

(2)

LETTERS

ON THE ILBERT BILL CONTROVERSY

BY

“GAMIN DE BON ACCORD.”



*Published by permission of the Writer
with a Prefatory Note*

BY

DINO NATH CHATTERJEE,
SHIBPUR.



Calcutta:

PRINTED AT THE HOWRAH VICTORIA PRESS,
102, G. T. ROAD.

1885.

(2)

LETTERS

ON THE ILBERT BILL CONTROVERSY

BY

“GAMIN DE BON ACCORD.”



*Published by permission of the Writer
with a Prefatory Note*

BY

DINO NATH CHATTERJEE,
SHIBPUR.



Calcutta:

PRINTED AT THE HOWRAH VICTORIA PRESS,
102, G. T. ROAD.

1885.



BEHARY LAL ROY, PRINTER.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"THE STATESMAN AND FRIEND OF INDIA,"

January 27th, 1884.

"BABU DINO NATH CHATTERJEE of Seebpore has obtained permission from the writer to publish, in pamphlet form, the several letters which have appeared in our columns under the **nom-de-plume** of "Gamin de Bon Accord." Many of those letters in favor of the policy of the "Ilbert Bill" are among the best that have appeared in the columns of the local newspapers. * * * *

These letters are written in a forcible style of idiomatic and grammatical English. The proposed pamphlet should therefore command a large sale, and become a sort of home class book for Bengali students who wish to cultivate a pure and forcible style of writing. * * * *

THE "ENGLISHMAN."

A REPUBLICATION.—It is said that Babu Dino Nath Chatterjee, of Shibpur, intends shortly, having obtained the permission of the original writer, to publish in pamphlet form, the whole of the letters written by "Gamin de Bon Accord," which appeared in the columns of some of our local contemporaries. These letters are on matters of public interest.

To

DINO NATH CHATTERJEE, ESQ.,
Seebpore.

MY DEAR MR. CHATTERJEE,

Your's to hand asking my permission to publish in pamphlet form the several letters written by me on the "Ilbert Bill" Controversy which have appeared in the columns of the "Statesman" and "Indian Mirror." I certainly have no objection to your doing so; for have we not the authority of Byron for saying:—

"'Tis pleasant sure, to see ones name in print.
A book's a book, although there's nothing in't."

But I am afraid you will have some difficulty in getting subscribers for the pamphlet. I am doubtful whether the reading public among English educated gentlemen and our College youths will consider my afflictions of the same value as you do, however, you can try.

You will also have to get the permission of the editors of the "Statesman" and "Indian Mirror" to republish the letters in question.

Wishing you every success in the undertaking.

Your's very Sincerely,

W. F. M., (*W. Forbes Mitchell*)

Alias GAMIN DE BON ACCORD.

18th December 1883.

PREFATORY NOTE.

*Dedicated to the Memory of our Late Viceroy.
"Ripon the Just."*

Having received permission from the writer to publish in pamphlet form the whole of the letters on the ILBERT BILL controversy which appeared from time to time in the columns of the "Statesman" and "Indian Mirror" under the *nom-de-plume* of "GAMIN DE BON ACCORD." The undersigned has determined to dedicate the Pamphlet to the memory of The Most Hon'ble George Frederick Samuel Robinson, Maquiss of Ripon Late Viceroy and Governor-General of India.

Considered from a controversial point of view these letters are among the best which appeared in the columns of the local newspapers in favor of the policy of our late noble and just Viceroy. **Long may he live.** Besides from an educational point of view the letters are of paramount importance being expressed in the most forcible style of idiomatic and grammatical English. The undersigned has no desire to acquire any pecuniary gain by this Pamphlet, and any profits which may arise from its publication will be devoted to the "Ripon Memorial Fund." There is also a number of other letter by the same writer on subjects of great importance to India. *Viz.*, Jails, Our Boys, The International Exhibition, Outstills, &c., &c., which the undersigned proposes to publish in separate forms if he should be so fortunate as to gain the support of the Public in the present undertaking. The profits of this second part, if ~~any~~ should arise, will be devoted to founding a Scholarship in the Engineering College, Seebpore, for the mechanical training of our Indian Youths.

DINO NATH CHATTERJEE.

SHIBPUR, HOWRAH ;

5th December 1884.

THE
Criminal P. C. Amendment Bill.

To

THE EDITOR OF THE STATESMAN,

SIR,

Notwithstanding the positive assertions of several Hon'ble Members at the late meeting of the Vice-regal Council that the feeling of the whole of the non-official Europeans in India evoked against the bill is deep and united, I, as a non-official European of close on 30 years residence in India, venture to challenge the truth of this assertion. Doubtless there has been a great ebullition of manufactured feeling on the subject, but I beg to assert that it is neither deep nor real, and that not one per cent of those who cheered the absurd and clap-trap sentiments expressed at the Town Hall meeting, and elsewhere could give you a logical reason for their conduct, or tell you how the Bill will affect them or their descendants. The fact is, an absurd race-cry ~~has~~ been got up by a few of the so called defenders of an Englishman's birth-right; and all, with the least claim to a drop of European blood in their veins, have thought it their duty to join in the general cry, and go to swell the crowds at such meetings. In Calcutta, itself not one in ten of the non-official European populations could tell how much the law differs with respect to a European British-born subject and an American citizen of the United States, and they would be astonished to know that a West Indian Negro is classed as a European British born Subject.

Regarding the reality or depth of the feeling called forth on this subject, permit me to recall to the minds of your readers a similar ebullition of manufactured feeling which was got up during the late Russian and Turkish War. A few Tory Jingoos and Russophobists raised the cry and held meetings of the Mohomedan population throughout India and collected subscriptions for the wounded Turks. But did any sane-man believe in the reality or depth of that mock feeling of sympathy for the Turk; and I venture to say that it had much more reality and danger in it than the present frothy ebullition, which has neither depth nor reality as far as the non-official Europeans, who can reason or think for themselves, are concerned.

With such a Text as a "Black Act" and the birthrights of an Englishman being in danger, it is a very easy matter for any irresponsible stump orators to collect a crowd and obtain thunders of applause for their absurd arguments and groans for the Hon'ble Mr. Ilbert. But notwithstanding all that has been asserted, the amendment will and must become law; and I will venture to predict that many of those who now join in the cry against it, will, before many years pass over, turn round and point to the Act as a standing monument of the equality, &c., of English rule.

A great deal has been said about the privileges of several classes of the natives. Granted that they have some unfair privileges, but how could the Government ever dare to encroach on these anomalies unless it can first, with truth, show that there are no anomalies or race privileges claimed by the ruling race.

A great point has also been made about false charges and the danger our wives and sisters will run from their Ayahs, &c., instituting such false charges against them. Such arguments are so evidently clap-trap, false and hollow that they don't require any refutation; but if there were any foundation of truth for them, I, for one, would far rather trust such a case to a native Judge, of the class to whom this Bill will give any powers, than to a European Junior Civilian, and I maintain that the former would be far more likely in such a case to sift truth from falsehood than the latter.

But I will not take up your space with arguments which have been already stated in your columns with ten fold more force than I could state them. But instead I will in another letter give a few facts from cases that have come under my own observation, if you think them worthy of a place in your columns, to show in what light the Bill is likely to be looked on by European criminals who are at all likely to be affected by it. But before I close this letter I would like to say a few words regarding the action of some men calling themselves Volunteers. One set call on all to throw down their arms, because Government has seen fit to bring in this Bill. Another class, and some turn-coats from the first, call on all Volunteers to stick to their arms, because if the Bill becomes law, it is sure to bring about a rebellion—On the principle that to give the Native his just inch he will then claim his unjust ell. Is such rubbish logic or argument? Is an act of justice to one class of our fellow-subjects certain to cause them to break out in revolt against a just and upright Government? If so, it will be a new chapter of history different from all that I have ever read. Be that, as it may, are such men as those who write the rubbish appearing in the daily papers as advice to Volunteers, the men on whom England would have to depend if ever her position in India should be assailed either from within or without. It was not such men as those who re-conquered India in the memorable 1857—at least that is the opinion of your,

GAMIN DE BON ACCORD.

P. S.—I must not be understood to class the soldier-like and sensible letter written by Mr. Robinson Soutter, among the ~~rubbish~~ heap.

GAMIN DE BON ACCORD.

To

THE EDITOR OF THE INDIAN MIRROR.

SIR,

To read the long and loud screeches and howls appearing in the daily papers against the Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Bill, one would think that the whole of us, official and non-

official Europeans, had degenerated, and become a race of Jackals, instead of "Lion-hearted."* To read all the rubbish, put forward as argument, one would think the whole European population of India belonged to the criminal classes, and all certain to have to answer for their crimes before some vindictive Native "Squire Western J. P.", who will most certainly send every European, man or woman, brought before him, to the Andaman Islands for seven years. If I were a poet, I would make a parody on the Old Jacobite song, and set it to the chorus of—

"We'll all be hanged and quartered, Sir,

And that you will soon see,

For there's Native Judges on the bench,

Without the leave of me."

