and the more recent incident in Calcutta in the Tenth Jat Regiment is a fresh proof of this nervousness. And all this shows that things are not what they seem in British India.

"Riding for a Revolution."

And the Government of India seem to be riding for a revolution in that peace-loving country. The present unrest is due to the loss of the faith of the people in British justice and British Liberalism. And they have been fighting it with methods that are hourly killing what little remnant of the old faith still was in the country. When the leaders of Bengal declared a boycott of British goods as a protest against the partition of their province, they simultaneously proclaimed also their faith in British laws and British justice. This boycott was a mere exercise of personal freedom in the choice of one's personal purchases. If a person wanted to pay more for a particular class of goods, simply because they were made in his own country, than what was needed for the same or similar goods imported from another country, he broke no law, committed no offence; and no civilised administration would interfere with his personal freedom in this matter. If the Bengalee leaders had any idea that the enlightened Government of Britain would penalise this patriotic sacrifice of the people, they would not, I am afraid, have proclaimed this boycott so confidently as they did. Their fear then was not from the Government but from the people. Would the people accept it? that was the question. But they were soon undeceived on both these points. The people readily took to the boycott, but the Government commenced to fight it with all the enormous resources at their command.

The Police and Lawlessness.

Executive lawlessness was first tried to drive the people to acts of lawlessness, and thus to place them under the clutches of law and thereby to crush the new movement. The policeman's quarter-staffs were fiercely applied for the dispersion of lawful and peaceful public processions. People suffered the outrage meekly and without any reply, but tightened their hold on the boycott more firmly than before. The lawless policeman being defeated, Moslem hooligans came upon the scene, and they created riots, looted the houses of Hindu boycotters, threatened to dishonour their women, and desecrated their temples, while the police looked on the outrage. But while the people had submitted to executive outrages to avoid even the least semblance of lawlessness, there was no such reason to suffer Moslem rowdyism. And here they commenced to retaliate; and there was general disorder all over the province, until the Government, seeing the defeat of the Moslem hooligans at the hands of the Hindu Nationalists, were forced to interfere in the interests of their own safety, and put these disturbances down. But even in so doing, the executive tried to turn the judicial proceedings that rose out of these riots against the Hindu boycotter.

Three men were charged with the murder of a Muhammadan rioter in Comilla, all of them Hindus, and one was sentenced to be hanged and two others to transportation for life. The verdict was quashed on appeal by the High Court, and the Honourable Judges who heard it recorded in their judgment that—"The truth has evidently been withheld." And how and by whom it was so withheld is suggested in another part of this judgment:—

The best and most reliable witnesses would have been the Commissioner of the division, the Magistrate of the district, and Superintendent Byrne; but none of them were called by the prosecution. The non-appearance in the witness box of the Commissioner of the division and the Magistrate of the district has not been explained, and we have every reason to believe that Superintendent Byrne, who could have given evidence on this as well as on other points of importance, was purposely withheld from appearance at Comilla or the court at the trial. During the course of the trial in the Sessions Court, Byrne, on 31st May, wired to the learned Sessions Judge himself enquiring from Dinajpur when he was required. He again wired from Dinajpur on 8th June "Kindly telegraph when required. Arrangements made to start to-night." The learned Sessions Judge directed an urgent telegram to be sent in answer, "Do not start till you get orders;" and an urgent telegram was accordingly sent to Byrne, and Byrne was not examined.

And the Honourable Judges said that "the inference from the withholding of such witnesses is irresistible;" that if examined they would not have corroborated the prosecution story regarding the guilt of the three Hindu accused.

Fostering Race Prejudice.

The Calcutta correspondent of the *Tribune* (London) sent the following telegram, which was published in that paper on August 16, 1907 :—

The High Court in Calcutta delivered a sensational judgment to-day upon the appeal in the Comilla shooting case, in which a Hindu was sentenced to death by the Sessions Judge for the murder of a Muhammadan during the riots in March last.

The High Court criticised severely the decision of the judge in the lower court, and commented upon the untrustworthiness of the evidence adduced by the police authorities. The Bench asserted that the District Judge had apparently divided the evidence into two classes, accepting that given by the Mussalman and rejected that tendered by Hindus. It went further, and declared that the failure of the Commissioner of the division and the District Magistrate to put in an appearance was an extraordinary feature of the case, and that the Police Superintendent, whose evidence was very material, had been purposely transferred to another district to prevent his being called in evidence. This is the third case within the last few days in which the High Court has either quashed a sentence of imprisonment or commuted a death penalty. Indian resentment has thus been roused against the judgments of the district civilians who have jurisdiction over such cases. The result of the Comilla appeal moreover, increases the bitter suspicions entertained by the Hindus that the Government of the new province is unfairly favourable to Muhammadans.

The disturbances in Comilla were followed by Moslem outrages in Mymensing. I do not say that the Government had any hand directly in encouraging these outrages—I have no evidence in support of a charge like this. But it is notorious that circulars were distributed broadcast in many of the eastern districts of Bengal saying that the Government had authorised Muhammadans to refuse to pay rents to Hindu landlords, and even to forcibly marry Hindu widows. The attitude of the district Executive, both at Comilla and in Mymensing, lent strong suspicion to the truth of these rumours in the eye of the unthinking populace. In Comilla, when the town was practically given over to Moslem rioters, the Hindu leaders, on appealing to the District Magistrate for police protection, were told "to go to Bepin Chandra Pal and get him to save them." In Mymensing the Magistrate permitted a number of Muhammadan rowdies to enter the local offices of a prominent Hindu zemindar with a police search party, and to help the latter in breaking open the boxes and throwing about the records. The High Court has assessed a damage of Rs. 500 on this Magistrate for this outrage.

The simple-minded peoples of India make no distinction between a high Government official and the Government itself. And high Government officials, from Sir Bampfylde Fuller downwards, had in many places shown a decided preference towards the Muhammadan as against the Hindu. The Comilla and Mymensing riots were, therefore, easily taken by unthinking people as part of the policy of the Government directed towards the Anti-Partition agitation and the Boycott Movement, to which it gave rise. And the sense of wrong thus created lies at the root of the propaganda of political violence which appeared in the autumn of 1907.

17

Extract from the "India," dated the 22nd April 1910.

THE INDIA GOVERNMENT AND AN EGYPTIAN STUDENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF "INDIA".

Sir,—May I draw your attention to the following summary of an ^{incident} ~~accident~~ which I read with some surprise in the "Al-Moayyid," of Cairo, dated March 31, 1910, so that British readers may know how indiscriminately and how unreasonably the Government of India sometimes acts?

During the beginning of the present year an Egyptian student, Muhammad Tewfik Rajab, of a well known local family, was sent to the Aligarh College for study. He was admitted to the college and the students gave an "At Home" in honour of the "first Egyptian of their college." A few days later, however, the Government of India brought pressure to bear on the college authorities, who intimated to the new student that as his admission was resented by the Government of India, they could not allow him to remain at the college. The poor student with all the inconveniences of a sudden dismissal went back to Cairo. The father of the boy then wrote to the "Al-Moayyid," whose editor, after publishing the letter, makes severe comments on the action of the Government of India.

I may add that there are to-day in the Aligarh College many students from Persia and not a few from other parts of the world. Can any one guess the effect of the action of the Government of India on the Aligarh College students, most of whom are the would-be leaders of the Muslim community in India, and on the hundreds of Indian Muslim students that are now receiving their education in the great Arabic University of Al-Azhar in Cairo, all of whom are destined to be the future leaders of Muslim religious thought in India?

31, ARDEN STREET, EDINBURGH; }

(Sd.) A. L. SAYEED.

April 19.