However I, for one, do not fear that this change in the law will either drive the Europeans or European Capital from the country; and if they could have sunk their own wretched race and cast feeling, and foregone the great temptation that it apparently has been to many of the so-called leaders of opinion, to enable them to pose as orators and the defenders of an Englishman's birth-right &c. The proposed change in the law would have gone a great way to have bridged the race-gulf which separates the Europeans and the Natives so far. Besides, I venture to predict that the proposed change will be entirely for the benefit of any unfortunate European who may be brought before the Criminal Courts of the country. From my own experience, I could name over a dozen Europeans who have been charged with crimes during the past 20 years, and have each and all declared themselves to be Americans to admit of their being tried before the Lower Courts, instead of claiming their rights as British-born subjects, and going before the High Courts.

I will now say a few words on the Town Hall meeting, and as a non-official European, I beg to protest against the general tone of the speeches and the language used at that meeting, and I venture to predict that the speakers will eventually find that

*The phrase "Lion hearted race" was used by Mr. J. J. Keswick in his infamous speech at the Town Hall meeting against the bill.

they have very much harmed the cause that they went to defend. I will also venture to predict that before many years pass, each and all of the speakers who were greeted with such "thunders of applause" will be heartily ashamed and sorry for the parts they have acted in this play of cant and clap-trap. What have the native gentlemen, who called for the alteration in the law, done that Mr. Keswick should throw Dr. Chever's Medical Jurisprudence at their heads? Is such language as Mr. Keswick uses in the whole of that para. of his speech, to be considered as argument? And the opinions of any European who can think for himself and discern truth from a scenic and clap-trap falsehood? If so, I am truly sorry for the future of "*the lion hearted race*." I cannot understand why a gentleman, claiming to stand in the front rank of that race, could have so far forgotten himself as to have damaged his case by language fit only for Billingsgate, instead of argument. Besides, I venture to doubt the truth of all that is asserted in Dr. Chever's "*Medical Jurisprudence*." However, is a work on Jurisprudence, which necessarily must deal with the seamy side of humanity, to be considered the test for the morality of a whole nation? If so, the Newgate calender, and the revelations of the Divorce Court must be considered the text book for the morality of "*the lion hearted*" Mr. Keswick must even have a tilt at the *Statesman*. He has evidently laid the advice of the Attorney to heart, *viz.*, "When you have a bad case and no better argument, abuse the Counsel for the opposition, and if you can make it personal, it is the more certain to tell with the mob."

Regarding Mr. Branson's Italian stiletto, I think that style of argument more suitable for a Dublin than for a Calcutta audience of the present day. I am also grateful for the fact that Natives of India are to be presumed to have been the murderers of Sir Louis Cavagnari. The fixing of that historical fact certainly deserved "thunders of applause," and groans and hisses for the Bengalis. Hitherto, I had been laying that political blunder and crime on the shoulders of Lord Lytton, and the *lion-hearted* Tory Jingo.

that Titus Oates of immortal memory was a Bengali. We could also spare them Jonathan Wyld and Old Fegan the Jew, if they did not object to take the latter off our hand. However, if they object to Old Fegan, we can look them up a few other real characters before the sheriff calls another meeting in the Town Hall.

I will now glance at the speech of the Revd. Mr. Finter, and will premise with the question what business had a minister of the Christian religion at a race meeting like this? Mr. Finter appears to have forgotten the fundamental doctrine of his own faith, *viz.*, "That God made of one blood all nations of the earth," and for this he has substituted a creed of his own *viz.*, "In the beginning, God created a free-born, lion-hearted Englishman, and rested 7 days. After this rest, the Almighty created the inferior race of nigger Jackals to act as the providers of the lion-hearted".

Before concluding I would ask the Eurasians and Anglo-Indians to think a little for themselves, and not put their trust in such leaders as the Revd. Mr. Finter and the others who addressed this meeting. Not one of those men but in their hearts consider the Eurasian as much a nigger as they do the pure Native.

If time and your space permitted, I could instance many cases to prove that the support of the country-born Europeans and Eurasians ought to be given to the Bill, and not against it. Instead of prolonged cheers, as reported in the *Englishman*, the speech of the Revd. Mr. Finter deserved groans and hisses from every Eurasian and Anglo-Indian present. To one and all Eurasian and Anglo-Indian non-official in India, I say, ~~don't~~ believe such clap-trap assertions as that the Europeans, official and non-official are banded with them in this matter. I tell them boldly it is not the truth. It is merely the old cry of Demetrius and the men of Ephesus, that has given this apparent cohesion. The official Europeans see in future that if this Bill becomes law, "Their craft is in danger" and cease not to shout great is the birth-right and privileges of a free-born *lion-hearted* Englishman.

Just one point more. Most of those speakers pretended that

they were very sorry for having to use the language which, in the interests of truth and justice, they were compelled to use, and even went so far as to pretend to say that there are some Native gentlemen whom they class as friends. What condescension!!! Surely, such jackals as Messrs. W. C. Banerjee and M. M. Ghose, not to mention the Hon'ble Kristodoss Paul and Amir Ali, &c., &c., ought to be truly grateful for the patronage of such lion-hearted friends. At least, that is the opinion of one who, rather than endorse such opinions, will class himself as

A. JACKAL.

To

THE EDITOR OF THE STATESMAN.

SIR,

As promised in my last letter, the following facts will show that the proposed Amendment of the Criminal Procedure Code, will put Americans of the United States and British-born subjects on the same footing.

In 1860, there was a man named George Ashton in Rawal Pindi, sentenced to be flogged and drummed out of the Army for theft, and to undergo six month's imprisonment, which he underwent in the Sealkote Military prison. About two years after, this same man figured before the Calcutta High Court as the Hon'ble J. Dudley Moncrieff, and got an accumulative sentence of, I think, seven years, for criminal breach of trust, theft, and cheating. This sentence expired in 1869, when the Hon'ble Dudley Moncrieff, was discharged from the European Penitentiary of Hazaribagh. He found his way to Simla, and, without her Majesty's leave, promoted himself to be Captain Hill, of the Royal Engineers, Public Works Department Madras, on leave; and with a plausible story of being robbed on his way to Simla, he managed to swindle several of the Simla branches of Calcutta tradesmen of articles of clothing and jewellery, &c., mostly of a saleable nature. And he was present as Captain Hill at the ball given by the Maharaja of Jeypore to Lord and Lady Mayo, in the full dress uniform of a Captain in the British Army.

rooms in the same hotel as a Captain of the Buffs who was on leave from Meerut, where the Buffs were lying and he managed to steal a blank cheque from this officers cheque book, and got to know the amount of his balance in the Simla Bank. This Captain of the Buffs went away for a fortnight's shooting in the interior and had no sooner left Simla than the self-styled Captain Hill drew a cheque in his name, and with it lifted the balance at his credit in the Simla Bank. But unfortunately for the success of his adventure, cholera had broken out in Meerut, and all the officers of the Buffs on leave were summoned to join the regiment, and the notice reached this Captain at Chenee dâk bungalow, and he returned to Simla ten days before he was expected. But when he applied to the bank for money to take him down to the plains, he found that the whole of his balance had been drawn on a cheque presented by Captain Hill with his signature so well imitated, that he could not swear but that it was his own handwriting. In fact, Captain Hill at first tried to prove that he got the cheque in payment of money lost at billiards, but that is anticipating. Captain Hill had no sooner got the money than he had left Simla, but having only a short start, the police arrested him before he reached Mussoorie, to which sanitarium he tried to go, and when taken back to Simla, he found too many anxious creditors looking out for him; and as soon as he saw that the Deputy Commissioner was to commit him to the High Court, Lahore, for forgery and cheating, he declared himself to be an American citizen, named John Dearden, and claimed to be tried by the Lower Court (he had had enough of being a British-born and High Courts,) and his plea was admitted, as there was no one there to prove otherwise, and he got off with a sentence of three year's imprisonment for a series of crimes for which he would have got life if he had gone before any High Court and an English Jury.

Case No. 2, was a man named Wyburn, who murdered a native woman in Ferozepore in 1869, and if he had gone before the High Court he would have been hanged, and this his pleader knew and made him declare himself a Dutchman, and claim to be

tried by the Lower Court, where he got off with a sentence of three years imprisonment.

Case No. 3, was the Soi-Disant Hon'ble George Cecil Stanley, who stole a portmanteau and jewel-case belonging to Mrs. Fortescue, wife of the Brigade Major of Mooltan. The Hon'ble George stood on his rights as a British-born and got sentenced to five years by Justice Bulnoise, High Court, Lahore. The next time I heard of him, he was a self-styled Indigo planter in Benares, and swindled several Calcutta tradesmen out of articles mostly of a saleable nature, but eventually he was found out; but he had also learned a lesson, and became an American, and went before the Lower Court, and got off with two years.

Case No. 4, was an East Indian Railway guard named Milton, who, as guard of the train, stole a portmanteau from Sir Stuart Hogg, Commissioner of Police, and when found out, he also became an American, and went before the Lower Court, and got off with two years for a charge that would have got him ten, being criminal breach of trust by a public servant.

I could give you half-a-dozen more cases, but these will suffice to upset a great deal of the theories that Europeans who know anything about our Courts would rather be tried by the High Courts and a Jury, than go before the Lower Court and assessors.

GAMIN DE BON ACCORD.

To

THE EDITOR OF THE STATESMAN.

SIR,

Will you permit me to make a few remarks on the able letter of "K" in your issue of the 27th instant? After twitting Mr. Robinson Souttar about "the deliciously simple idea" of asking the opponents of the Bill to discuss the matter without using epithets and language which, in my opinion, are not only calculated, but intended, to wound the feelings of every one of our native fellow subjects who can understand English, "K" goes on to say that this would be like asking a man to fight another with his right arm tied behind his back. And further on, he says

"The charge of habitual perjury is unfortunately too true, and not to refer to it is to needlessly weaken ones case.' Granted. I would endorse "K's" opinions and approve of the language in which they are couched, if the matter at issue were the trustworthiness of native witnesses, as a rule, and the reliance that may safely be placed on their testimony. But unfortunately for "K's" argument, the point at issue is the fitness of native Judges to weigh and sift such evidence, and I maintain that the gentlemen who will be affected by the present bill, are better fitted and more likely to do justice to such evidence than nine-tenths of the Junior European Civilians. I could give many instances where Mofussil European Magistrates have been entirely in the hands of the *amla* of their courts, and during the past 25 years, I have personally known several *Sheristadars* who were the Magistrates *de-facto* of the district, and the European incumbent merely the Magistrate *de-jure*. But to go into such details at present would have too great a tendency to exasperate the feelings of the opponents of the Bill. But to take advantage of "K's" rules for one round before I tie up my right hand, I will quote one case of injustice to a native woman by a European Magistrate, and I challenge "K" to produce one to match it from the cases of the whole of the Europeans who have hitherto been criminally tried by native magistrates who have had such powers in the Presidency Towns. I allude to the notorious case of Mr. Field's *ayah* who was prosecuted by a European Judge—an authority on law, and tried and condemned by a European Magistrate, not in open court, but in the drawing-room of the Magistrate of Howrah.

"K" draws a comparison from the history of the events which led to the independence of America, but "K" and I look at the matter from different points of view and as a matter, of course, apply it differently. I class the European opponents of the Bill along with George III and Grênvillè; and the supporters of it with Burke and Pitt. But whether "K" or I be right, no one can certainly say to-day, but with "K's" permission I will gladly submit the point at issue to the arbitration of 1893.

As "K" has referred to the history of 120 years ago, I will ask him if he recollects the following quotation from the parliamentary speeches of that period *viz.*—

"There is an idea in some that the colonies are virtually
 "represented in this House. I would fain know by whom an
 "American is represented here! Is he represented by any
 "knight of the Shire in any country in the Kingdom? Would to
 "God that respectable representatives were augmented to a
 "greater number. Or will you tell him he is represented by
 "any representative of a borough?—A borough which, perhaps, its
 "own representative never saw! This is what is called '*the*
 "*rotten part of the constitution*' It cannot continue a century. If
 "it does not drop, it must be amputated. The idea of a virtual re-
 "presentative of America in this House is the most contemptible
 "idea that ever entered into the head of man; it does not deserve
 "a serious refutation."

Thus spake William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, on the 14th January 1766. And I will leave all who can discern the signs of the times to say how applicable the sentiments are to India to-day. Pitt spoke the truth; but the ideas of Bute and Grenville were so deeply ingrained in the public mind that but few believed it. I don't pretend to the gift of prophecy, but I have read history, and I firmly believe that if the Government, were to be so weak as to withdraw the Bill now, they would sow the seeds of a revolution in India which would be differently carried out, and have a different termination to that of 1857. If England is to rule India, and I sincerely pray that she may rule it for ages to come, she must rule it in Christian equity, and not by virtue of class distinctions among the servants of her Government. There is a letter from Mr. Wordsworth, Principal of the Elphinstone College, Bombay, to the *Bombay Gazette*, reproduced in the *Indian Mirror* of the 17th Instant. I would ask "K" to read and digest that letter, and I will also leave the points at issue to the arbitration of 1893.

ANOTHER HISTORICAL PARALLEL FOR THE
CONSIDERATION OF "K" WITH SOME
ADVICE BOTH TO NATIVES AND
TO THE EUROPEAN OPPO-
NENTS OF THE C. P.
AMENDMENT
BILL.

To

THE EDITOR OF THE STATESMAN.

SIR,

I beg to thank you for publishing my remarks on the able letter of "K" and hope you will permit me to make a few more on a part of his letter, which you have not noticed in your article of the 30th ultimo.

Referring to the Town Hall meeting, "K" says: "At the risk of being counted as a man of the coarsest fibre, I being one present, declare that not only am I not ashamed of having been there, or of the speeches delivered there, but that I should be perfectly willing to attend another such meeting again." I have no desire to quarrel with "K" on account of his opinions, but as he was pleased to appeal to the history of "the American business of last century," he will doubtless be grateful to me for calling the following parallel case to his recollection. Unfortunately for "K" Grenville is the party alluded to, and not Burke or Pitt. The historian of the time (1766) says: "The Declaratory Act, passed readily enough for all the parties agreed to it; but the repeal of the Stamp Act, meet with stout opposition. Grenville, with the pertinacity of a man who glories in his disgrace, resisted it at every stage. When he was hissed by the people, he declared that 'he rejoiced in the hiss. If it were to do so again, he would do it!' When the crowds around the doors of the House of Commons, hissed and hooted him, in his rage he seized one man by the collar and shook him. 'Well, if I may not hiss,' said the fellow, 'at

“least I may laugh,” and he laughed in Grenville’s face, and the “mob laughed.”

I will leave it to your reader’s to say whether the attitude assumed by “K” in the present instance, most resembles that of Burke and Pitt, or that of Grenville.

With your permission I will now address a few words to Mr. Lallmohun Ghose and the other leaders of native opinion. In your issue of the 31st Ultimo you say: “It is with very sincere regret that we publish this morning a telegram from Dacca, informing us that Eastern Bengal has begun a counter agitation on the subject of the Criminal Procedure Amendment Bill.”

As a non-official supporter of the Bill I sincerely regret this too, and beg of Mr. Ghose to pause before he stirs up an agitation that he may not be able to control. Up to the present, Government shows no signs of wavering in its just and liberal policy, and unless it were to show such signs, agitation will do more harm than good. If my opinion be worth any thing, I think Mr. Ghose ought to confine himself to collecting the opinions of the educated classes in a quiet manner and send them to Government in support of the measure, as it has been stated by the opponents of the Bill that but few of the natives desire the change in law; but *have nothing like a counter agitation at present.*

As I have been quoting from the history of the events which led to the independence of America, I will give another quotation for the consideration of Mr. Ghose and other leaders of native opinion. Referring to the American Colonists, in his famous speech of the 14th January 1766, Mr. Pitt said: “They “are the subjects of this Kingdom, equally entitled with your-
“selves to all the rights of mankind and the peculiar previ-
“leges of Englishmen, and equally bound by its laws. The
“Americans are the sons, not the bastards, of England.”

Now I tell the educated men of India, that *they also are the sons, not the bastards of England.* And although younger sons, I hope they will never lose sight of their relationship, and by their moderation under the present tempting opportunity let them

prove to the Government, and to all right-thinking Christian men; that they are as much deserving of their portion in the inheritance, and to rank themselves as brothers in the great confederation called "the British Empire" as their elder brothers are.

Before I conclude this letter, allow me to say a few words to the opponents of the Bill, who think to strengthen their case by allusions to Cawnpore and 1857. I would beg of them to recollect that there is also another side to that style of argument. I am one of those who had, in the performance of my duty, to stand over high-caste Hindoos, who, under the lash of the provostmartial, were compelled to clean the blood from part of the floor of the slaughter-house of Cawnpore, before they were sent to the gallows, and I am not ashamed to say that I sincerely pitied them, and considered that the fierce thirst for vengeance then shown by many of our bravest Military leaders was a stain on them individually, and a disgrace to Christian England. I suppose it would be called *cant* if I were to say that the bullet which struck down the brave Niel in the moment of victory was directed by Him who said. "Vengeance is mine: I will repay." However, I leave preaching to the *padres*, and confine myself to telling those who use such arguments that before a just comparison can be drawn, something of the injustice which led to the Mutiny and semi-rebellion must also be stated. And if the Nana Sahib and Azimolla of Cawnpore, are to be for ever held up as the prototypes of the whole Indian people, would the gentlemen who have asked for this Bill and the native press be justified in taking "a Royal Duke of England, and his *fidus achates*, the Brutal General Hawley," as the prototypes of the English nation of the last century? In support of my argument, I will just give one more quotation. The historian of 1746 writes: "After all," wrote Cumberland from Fort Augustus to the Duke of Newcastle. "I am sorry to leave this country in "the condition it is in, for all the good that we have done "has been a *little blood letting, which has only weakened the "madness, but not at all cured it.* And I tremble for Fear

“that this vile spot may still be the ruin of this island and our family.”

The historian goes on to say that “To arrive at a perfect idea of the character of Cumberland, it must be borne in mind that for months before he wrote the above, his soldiers had been massacring men, violating the women, and immolating the children, till, according to Smollet, in addition to one thousand Highlanders who fell in the field of Culloden, two thousand five hundred had been slaughtered in cold blood, and the country for fifty miles round had neither house nor cottage, man nor beast, left, but was one vast scene of ruin, silence, and desolation, and during this time Cumberland and his deputy, butcher, Hawley, were indulging in a Saturnalia, in which every beastliness and scandal to human nature was practised. Amongst the entertainments given by this young prince, were *“races by naked women!* This and other indecencies and abominations, as the amusements of the camp at Fort Augustus, were patronised by his Royal Highness, and are formally attested by the Rev. James Hays of Inverness, and his testimony is only too well supported by others of unquestionable character and veracity.”

I don't give those historical facts as arguments. I merely quote them to show those who wish to adopt this style of argument, that English history can furnish a few vile specimens of humanity as well as Indian. And considering that the “Butcher of Culloden” was a Christian Prince, and the Nana, a heathen, a picture from the scenes described above would form no mean companion to one of Cawnpore. At least that is the opinion of.

W. F. M.

A FEW MORE REMARKS ON THE INDIAN POLICY
OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT AS IT
OUGHT TO BE, FOR THE CONSIDER-
ATION OF "K" AND OTHER
OPPONENTS OF THE C. P. C.
AMENDMENT
BILL.

To

THE EDITOR OF THE STATESMAN.

SIR,

Who is this d——d nigger? Such, Sir, was the exclamation that I heard in the office of one of the largest mercantile firms of this "City of Palaces" on the morning of the 3rd instant, the date on which you published the speech delivered by Mr. Lallmohun Ghose at Dacca, and the query combined in the exclamation referred to that gentleman. Now I do not intend to give the readers of the *Statesman* any particular history of that particular nigger. He ought to be pretty well known already, to all who have paid any attention to the Indian subjects discussed during the past five years. But, with your permission, I wish to say a few words to Europeans in general, and to all who use such language in particular, to protest in the strongest terms possible against the application of the term "*Nigger*" to our Indian fellow-subjects, and I plainly say to all who delight in the use of such expressions, that if a great change does not take place, and a more manly course of treating and speaking of the natives of the country take the place of the present harsh treatment and scurrilous epithets which are now considered the proper thing, I emphatically say this pride of race on the part of the European population will eventually pull down the British Empire in India. I need not go into details to prove this. The extracts which you have lately published from the life of Lord Lawrence will bring home my argument to all thinking men with tenfold more force than I could state it, and I am afraid no amount of

argument on the subject will ever cause unthinking Europeans in this country to pause and consider. But I would ask all right-thinking men to rigidly set their faces against the use of all such epithets and scurrilous phrases. I tell all plainly that the time has come when the natives of India must be considered "the sons, and not the bastards of England"; and the sooner that every official and non-official European in the country begins to recognise that fact, the better it will be for all; and to slightly paraphrase a couplet from Prior I say: "Be to their faults a little blind; be to their virtues very kind."

I see by a letter in your issue of the 4th Instant, that the righteous soul of Mr. A. W. Phipson has become grieved because you have called Lallmoh in Ghose *Mr.*, instead of *Baboo*. Verily, what next? Can cadism go much further than this? From the 2nd para of Mr. Phipson's letter, as I read it, I am afraid he is but a Brummagem sort of a Christian, notwithstanding his apparent zeal. However, I have no time to spare for further remarks on his letter. But I beg to crave space for a few words with my countryman "K." To commence, I must say I agree with him in his reply to "H. B." I also have no desire to see the Hooghly run into the Tames. I would rather see the Dee and the Don, aye, and the Spey too, flow into the Ganges. You see "K." I am Scotch as well as yourself, and Highland to boot, but although my heart still warms to the *tartan*, 40 years knocking about the world have very much broadened my views, so much so, that my Scotland has become the world and my clan the human race. With this premise, I will pass over the first three parās. which "K." devotes to my remarks, and come to the fourth, where he says: "I am not in the habit of reading police reports," &c. I suppose that to mean that such degrading literature as police reports, is unworthy of the attention of a person of "K's" refinement. Be that as it may, the case of Mrs. Field's ayah did not reach the public, thanks to the judge, while it could have been characterised as a police report; it only came to the notice of the public after it was promoted to the High Court. But that is another

point on which I wish to touch. I wish to ask "K" if he is above reading the reports of the courts, whence does he learn that perjury is the national vice of India? Perhaps from such sensational writers as Macaulay. If so, I beg to say that I consider a great deal of what Macaulay says on this point ought to be swallowed in small morsels with a good pinch of salt. And although Mr. Lallmohun Ghose says, with truth, that we have had too much of Macaulay, diluted and re-warmed up for the present discussion, already, still, not exactly for the edification of "K" but for the edification of a great number who think Macaulay is the proper authority to quote at present, I beg space for a few quotations from his History of England regarding my own countrymen. And I must promise that I quote from memory, and if I do paraphrase a little, I will keep near enough to the sense of the original for the present purpose. Writing about the state of the Highlands down till 1745, when Cumberland put the country to rights, and in describing what an English traveller would have found, Macaulay goes on to say, "In many dwellings
 "the furniture, the food, the clothing, nay, the very hair and
 "skin of his hosts, would have put an Englishman's philosophy to
 "the proof. His lodgings would have been in a hut with every
 "nook and corner swarming with vermin. At supper, grain fit
 "only for horses would have been set before him, accompanied by
 "a cake of blood drawn from living cows. Most of the company
 "with whom he would have feasted would have been covered
 "with a cutaneous eruption peculiar to Scotchmen, and others
 "would have been smeared with tar like sheep; while from his
 "couch he would have risen half-poisoned with stench, half blind
 "with the reek of turf, and half mad with the itch. When an
 "Englishman condescended to think of a Highlander at all, he
 "considered him as a filthy object, savage, a papist, a cut throat,
 "and a thief!" This is not an attractive picture. Surely after that, Scotchmen at least will not quote Macaulay as an authority. Does "K" admit the truth of the picture? I don't, and I consider myself something of an authority on that point, because I have listened when a boy to men and women in the glens of

Braemar, who were old enough to remember the rising of the clans in the forty five, and I have heard them describe what the country was like in their youth, and I believe it remained much the same till the Queen took up her residence at Balmoral in 1848. I have therefore no hesitation in saying that if there is a grain of truth in Macaulay's description, it is so much over drawn, that the few grains of truth could not be picked out from the bushels of falsehood. And his often-quoted phrases about the natives of India are on a par with those about the highlanders of Scotland.

Notwithstanding "K's" argument I can see no analogy whatever between the American Colonists of last century and the Europeans of the present day in India. In the first place, in most cases the American Colonists were men who had left their fatherland intending never to return to it, and in many cases shaking the very dust from their feet against the Governments of their native countries, going out to form a home of freedom and liberty in the far West; whereas the Europeans in India, as a rule, come to India to make as much money as possible in the shortest possible time, to enable them to return to their native country as soon as they have enough to enable them to live in a better state than before they came to India. This is true of at least nine-tenths of the non-officials, and the official class is just as bad. Their creed is, become a member of the Mutual Admiration Society, get as much leave during their service as possible, and when not on leave, do as little as possible for the fat salaries which they draw, untill the time arrives when they can retire on that allowance, which Dr. Johnson calls.—"An allowance made to any one without an equivalent, and generally means pay given to a state hireling for treason to his country." This is strong language I admit, but not a bit too strong for the class of men both official and non-official, who have opposed the present Bill. They are the class who, as aptly shown in the extracts you have lately published from the life of Lord Lawrence, raise such howls of indignation if the Government should dare to pass any measure of

justice to the two hundred and fifty millions of their fellow-subjects.

As "K" has put Knox and Melville, Cameron and Renwick into the witness box, I have examined them, and I cannot learn that they ever preached or shed their blood to establish a race of pale-faced Brahmins to usurp the place of the brown-faced ones, to govern and deny their just rights to the two hundred and fifty millions of India. If either Knox and Cameron were to rise from their graves and go along the Calcutta Strand-road on a Sunday morning, what would they see? Would they find our eminent Scotch firms keeping the day holy to the Lord? No, but their righteous souls would be vexed to see the examples set by Scotchmen in this heathen land. From day light till dark they would hear nothing but the clank of the donkey-engine loading and unloading steamers. The six days are not enough to pile up money fast enough, for the Indian money-grubbers men who *à la* the Glasgow Bank Directors, would rob the widow and the orphan, "to build a church to God" in Scotland, and profane his Sabaths and "laugh his word to scorn" in India "*Deo erexit Voltaire*" over again, plus a good deal more hypocrisy. If "K" sees any parallel between such men and the Pilgrim Fathers of America, I don't. "K" says "the duty of Government is to level up, not level down." Just so, I agree with him; and if he will look at the matter in dispute from the proper point of view, he will see that that is just what Government proposes to do, *viz.*, to level up a few native magistrates who have proved themselves worthy of the promotion to the same level as their European brethern on the bench.

But my time is short and your space is limited, I must, therefore, close this letter, and beg of you to let me continue the subject in another.

W. F. M.

THE REMARKS OF "W. F. M." CONTINUED.

To

THE EDITOR OF THE STATESMAN,

SIR,

In his letter under notice, "K" draws a most happy parallel between the Bengalis and Oliver Twist; not only the Bengalis, but the whole of the natives of India hold the same relation to the Europeans, as Oliver did to the fat beadle and the church wardens, and if they should dare to ask for more, we must call a meeting of the European Board in the Town Hall and howl them down again.

I think "K" will agree with me that there are only two ways of binding India to England. One is by the bands of force, and hitherto England has held those bands pretty tight, and India has, with the exception of a few convulsive struggles, submitted to her bands, and may still submit for some time to come. But if the bands of force are to continue, a day will come that India will sever them with the sword. That day may still be distant. I know the valour of British troops. I have seen them in victory, and I have seen them in defeat. I know the skill of many of our officers, and I believe that in a good cause England is still able to crush India to atoms. But all who have studied the history of the British conquest in India, know that it has not been with British troops alone that our battles have been fought and won. We have fought the Sikhs with Poorbeahs, and the Poorbiahs with Sikhs, and we have fought both with Goorkhas. But all who can read the signs of the times must see that mass education and a free press will render that impossible in future. Let all who think otherwise carefully read the late letters from "R. D. O." in the *Statesman*. If the law of force is to be continued, I can clearly see that the victory of England over India will be the victory of the Philistines over Samson. India may be kept bound and blind for a season, but her opportunity will one day come, when she will seize hold of the pillars of the State and pull down the British Empire with her.

I now come to the other and only way by which England can certainly bind India to her: that is, by the bands of justice, equality, and fraternity—I don't take these terms in the communistic sense, and by these bands you may bind India for ever. And with her fleet at sea, her volunteers at home, and a loyal and contented India, England might defy the world combined in arms against her.

I confess, I cling to Britain's traditional Imperial policy. But it must be a policy of freedom and justice, of equality and fraternity. Under these banners England will hold her proud position of creator and ruler of empires. Under these her influence, as a guiding and directing influence, in this great Anglo-Indian confederation or empire, will go on increasing. But I clearly see that the cultivation of such a spirit of patriotism among the official and non-official Europeans of this country will tax the skill and forbearance of successive Governments to the utmost. However, if the will be present, the way will be found and whatever changes may be brought about in our Indian constitution, loyalty to the throne must continue to be an essential quality, for natives and Europeans alike. For loyalty to the throne must continue to be the platform on which all must agree.

As quoted in my first letter "K" says we must level up, not down. I say so, too, but I am afraid I would level up much higher than "K" will be willing to agree with me. On the 1st January 1877, our gracious Queen was proclaimed Empress of India, and although a Liberal in politics, I heartily agreed with that part of Tory policy, but it did not go half far enough to meet my views. What did we do for any natives of India when we presumably attached this great Empire to the Throne of England? I believe we made the Maharajas Scindia and Cashmere Generals, and gave gold and silver medals to a few others. Now, I maintain that a great mistake was then made, and a grand opportunity for the levelling-up policy lost, not to occur again, unless advantage were to be taken of the time—May it still be distant—when the Prince of Wales may be proclaimed Emperor. Instead of the mean and paltry way in which the Government acted at that great and now historical ceremony, I say that every Raja

entitled to a salute of 19 guns ought to have been proclaimed a Prince of the British Empire, taking rank and precedence immediately after the Princes of the blood in England; and all the other Rajas ought to have been proclaimed Dukes, Marquesses, Earls, Viscounts, and Barons of the Empire according to their several ranks, with seats in the House of Lords when they might visit England, and there ought to have been at least 500 Baronets, created by Royal Letters Patent, selected from among the leading native gentlemen from each of the provinces of India. Then, instead of plain Mr. Lallmohun Ghose, he might have been Sir Lallmohun Ghose, Bart., K.C.S.I., &c., &c. If England had done this, she would have scored the four points—High, Low, Jack, and the Game—and Russia might have knocked at the North-Western gates of India till the day of doom. England could have defied her ever to enter. But as it is, we have got but a Brummagem Empire, and the sooner that England begin to remodel it on the above lines the better!

I am glad to see that the papers from England by the last mails that the battle of the Civil Procedure Code Amendment Bill is virtually won. Right has prevailed over rant, cant, and clap-trap. And the red-hot opponents of the measure have only succeeded in covering themselves with ignominy and the well-deserved contempt of all right-minded men. If “K” does not agree with me, let us sing “Tullochgorum together and lay our disputes all aside. What signifies for folks to chide for what’s been done before them. Let Whig and Tory all agree,” &c. If “K” does not like this, I will join him in a new chorus to the old Jacobite song and let us sing together—

“We’ll all be hanged and quartered, Sir,
And that you’ll soon see,
For there’s Native Judges on the bench,
Without the leave of me.”

Apologising for having taken up so much of your space, and if you should see fit to print this, I promise not to send you another affliction for a long time to come.

W. F. M.

**THE ROORKEE RESOLUTION AND ITS BEARING
ON THE CRIMINAL PROCEDURE CODE
AMENDMENT BILL.**

To

THE EDITOR OF THE STATESMAN,

SIR,

As a domiciled non-official European, I beg to thank you for your excellent short article supporting the *Indian Daily News* regarding the now notorious Roorkee Resolution. That unfortunate resolution is the only shred of truth which has made all the other lies and bluster against the Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Bill appear plausible, and it is to it that the opponents of the Bill owe all the support they have received from the unthinking portion of the Anglo-Indian and Eurasian community. The truth of a couplet from Tennyson has been well verified in this matter, viz.—

“A-lie that is all a lie, may be met and fought out-right,
“But lie with an atom of truth in it, it is a harder matter to fight.”
And this Mr. Branson well knew, when, from the top of his stump in the Town Hall, he proclaimed to the applauding mob that “Louis Cavagnari died by the hand of an assassin, and if he had left a son, and if his assassin had also left a son, the son of the assassin would be preferred for Government employ, to the son of him who gave his life for his country (groans and hisses).”

Although this is a piece of clap-trap reasoning, still I think Mr. Branson was partly right, but not in the sense that he intended his hearers to understand him. Sir Louis Cavagnari, was a covenanted servant of the Government, holding a high position, and not claiming to be domiciled in India; and I don't see that, if he had left a son, such son could have had any claim to the cheap education, and appointments set apart for such an institution as the Roorkee Engineering College. Any one comparing the expense of an engineering education in

England with that of Roorkee will understand where the advantage lies. And, *en passant*, I may remark that the Roorkee trained engineers have proved themselves equal to those from home. I am told—I don't know personally—that Mr. F. S. O'Callaghan, who has just completed the Attock Bridge, is a Roorkee trained engineer. However, the point I wish to come to is that, all along, I have thought there has been an error in the wording, or in the interpretation put on the order of the Secretary of State, now firmly stereotyped in the minds of every Anglo-Indian and Eurasian as the infamous Roorkee Resolution of Lord Ripon. A friend in London informed me of this resolution some months before it was published in India, and he considered it a most just regulation, and a good thing for all domiciled Europeans and Eurasians with families. But at the time he wrote, my friend informed me that the intention of the framers of the resolution was to prevent the officers of Government, civil or military, in high positions and not domiciled in India, taking advantage of the cheap education of the Indian Engineering Colleges for their sons, instead of sending them to England, being expected, from the liberal salaries paid to such servants, to have ample means to do so; and that the intention of the framers of the resolution was to confine all appointments to the Public Works Department, through the Roorkee College and other Engineering Colleges, to the natives of the country according to qualifications, whether of Asiatic race or the sons of Europeans and Eurasians domiciled as permanent residents of India. And that no appointment would be given to the son of any European not so domiciled, unless it should ever happen that there were more vacancies than there were passed candidates of the aforementioned classes to fill them; in such cases the remaining appointments might be given to Europeans whose parents were not domiciled in India.

Now, notwithstanding all that has been said and written on this—for the present policy of Government—unfortunate resolution, I still think it will yet come out that it has either been wrongly

worded by some clerk who did not understand the subject or the intention of the framers of the resolution, or an interpretation has been put on it not intended.*

Whether I am right in this opinion or not, I hope you will allow me space to make a few remarks on the culpability of the men who have made this resolution the lever by which they have been able to mislead so many of the Anglo-Indians and Eurasians regarding the justness of the Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Bill—especially the Eurasian part of the community. I boldly tell every domiciled European and Eurasian that their utmost support ought to have been given to the Bill, and not to the other side, for the time is coming that every Indian domiciled European and Eurasian must be legally classed as natives of India, and if any of these men were to go to England and pass for the Civil Service, and rise to the position of District Magistrate, would they like an English loafer to be legally able to prove that they were not qualified to sit in judgement on him? And I here beg to tell them that, as the law at present stands, a Chandney-Chowk Loafer, who could prove that he had been born in Great Britain or Ireland or in any of the colonies, could legally do so. To prove my assertion, one fact is worth pages of argument. The facts of the following case are well known to many in Calcutta, but for obvious reasons, I will not mention names. In 1869, a young man of one of the most respected Eurasian families in Calcutta was charged with the crime of dacoity, along with ten of his zemindary servants, and, *en pass ant*, I may remark that I, for one, and most people who knew the family, believed it to be a false charge concocted by the police. I believe the only atom of truth in the charge was the fact that, when first arrested, the young man's servants rescued him, and gave a good thrashing to the European superintendent of police, who vindictively tortured this into an attempt to murder him. However, the case was such

* We are afraid there is no mistake about the meaning. At any rate, there was correspondence enough about the Resolution before it was published to have made the meaning tolerably clear.—Ed., S.

that the prosecution feared, if it went before a Jury of the High Court, they would not obtain a conviction, and therefore they refused to allow the defendant to claim trial as a British-born subject, and he was classed as a native, and tried along with his servants, and sentenced to ten years' penal servitude by the lower court at Alipore, and the law under which this was done is still in force, which is to the effect that before Anglo-Indians or Eurasian can claim to be British-born subjects, they may be required to prove legitimacy back to their great-grand-fathers. In the case under notice, the accused was able to prove his legitimacy by the marriage certificates of his father and grand father, but unable to prove the marriage of his great-grand-father, and for that reason, when the prosecution deemed it for their interest to do so, he was classed as a native. Now, I will ask every Anglo-Indian or Eurasian who may read this, can they prove the legitimacy of their great-grand-father? If not, it is their interest to support the Civil Procedure Code Amendment Bill, along with your—

GAMIN DE BON ACCORD.

NON-OFFICIAL EUROPEANS AND THE CRIMINAL PROCEDURE CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

To

THE EDITOR OF THE INDIAN MIRROR.

SIR,

It was with great pleasure that I read the letter of Sir J. B. Phear to the *Times*, reproduced in your paper a few days ago. But as a non-official European of close on thirty years' experience in India, I beg you will allow me space to protest against the opinion that this deeply-to-be-deplored out burst of race-feeling has taken its rise among the non-official Europeans. Such a statement is a libel on the non-official community, and I, for one, boldly plead not guilty to the charge, and demand an acquittal, and on the part of myself and every non-official European in the

country who will think for himself and will not be led by one or two insane editors and an interested clique—I have no hesitation in telling Sir J. B. Phear and the Government of India, too, that the whole of the opposition to the Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Bill was begotten and nursed in the Bar Library of the High Court of Calcutta—and the non-official Europeans have been misled into taking part in the excitement by false statements. As I said in a former letter, the interested clique, whose pride of race—they have little else to be proud of—has been hurt by this Bill coming so soon after Mr. Justice Mitter had been made Officiating Chief Justice, knew perfectly well that they dared not themselves openly oppose the Bill under their own names and official position, and knowing well the inflammable material they have at hand, raised the false cry of an Englishman's right being in danger, a Black Act, &c., &c., knowing well how the mob would rally to such a cry. But, in spite of all this and the Town Hall Meeting to boot, with all its cant and clap-trap, I maintain that not one in ten of the rubbish of letters against the Bill which have appeared in the *Englishman* and *Indian Daily News*, have been written by non-official Europeans; but, instead, they are the productions of the clique who have been base enough to pander to this contemptible and un-English race-cry by concealing themselves under different *nom de plume* to mislead those at a distance, like Sir J. B. Phear, into the belief that this outburst has sprung from the non-official Europeans.

One correspondent in the *Englishman* under the *nom de plume*, “Britannicus,”—Catalina would have been in more appropriate *nom de plume*,—has been especially bitter against the Bill. I recollect one of his letters in which he twitted the Editor of a Calcutta Native paper about his identity in which he said he might be the famous (I think the prefix is mine) “Number one.” I have no wish to unveil “Britannicus,” but he may rest assured that he is no second Junius come to judgement, and that many more

than he suspects know perfectly well who he is. "Britannicus" is a man who holding a high position under the Government of his country, has lent his talents and lowered the dignity of that position to stir up a race-feeling by screening himself under a *nom de plume* to make it appear that he is non-official European, because he dare not play such a *role* under his own name, and continue to draw about Rs. 4,000 per month for stirring up treason against his country and the Government which he has sworn to faithfully serve.

Before closing, allow me to say a few words to the clique who are rejoicing so much that, by the exercise of a questionable power, they have been able to get Surendra Nath Banerji locked up in jail. They think they have gained a victory; and, doubtless, it was a fine spirit of English patriotism that actuated the European Barristers to refuse to accept a brief for his defence. Verily the Calcutta Bar are to be commended. Their action in Surendra Nath's case in particular, and their opposition to the Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Bill in general, goes a great way to confirm the following opinion of a celebrated Statesman, expressed in the House of Lords forty-five years ago, who said:—"Regarding lawyers in general my opinion is, let a man's understanding be as bright as it may, let his genius be what it may, that profession—the profession of the law—does little else but cramp the understanding and fetter the mental faculties, and that almost universally." Thus spoke Viscount Melbourne, Prime Minister of England, in his famous speech on the Canada Government Act Declaratory Bill, 10th August 1838, in the second year of the reign of our gracious Queen and Empress Victoria. And in this the 47th year of her reign the lawyers of Calcutta have done a great deal to prove the correctness of the above opinion, and to bring lasting disgrace on the English name; but this fever of insanity will not last—lucid intervals of increasing duration are now setting in, and I venture to predict that before long a return to actual sanity on the part of all thinking non-official Europeans will take the place of the present fever, and then Surendra Nath Banerji will

find that there are many Europeans who, to slightly parody the words of brave old Daniel De Foe in his hymn to the Pillory, consider that his imprisonment is no disgrace. And that the men who rejoice to see him in jail—

“ Are scandals to the times
Are at a loss to find his guilt
And can't commit his crimes ”

And I sincerely pray, for the good and honor of my country, that the opinion of Her Majesty's Privy Council will be the same as that of your correspondent

GAMIN DE BON ACCORD.

THE PRESENT AGITATIONS AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE COUNTRY.

To

THE EDITOR OF THE STATESMAN.

SIR,

You refused to publish my last affliction on this subject, because I made use of too strong language. I plead guilty. To quote the words which Voltaire in his tragedy of *Brutus* puts into the mouth of Titus :—

“ J'aime avec transport, je hais avec furie :
Je suis extrême en tout, je l'avoue.”

I cannot help it ; where I feel strongly, I am a little too apt to call things and actions by their proper names, and in honest truth, I believe this is no time for mincing matters. But I submit to your cooler head and better matured judgement, and will try and not offend again, and trust you will forgive me for the past, and allow me to add my quota to the remarks of RE-ACTION in your's of the 7th instant. I will not quote any particular part of his letter. I agree with every word of it. It also gave me great pleasure to see a letter of Mr. Allan Hume to the *Pioneer*, and the *Daily News*, reproduced in your's of the 7th and 9th instant. In a crisis like the present, such letters from one in the position of Mr. Hume do yeoman's service and something more.

But I take exception to one part of Mr. Hume's letter to the *Daily News*. He says, "Will England allow herself to be bullied out of what is clearly simple Justice by an insignificant Coterie of, at the outside, 5,000 Englishmen."

Now as a non-official European who has closely studied this question, which you, I think, can testify, I object to the above figures and would ask Mr. Hume to amend them, and substitute FIVE SCORE for five thousand, and that I believe would be over the mark. Doubtless, a far greater number than 5,000 names can be shown by the opponents of the Bill. But who are they? They are, to quote the words of the Prayer Book, composed of all sorts and conditions of men—all creeds and colors too. But if all the names attached to the monster petition, for instance, were to be closely analysed, it would be found that 90 per cent. of them are not "as by law established" entitled to a vote, and nine of the remaining ten per cent. would be found to be men who have no opinions of their own, but who have allowed themselves to be misled by the small clique who have *Messrs. Britannicus, Branson* and *Keswick* for their gods. I was glad to see that you noticed the fact a few days ago that, until lately, the belief was almost universal amongst native society that "Britannicus" and Mr. Justice Norris were synonymous. Allow me to tell you that that is still the opinion of many gentlemen of education who may be classed as leaders of the people, and who do not know Mr. Justice Norris personally; and this opinion is the unknown factor that has so much stirred the feelings of the people against the action of the High Court in Surendro Nath's case. I venture to say that 12 months ago the idol case would have passed without notice; and I am sorry for the sake of both England and India to have to admit that the Judges increased the race bitterness by their action. I am afraid it is but too true that Mr. Justice Norris showed his colours rather conspicuously, to say the least, for one of Her Majesty's Judges of the High Court, when Mr. Branson was gibbeting the honor and reputation of him and his countrymen in the Town Hall—as RE-ACTION so well puts it,

However, at the time of the trial of Surendro Nath, was Sir Richard Garth aware that Mr. Justice Norris and "Britannicus" were believed to be identical? If so, it was certainly the evil genius of the High Court that suggested to him to reject the apology, and send Surendro Nath to Jail. If he was in ignorance of this fact, then he must see now what an opportunity he has lost. Sir Richard Garth might have then wiped out the whole of the bitter feeling against the High Court, and not only earned the gratitude of two hundred and fifty millions of his fellow subjects, but have re-established the Bench of his Court to the place which it occupied in the native mind, before the honor of some of its Judges was dragged in the dust by their action in the trials of Ameer Khan and others, who were obnoxious to the then executive. I am afraid the historian of that period will have to admit that the High Court did not then stand between a vindictive Executive and its victims. However, that is past; let it be buried. Of course, as you have said, the opinion that Mr. Justice Norris and "Britannicus" are one is absurd. All who can judge from the internal evidence of the letters themselves must see that the *howls* of "Britannicus" proceed from the jungles of Central India, and not from the High Court of Calcutta; although I am sorry to have to admit these howls are but two strongly re-echoed from that quarter. I am treading on dangerous ground, and must *gang warily*. But I hope you will permit me to tell such writers as "Britannicus" plainly that they do not know what they are doing. They appear to know nothing of the depth of feeling evoked by all classes of the native community by the present agitation. I know a little of it, and I say plainly that that since the Town Hall meeting, the state of the country has become such that it only now requires a *greased cartidge* to fire the mine, and this is mainly due to such writers as "Britannicus" and the editors of a portion of the Anglo-Indian press who have become members of the *anti-native clique*, and if it were not for the faith that the leaders of native society have in the personal character and justice

of Lord Ripon and the Honorable Major Baring, with a few others, the crisis would be a serious one for the Government of the country. Instead of being the guilty cause of stirring up this race animosity, it is the well-known personal character of Lord Ripon *alone* that has acted as the antidote to the insane action of the anti-native clique; or I fear we would have had an explosion before now. When one thinks of the pusillanimous action of the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal who (as RE-ACTION so well puts it) has been "found out," one is inclined to exclaim, "oh, for an hour of Sir Ashley Eden or even Sir George Cambells" if either of these had steered the boat "Bengal" they would, I venture to say, long ago have put down this insane opposition to the Procedure Bill—by the servants of Government at least. And that means the entire opposition, for I maintain that the non-officials have merely joined in the cry like a pack of hungry Jackals after a wounded deer. But now the situation has become such that should the advisers of the Earl of Kimberley and the Marquis of Ripon be so blind, or so weak, as to advise the withdrawal of the Bill, or even great alterations in it, I firmly "beleive that before ten year's pass, there will be a rebellion in India; that the mutiny was but as "*Beaconfields' fire works*" in comparison to what it will be, and it may end in a *revolution*, and India may thus become to England what South America has become to Spain.

One good thing the present excitement had done, it has enabled all who can discern the signs of the times to, in some measure, gauge the political progress made among all classes of the people by mass education and a free vernacular press. And I tell those who don't think of such things that the progress made is enormous; comparing 1857 with 1883 is like comparing the time of William the Conqueror and the present day in England. At least that is the result of about 30 year's study of the Subject by your.

GAMIN DE BON ACCORD.

THE TACTICS OF ANTI-NATIVE CLIQUE.

To

THE EDITOR OF THE STATESMAN,

SIR,

Every loyal subject, who has the good of India and England at heart, must be grateful to you for the fearless manner in which you have spoken out in your articles on Mr Banerjis' case and the Anti-Native clique in the *Statesman* of the 13th Instant. In the last para. of the article regarding the suspicion that lately possessed the native community, that a crusade was about to be undertaken against the native press, you say, "We suppose their vexation has been soothed by the prosecution of the" *Bengalee*." I venture to tell you that your supposition is wrong. The clique are by no means soothed by that now historical but as far as their intentions were concerned abortive blunder. From their point of view, the only favourable feature in the whole affair was the school boy *émeute*, and how much they have tried to make of that bit of boyish foolishness, let the inspired telegrams to the *Times* testify. However, the tactics are by no means to be given up. I have reason to believe that every-thing possible will be tried with the deliberate intention of goading native society into retaliation, and I beg to warn the editors of native papers published in English, and every native who can read English, to set their faces like a flint against any thing like a physical force *émeute* or even retaliation in print, no matter what the provocation may be. Let the concluding para. of your article on the new method which is to be tried on Lord Ripon be engraven on the heart of every native worthy of the name of patriot, viz., "He that ruleth his own spirit is greater than he that taketh a city, and in the present contest, it is the party that best exercises self restraint in word and act that will triumph."

Of course, you will have seen the expurgated edition of the Town Hall speeches, lately issued from the *Englishman* press. That

edition is now to be taken as the text by which the Anti-Native clique are to swear. Witness the barefaced assertions of "Britannicus" in some of his latest productions, that nothing but the most correct and gentlemanly language was used on that occasion. But this is all part of a set plan to provoke retaliation. The scandalous attack on Mr. Budroodeen Tyabjee by this same "Britannicus" published in the *Englishman* of the 24th May, is also in furtherance of the common object. But although I caution every gentleman worthy of being considered a leader of the people against meeting abuse by abuse, still there is one mode of retaliation that I should like to see adopted with such as "Britannicus." That is, for the leaders of the people to form a society and collect funds, and have "Britannicus" and such as he who are public servants of the Crown, impeached in Parliament for their share in this Anti-native agitation.

Allow me now to say a few words to all domiciled Europeans and Eurasians. I tell them one and all that their interest in the present crisis is to boldly side with the Indians, and not to allow themselves to be misled by the Anti-native clique. Let all of whatever race or parentage, born and domiciled in India, boldly come forward and call themselves Indians, ceasing to use the term *native* which in the mouths of many has become a term of semi-reproach. Therefore, I say, let every one who has adopted India as his country boldly call himself an Indian,—and the term will soon become as common and as honorable as a "Canadian" or an "Australian." Why should the Eurasian be ashamed to own himself to be child of the soil?—Away with such empty pride, worse than vanity. I tell them plainly that their own and their children's interest is the same as that of the purely Asiatic races of the country. Let them declare themselves to be the legitimate sons of India, where by their talents, mental and physical, and in many cases by their social positions, they can claim to be leaders of the people. But, on the other hand, if they are to hang on for ever to the skirts of the Europeans, and join with them in

every race question, they are only playing the game of those who will ever consider the Eurasians as the political bastards of Europe and Asia ; whereas if they are true to themselves, I maintain that they are now in a position to turn the scales, and to prove their birth-right as legitimate sons of the soil.

This, Sir, you may consider strong language, but it is the truth, and a time like the present requires the truth to be spoken. So much for the Eurasian and domiciled European portion of the community. I now wish to address a few words to the leaders of native society, and the editors of the native press, both English and Vernacular. I wish them, one and all, to boldly speak out, and give an unqualified condemnation of the infamous Roorkee resolution of the Secretary of State for India. I know that the leaders of the people don't desire such a resolution. They ask for no more favourable position than that of the domiciled European or Eurasian. All that they desire from the English Government is "a fair field and no favour." On every possible chance since the Town Hall meeting, I have been fighting on the side of the principle at stake in the passing of the Procedure Bill, and I eternally get this Roorkee resolution thrown at my head as a test problem, and many will argue with me that the natives asked for it at the same time as the Procedure Bill was asked for. I therefore ask the editors of the native press to boldly speak out, and tell both the Government and the opponents of the Bill that they have never asked for, neither do they desire, such a resolution. In real truth, I firmly believe this unfortunate resolution to have been the work of an enemy, some concealed member of the Anti-native clique in the Indian Council, who knew that the Procedure Bill was coming on, and therefore got this most unjust resolution brought out to form the only handle of truth that could be laid hold on as an argument against the Bill, and one that was certain to raise up the whole of the Anglo-Indian and Eurasian community against the action of the Government; and which gives a colouring of

truth to the "Oliver Twist" style of argument, that the Bengalee is still calling for more.

I have discribed the position. Let the editors of the Indian ~~press~~ and the leaders of the people calmly and firmly do their duty, and I for one have no fear but Lord Ripon will stand to his guns as long as there is a shot in the locker, and when the last cartridge is fired, let him imitate his countrymen at Inkerman, and fight with the sponge staff—is the advice of

ANTI BRITANNICUS.

RELEASE OF BABU SURENDRANATH BANERJIE ON THE 4TH OF JULY.

To

THE EDITOR OF THE "INDIAN MIRROR"

SIR,

There is an American tradition, of which I have read, but can not now recollect where, that on the 4th July 1727 a bell was cast in the city of Bristol, England, bearing the following prophetic motto on its ample curve :— "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof," and just seven weeks of years after that date, *viz.*, on the 4th of July 1776, from the tower of the Hall of Independance, Philadelphia, that same bell with its iron tongue proclaimed the birth of a new nation in the Western world, *viz.*, the Republic of the United States of America, a nation which, in the words of the historian of the period, had "Defiance to tyrants emblazoned in empyreal light upon her brow and Freedom and Justice for frontlets between her eyes. Monarchs crowned with kingly diadems stood awed at the august manifesto and at the solemn arraignment of King George before the Judgement of mankind and Parliaments and Cabinets started in dismay to their feet; but the people as they descried the eagle of liberty spreading her wings and soaring proudly aloft, breathed freer and took stronger heart as the clear ring of her Voice sounded through the air, declaring with grandly rounded enunciation that 'all men are created equal'!"

Just 107 years after that event Surendronath Banerji has been released from Jail where he was confined for using what many consider the just rights of freedom of criticism. I don't mean to draw an inference that the date is ominous for the *prestige* or supremacy of British power in the East. But I would ask many of my countrymen, who rejoiced so much when Surendronath was locked up and who can not conceal their chagrin that his freedom has been gained so soon, to pause and look back 107 years and consider, if they are still fit to consider anything, whether George the Third and his Ministers or the Patriots of America form the most worthy or the most prominent figures in the Pantheon of history. And instead of continuing in this mad career of hatred to, and vilification of, our fellow Indian subjects, I would ask them rather to rejoice that another Europe is rising in the East, and that in future ages, it will be the glory of the English nation to have sown in India the seeds of Independence of Thought, of Freedom and Liberty, of Virtue and Science; and I sincerely hope and pray that it may prove to be also of Piety and true Christianity which alone constitute the prosperity of nations and the happiness of human race. I for one heartily welcome Surendro Nath Banerji once more to liberty and for the future I hope he will let the memory of the past, act as a light, a warning bell, of sunken rocks and shoals to tell, and may his future life thus be unruffled as the Summer's Sea, useful to all wherever he roams until his Father calls him home,—is the sincere wish of your

GAMIN DE BON ACCORD.

P. S.—This was intended to have been sent to you in time for publication on the 4th July, the day of Mr Banerji's release. But on second thoughts I kept it back, and should not have inflicted your readers with it now, if I had not seen that the authorities of Barrakpore have been making an exhibition of them-

selves, I therefore, determined, to have a *hee haw ! hee haw !! hee haw !!!* in opposition.

GAMIN DE BON ACCORD.

THE CALCUTTA VOLUNTEERS,

To

THE EDITOR OF THE STATESMAN,

SIR,

Regarding the language used on the subject of the Ilbert Bill by many men calling themselves Volunteers, I would beg to remind them that, as volunteers they are bound to class themselves with the Militray servants of the Government, and when, as Volunteers, they may venture to discuss the acts of Government or to connect themselves with any party association under any circumstance or upon any pretence whatever, they incur a heavy responsibility, and expose themselves to the heaviest blame. There are but few Military men in the country who will recollect the time when Colonel Thomas, of the 20th Regiment, was nearly losing his commission for having listened to a disloyal speech at a political dinner, when the late Lord Hill was Commander-in-Chief and the late Sir Charles Napier Commanding the Northern District in 1839. But as an old soldier I would recommend the Horse Guards orders on that subject to the study of every Volunteer Officer in India.

GAMIN DE BON ACCORD.

THE ILBERT BILL: A HISTORICAL COMPARISON.

To

THE EDITOR OF THE STATESMAN,

Sir,

In the name of every man who considers freedom and liberty to be the birth-right of the human race, without reference to

complexion or the colour of their skin, I beg to thank you for your articles on the Ilbert Bill; and I hope you will allow me to call the attention of the opponents of the proposed amendment of the law, to the following historical parallels. In 1825 the aristocracy of England were unanimous in repealing the duty on the silks and laces of Paris and Brussels, so that the peeresses might visit Almack's and the Drawing rooms in duty-free finery. But when it was proposed to apply the same principles to the abundant corn and provisions of Russia, Poland and the United States, to enable the starving mechanics and labourers of England to enjoy cheap food, the principles of free-trade were at once repudiated, and the aristocracy almost to a man rose against the repeal of the corn laws. It is also worth remembering that the great towns of Birmingham, Manchester and Leeds in which the demand for cheap food was loudest, were then without any voice in the legislature of the country. And such is the case to-day, with the two hundred-and-fifty millions of India. All history is full of agitation similar to that which is exciting India to-day. In every country, a portion of the people which had formerly been of no account, expands and becomes strong. It demands a place in the national system, not in accordance with its former weakness, but suited to its present strength. If this just demand is granted, all is well; but if it is refused and resisted, then comes the struggle that ends in revolution. Such was the struggle between the patricians and plebeians of Rome and of the Italian allies for admission to the full rights of Roman citizens. Such was the struggle of the North American Colonies against the mother country such was the struggle of the *Tiers État* of France against the aristocracy of birth there. Such was that of the Catholics of Ireland, against the aristocracy of creed. And such is the struggle which the Government of Lord Ripon and the people of India, are called on to wage against an aristocracy of—shall I say *colour* or *skin*? the most contemptible of all the aristocracies that ever yet claimed superiority over their fellow-men.

The teaching of history is that the fall of all the free states that ever existed on earth, has been owing to the obstinate resistance of a small privileged class to the extension of equal privileges to the great mass of the people. Mr. Arbuthnot in his late speech makes a great deal of the fact that the greater part of the members of the Mutual Admiration Society of India are against the Ilbert Bill. But he ignores the other fact that a great member of these patriotic gentlemen are men who would accept of, and who actually strive for, honours without merit, places without duty, and pensions without service; and the sooner this bureaucracy is swept away, the better it will be for India and England too. This patriotic bureaucracy, which is so ready to prate about *Black Acts* and the birth-right of Englishmen, has too long repressed every wholesome and invigorating reform in the country, and their present opposition is merely the old cry of "our craft is in danger." If the opponents of the Ilbert Bill had confined themselves to demanding some security from the Government that none but men of known and tried ability should be invested with the powers that the Bill proposes to confer, they would have gained the respect and support of every man, native or European, whose support is worth having; but the way in which the opposition has been conducted, has clearly shown that the opponents of the measure are unworthy of any consideration whatever.

GAMIN DE BON ACCORD.

THE OPPOSITION TO THE ILBERT BILL,
To
THE EDITOR OF THE STATESMAN,
Sir,

In the *Statesman* of the 3rd instant there is a letter signed AN ENGLISH CHURCHMAN in which the writer says, "I have long felt that there was something besides race antagonism in the opposition to the Ilbert Bill, and that that something was

religion." AN ENGLISH CHURCHMAN has hit the right nail on the head this time, more evenly than he thinks. Religion has had a great deal to do in stirring up the rabid opposition we see to the Bill, but not exactly in the sense in which AN ENGLISH CHURCHMAN draws his deductions. The fact is, if this miserable Bill had been introduced by a Viceroy like our late one, it would have met with little or no opposition. In fact, I believe it would have been pointed to by at least nine-tenths of its present opponents, as a great measure of English Liberalism, of which we all ought to be proud. But unfortunately for the Bill, it was introduced by a Catholic Viceroy. If the Bill had been introduced by an avowed unbeliever it would have been hailed by many so-called Protestants, as a great measure of Liberalism and equality of all our fellow subjects in the eye of the law. But the obnoxious fact is that it has been introduced by a Catholic, and not only a Catholic, but a recent convert to Catholicism—yea, a convert from the opposit pole of Catholicism.

The Grand Master of English Freemasons dared to think for himself, and because he conscientiously believed that the Catholic Church was the true Apostolic Church, he had the boldness to abjure both the mystic touch of the masonic fraternity and his Protestant faith, and has thereby shown himself to be a man who feared God and who has nothing else to fear. And when this man was selected for the highest office under the British Crown, a howl of indignation went up from the mis-named Protestants of Tory England and Ultra Tory-India. Indignation meetings were held, and the protests of a clique, mis-named Protestant, were re-echoed in Parliament and in the Press, without any effect on the policy of Mr. Gladstone. And then to crown all, this Catholic Viceroy who, it was prophesied, would bring ruin on the whole British Empire, proved such a success that no Church of England, or Presbyterian dog dared wag his tongue against him. The Protestant or rather Orange

clique found themselves powerless. Then came the Ilbert Bill. This was their chance, and how that chance, was seized on, let the Town Hall meeting and the columns of the *Calcutta Englishman*, *Daily News*, and *Pioneer* testify. Meetings were held in the Bar Library and elsewhere in Calcutta, at which no Catholic was admitted. Secret machinery was set to work, and the cry of a "Black Act" and the birth-right of British-born subjects was raised, and every misnamed Protestant cur joined the mongrel pack in this patriotic howl. The great apostles of the clique, Lord Lytton and Mr. Ashmead Bartlett, were elected to represent the matter in Parliament.. But I need not go on. Your readers know all this as well as I do. But the astonishing fact is that the Catholic community almost to a man, fell into the misnamed Protestant trap, and the Eurasians, both Protestant and Catholic, have been entrapped into signing the monster petition, and have thereby signed away either the birth-right of themselves, their children, or grandchildren.

Your space will not permit me to enlarge on this subject; but before it is too late, I beg to ask every Catholic to examine the matter for himself, and to enable him to understand it a little more clearly, let him look back to the time when a *pucca* Protestant, William Cobbett, almost single handed was fighting the battle of Catholic emancipation with bull-dog pertinacity; let him closely study how Orange lodges were then worked, to deprive many millions of Englishmen, and more than two-thirds of the people of Ireland, of their political and religious rights. Yea, even to exclude the Princess Victoria from the throne. In 1835 a league was formed with that Ultra Tory and enemy of liberalism, the late Duke of Cumberland at its head for this very purpose, and the repeal of the Catholic Emancipation Bill. The loyalty of the Army was tampered with. Orange lodges were formed all over England and the north of Ireland and in over sixty regiments of the army. I cannot take up your.

columns repeating history, but all who desire to know the facts will find them in the Parliamentary debates on the motion of Mr. Finn in May 1835. And when the eyes of the country were opened, and the Orange lodges dissolved, the leaders declared that they could work the same treason, under the guise of Freemasonry.

As for the Eurasians who signed that petition, they have, in ignorance of how the present law stands, been signing away the birth-right of themselves and children. The opposition Clique were glad enough to accept their assistance in this attempt to upset the righteous policy of Lord Ripon, but if the Eurasians wish to know how much they are loved by the European, they have only to read the late trial of Pigot *Versus* Hastie, and I think they will come to the conclusion that Miss Pigot's chief crime was that she was a "half caste," and unfortunately was placed over the virtuous, pure, European Miss Smale. But enough.

GAMIN DE BON ACCORD.

P. S.—Since writing the above, I have received the able pamphlet by the Calcutta Correspondent of the *Dundee Advertiser*, and I cannot let this go to you without saying "Well done, my countryman." I have also to thank, a LOYAL SCOTCHMAN AND A CHIEL AMANG YE for their able assistance. When your GAMIN from the good city of BON ACCORD *alias* Aberdeen, commenced to write on this subject, he was almost alone and he is now truly glad to see that there are still a few sane countrymen in India.

GAMIN DE BON ACCORD.

Note.—Our correspondent comes some-what late into the fray, but he dashes in with such vigour, and lays about him to such purpose, that we cannot forego the pleasure of seeing him fight. We hope, however, there will be no retort, as it can do no good. We do seriously ourselves fear that Lord Ripon's withdrawal from the Protestant communion, and from the Masonic body has been the real cause of much of his unpopularity. It is, not worthy, my masters!—E d., S.

